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Introduction

Mississippi Bend Area Education Agency developed a strategic five-year (2011-2016) Comprehensive Improvement Plan. The Plan is designed to achieve the Agency’s three student learning goals, accomplish the Agency’s teaching and learning mission, and adhere to the Iowa Code mandated AEA Service Standards. The Plan will be operationalized through four connected action plans. These four connected action plans reflect an inclusive approach to successfully meet the needs of schools, school districts, customers, and other stakeholders.

The Agency has established four Building Blocks and corresponding action plans have been designed for each Building Block. These Building Blocks were identified through an extensive exploratory process. The process included consulting support by national and international education experts, a review of literature and research, input from internal and external stakeholders, and the alignment of actions to goals, mission, and Iowa Code AEA mandates. The Building Blocks are: Iowa Core, AEA Budget, Reorganization, and CAPS. Iowa Core is ensuring all students are successful in achieving the essential student learning standards. AEA budget is sustaining priority programs and services to maximize implementation effectiveness. Reorganization is guaranteeing AEA programs and services are effectively and efficiently delivered to customers. CAPS is assuring AEA staff have the skills and expertise to deliver high quality services to customers.

**COMPREHENSIVE IMPROVEMENT PLAN**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Plan</th>
<th>Building Block</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Iowa Core</td>
<td>To improve teaching and learning through active partnerships that increase low socioeconomic, minority, and students with disabilities subgroup reading, mathematics, and science performance and achievement, the strategy is to assist schools and school districts with implementing effective instructional practices, developing leadership skills, and enhancing media and technology utilization to meet their needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>AEA Budget</td>
<td>To sustain quality programs and services through a budgetary process that aids the coordination, implementation, and measurement of the Agency’s Comprehensive Improvement Plan, the strategy is to use an agency-wide budgetary process to ensure priority programs and services are fully resourced to sustain school, district, and customer support of improvement efforts that meet their needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Reorganization</td>
<td>To improve service delivery at the classroom level through integrated and customized programs and services by interconnected specialized platforms, the strategy is to use Partnership Agreements, Enhance Service Delivery System, and media/technology tools to better serve the needs of each school, district, and customer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>CAPS Comprehensive Aligned Personnel System</td>
<td>To build internal capacity to deliver high quality services through finding, developing, and retaining staff with highly specialized expertise, the strategy is to recruit, select, induct, mentor, supervise, evaluate, retain, and advance staff to maximize their ability to deliver services to schools, districts and customers.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Action Plans A, B, C, and D are connected and aligned to the Agency’s Goals, Mission, and AEA Service Standards. These action plans will be measured using a strategic management Balanced Scorecard with regular progress evaluations. The anticipated outcome will be accelerated student learning and higher levels of learning for all students. The Agency is confident the Plan meets the needs of schools, districts, customers, and stakeholders.
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Comprehensive Improvement Plan
Executive Summary

The mission of the Mississippi Bend Area Education Agency (MBAEA) is to improve teaching and learning for all students through active partnerships and assertive leadership in a climate of mutual respect. The Board of Directors re-adopted and renewed its commitment to the current agency-wide reading, mathematics, and science student learning goals.

Agency-Wide Goals

Increase the percentage of low socioeconomic, minority, and individualized plan students achieving reading proficiency in grades 3-8 and 11.

Increase the percentage of low socioeconomic, minority, and individualized plan students achieving mathematics proficiency in grades 3-8 and 11.

Increase the percentage of low socioeconomic, minority, and individualized plan students achieving science proficiency in grades 5, 8, and 11.

Mississippi Bend Area Education Agency first adopted these three student learning goals in 2000 and re-adopted in 2006. The baseline proficiency subgroup rates were established in 2001.

The Board of Directors re-committed to the current agency-wide goals for the following reasons: a) current goals have not yet been satisfactorily achieved; b) Iowa’s mandated student achievement targets for schools and school districts have not yet been adequately accomplished; c) needs assessment data indicate schools and school districts do not yet have the system capacity to eliminate subgroup achievement gaps; and d) Iowa’s State Board of Education’s early childhood, K-12, and postsecondary student learning goals have not yet been fully realized. The Board of Directors agreed these reasons were a justification for their unanimous decision.

These goals were established 10 years ago. The goals responded to school and school district teaching and learning needs. MBAEA efforts have had positive student learning results for low socioeconomic and minority subgroups. These subgroups had an initial five-year reading, mathematics, and science achievement gain ranging from 12.9% to 15.8%. However,
achievement feedback data indicated these initial efforts did not have the specificity needed to
dress the uniqueness of some students with disabilities. These students with individualized
education plans (IEPs) had smaller gains. They had proficiency rate gains of 3.3% in reading,
7.4% in mathematics, and 10.1% in science. The 2006 Comprehensive Improvement Plan
responded with a more systematic reform action plan.

Five years ago, these goals were once again re-adopted. System design conversations
began with Dr. Howard Adelman, Dr. Richard Elmore, Dr. Dean Fixsen, Dr. Michael Fullan, Dr.
Susan Leddick, Dr. Douglas Reeves, and Dr. Linda Taylor, nationally recognized education
researchers and leaders, to identify the supports needed to change classroom teaching and
learning practices. These conversations informed the Agency’s system support service design
work. The first iteration of this design work was Accelerating Student Achievement Pilot (ASAP)
project. ASAP was conceptualized as a school (a child’s attendance center) and MBEA
partnership or commitment of resources to improve teaching and learning through effective
school improvement (school reform) implementation. ASAP was operationalized as a support
system involving an AEA school facilitator working collaboratively with a school principal and
teacher leadership teams. The facilitator assisted in the coordination of AEA services related to
teacher implementation of improved practices through training, coaching, diverse learner
expertise, collaborative data teams, effective formative assessments, and a tiered system of
supports for struggling learners. ASAP feedback continually informed the Agency’s efforts to
support effective school improvement.

Table 1 is presented to illustrate ten years of goal success. Teacher and administrator
feedback has credited AEA services with assisting their schools in attaining this student
achievement success. However, this is a continuous improvement process; early 2008 student
achievement data indicated reading, mathematics, and science trend lines were becoming flat or plateaued. MBAEA responded to this emerging data by conducting an in depth study.

Table 1: Subgroup Goal Area Proficiency Rate Gains (2001-2010)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency Goal</th>
<th>Low Socioeconomic Subgroup</th>
<th>Minority Subgroup</th>
<th>Individualized Plan Subgroup</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
<td>24.7%</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dr. Susan Leddick was hired early 2008 to conduct a comprehensive service needs assessment study. The study highlighted how the former AEA divisions generated service delivery barriers through their independence which created service overlaps among the divisions at the school or district level. The study recognized these divisions were highly cooperative; however, the division structures hindered the development of a fully collaborative ASAP service delivery system. The study’s findings initiated a reorganization of the Agency’s four divisions into three platforms. The platform structures provided interconnected components rather than separate divisions. The purpose was to create a high leverage customized service organization. The new Evaluation & Market Research, Integrated Services, and Support Services platforms were designed for their specialization and interdependence to successfully achieve the Agency’s goals and mission. Partnership Agreements were added to the ASAP design and the Agreements reinforced the interdependence among the platforms. The Agreements are allocations of integrated and customized MBAEA resources and services through a mutual school and MBAEA commitment to effectively implement a school’s improvement effort. (Partnership Agreement description is provided in Appendix D.)

The first reason for readopting the current goals was the analysis of the subgroup achievement gaps. The minority, low socioeconomic status, and individualized plan (IEP) subgroup gaps remain too large. Chart 1 is presented to illustrate the reading, mathematics, and science achievement gaps among subgroups. First and foremost, students with disabilities have
the greatest proficiency rate gap. This subgroup has a 45% to 60% gap when compared to majority students (see Chart 1). Low socioeconomic status has a proficiency rate gap of 16% to 20% (see Chart 1). Lastly, minority status subgroup has an 8% gap (see Chart 1). The finding was the gaps have remained too big and overall achievement is unsatisfactory. It was decided additional support to schools and school districts is needed to reduce the gaps.

**Chart 1: Subgroup Proficiency Rate Comparisons**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Reading</th>
<th>Mathematics</th>
<th>Science</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Students with Disabilities [IEPs]</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only Low Socioeconomic [SES] Status without IEPs</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only Minority Status without Low SES &amp; IEP</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only Majority Status without Low SES &amp; IEP</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Another reason for re-adopting the current goals was Iowa’s 100% 2014 mandated student achievement target for schools and school districts. Regional 2009-2010 achievement rates presented in Chart 1 are evidence of reading, mathematics, and science proficiency rates well below 100%. Comparing Chart 1 and Table 2 indicated that more work needs to be done. Iowa’s student learning goals have not yet been adequately accomplished. It is expected the new Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) will have additional incentives to entice more voluntary reform as well as stronger mandates to turn-around low-performing schools.
Table 2: Regional Proficiency Rates for All Students.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade Levels</th>
<th>Reading</th>
<th>Mathematics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grades 3-5</td>
<td>77.4%</td>
<td>80.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grades 6-8</td>
<td>73.7%</td>
<td>76.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 11</td>
<td>77.1%</td>
<td>77.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Yet another reason for readopting the goals is that the Agency’s needs assessment findings indicate school and school district needs are primarily focused on building teaching and learning capacity to reach and consistently sustain high levels of learning for all students. The process includes collecting and analyzing data from the following sources: surveys from school leaders; LEA CSIPs; LEA APRs; results from conducting building-level focus groups; comments from school board advisories, superintendent advisories, district-wide administrator advisories, and teacher advisories; and results of the statewide AEA satisfaction survey. The Agency concluded the goals are aligned to the following 2007-2011 HIGH PRIORITY service needs:

a) Develop a plan to fully implement the Iowa Core;
b) Reduce initiatives and increase coherence around the teaching and learning priorities;
c) Reach students not actively engaged in the school's curriculum and connect students socially and emotionally to school (develop caring learning environments i.e., learning supports);
d) Focus on improving the academic performance, or reducing the achievement gap, of students from poverty and low income households as well as students with disabilities;
e) Improve reading/language arts, mathematics, science, and career preparation (evidence-based instruction, rigor and relevance, formative assessment, and summative assessments);
f) Implement professional development which includes data-driven collaborative teaming, lesson study, and high quality feedback.

The last reason for readopting that goals is the Agency’s desire to align itself with the statewide system of AEAs and Iowa Department of Education. The Iowa State Board of Education adopted three goals: 1) all children will enter school ready to learn (early childhood); 2) all K-12 students will achieve at a high level (K-12); and 3) individuals will pursue postsecondary education in order to drive economic success (postsecondary education). The Agency’s programs and services have spanned early childhood through K-12 to postsecondary
supports. The Agency believes it is important to support early childhood school readiness, K-12 quality instruction, and postsecondary transitions. The reading, mathematics, and science goals reflect the Agency’s belief that it is important to be a full partner in the statewide system.

The Board of Directors adopted an action plan to achieve the goals and mission of the Agency. The 2011-2016 Comprehensive Improvement Plan (CIP) integrates **Building Blocks for Success** as an overarching structure for the action plan. These Building Blocks have generated an inclusive strategy targeting additional efficiencies and effectiveness. The Building Blocks have been presented and summarized in Table 3. The balanced scorecard format presented in Table 3 evidences a comprehensive planning approach. This particular format (balanced scorecard) was selected to ensure the Agency remained focused on effective learning strategies, improved teacher and student performance by measuring what matters; effective day-to-day operations, and better communication techniques.

### Agency-Wide Action Plan

**A. Building Block Iowa Core:** According to the Iowa Department of Education, “The Iowa Core provides academic expectations for all Iowa’s K-12 students. The Iowa Core assists schools in delivering that education.” Iowa Core is Iowa’s foundation for student learning and teaching practices. The objective of this building block is to improve teaching and learning through active partnerships that increase low socioeconomic, minority, and IEP subgroup reading, mathematics, and science performance and/or achievement. This objective will be measured using reading, mathematics, and science student achievement data identified within the Agency’s CIP goals. The following action plan strategies have been identified: a) implement effective instructional practices through the Iowa Core and Learning Supports; b) develop leadership capacity to support school improvement; and c) enhance access of media and technology resources. The Building Block Iowa Core outcome is to provide high quality support to increase
the effectiveness of school and school district systems which will result in improved student performance in reading, mathematics, and/or science.

B. **Building Block AEA Budget:** AEA budget is the foundation for service stability and resource prioritization to schools and school districts. The objective of this building block is to sustain quality programs and services by means of a budgetary process that aids in the coordination, implementation, and measurement of the Agency’s Comprehensive Improvement Plan. The outcome is to successfully shift more resources to a more intensive school level service delivery support system even though the Agency is experiencing diminishing funding. An agency-wide interconnected budgetary process has been developed to ensure consistency of services in targeted areas to improve teaching and learning. The Building Block AEA Budget outcome will be measured by tracking resource allocation trends for a period of time and correlating those trends to effective system instructional change.

C. **Building Block Reorganization:** The new platform structures have been established as the foundation for operationalizing effective and efficient service delivery. The objective of this Building Block is to improve service delivery at the classroom level through integrated and customized programs and services. The three newly-formed platforms (Evaluation & Market Research, Integrated Services, and Support Services) were implemented to accomplish improved service delivery. These platforms are interconnected and complementary components of a high leverage service organization (Dr. Susan Leddick, 2008). This objective will be measured by the Federal Special Education Indicators, Partnership Agreement outcomes, and results of the statewide AEA Customer Satisfaction Survey. Its intended outcomes are change leadership and sustaining effective implementation practices.

D. **Building Block CAPS:** CAPS (Comprehensive Aligned Personnel System) is the foundation for building AEA internal staff capacity to deliver high quality services. The
objective of this Building Block is to build internal capacity among staff to deliver high quality services through a Comprehensive Aligned Personnel System (CAPS). CAPS was developed using the "Strategic Management of Human Capital in Public Education" by Allan Odden and James Kelly. Odden and Kelly’s work has focused on the "strategic management of human capital in public education concerning the acquisition, development, performance management and retention of top talent in the nation’s schools.” Recognizing that the most important investment for an effective service organization is its people, the objective will be measured using the metrics devised by the internal CAPS committees. These representative committees are working to seek input from all AEA staff members about measuring effectiveness. They are aiming at guiding the development of processes to: select and recruit high level talent for every AEA position; evaluate, supervise, and support AEA staff; mentor and induct all new AEA staff; and grow AEA staff capacity through professional development and collaborative groups. The Building Block CAPS outcome is having highly effective AEA staff serving every school.

These four Building Blocks are the foundation of the new Comprehensive Improvement Plan. The Board of Directors will evaluate the new plan using the balanced scorecard presented in Table 3. The balanced scorecard has been designed so that it is supported by field level data collected, analyzed, and evaluated to ensure the Board of Directors utilize pertinent information to make critical decisions about programs and services.
Table 3: MBAEA Balanced Scorecard

Action Plan 2011-2016

Comprehensive Improvement Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building Blocks</th>
<th>Objectives</th>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>Strategies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Iowa Core       | To improve teaching and learning through active partnerships that increase low socioeconomic, minority, and IEP subgroup reading, mathematics, and science performance/achievement. | - Annual Iowa Test Student Data  
  – Grades 3-8 & 11 Reading  
  – Grades 3-8 & 11 Mathematics  
  – Grades 5, 8, & 11 Science  
  – Minority, low socio-economic, and IEP subgroup achievement trends and gaps | - Implementing Effective Instructional Practices  
  – Iowa Core  
  – 21st Century Skills  
  – Learning Supports  
  – Developing Leadership Skills  
  – Enhancing access to Media and Technology |
| Budget          | To sustain quality programs and services through a budgetary process that aids in the coordination, implementation, and measurement of the Agency’s Comprehensive Improvement Plan. | - Resource allocation trends | - Using an Agency-wide Budgetary Process |
| Reorganization  | To improve service delivery at the classroom level through integrated and customized programs and services. [Interconnected Platforms – Evaluation & Market Research, Integrated Services, and Support Services] | - Federal Special Education Indicators  
  - Partnership Agreement Outcomes  
  – Building Level Achievement  
  – AEA Service Outcomes  
  – Implementation Indicators  
  – Statewide AEA Satisfaction Survey | - Using Partnership Agreement Commitments  
  – Training  
  – Coaching  
  – Consulting  
  – Using an Enhanced Service Delivery System  
  – Using Media and Technology |
| CAPS            | To build internal staff capacity to deliver high quality services through a Comprehensive Aligned Personnel System (CAPS). | - To be determined by Agency Committees with representation by all employee groups | - Evaluating & Supervising Staff Effectively  
  - Mentoring & Inducting New Staff  
  - Growing Staff Capacity - Professional Development  
  - Retaining High Quality Staff  
  - Selecting & Recruiting High Quality Staff |

**BALANCED SCORECARD INSTITUTE:** The balanced scorecard is a strategic planning and management system that is used extensively in business and industry, government, and nonprofit organizations worldwide to align business activities to the vision and strategy of the organization, improve internal and external communications, and monitor an organization’s performance against strategic goals. It was originated by Drs. Robert Kaplan (Harvard Business School) and David Norton as a performance measurement framework that added strategic non-financial performance measures to traditional financial metrics to give managers and executives a more 'balanced' view of organizational performance. While the phrase balanced scorecard was coined in the early 1990s, the roots of this type of approach are deep, and include the pioneering work of General Electric on performance measurement reporting in the 1950’s and the work of French process engineers (who created the Tableau de Bord – literally, a "dashboard" of performance measures) in the early part of the 20th century.
Vocabulary

AEA 9, Agency, MBAEA, and Mississippi Bend Area Education Agency – refers to synonymous titles for Mississippi Bend Area Education Agency.

APR (Annual Progress Report) – refers to the annual Mississippi Bend Area Education Agency progress report regarding progress toward agency-wide goals and the AEA indicators of quality. The report is required by Iowa Code 72.10(2). The report is available on the agency website (www.aea9.k12.ia.us).

Balanced Scorecard – refers to a strategic planning and management system that is used extensively in business and industry, government, and nonprofit organizations worldwide to align business activities to the vision and strategy of the organization, improve internal and external communications, and monitor performance against strategic goals. See the Balance Scorecard Institute.

Building Blocks – refers to the new AEA structures established to reach the Agency’s goals and deliver on its improved teaching and learning mission. The Building Blocks are: Iowa Core, Budgeting, Reorganization, and Comprehensive Aligned Personnel System (CAPS). These structures are represented within the new Balanced Scorecard being used for agency-wide data collection, analysis, and evaluation. The Building Blocks are the Agency’s improvement strategy. It is important to fully operationalize these structures in the following ways: improve teaching and learning at the classroom level (Iowa Core); sustain quality service delivery through effective budgeting (Budget); deliver quality services to schools (Reorganization); and support AEA personnel recruitment, hiring, induction, mentoring, ongoing training, supervision, and evaluation to ensure Agency effectiveness and efficiencies.

Building Level – refers to the preschool, elementary, middle, junior high, and high schools within the AEA 9 service region. 110 schools or buildings report school level Annual Student Progress data. The building level is also considered students’ attendance center where teaching and learning are occurring during the school calendar year.

CAPS, Comprehensive Aligned Personnel System – refers to the capacity building mechanisms to ensure high quality staff serving schools and school districts. The capacity building of AEA staff members is accomplished through evaluating, using effective professional development and collaborative data-teams, inducting, mentoring, recruiting, retaining, selecting, and supervising its people or staff.

CIP, Comprehensive Improvement Plan – refers to the comprehensive improvement plan submitted every five years following an accreditation site visit by the Iowa Department of Education. The plan is required [281—72.9(273)]. The plan is annually updated to reflect the current schools’ and school districts’ needs.

Customers – refers to students, teachers, administrators, school staff, parents, and community agency/group members receiving services from AEA 9. Customer also refers to the
collaborative school improvement efforts with the Iowa Department of Education and the Department is also a customer.

**Decision-Makers** — refers to employees at every level, professional staff serving schools and school districts, professional staff serving students and parents, and administrators. The Agency has processes to gather, analyze, and make decisions involving stakeholders. The Leadership Team is made of employees from all levels to assist in procedure and policymaking. Committees are formed to study issues and make recommendations.

**IEP** — refers to an individual education plan required for students identified as having disabilities. The IEP states the individualized program and program goals for the child or youngster with disabilities.

**IDEA** — refers to Individuals with Disabilities Education Act administered by the U. S. Department of Education and authorized by the U. S. Congress. The IDEA has recently established accountability indicators for special education programs and Iowa Department of Education has established indicators and targets for area education agency and school district special education programs.

**Leadership Team** — refers to a group of staff members that meet monthly to plan, have conversations about policy and service implementation, and evaluate services. The leadership team group includes all agency administrators and representatives from bargaining groups and/or specific work groups. All agency platforms, departments, and work groups have representatives on the leadership team. All agency planning, implementation, and evaluation is processed through the leadership team. The leadership team is also engaged in processing needs assessment data to validate findings. It is the Chief Administrator’s agency-wide team.

**Partnership Agreement** — refers to a commitment of effort, time and resources (i.e., programs & services) by Mississippi Bend Area Education Agency that explicitly describes AEA Customization of services to a school. AEA Customization is the specialized supports to assist implementation and ensure fidelity of a school’s improvement strategy. The process allows the Agency to leverage its expertise and resources to school sites where these services are most needed and where school commitment to reform efforts is the most profound. These Agreements are NOT service plans or a list of AEA services to a school. The Agreement is a mutual promise and commitment to effectively implement and use data-driven techniques to accelerate improved teaching and learning.

**Platform** — refers to the reorganization of the 4 divisions (Administrative Services, General Education, Research & Development, and Special Education) to 3 platforms (Evaluation & Market Research, Integrated Services, and Support Services). The platforms are interconnected components with specific purposes to the overall mission of the organization.

**NCLB, No Child Left Behind** — refers to the No Child Left Behind Act administered by U. S. Department of Education and authorized by U. S. Congress. The Iowa Department of
Education has submitted a No Child Left Behind plan to the U. S. Department of Education outlining Iowa's efforts to improve student learning. NCLB and No Child Left Behind are synonymous terms and represent student learning expectations for all students.

**Schools (accredited non-public and public)** – refers to the elementary, middle, junior high, and high schools within the AEA 9 service region. The number of schools served is 133 sites or 110 sites reporting annual student progress data. The school and building level are synonymous terms. Schools are considered a students' attendance center where teaching and learning is occurring during the school calendar year. Schools for the purposes of the planning process include only accredited non-public (17 accredited non-public schools) and public schools.

**Accredited Non-Public Schools**

- All Saints (PK-8), Davenport
- Assumption High School, Davenport
- J. F. Kennedy School (PK-8), Davenport
- Lourdes School (PK-8), Bettendorf
- Marquette Academy (PK-5), Davenport
- Marquette System (K-12), Bellevue
- Rivermont Collegiate (PK-12), Bettendorf
- Prince of Peace Academy (K-12), Clinton
- St. Joseph's School (K-8), DeWitt
- St. Mary & Mathis School (PK-5), Muscatine
- St. Paul Apostle School (PK-8), Davenport
- Trinity Lutheran School (PK-8), Davenport
- Zion Lutheran School (PK-6), Muscatine

**School Districts** – refers to the school districts within the Mississippi Bend Area Education Agency's service region. The districts within the region are:

- Andrew Community School District
- Bettendorf Community School District
- Calamus-Wheatland Community School District
- Camanche Community School District
- Central Community School District
- Clinton Community School District
- Columbus Community School District
- Davenport Community School District
- Delwood Community School District
- East Central Community School District
- Louisa-Muscatine Community School District
- Maquoketa Community School District
- Muscatine Community School District
- North Scott Community School District
- Northeast Community School District
- Pleasant Valley Community School District
- Preston Community School District
- West Liberty Community School District
- Wilton Community School District

**Services (Programs and Services)** – refers to the programs and services found in Appendix B. Services are annually reviewed by internal staff members and external customers before being approved by the AEA 9 Board of Directors each April. Services to meet agency-wide goals defined in 281—IAC 72.9(1)(e)(3) are program and services in AEA 9’s Comprehensive Improvement Plan.
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## Guidance/Directions

- Area education agencies are encouraged to go beyond the minimum with their work toward continuous improvement.
- Write the page(s) on which documentation appears in the CIP in the column labeled “Page(s)#.” Multiple page numbers may appear in a single box.
- Data listed in the CIP may serve as the baseline data for the agency’s Annual Progress Report (APR).
- **If the agency changes a goal after approval of the CIP, the agency must submit new baseline data.**
- **The CIP components listed in 281—IAC 72.9 do not need to appear specifically as headers or in any particular order. Requirements may appear in multiple places in the plan and in a locally determined format.**
- Iowa Administrative Code, Chapter 72 can be accessed through the Iowa Legislature General Assembly website, located at the following link: [http://www.legis.state.ia.us/IAC.html](http://www.legis.state.ia.us/IAC.html)

## General AEA Accreditation Requirements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Page(s) #</th>
<th>Needs Assessment 281—IAC 72.9(1)(a)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Guidance:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1. The kind of process used to identify needs is an AEA decision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. The “what” is a local AEA decision.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>21-33</td>
<td>The plan shall contain a description of how the AEA conducts ongoing needs assessment. 281—IAC 72.9(1)(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Expectation:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- The plan describes the process used to identify needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Sufficient detail is provided to identify who is involved, how data are collected, and what data are collected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- The plan describes an ongoing needs assessment process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- The needs assessment process is agency-wide; all schools and school districts served by the agency are assessed for needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- All Chapter 72 standards are included somewhere in agency-wide needs assessment activities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Page(s) #</th>
<th>Needs Assessment Summary 281—IAC 72.9(1)(b)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Guidance:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- The kind of data/information reflecting agency strengths and areas for improvement is a local AEA decision.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Findings can be data and/or narrative.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Reference to “internal” means AEA employees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>33-46</td>
<td>The summary includes findings from internal needs assessment about the implementation of the agency’s continuous improvement model. 281—IAC 72.9(1)(b)(1)(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Expectation:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Evidence is included that the agency has gathered information from AEA employees on the implementation of the continuous improvement model.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item #</td>
<td>Page(s)</td>
<td>Agency-Wide Goals 281—IAC 72.9(1)(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Guidance:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• The goals may or may not contain a specific level of increase.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Goals are to be developed for a five-year time frame.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Consider the number of agency-wide goals that can be reasonably monitored and achieved over a five-year period given agency resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Progress made toward each agency-wide goal must be reported in the agency’s Annual Progress Report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>33-43</td>
<td>The summary includes findings from internal needs assessment about implementation of agency services that respond to schools’ and school districts’ needs. 281—IAC 72.9(1)(b)(1)(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Expectation:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Evidence is included that the agency has gathered information from AEA employees on the implementation of services that respond to schools’ and school districts’ needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>The summary includes findings from internal needs assessment about how the agency demonstrates proactive leadership. 281—IAC 72.9(1)(b)(1)(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Expectation:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Evidence is included that the agency has gathered information from AEA employees regarding how the agency demonstrates proactive leadership.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>21-33</td>
<td>The summary includes findings from internal needs assessment about how the agency uses data to implement actions to improve student learning. 281—IAC 72.9(1)(b)(1)(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Expectation:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Evidence is included that the agency has gathered information from AEA employees on how the agency uses data to implement actions to improve student learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>33-41</td>
<td>The summary includes findings from state indicator data for schools and school districts the agency serves. 281—IAC 72.9(1)(b)(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Expectation:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Evidence is included that the agency has analyzed and generated data from LEA Annual Progress Reports (APRs) (e.g., pre-populated agency-wide data included in the AEA APR).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>33-41</td>
<td>The summary includes findings from reviews of comprehensive school improvement plans for the schools and school districts the agency serves. 281—IAC 72.9(1)(b)(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>The summary includes findings from reviews of comprehensive site visit reports for the schools and school districts the agency serves. 281—IAC 72.9(1)(b)(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>43-46</td>
<td>The summary includes findings from the AEA’s comprehensive site visit report(s). 281—IAC 72.9(1)(b)(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>The summary includes findings from customer feedback regarding the agency’s 2008-2009 services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>83-96</td>
<td>Expectation:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• At a minimum, data from the AEA Customer Survey regarding services provided during the 2008-2009 school year are included.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>47-48</td>
<td>Agency-wide goals are developed as a result of needs assessment findings. 281—IAC 72.9(1)(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Expectation:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• There is a clear alignment between data/findings and established goals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>48-49</td>
<td>Agency-wide goals are measurable. 281—IAC 72.9(1)(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Expectation:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• The criteria to determine goal attainment are quantifiable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• The criteria provided are clearly connected to the stated goal(s).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Agency-wide goals are focused on assisting schools and school districts with the school improvement process as evidenced in the indicators of quality as prescribed in subrule 72.10(2). 281—IAC 72.9(1)(c)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Page(s)</th>
<th>Services 281—IAC 72.9(1)(d)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item #</td>
<td>Page(s)</td>
<td>Action Plans 281—IAC 72.9(1)(e)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Guidance:**
- There may or may not be a label "services" in the CIP.
- One service may meet multiple goals.

**Guidance:**
- Items 19-32 must appear somewhere within the CIP. There may or may not be an "action plan" section; this is an AEA decision.

**Guidance:**
- The aggregate of all services in the actions plans demonstrate support for all standards for services.
- The AEA clearly shows/explains the connection between identified agency-wide actions and the standards for services.

**Guidance:**
- The action plans include some system to indicate equitable availability of services for the recipients of those services.
| 22  | 67 | Action plans reference agency-wide data sources.  
281—IAC 72.9(1)(e)(1)  
Expectation:  
- The action plans include information from agency-wide data sources that support provision of the identified services or actions. |
| 23  | 33-46 | Action plans include agency-wide baseline data.  
281—IAC 72.9(1)(e)(2)  
Expectation:  
- The action plans include baseline information from the agency-wide data sources that support services or actions. |
| 24  | 60-73 99-124 | Action plans include services to meet agency-wide goals.  
281—IAC 72.9(1)(e)(3)  
Expectation:  
5. Services are aligned with the established agency-wide goals. |
| 25  | 67-68 | Action plans include information about agency-wide funding resources to deliver services to meet agency-wide goals.  
281—IAC 72.9(1)(e)(4)  
Expectation:  
- Funding resources are designated in each action plan for delivery of services aligned with each agency-wide goal (specific dollar amount are not required) |
| 26  | 67-69 | Action plans include information about agency-wide staff allocations to deliver services to meet agency-wide goals.  
281—IAC 72.9(1)(e)(4)  
Expectation:  
6. Staff allocations are indicated for each agency service.  
Guidance:  
7. Staff allocation could include staff FTEs, positions, specific personnel, or categories of personnel. |
| 27  | 67-69 | Action plans include information about agency-wide time resources to deliver services to meet agency-wide goals.  
281—IAC 72.9(1)(e)(4)  
Expectation:  
- The amount of time allocated by the agency to accomplish the service delivery is provided (e.g., staffing, % of job assignment). |
| 28  | 69-71 | Action plans provide information about how services are delivered.  
281—IAC 72.9(1)(e)(4)  
Expectation:  
- Each action plan includes information about how services are delivered to recipients of the services.  
Guidance:  
8. Consider information provided in response to item #21. |
| 29  | 61-66 71-72 | Action plans designate the responsible parties who will monitor implementation of services.  
281—IAC 72.9(1)(e)(5)  
Expectation:  
- Each service has a designated responsible party for implementation of that service. |
| 30  | 70-71 | Action plans include a system for measuring the efficiency of services.  
281—IAC 72.9(1)(e)(6)  
Expectation:  
9. The system for measuring the efficiency of services includes the agency’s definition of efficiency. |
| 31  | 70 | Action plans include a system for measuring the effectiveness of services.  
281—IAC 72.9(1)(e)(6)  
Expectation:  
10. The system for measuring the effectiveness of services includes the agency’s definition of effectiveness. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Page(s) #</th>
<th>Provisions for Management Services 281—IAC 72.9(1)(f)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>73-74</td>
<td>Action plans include a process for reporting progress toward agency-wide goals. 281—IAC 72.9(1)(e)(7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Expectation:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11. Sufficient detail is provided to identify who is involved in the reporting of progress and what data are collected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Guidance:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12. Consider information provided in response to item #23.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>73-76</td>
<td>The plan states whether or not the agency provides management services to school districts or other area education agencies. 281—IAC 72.9(1)(f)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>73-76</td>
<td>The plan provides a description of how the agency provides management services if requested by school districts located in the area education agency. Section 273.7A, Code of Iowa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>73-76</td>
<td>The plan describes if/how the AEA provides for furnishing expensive and specialized equipment for school districts. Section 273.7A, Code of Iowa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>73-76</td>
<td>The plan describes how the AEA determines the cost of the specialized equipment and management services provided, which school districts shall pay to the area education agency. Section 273.7A, Code of Iowa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>The plan describes how the AEA provides services authorized to be performed by area education agencies to other area education agencies in Iowa. Section 273.7A, Code of Iowa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>74-75</td>
<td>The plan describes how the AEA determines the cost and method of payment for services provided to other area education agencies in Iowa. Section 273.7A, Code of Iowa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>76-82, 136-142</td>
<td>Professional Development Plan 281—IAC 72.9(1)(g)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The plan contains a summary of the agency-wide professional development plan developed pursuant to 281—subrule 83.6(2).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Needs Assessment 281—IAC 79.9(1)(a)

The needs assessment portion of the Comprehensive Improvement Plan has been generated from a continuous improvement process. Needs assessment has been integrated as a feedback loop within planning, implementation and evaluation activities. Feedback loops have been established to a) know what to do (planning), b) how to do it (implementation) and c) how well it is being done (evaluation). All three have informed the Agency’s needs assessment findings. The Agency’s process has included knowing a) the school and school district priority teaching and learning needs and b) whether or not those needs have been met. The Agency has adopted a new continuous improvement process that has needs assessment fully integrated throughout. Diagram 1 is presented to illustrate the Agency’s new process to better inform, operationalize, and judge the Agency’s efforts to reach its goals, accomplish its improved teaching and learning mission, and meet/exceed the Iowa Code AEA Service Standards.

Continuous Improvement Process

The Agency has adopted a new comprehensive continuous improvement process. The new process is illustrated in Diagram 1. The following reasons led to the decision to adopt a new process: a) needed market research feedback to customize AEA services and support educators with school improvement implementation efforts; b) wanted to utilize a strategic management balanced scorecard to improve the delivery system through evaluation (i.e., Deming); c) sought a process aligned to the Partnership Agreement delivery mechanism as a primary school and school district needs assessment information source; and d) needed to integrate the new legislation requiring stakeholder recommendations into the needs assessment feedback. The new process continues to have planning, implementation, and evaluation as interrelated activities. These activities are continuous conversations about WHAT we do, HOW we do it, and HOW WELL we perform. It is estimated this new process will be implemented by August 2012.
Diagram 1: MBAEA Continuous Improvement Process

PLANNING
1. Needs Assessment
2. Market Research
3. Strategic Deployment

IMPLEMENTATION
4. Programs & Services
5. Partnership Agreements
6. Service Monitoring

EVALUATION
7. Meeting Customer Needs
8. Program Sustainability
9. Quality Service Delivery
10. High Levels of Performance

Selected Process Definitions

Market research is defined as the study of system practices to meet school and school district teaching and learning wants. It is gathering and analyzing research, evidence, and literature to identify ways to improve AEA service delivery leverage to improve teaching and learning for all students at the classroom level.

Partnership Agreement is defined as a commitment of effort, time and resources that explicitly describes an AEA Customization of services to a school. AEA Customization includes specialized supports aligned to learning needs of students in a building and targeted instructional supports to ensure fidelity of implementation that will result in improved teaching and learning. Agreements allow for leveraging AEA services to school sites where these services are most needed and where school commitments to reform efforts are the most profound.

Stakeholder recommendations are defined as annual statements from regional advisory groups to the AEA Board of Directors. Iowa Code requires representatives from the following groups participate: superintendents, principals, teachers, special education teachers, parents, special education parents, and accredited nonpublic school educators. These members provide needs assessment input. Each group is given an opportunity to craft recommendation statements and have these statements presented to the AEA Board of Directors.

PLANNING, see Diagram 1. It is the WHAT question regarding AEA programs and services delivered to attain the Agency’s goals and address its improved teaching and learning mission. Planning is captured through answering the following questions: a) WHAT are the teaching and learning needs of schools and school districts? b) WHAT are the research-evidenced based AEA programs, services, and supports needed to accelerate improved teaching
and learning at the classroom level? WHAT are the priorities for deploying AEA services to accelerate this improved teaching and learning at the classroom level?

1. Needs Assessment refers to knowing WHAT the teaching and learning needs are of schools and school districts. The following information and/or feedback are collected and analyzed annually from these sources: Agency goal feedback data, Agency program and service feedback data (participant evaluation feedback and AEA staff input), 34 Federal Special Education Indicator data, Iowa Youth Survey data, surveying school leaders, LEA Comprehensive School Improvement Plans, LEA Annual Progress Reports, LEA accreditation feedback, building level focus groups, school board advisories, superintendent advisories, district-wide administrator advisories, teacher advisories, parent advisories, and statewide AEA satisfaction survey. The AEA Annual Progress Report has summarized these analyses annually. (See Appendix A) The evaluation feedback from Partnership Agreements will be added to the needs assessment list. Partnership Agreement feedback has been designed to become a dominate data set. The feedback will have AEA program and service: a) alignment data to school level teaching and learning needs (LEA priority needs, CSIP, APR, accreditation, teacher level advisories, and SINA/DINA data points); b) implementation data reflecting service effectiveness and efficiencies; c) outcome data reporting progress on improved classroom level teaching and learning; and d) usage data to track AEA resources allocations.

Needs Assessment Advisories have been established to gather input, feedback, and recommendations. These advisories are listed in Table 4. Recent changes to the Iowa Code have mandated an advisory process so that stakeholders can make recommendations to the AEA Board of Directors. MBAEA has modified its advisory stakeholder input and feedback processes to adhere to the code changes. The Board of Directors annually, prior to the publishing the Annual Progress Report, will have deliberated on the presented recommendations from the
advisories. The following questions will be processed by all advisory groups annually: 1) What are the regional teaching and learning needs, specifically asking for diversity need input, regarding academic, learning supports, media, and technology needs? 2) Which AEA services are meeting those regional teaching and learning needs, which services are working well, and which services are not working as well? 3) What additional AEA support is needed to meet those regional teaching and learning needs, what new AEA services would be helpful, and what AEA services other AEAs may provide would be helpful? 4) What teaching and learning priorities (recommendations) should be shared with the AEA Board of Directors? The advisory process has been valued for years because it has provided specific details about LEA needs.

Table 4: MBAEA Advisory Input & Recommendation Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advisory Group</th>
<th>2011-2016 Responsibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LEA Superintendents (Elected Advisory Group)</td>
<td>Chief Administrator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEA School Boards</td>
<td>Administrative Cabinet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEA Administrative Cabinets (Partnership Agreement Activity)</td>
<td>Sector Coordinators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum Directors (Curriculum Network)</td>
<td>Head of Staff Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principals (Principals’ Leadership Academy)</td>
<td>Head of Staff Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counselors’ Academy</td>
<td>Head of Staff Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Development (required by Iowa Code)</td>
<td>Head of Staff Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology Coordinators</td>
<td>IT Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Childhood Council &amp; Empowerment Early Childhood Boards</td>
<td>Early Childhood Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Advisories (Building Level Representatives)</td>
<td>Sector Coordinators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency Equity Committee</td>
<td>Support Services Director</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. **Market Research** refers to knowing WHAT the research/evidence based foundation is for accelerating improved teaching and learning at the classroom level. This has been established as a new feature. Market research is defined as the study of system practices to meet school and school district teaching and learning wants. It is gathering and analyzing research, evidence, and literature to identify ways to improve AEA service delivery and leverage improved teaching and learning for all students. Preliminary needs assessment findings have indicated educators “want” better methods of leveraging successful IMPLEMENTATION of school improvement efforts.
The market research concept/activities began six years ago (2005). It was apparent superintendents, principals, and teachers "wanted" every child and student to be successful. They had completed over 15 years of statewide planning initiatives (280.12, 280.18, CSIP, SINA, DINA, and so on) with minimal sustained student learning success. Consistently, feedback suggested schools struggled with moving planning efforts to fully implemented/sustained practice among teachers. Dr. Pelecky, Chief Administrator, and his Administrative Cabinet (all director level positions) decided to address this problem and began direct face-to-face conversations with Dr. Howard Adelman, Dr. Richard Elmore, Dr. Douglas Reeves, and Dr. Linda Taylor. Furthermore, Drs. Fixsen and Fullan participated in conversations via phone conferencing to provide additional perspectives. These conversations informed two decisions.

**Market Research Supported by National & International Education Experts**

**Dr. Howard Adelman**, UCLA Professor, Director of the National Center for Mental Health in Schools, provided an extensive background in programs to address school learning climate and student mental health issues. He facilitated conversations addressing multifaceted models and practices to deal with the many external and internal barriers that interfere with teaching and student learning and mental health development.

**Dr. Richard Elmore**, Harvard Professor, Gregory R. Anrig Professor of Educational Leadership Co-Director, provided research and clinic work findings from his efforts to build capacity for instructional improvement in low-performing schools. He assisted MBAEA and the statewide AEA system with establishing his Instructional Rounds professional development for superintendent school improvement leadership skills.

**Dr. Dean Fixsen**, Co-Director of the National Implementation Research Network, provided consultation on critical dimensions associated with implementation of evidenced-based programs. He assisted leadership in the identification of successful strategies for program replication and implementation, organizational and systems development, managing change processes, practical program evaluation, program administration, and systems transformation.

**Dr. Michael Fullan**, Professor Emeritus of the Ontario Institute of Studies in Education of the University of Toronto, provided support for educational reform and the culture of change. He consulted with administrators and an internal design team to integrate change leadership into the structure of the Accelerating Student Achievement Pilot.

**Dr. Susan Leddick**, President of Profound Knowledge Resources INC, provided an independent needs assessment audit focusing on system improvements needed to ensure success regarding the Agency’s goals, mission, and statewide AEA Service Standards. Her assistance supported the reorganization from divisions to interconnected platforms.

**Dr. Douglas Reeves**, founder of the Center for Performance Assessment and The Leadership and Learning Center, provided research on transforming low-performing schools from his 90-90-90
research findings. He assisted conversations about impacting change at the classroom level and leveraging success through classroom level implementation.

**Dr. Linda Taylor**, UCLA Professor, Co-Director of the National Center for Mental Health in Schools, provided an extensive background in programs to address school learning climate and student mental health issues. She facilitated conversations addressing multifaceted models and practices to deal with the many external and internal barriers that interfere with teaching and student learning and mental health development.

First decision, Accelerating Student Achievement Pilot (ASAP) was launched in 2006. The pilot project placed a service facilitator or change agent in 11 area volunteer schools (4 high schools, 3 middle schools, and 4 elementary schools). The facilitator role was developed using the “organizational facilitator” research presented by Drs. Adelman and Taylor. An internal design team was formed that elected to have the facilitator manage specific aspects of AEA service delivery (large-scale school reform) and system change support (collaborative data-driven team training and implementation). This pilot generated positive results; however, a federal special education ruling regarding funding for general education system support by special education staff and continued statewide AEA special education funding cuts, unfortunately, led to the elimination of the service facilitator role. The project was modified and the project began reconfiguration through the Partnership Agreement process.

The Partnership Agreement process incorporates the service facilitation by focusing all AEA staff on implementation and coaching support efforts. Dr. Fixsen had shared the importance of building capacity with supports so that all teachers could learn new knowledge and skills as well as operationalize their training in the classroom. Dr. Fixsen also shared the Joyce and Showers (2002) research presented in Table 5. It highlighted the importance of classroom coaching support on implementation efforts. Dr. Fixsen’s research was confirmed by the strategic management of human capital literature base. This research was so compelling the Agency modeled its own Comprehensive Aligned Personnel System (CAPS) and used AEA Teacher Quality funding to support the development of a new human resources system. These
market research activities have improved the Agency’s decision-making ability and understanding of customer “wants” or needs.

**Table 5: Impact of Coaching Support**

A Summary of a Meta-Analysis of the Effects of Training and Coaching on Teachers’ Implementation in the Classroom (Joyce & Showers, 2002)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TRAINING COMPONENT</th>
<th>OUTCOMES</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td>Skill Demonstration</td>
<td>Use in the Classroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theory and Discussion</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ Demonstration in Training</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ Practice &amp; Feedback in Training</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ Coaching in Classroom</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Second decision, an independent audit (2008) was conducted by Dr. Susan Leddick. Her in-depth needs assessment and findings were analyzed and led to a reorganization decision. It was decided to move from four division structures to create three interconnected platforms working together. Her audit highlighted how the former divisions created service delivery barriers through their independence such as service overlaps among the divisions at the school or district level. The audit recognized these divisions were highly cooperative; however, the division structures hindered the development of a fully collaborative system. Thus, it was decided to reorganize into platform structures and have interconnected operations rather than separate divisions. The purpose was to create a high leverage customized service organization. The new Evaluation & Market Research, Integrated Services, and Support Services platforms were designed for their specialization, interdependence, and efficiencies. The platform structures were also highly compatible with the new Partnership Agreement processes.

Market research evolved and became an internal conversation about WHAT needs to happen so that AEA programs and services fully maximize their utility (satisfaction). Market research activities have generated the following “implementation support theory”: a) must begin with “where the school is” and build on their improvement strategy; b) must build a relationship
where everyone commits to action and regular monitoring; c) must involve collaborative teacher data-driven teams that include job-embedded professional development with coaching support; and d) must customize AEA programs and services to leverage change, support a school’s improvement effort, and create time and efficiencies for teachers and principals. The Partnership Agreement development process continually tests this theory as AEA staff work with schools to IMPLEMENT their school improvement strategy. The goal is to accelerate student learning gains, reduce achievement gaps, and meet our customer “wants” while producing high AEA customer satisfaction rates.

3. **Strategic Deployment** refers to WHAT the priorities are for allocating AEA services to accelerate improved teaching and learning at the classroom level. MBAEA’s $35 million operating budget is a limitation on HOW MUCH service the Agency can provide schools and school districts. Therefore, MBAEA must be strategic in its deployment of these “scarce” or limited operating funds by setting priorities. The following are operational components of strategic deployment: a) building a relationship and having “critical” conversations with principals and teachers about how much TIME is available to accomplish their most important work; b) focusing on getting and sustaining a commitment to their work to fully utilize the allocated AEA resources; and c) aggregating the sum (time) of this most important work across all schools and equating it to the programs and services offered by the Agency. MBAEA has learned school and school district improvement plans have too many initiatives and too little time for teachers to learn, practice, and effectively implement those initiatives. Thus, strategic deployment is judged by whether or not the AEA committed adequate and effective service support to change/sustain teacher practices and improve student learning.

The PLANNING phase of the continuous improvement process will provide Decision-Makers with the teaching and learning needs assessment findings, leverage mechanisms through
market research to improve and sustain implementation efforts, and priority district/school requests in order to strategically deploy its resources. Planning is an ongoing activity and the Evaluation and Market Research Platform is responsible for orchestrating and engaging internal and external stakeholders in conversations to inform Decision-Makers.

**Proactive Leadership** is demonstrated in the following three ways during the continuous improvement process: 1) AEA Leadership Team processes program and service data and decisions, agency procedures, and agency policymaking (The Team is comprised of administrators and representatives from all employee groups.); 2) AEA staff and administrators collect and analyze field program and service implementation data to make judgments about effectiveness and efficiencies; and 3) student and service data are disaggregated by AEA staff individually and within departments to identify their professional development needs. All of this information is used in the program and service review processes involving AEA field staff, AEA administrators, and LEA educator feedback. The new Partnership Agreement process has added explicit outcomes to better inform these conversations and improve the judgments made. It is believed these Agreements with established outcomes will improve agency-wide proactive leadership and student outcomes at the field delivery level.

**IMPLEMENTATION**, see Diagram 1. It is the HOW question: HOW are teaching and learning needs being met through the execution of the planning phase? Implementation is operationalizing the plan and continually improving services. Implementation is developing programs and services to meet customer needs, customizing the services to maximize impact, and monitoring the services to ensure effectiveness.

4. **Programs and Services** refer to the specific programs and services provided to schools and school districts to meet their teaching and learning needs. These programs and services are aligned to the AEA Service Standards to ensure schools and school districts have access to an array of quality services meeting their comprehensive educational needs. Programs and services are added, modified, and deleted through collaborative activities involving AEA staff and LEA educators. AEA administrators have the responsibility to maintain the integrity of their assigned programs and services through ongoing evaluation and stakeholder involvement.
The new statewide AEA accreditation and data capture system under development will be used in the near future to display all programs and services online with pertinent supporting information (program outcomes, user data, standard alignment and so on). In anticipation of the new statewide AEA data system, all programs and services will be reviewed in 2011-2012 before being placed into the new system. The programs and services designated as possible Partnership Agreement commitments will also be formatted for that purpose in 2011-2012.

5. **Partnership Agreements** refer to a commitment of effort, time and resources that explicitly describe an AEA Customization of services to a school. AEA Customization includes specialized supports aligned to specific learning needs of students in that building and targeted instructional supports to ensure fidelity of implementation that will result in improved student learning. Agreements allow for leveraging AEA expertise and resources to school sites where these services are most needed and where school commitments to reform efforts are the most profound. Appendix D has been attached to provide a full description of the Partnership Agreement process and examples.

6. **Service Monitoring** refers to the systematic routine of collecting, analyzing, and evaluating program and service feedback as well as Partnership Agreement outcomes. The new AEA accreditation and data capture system is being designed to include a centralized tool for collecting these data for analyses. The Partnership Agreement process includes regular conversations between principals and AEA Sector Coordinators about the mutually agreed-upon data set being used to measure teaching and learning success resulting from the Agreement's actions by AEA staff and LEA educators. These data are being organized so that evaluation conversations are aligned. These conversations within the field, departments, sectors, and AEA Board are connected to improved teaching and learning progress.
EVALUATION, see Diagram 1. It is the HOW WELL the Agency is performing. Evaluation is HOW WELL the plan was implemented or executed; plus, it is HOW effective the decisions were if adjustments were made to the plan or implementation. Evaluation will be executed through a balanced scorecard approach. It is important to evaluate all operational phases. A balanced scorecard is strategic management by MEETING customers’ needs (Iowa Core); HITTING financial targets (Budget), DELIVERING through effective internal operations (Reorganization), and DEVELOPING the capacity of your work force to meet needs of the organization (CAPS). The evaluation process has been initiated at all levels of the organization (field, supervisory, leadership, and cabinet levels).

7. Meeting customer needs refer to measuring the impact of the Iowa Core. MBAEA’s key measure of impact is the reading, mathematics, and science achievement growth and reduction of minority, low socioeconomic, and IEP subgroup achievement gaps (MBAEA Goals). The objective is to improve teaching and learning through active partnerships (Partnership Agreements) that result in improved student performance outcomes. It is believed the following strategies will produce these outcomes: a) active partnerships supporting effective instructional practices within area classrooms (Iowa Core and Learning Supports); b) assisting educators with leadership development at all levels; and c) enhancing learning for adults and students through access to and utilization of media and technology.

8. Program stability refers to funding sustainability of priority efforts through agency-wide budgeting. Effective reform efforts are successful over a multi-year implementation process. A new agency-wide budgeting process has been initiated to prioritize efforts and sustain school level reform efforts. The objective of this new process is to sustain quality services through budgeting that aids the coordination, implementation, and measurement of the Agency’s Comprehensive Improvement Plan. The strategy is twofold: a) continually shift AEA
resources toward the support of the highest priority classroom level improved teaching and learning programs and services; and b) provide management services to increase educational efficiencies. The management service efficiencies will allow schools to shift more funding to classroom teaching reforms. Table 5 illustrates “coaching in the classroom” transferred to 95% teacher classroom use of a new strategy; thus, coaching appears to be the most effective strategy to improve student learning. Because the Agency is experiencing diminishing statewide funding, the outcome is to successfully shift more resources to a “coaching” delivery model, a more intensive one-on-one delivery strategy.

9. **Quality service delivery** refers to effective internal operations that deliver programs and services through platforms. The objective is to improve service delivery at the classroom level through integrated and customized programs and services. The Agency reorganized into the following specific operations: a) Integrated Services which is the seamless delivery of General and Special Education services at the school level; b) Evaluation and Market Research which is the continuous examination of how well we are doing and how well we are satisfying customer wants and needs; and c) Support Services which are the necessary organizational functions such as accounting, human resources, maintenance, technology, and printing. The key measures of the reorganization’s success are the Federal 34 Special Education Indicators, Partnership Agreement outcomes, and customer satisfaction feedback. The strategies identified that will successfully produce positive outcomes are implementing Partnership Agreements, Enhanced Service Delivery System (ESDS), and media/technology improvements. Thus, reorganization is the interconnectedness of integrated service delivery, internal and external assessment of progress, and people support functions.

10. **High levels of performance** refer to capacity-building of the organization’s people through CAPS. It is the comprehensive human resource strategy including recruiting, hiring,
inducting, mentoring, training, supervising, evaluating, and retaining. The Agency has created the following representative employee committees to develop these human resource processes: Recruitment and Selection, Mentoring and Induction, Supervision and Evaluation, Professional Development, and Retention and Succession Planning. The objective is to build internal staff capacity to deliver high quality services. The outcome is the “best” possible work force at every level of the organization. Each committee is developing mechanisms to measure all the CAPS activities and functions. AEA staff members have been engaged in surveys and focus groups providing feedback to these committees. For example, May 2010, using Dr. Douglas Reeves’s Science Fair Board concept, staff members within their new collaborative teams had an opportunity to display and share their professional development with AEA staff, LEA superintendents, and the Acting Director of the Iowa Department of Education. Appendix E is attached to provide detailed information regarding CAPS and Teacher Quality funding.

**Needs Assessment Findings**

The Agency’s needs assessment process has generated the following HIGH PRIORITY teaching and learning service needs (2007-2011):

A. Schools want AEA support for planning efforts to fully implement the Iowa Core.

B. Schools request AEA support for reducing initiatives and increasing coherence around the teaching and learning priorities.

C. Schools want AEA programs and services integrating strategies for reaching students not actively engaged in the school’s curriculum and connecting students socially and emotionally to school (developing caring learning environments i.e., learning supports).

D. Schools want AEA programs and services integrating interventions focused on improving academic performance, or reducing the achievement gap, of students from poverty and low income households as well as students with disabilities.
E. Schools want AEA programs and services providing professional development for improving reading/language arts, mathematics, science, and career preparation (evidence-based instruction, rigor and relevance, formative assessment, and summative assessments).

F. Schools want AEA programs and services implementing professional development which includes data-driven collaborative learning, lesson study, and high quality feedback.

These summary needs assessment findings have been generated from the needs assessment process described on pages 21-29. This included findings from LEA comprehensive improvement plan feedback, LEA Iowa Department of Education Accreditation feedback, AEA comprehensive site visit reports, and customer (surveys, advisories, and usage) feedback. These findings have been regularly validated by superintendents, central office administrators, principals, and teachers. The stakeholder validation has been confirmed through surveys, advisories, and AEA program/service user feedback.

**LEA Accreditation Assistance**

Following LEA accreditation feedback, AEA staff contacts schools and school districts regarding any Iowa Department of Education suggestions needing action. Quality Learning Consultants are assigned to address any immediate needs following a site visit report. Special Education staff is involved in regular visits to review special education procedures to support LEA compliance.

An emerging service need is assisting schools with a tiered system of supports to ensure all students are successful. The Agency recently has had an increase in requests from school administrators to establish action plans and training to implement a tiered system of supports. Iowa’s Instructional Decision-Making (IDM) Model, Response to Intervention (RTI) materials, and Douglas Fisher/Nancy Frey “Enhancing RTI” through a gradual release model are the foundational theory, concepts, and processes being used for planning and training. The roll-out process has been aligned to the ASCD Differentiated Instruction efforts that have been a major professional development intervention adopted by many schools within the region. This
emerging priority will be integrated into the Agency’s program and service development process. It will be a priority to work collaboratively with schools to initiate a tiered system of supports.

**Student Learning Findings**

The Agency has identified four key student learning findings: 1) reading, mathematics, and science achievement gaps exist among the students with disabilities, low socioeconomic subgroup, and minority subgroup; 2) graduation rates are below the state average within the five of the six largest enrollment school districts which includes more than 60% of MABEA regional enrollment; 3) students with disabilities are underperforming the reading and mathematics performance targets; and 4) several school climate issues were found based on the Iowa Youth Survey data. These student learning findings are:

1. Achievement gaps have continued to exist among students with disabilities, low socioeconomic, and minority subgroups. The achievement trend lines in reading and mathematics have been somewhat flat in recent years. Science has had a fairly consistent positive trend line and consistently the highest proficiency rates. (See Appendix A) Science has not been the priority; thus, it has been hypothesized that a focus on reading has likely had a positive impact on students’ science performance.

   a) Table 6 is presented to display the subgroup reading achievement gaps. These subgroups included 77% of the 6,253 non-proficient students. A major finding has been the 72% non-proficiency rate among students with disabilities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 6: 2009-2010 Reading Proficiency and Non-Proficiency Comparison Rank-Ordered by Non-Proficiency Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subgroups</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Students with Disabilities or IEPs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only Low Socioeconomic (SES) status students without IEPs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only Minority students without Low SES status and IEPs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only Majority students without Low SES status and IEPs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Students Tested in Grades 3-8 &amp; 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-Proficient Percentage Numbers</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72% 1,978 753</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32% 2,570 5,490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20% 295 1,182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12% 1,412 9,889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27% 6,253 17,314</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
b) Table 7 is presented to display the subgroup mathematics achievement gaps. These subgroups included 80% of the 5,334 non-proficient students. A major finding has been the 62% non-proficiency rate among students with disabilities.

Table 7: 2009-2010 Mathematics Proficiency and Non-Proficiency Comparison
Rank-Ordered by Non-Proficiency Numbers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subgroups</th>
<th>Non-Proficient Percentage</th>
<th>Non-Proficient Numbers</th>
<th>Proficient Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Students with Disabilities or IEPs</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>1,682</td>
<td>1,046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only Low Socioeconomic (SES) status students without IEPs</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>2,309</td>
<td>5,747</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only Minority students without Low SES status and IEPs</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>1,209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only Majority students without Low SES status and IEPs</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>1,075</td>
<td>10,221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Students Tested in Grades 3-8 &amp; 11</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>5,334</td>
<td>18,223</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

c) Table 8 is presented to display the subgroup science achievement gaps. These subgroups included 71% of the 2,052 non-proficient students. An important finding has been the 55% non-proficiency rate among students with disabilities.

Table 8: 2009-2010 Science Proficiency and Non-Proficiency Comparison
Rank-Ordered by Non-Proficiency Numbers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subgroups</th>
<th>Non-Proficient Percentage</th>
<th>Non-Proficient Numbers</th>
<th>Proficient Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Students with Disabilities or IEPs</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>635</td>
<td>525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only Low Socioeconomic (SES) status students without IEPs</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>806</td>
<td>2,313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only Minority students without Low SES status and IEPs</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only Majority students without Low SES status and IEPs</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>499</td>
<td>4,597</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of Students Tested in Grades 5, 8 &amp; 11</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>2,052</td>
<td>7,963</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. High graduation rate data evidenced that five of the largest school districts in 2009 were below the state average. Table 9 is presented to display these alarming findings. These school districts represented more than 60% of the regional student enrollment population. Furthermore, four school districts have experienced graduation rate decline in 2009. The AEA has been involved in the ACHIEVE Project that is addressing drop-outs within Scott County. The project has been a community and school collaboration facilitated by United Way and Great River Bend Community Foundation. Schools have expressed a need for more Learning Supports efforts connecting students to their school. Educators have shared these concerns in the context of the new COMMON CORE standards which will raise the achievement bar for all students.
Table 9: High School Graduation Rate Trend

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School District</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bettendorf</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinton</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davenport</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muscatine</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Scott</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleasant Valley</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Students with disabilities reading and mathematics proficiency rates are below the state’s targets on the 34 Federal Special Education Part B indicators. These indicators have been established as mandated statewide targets for AEAs and LEAs. The newly-developed Enhanced Service Delivery System (ESDS) for Special Education service delivery has been designed to address all Part B Indicators. MBAEA reading and mathematics goals overlap the federal indicators. A new field-level data capturing system has been initiated statewide for AEAs to provide more data-driven decision-making efficiencies at the field level. It has been a priority to implement new practices that support educator efforts to differentiate instruction and modify practices to better serve diverse learner needs.

Table 10 is presented to compare the recently published MBAEA IDEA Part B Indicator data and the 2008-2009, 2009-2010, and 2010-2011 Indicator Target results. These results are a key component of the Agency’s new Plan’s measurement and evaluation system. The following findings were identified:

A. Graduation rate is below Part B Indicator target.
B. Participation rate meets Part B Indicator targets.
C. Proficiency rates are below Part B Indicator targets.
D. Percent removed meets Part B Indicator targets.
E. Preschool Part B indicators are slightly below the targets.
F. IEP process rates are close to the target except measurable and transition goals are below the Part B Indicator target.
G. IEP students enrolled in higher education rates are meeting or exceeding the Part B Indicator targets.
## Table 10: Mississippi Bend Area Education Agency IDEA Part B Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B1: Graduation*</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>80.9</td>
<td>91.3</td>
<td>91.3</td>
<td>91.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2: Dropout*</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>-0.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>11.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3A: Percent of Districts Meeting AYP</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3B: 3rd Grade Participation (Reading)</td>
<td>98.3</td>
<td>99.0</td>
<td>99.7</td>
<td>98.2</td>
<td>95.0</td>
<td>95.0</td>
<td>95.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3B: 3rd Grade Participation (Math)</td>
<td>98.0</td>
<td>98.7</td>
<td>98.4</td>
<td>99.0</td>
<td>95.0</td>
<td>95.0</td>
<td>95.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3B: 4th Grade Participation (Reading)</td>
<td>99.7</td>
<td>98.6</td>
<td>98.9</td>
<td>98.5</td>
<td>95.0</td>
<td>95.0</td>
<td>95.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3B: 4th Grade Participation (Math)</td>
<td>99.2</td>
<td>98.6</td>
<td>99.5</td>
<td>99.6</td>
<td>95.0</td>
<td>95.0</td>
<td>95.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3B: 5th Grade Participation (Reading)</td>
<td>98.8</td>
<td>99.3</td>
<td>99.5</td>
<td>99.8</td>
<td>95.0</td>
<td>95.0</td>
<td>95.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3B: 5th Grade Participation (Math)</td>
<td>99.0</td>
<td>99.0</td>
<td>98.8</td>
<td>99.8</td>
<td>95.0</td>
<td>95.0</td>
<td>95.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3B: 6th Grade Participation (Reading)</td>
<td>99.3</td>
<td>99.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>99.5</td>
<td>95.0</td>
<td>95.0</td>
<td>95.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3B: 6th Grade Participation (Math)</td>
<td>99.6</td>
<td>99.3</td>
<td>98.8</td>
<td>99.5</td>
<td>95.0</td>
<td>95.0</td>
<td>95.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3B: 7th Grade Participation (Reading)</td>
<td>99.2</td>
<td>99.6</td>
<td>99.3</td>
<td>99.5</td>
<td>95.0</td>
<td>95.0</td>
<td>95.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3B: 7th Grade Participation (Math)</td>
<td>99.2</td>
<td>99.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>98.9</td>
<td>95.0</td>
<td>95.0</td>
<td>95.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3B: 8th Grade Participation (Reading)</td>
<td>99.2</td>
<td>98.3</td>
<td>99.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>95.0</td>
<td>95.0</td>
<td>95.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3B: 8th Grade Participation (Math)</td>
<td>98.6</td>
<td>98.6</td>
<td>98.3</td>
<td>78.1</td>
<td>95.0</td>
<td>95.0</td>
<td>95.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3B: 11th Grade Participation (Reading)</td>
<td>98.4</td>
<td>97.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>98.7</td>
<td>95.0</td>
<td>95.0</td>
<td>95.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3B: 11th Grade Participation (Math)</td>
<td>97.7</td>
<td>97.9</td>
<td>99.7</td>
<td>99.0</td>
<td>95.0</td>
<td>95.0</td>
<td>95.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3B: 3rd Grade Proficiency (Reading)</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td>28.7</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>38.2</td>
<td>74.1</td>
<td>74.1</td>
<td>74.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3B: 3rd Grade Proficiency (Math)</td>
<td>45.4</td>
<td>48.6</td>
<td>42.7</td>
<td>47.3</td>
<td>73.9</td>
<td>73.9</td>
<td>73.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3B: 4th Grade Proficiency (Reading)</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>30.2</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>76.0</td>
<td>76.0</td>
<td>76.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3B: 4th Grade Proficiency (Math)</td>
<td>47.1</td>
<td>47.1</td>
<td>47.7</td>
<td>48.9</td>
<td>74.7</td>
<td>74.7</td>
<td>81.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3B: 5th Grade Proficiency (Reading)</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>38.4</td>
<td>76.4</td>
<td>76.4</td>
<td>76.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3B: 5th Grade Proficiency (Math)</td>
<td>51.7</td>
<td>37.1</td>
<td>38.6</td>
<td>40.8</td>
<td>76.6</td>
<td>76.6</td>
<td>82.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3B: 6th Grade Proficiency (Reading)</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>69.7</td>
<td>69.7</td>
<td>77.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3B: 6th Grade Proficiency (Math)</td>
<td>33.2</td>
<td>30.9</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>72.8</td>
<td>72.8</td>
<td>79.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3B: 7th Grade Proficiency (Reading)</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>71.5</td>
<td>71.5</td>
<td>78.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3B: 7th Grade Proficiency (Math)</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td>33.8</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>72.0</td>
<td>72.0</td>
<td>79.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3B: 8th Grade Proficiency (Reading)</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>73.3</td>
<td>73.3</td>
<td>80.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3B: 8th Grade Proficiency (Math)</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td>72.0</td>
<td>72.0</td>
<td>79.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3B: 11th Grade Proficiency (Reading)</td>
<td>33.8</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>79.3</td>
<td>79.3</td>
<td>84.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3B: 11th Grade Proficiency (Math)</td>
<td>31.2</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>79.3</td>
<td>79.3</td>
<td>84.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B4: Suspension and Expulsion (% of districts with significant discrepancy in suspensions/expulsions)</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B4: Suspension and Expulsion (% of students with an IEP suspended/expelled for more than 10 days)</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B5A: Percent of students removed from regular class less than 21% of the day</td>
<td>42.0</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>52.2</td>
<td>58.2</td>
<td>55.0</td>
<td>65.0</td>
<td>75.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Continued, Table 10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B5B: Percent of students removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B5C: Percent of students in separate school, residential, homebound, or hospital placements</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B7A: Social Emotional (Percent of preschool children substantially increasing rate of growth)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>63.6</td>
<td></td>
<td>69.8</td>
<td>73.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B7A: Social Emotional (Percent of preschool children functioning within age expectations)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>46.8</td>
<td></td>
<td>57.0</td>
<td>60.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B7B: Appropriate Behaviors (Percent of preschool children substantially increasing rate of growth)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>72.9</td>
<td></td>
<td>77.5</td>
<td>81.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B7B: Appropriate Behaviors (Percent of preschool children functioning within age expectations)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>40.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>38.4</td>
<td>41.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B7C: Acquisition of Knowledge and Skills (Percent of preschool children substantially increasing rate of growth)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>56.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>60.2</td>
<td>63.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B7C: Acquisition of Knowledge and Skills (Percent of preschool children functioning within age expectations)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>40.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>58.5</td>
<td>62.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B8A: Percent of parents (children aged 3-5) reporting schools facilitated involvement</td>
<td>78.9</td>
<td>78.3</td>
<td>79.8</td>
<td>75.4</td>
<td>75.5</td>
<td>75.5</td>
<td>75.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B8B: Percent of parents (children aged 6-21) reporting schools facilitated involvement</td>
<td>54.5</td>
<td>52.1</td>
<td>62.1</td>
<td>65.0</td>
<td>64.0</td>
<td>64.0</td>
<td>64.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B11: Percent of children determined eligible within 60 days</td>
<td>90.0</td>
<td>89.5</td>
<td>92.9</td>
<td>97.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B12: Percent of children with IEP by 3rd birthday</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>84.3</td>
<td>93.2</td>
<td>93.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B13: IEPs with measurable annual goals and transition services</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>44.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B14A: Enrolled in higher education</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>68.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>66.4</td>
<td>66.5</td>
<td>66.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B14B: Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>81.4</td>
<td></td>
<td>66.4</td>
<td>66.5</td>
<td>66.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B14C: Enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training, competitively employed or in some other employment</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>95.8</td>
<td></td>
<td>66.4</td>
<td>66.5</td>
<td>66.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B15: Effective general supervision system</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B20: Timely and accurate data--</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>Met</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. Iowa Youth Survey responses from students in grades 6, 8 and 11 indicated the following learning environment needs:

a. 61% responded unfavorably to school staff and/or student support.
b. 57% responded unfavorably to school adults stop bullying.
c. 34% responded unfavorably to school expectations and/or boundaries.
d. 34% responded unfavorably to self-confidence and 31% to self-esteem.
e. 27% responded unfavorably a commitment to school and/or learning.

Table 11: 2008 Iowa Youth Survey – Students from Grades 6, 8, & 11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Safe and Supportive School Climate</th>
<th>Learning Supports</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Favorable</td>
<td>Unfavorable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Youth Successful in School</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Favorable</td>
<td>Unfavorable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Youth Prepared for a Productive Adulthood</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Favorable</td>
<td>Unfavorable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bullying</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Favorable</td>
<td>Unfavorable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Secure and Supportive Family</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Favorable</td>
<td>Unfavorable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Safe and Supportive Community</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Favorable</td>
<td>Unfavorable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Healthy Youth – Avoidance of Risky Behavior</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Favorable</td>
<td>Unfavorable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Socially Competent Youth</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Favorable</td>
<td>Unfavorable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Youth Engaged In and/or Contribute To Community</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Favorable</td>
<td>Unfavorable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Iowa Youth Survey has been a cost-efficient method to gather student learning climate responses from a large regional student sample. The Agency has offered numerous programs to address learning climates including federal Safe School Healthy Students and Counseling Grants. The grant projects have provided substantial professional development for school counselors. The school counselors have continued their professional development through an Agency Counselors’ Academy. The Agency has developed a learning supports program to address behaviors and bullying issues. The most recent Iowa Youth Survey data have been presented in Table 11.

**Teaching & Learning Needs**

Table 12 has been presented to illustrate the alignment of the needs assessment findings to AEA programs and services targeting school and school district needs. The alignment has been coded using the school and school districts needs A-F and student learning needs 1-4 below. An X has been placed in the appropriate Table 12 need column to display which programs and services are designed to address the identified needs assessment findings.

**Identified School and School Districts Needs**

A. Planning efforts to fully implement the Iowa Core;
B. Reducing initiatives and increasing coherence around the teaching and learning priorities;
C. Reaching students not actively engaged in the school’s curriculum and connecting students socially and emotionally to school (developing caring learning environments i.e., learning supports);
D. Focusing on improving the academic performance, or reducing the achievement gap, of students from poverty and low income households as well as students with disabilities;
E. Improving reading/language arts, mathematics, science, and career preparation (evidence-based instruction, rigor and relevance, formative assessment, and summative assessments);
F. Implementing professional development which includes data-driven collaborative teaming, lesson study, and high quality feedback.

**Identified Student Learning Needs**

1. Minority, low socioeconomic, and students with disabilities subgroups have achievement gaps.
2. Graduation rate among larger school districts is too low.
3. Students with disabilities proficiency rates are below the state targets.
4. Student climate feedback indicated improvements were needed in the learning environment.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2011-2012 Programs and Services</th>
<th>School &amp; District Needs</th>
<th>Student Learning Needs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. ASAP</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Instructional Decision-Making</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Learning Supports</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Mathematics</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Reading/Language Arts</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Science</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Closing the Achievement Gap</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. CIP</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Early Childhood Services</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. English Language Learners ELL</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Media Materials Distribution</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Media Services</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Paraeducator Training</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Principals' Leadership Academy</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. School and Community Planning</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. ACCESS Program</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Alternate Assessment</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Assistive Technology Team</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Audiological Services</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Autism Resource Team</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Brain Injury Team</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Compliance Monitoring</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Counseling Services</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Early ACCESS</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Educational Consultant Services</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Hospital and Home Instruction</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Independent Evaluations</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Itinerant Hearing Services</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Itinerant Vision Services</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Occupational Therapy</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Orientation and Mobility Services</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Parent-Educator Connection</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Physical Therapy</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. School Psychology Services</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. School Social Worker Services</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Speech and Language Services</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. Transition Services</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. Administrative Services and Support</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. Communication Audits &amp; Planning</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. Content Area Teacher Networks</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. Crisis Intervention</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. Environmental Services Program</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. Home Schooling</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. Information Management Systems</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. Information Technology</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. Iowa’s Educator Consortium</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47. Learning Center</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48. Legal Cooperative</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49. Non-Violent Crisis Intervention</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50. Professional Development</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-2012 Programs and Services</td>
<td>School &amp; District Needs</td>
<td>Student Learning Needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51. School Bus Driver Training</td>
<td>A  B  C  D  E  F</td>
<td>1  2  3  4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52. School Technology</td>
<td>X  X  X  X  X</td>
<td>X  X  X  X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53. Sexual Harassment Investigators</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54. Sexual Harassment Training</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55. Solution Focused Mediation Center</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56. Statewide On-Deck Services</td>
<td>X  X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57. Student Activities and Events</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58. Student Programs</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59. Targeted Services on Request</td>
<td>X  X  X</td>
<td>X  X  X  X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60. Teacher Job Fair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61. Web Construction &amp; Support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62. Web Hosting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Number of Xs</strong></td>
<td>25  18  42  25  26  26  26  32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percent of Programs &amp; Services</strong></td>
<td>40% 29% 58% 48% 40% 32% 42% 42% 52%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Accreditation Feedback and Response**

2010 Iowa Department of Education Accreditation Site Visit concluded with full accreditation by the Iowa State Board of Education. The accreditation process is embedded into the Agency’s continuous improvement process as another needs assessment and validation source. The Department feedback included suggestions to support MBAEA future planning efforts. The feedback has been processed by leadership and action plans were developed. The Leadership Team had an opportunity to process these identified action steps. The actions have been embedded in the 2011-2016 Comprehensive Improvement Plan to ensure implementation of the Department’s suggestions.

**Accreditation Follow-up Action Plan**

**Iowa Department of Education 2010 Accreditation Feedback**

Mississippi Bend Area Education Agency has MET all 8 Iowa Area Education Agency Service Delivery Standards for the third consecutive time (2000, 2005, and 2010) through the statewide Iowa Department of Education Accreditation Process mandated within Iowa Code. The comprehensive improvement planning process has already begun. Dr. Pelecky and his Cabinet have identified actions to address the recommendations by the 2010 Iowa Department of Education Accreditation Site Team. The following actions have been identified:
1. Develop Partnership Agreements (PA) with area schools that commit agency resources to a school's reform efforts.

   The PA process has been designed to:
   a. Include an effective monitoring component to address data collection and analysis, and data-driven decision making.
      i. Example: Supporting IDM or RTI implementation through effective data-driven decision-making
      ii. Example: Gathering program and service data around specific programs such as PBIS
   b. Integrate diversity support and the agency Equity Plan to ensure agency staff members have the skills and LEAs have fully supported processes to address cultural competency, multicultural education, ELL, and gender fair practices.
      i. Integrate service delivery to impact internal and external beliefs and behaviors through embedded support within the school improvement service delivery model.
      ii. Pilot the new diversity integration support with the Columbus Community School District during the Partnership Agreement planning process.
   c. Involve a communication component so that teachers within the schools with Partnership Agreements fully understand the scope of the work and outcomes.
      i. Linked to agency goals and diversity
      ii. Linked to agency program and service decision-making
      iii. Linked to agency resource allocations and staff assignments
      iv. Linked to multi-approaches to connecting agency staff and LEA educators across distances through various technology options
   d. Build a centralized database so that agency staff and LEAs have quality decision-making information. The centralized database will have a link to the statewide AEA standards of service database being developed in partnership with the Iowa Department of Education.

2. Implementing the new Enhanced Service Delivery System for Special Education (ESDS) to focus on direct service and team-based planning, implementation, and monitoring.

   ESDS has been designed to:
   a. Create a direct service delivery supported by a team of AEA staff experts to meet the varied diverse learner specialities to fully support the development, implementation, and evaluation of IEPs.
   b. Allocate effectively and efficiently agency resources with a greater emphasis on communicating to LEAs how their allocated resources match their teaching and learning needs.
   c. Integrate the new centralized agency database protocols for decision-making.
d. Develop multiple approaches to connecting agency staff and LEA educator across distances through various technology options.

3. **Coordinate a new internal and external communication plan and its delivery to address educator awareness and access to AEA services.**
   
a. The plan has the following content outcomes:
   
i. Communicate the decision-making protocol used to develop, implement, and evaluate Partnership Agreements.
   
ii. Communicate the diversity support within the agency goals, changes in data trends, and support through specific actions.
   
iii. Communicate agency planning processes, service delivery priority setting, resource allocations, and decision-making processes through the new comprehensive improvement plan being developed by April 2011.
   
iv. Communicate agency diversity training and support to schools for such topics as cultural competence, multicultural education, ELL support, and gender fair practices.
   
   b. The plan must include clear multiple approaches to communicating how the agency supports internal staff members and LEA educators through training and services to meet their diverse needs such as cultural competency, multicultural, ELL, and gender fair.

   c. The plan has the following process outcomes:
   
i. Use multiple approaches to frequently communicate with internal and external customers so that they retain the information and understand how the agency supports their school improvement work and goals.
   
ii. Use multiple approaches to connecting agency staff and LEA educators across distances through various technology options.

4. **Implement the Comprehensive Aligned Personnel System (CAPS) to support agency staff delivery of service to customers.**

   a. An internal review has already begun and the agency has added the following expectations to the review of licensed staff job descriptions:
   
i. Presentation skills
   
ii. Diversity skills and supports for LEAs such as cultural competence, multicultural, ELL, and gender fair

   b. Coaching training for agency staff to support high quality interactions with Agency colleagues as well as with LEA staff that will lead to improved student learning.

5. **Add specific processes to enhance the new Comprehensive Improvement Plan’s development, implementation, and evaluation.**
a. Enhance the communication process to address customer awareness of:
   i. Agency goals, data trends, and outcomes
   ii. Agency response to diversity
   iii. Partnership Agreement protocols for internal and external actions that address
        needs assessment, priority setting, service delivery, decision-making, resource
        allocation, and articulation to school level teaching and learning needs
b. Initiate a review process by Dr. Gronlund, Dr. Wolzen, Dr. Wirtz, Nancy McIntire,
   Trampus Budde, Margaret Van Fossen, Cindy Swanson, and Martha Yearington to
   ensure the plan:
   i. Integrates school improvement support and diversity
   ii. Integrates internal and external professional development linked to diversity
       supports
   iii. Monitors feedback related to internal and external diversity needs

c. Implement a data process to build an effective centralized database to support agency
   decision-making protocols, individual staff member data-driven needs, and LEAs
   feedback about AEA effectiveness.

In addition, the action plan has several very specific recommendations related to agency
processes. The complete accreditation response is found in Appendix F. Appendix F has these
action steps coded within a narrative for each Iowa Department of Education Accreditation Site
Team suggestion.
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The continuous improvement process and the ongoing needs assessment findings resulted in AEA Board of Directors deciding to readopt the current Agency-wide goals. The compelling minority, low socioeconomic, and students with disabilities subgroup achievement gaps in reading, mathematics, and science remained pertinent to the Agency’s overall teaching and learning mission, the 34 Federal Special Education Part B Indicators, State Board of Education’s Strategic Plan, and statewide AEA Service Standards. The student learning findings and LEA feedback have informed Decision-Makers about providing relevant programs and services and attaining the following Agency adopted goals:

2011-2016 Agency-Wide Goals

Increase the percentage of low socioeconomic, minority, and individualized plan students achieving reading proficiency in grades 3-8 and 11.

Increase the percentage of low socioeconomic, minority, and individualized plan students achieving mathematics proficiency in grades 3-8 and 11.

Increase the percentage of low socioeconomic, minority, and individualized plan students achieving science proficiency in grades 5, 8, and 11.

The Agency has recommitted to the existing Agency-wide Goals. MBAEA realizes the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) will likely have more accountability regarding higher levels of educator performance to meet the student learning challenges. The AEA Board of Directors recognize the existing goals have a "good fit" and that they address the current and future teaching and learning needs. MBAEA has developed a plan to meet these challenges through providing special education support services, media and technology services, instructional services, professional development, leadership development and management services. The plan has been aligned to the Iowa State Board of Education Goals to ensure Iowa’s educational resources are focused on a common mission and outcomes.
Iowa State Board of Education Goals

Goal 1: All children will enter school ready to learn. (Early Childhood)

Goal 2: All K-12 students will achieve at a high level. (K-12)

Goal 3: Individuals will pursue post-secondary education in order to drive economic success. (Postsecondary Education)

These Agency goals were first adopted in 2002; and they were renewed in 2006 following the last accreditation visit. The goals have represented MBEA’s assertive leadership to join area schools and school districts in the common pursuit of improved student learning. The goals were renewed based on the following needs assessment summary findings: 1) reading, mathematics, and science achievement gaps are too wide among students with disabilities, the low socioeconomic subgroup, and the minority subgroup; 2) high school graduation rates are below the state average in the large district high schools, and several large districts have declining rates; 3) students with disabilities achievement rates are below the state special education targets; and 4) Iowa Youth Survey data evidenced that the learning environment needs to be improved such as more support, less bullying, clearer expectations, building more self-esteem, and fostering more commitment to school and learning. The new Comprehensive Improvement Plan has been developed to address these findings and attain the Agency’s goals.

Measurable Goals

The Agency’s goals are measured using the Iowa Testing results provided annually. The Iowa Testing results provide student achievement scores in reading, mathematics, and science. The subgroup data (low-socioeconomic, minority, and IEP) are accessed using Iowa Testing regional results and the new EdInsight data warehouse. Reading and mathematics achievement are reported as a proficiency rate (percentage) for students in grades 3-8 and 11. Science achievement is reported as a proficiency rate (percentage) for students in grades 5, 8 and 11. The
agency-wide goals have been constructed to be measurable and quantifiable. Valid student data will be provided through the Iowa Tests of Basic Skills, grades 3-8, and Iowa Tests of Educational Development, grade 11, results. Iowa has provided an alternate assessment mechanism to appropriately identify successful attainment for some students with disabilities. Additionally, the balanced scorecard presented in Table 3 and evaluation process described on pages 31-33 are strategic management tools to measure program and service operations to ensure an agency resource alignment to its goals and mission.

**Agency-wide goals are focused on assisting schools and school districts with the school improvement process.** Table 13 has three years of high levels (90% agreement) of customer satisfaction data resulting from AEA school improvement supports. The following are AEA activities contributing to this satisfaction: Superintendents Network, Comprehensive School Improvement Network, SINA/DINA Support Teams, Partnership Agreements, Technology Directors, and Principals’ Leadership Academy. Other supports such as Iowa Core and (reading, mathematics, and science) curriculum/instruction/assessment are evident in the Table 13 feedback. Another source of data were the Davenport Special Education Services Audit conducted by an independent professional that provided relevant feedback to improve district and AEA special education programs. These Agency Goals have continually driven Decision-Makers to provide school improvement assistance.

**Agency-wide goals are focused on assisting schools and school districts with improving teaching and learning.** Table 13 has been presented to display three years of data from the Statewide AEA Customer Satisfaction Survey as evidence indicating reading, mathematics, and science teachers and administrators have found MBAEA services have been responsive to student learning needs, have assisted in improving instructional practices, and have assisted in improving student achievement. The 90%+ agreement the past two years on the
survey feedback has indicated to Decision-Makers that Agency efforts to provide additional support and coaching at the school level has been appreciated by educators.

Table 13: Statewide AEA Customer Satisfaction Survey

Percentages represent affirmative responses and excluding the “no opinion” responses from the calculation.

| Please rate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements about AEA services. | % Agree/Strongly Agree |
|---|---|---|
| | 2007-2008 (N=525) | 2008-2009 (N=1,161) | 2009-2010 (N=699) |
| a. Generally the AEA services that I have received or participated in met my professional needs. | 92.4% | 95.5% | 95.9% |
| b. The AEA is responsive to my school's student learning needs. | 87.6% | 91.0% | 92.3% |
| c. The AEA provides leadership to meet emerging educational needs. | 89.5% | 91.9% | 92.1% |
| d. The AEA delivers current and timely services to meet my district or school's needs. | 82.6% | 90.9% | 90.0% |
| e. The AEA delivers cost-efficient services to meet my district or school's needs. | 90.3% | 92.7% | 92.3% |
| f. The AEA delivers services that assist our district in meeting federal and state mandates NCLB, IDEA, etc. | 91.9% | 95.4% | 95.1% |
| g. The AEA services that I have received assisted in improving my students' achievement. | 87.0% | 91.3% | 89.6% |
| h. The AEA services I received have assisted in improving my instruction or job-related practices. | 90.7% | 92.8% | 92.3% |
| i. The AEA staff I have contact with have the knowledge and skills needed to have a positive impact on our schools. | 91.8% | 93.6% | 93.2% |
| j. The AEA staff I have contact with create and maintain good working relationships with people in my school and/or district. | 88.8% | 93.7% | 93.5% |

| Please indicate the need for the AEA to allocate resources to assist your school with its efforts to improve teaching and learning in the following areas: | % Very High to Moderate |
|---|---|---|
| | 2007-2008 (N=525) | 2008-2009 (N=1,161) | 2009-2010 (N=699) |
| a. Improving student reading performance, especially students within the low socioeconomic status, minority, and special education subgroups. | 94.5% | 95.8% | 96.9% |
| b. Improving student mathematics performance, especially students within the low socioeconomic status, minority, and special education subgroups. | 94.1% | 94.8% | 95.1% |
| c. Improving student science performance, especially students within the low socioeconomic status, minority, and special education subgroups. | 90.5% | 92.3% | 91.0% |

Table 13 displayed three years of data from customers validating MBAEA agency-wide goals. AEA customer agreement levels regarding the Agency’s goals are consistently above 90%. Decision-Makers have found schools and school districts more focused on accountability and student learning gains. It has become a more common practice for educators to seek
“assistance” than ask the AEA to “bring in” a national speaker. Fewer large-scale training events have been presented by AEA at its Bettendorf Learning Center. This is an example of how the MBAEA has shifted its efforts to improving teaching and learning at the school site.

The agency-wide goals and comprehensive improvement plan are focused on assisting schools and school districts with improving teaching and learning. The new plan has adopted four objectives: 1) high levels of learning for all students; 2) service stability to consistently provide priority services; 3) effective and efficient AEA programs and services; and 4) high performing AEA professionals and staff delivering evidenced-based strategies and practices. Table 3, page 11, is the balanced scorecard being used to evaluate the Agency’s plan.

The plan has been designed to reflect the improvement efforts by schools and school districts. The goals and action steps are also aligned with school and district needs assessment data. The new Partnership Agreement process has provided a mechanism so that in the future the Partnership Agreements will be an effective tool to validate critical AEA programs and services. These changes are congruent with the Agency’s operational target that all programs and services will have a connection to: a) school level teaching and learning implementation effectiveness; or b) school level system efficiencies to support a shift of more resources to direct teaching and learning support.
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Services portion of the Comprehensive Improvement Plan has identified programs and services aligned to the Agency's goals. Beginning 2011-2012, programs and services will be reviewed to align these services with the Partnership Agreement process, Enhanced Service Delivery System, and new statewide initiatives. These review activities will be scheduled to coincide with the launching of the new statewide AEA data capturing system. It is anticipated program and service information associated with AEA accreditation will be entered into the new data system by AEA staff and administrators during 2012. These activities are tentatively scheduled to be completed by June 30, 2013.

Diagram 2: MBAEA Program & Service Learning Cycle

CREATE a purpose for new learning (Learning Needs)

EVALUATE the impact on student learning effectiveness and efficiencies

TRAIN & COACH people to change their practices and study implementation

Next Iteration

ORGANIZE a context to support school level improvement efforts

The graphic depicted in Diagram 2 is presented to demonstrate the ongoing internal program and services LEARNING cycle. The cycle has been followed in the development of the new plan. In the future, the cycle will be used to generate conversations among AEA field staff and administrators with LEA educators to determine how AEA services support teachers at the
classroom practice level. The most important aspect of this cycle has been placing a priority on data-driven decision-making within a collaborative team setting.

The 2011-2012 programs and services have been organized into five categories. The categories have been identified to temporarily bridge the current programs and services to a new anticipated 2013 format. It is anticipated the Partnership Agreement process and Enhanced Service Delivery System plus the AEAs reflection of common statewide core services within the new AEA statewide data capturing system will require major program and service format changes. These factors have led to moving programs and services reviews to 2012.

**Temporary Program & Service Categories**

A. 2011-2012 Development Projects  
B. Agency Goal Instructional Practices  
C. LEA Priorities and Accountability  
D. Enhanced Service Delivery System  
E. Other LEA Supports

**A. 2011-2012 Development Projects** are presented in Table 14. Six project areas were identified, and it is not certain what the program and service implications are at this time. Superintendents have requested support for a common curriculum (curriculum, instruction, and assessment) supporting the Iowa Core/Common Core. The Massachusetts curriculum and support model has been investigated, and MBAEA has been working with superintendents and educators to fully design a potential common curriculum project. Massachusetts was selected because they have demonstrated student learning results nationally and their students internationally are performing academically better than Iowa’s students. Learning Supports and tiered system of supports has been tagged by Iowa Department of Education as needing a comprehensive review. The Department has engaged AEAs in a conversation to complete this new Learning Supports design. Partnership Agreements have not been fully implemented; therefore, it is uncertain whether these Agreements are a service or a delivery mechanism. It also
has not been decided whether the Superintendents’ Network will be a separate program or if it will be combined with other leadership programs. These projects are explicitly aligned to the AEA Service Standards and goals and Table 14 has been presented to illustrate the alignment.

### Table 14: 2011-2012 Development Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MBAEA Programs and Services</th>
<th>Statewide AEA Standards of Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Development Projects</td>
<td>Agency-Wide Goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common Core English/LA</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common Core Mathematics</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Supports</td>
<td>ALL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnership Agreements</td>
<td>ALL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendents’ Network</td>
<td>ALL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiered System of Supports</td>
<td>ALL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentages</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. **Agency Goal Instructional Practices** are presented in Table 15. The Agency has decided the priority programs and services associated with Agency’s goals are: Accelerating Student Achievement Partnerships, Instructional Decision-Making, Learning Supports, Mathematics, Reading & Language Arts, Science, and Differentiated Instruction. Accelerating Student Achievement Partnerships, Instructional Decision-Making, and Learning Supports are overlapped with the development projects in Table 14. It was decided to leave the overlap at this time given the uncertainty about what these programs/services will “look like” in the future. The Agency has allocated resources to establish Partnership Agreements, to train and to support educators to implement Learning Supports (school climate), and to engage districts in Instructional Decision-Making/Response to Intervention/a tiered system of supports efforts.
Table 15 presents programs and services that are explicitly aligned to the AEA Service Standards and AEA goals. The 2012 review process has been adopted to ensure that the priority school level instructional reform and professional development are integrated into these AEA services.

### Table 15: Agency Goal Instructional Practices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programs and Services</th>
<th>MBAEA</th>
<th>Agency-Wide Goals</th>
<th>Curriculum/Instruction/Assessment</th>
<th>Diversity Learners</th>
<th>Leadership Development</th>
<th>Media Services</th>
<th>Multi-Cultural Gender Fair</th>
<th>Professional Development</th>
<th>School &amp; Community Planning</th>
<th>School Technology</th>
<th>Management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. ASAP</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Instructional Decision-Making</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Learning Supports</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Mathematics</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Cognitive Tutor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Every Student Counts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Iowa Core</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Research Strategy Support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Site-Based Coaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Reading/Language Arts</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Elementary Reading</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Iowa Core</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. KU Content Enhancements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. KU Learning Strategies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Learning to Write</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Read Naturally</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Reading Recovery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Research Strategy Support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Second Chance Reading</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Secondary Reading</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. Site-Based Coaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Science</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Every Learner Inquires</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Iowa Core</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Research-Based Strategy Support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Site-Based Coaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. V.A.S.T. Project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Differentiated Instruction</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Percentages**

- 100% 100% 100% 100% 57% 100% 100% 60% 86% 0%
C. LEA Priorities and Accountability are presented in Table 16. The Agency has decided to provide these programs and services to address LEA priorities and statewide accountability initiatives. The following services are associated with Agency’s goals through system supports: comprehensive school improvement (CSI) and program evaluation, early childhood services, English Language Learners, media distribution and services, paraeducator training, Principals’ Leadership Academy, and school & community planning. It is being considered to reformat this section as System Supports. The following AEA Service Standards—media, Multi-Cultural Gender Fair, and School Technology—will be integrated at higher levels within system supports during the 2011-2012 review.

Table 16: LEA Priorities and Accountability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MBAEA Programs and Services</th>
<th>Statewide AEA Standards of Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>LEA Priorities &amp; Accountability</strong></td>
<td>Agency-Wide Goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. CSI Support &amp; Program Evaluation</td>
<td>ALL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Curriculum Network</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Co-Teaching</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. SINA/DINA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Walk Throughs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Teacher Quality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Iowa Core</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Early Childhood Services</td>
<td>ALL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. English Language Learners</td>
<td>ALL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Media Distribution Center</td>
<td>ALL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Media Services</td>
<td>ALL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Paraeducator Training</td>
<td>ALL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Principals’ Leadership Academy</td>
<td>ALL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. School &amp; Community Planning</td>
<td>ALL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percentages</strong></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
D. **Enhanced Service Delivery System** is presented in Table 17. The programs and services listed in Table 17 will be integrated into the following new delivery system’s core functions: Child Find screening, Child Find evaluation, direct services, and system supports. The review process, special education core functions, and new statewide AEA data capturing system will be used to carefully configure these programs listed in Table 17 and their alignment to AEA Service Standards. It was decided to engage in this work during 2011-2012.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MBAEA Programs and Services</th>
<th>Agency-Wide Goals</th>
<th>Curriculum/Instruction/Assessment</th>
<th>Diverse Learners</th>
<th>Diversity Development</th>
<th>Media Services</th>
<th>Multi-Cultural Gender Fair</th>
<th>Professional Development</th>
<th>School &amp; Community Planning</th>
<th>School Technology</th>
<th>Management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16. ACCESS Program</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Alternate Assessment</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Assisitive Technology</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Audiological Services</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Autism Resource Team</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Compliance Monitoring</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Counseling Program</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Early ACCESS Program</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Educational Consultant Services</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Hospital and Home Instruction</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Independent Evaluations</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Itinerant Hearing Services</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Itinerant Vision Services</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Occupational Therapy</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Orientation &amp; Mobility Services</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Parent-Educator Connection</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Physical Therapy</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. School Psychology Services</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. School Social Work Services</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Speech and Language Services</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. Transition Services</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percentages</strong></td>
<td><strong>95%</strong></td>
<td><strong>73%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td><strong>0%</strong></td>
<td><strong>0%</strong></td>
<td><strong>45%</strong></td>
<td><strong>5%</strong></td>
<td><strong>23%</strong></td>
<td><strong>0%</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
E. Other LEA Supports are presented in Table 18. These programs and services have been identified to support school and school district effectiveness and efficiencies. All these programs and services will be reviewed and some are management services. Usage rates and user fees will be examined to determine the future of these programs.

**Table 18: Other LEA Supports**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MBAEA Programs and Services</th>
<th>Statewide AEA Standards of Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agency-Wide Goals</td>
<td>Curricular/Instruction/Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. Administrative Services &amp; Support</td>
<td>ALL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. Communication Audits &amp; Planning</td>
<td>ALL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. Content Area Teacher Networks</td>
<td>ALL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. Crisis Intervention</td>
<td>ALL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. Environmental Services Program</td>
<td>ALL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. Home Schooling</td>
<td>ALL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. Information Management System (IMS)</td>
<td>ALL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. Information Technology</td>
<td>ALL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. Iowa Educators Consortium</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47. Learning Center</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48. Legal Consortium</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49. Non-Violent Crisis Intervention</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50. Professional Development</td>
<td>ALL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51. School Bus Driver Training</td>
<td>ALL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52. School Technology</td>
<td>ALL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53. Sexual Harassment Investigator Training</td>
<td>ALL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54. Sexual Harassment Training</td>
<td>ALL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55. Solution Focused Mediation Center</td>
<td>ALL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56. School On-Deck Services</td>
<td>ALL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57. Student Activities and Events</td>
<td>ALL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58. Student Programs</td>
<td>ALL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59. Targeted Services on Request</td>
<td>ALL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60. Teacher Job Fair</td>
<td>ALL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61. Web Construction &amp; Support</td>
<td>ALL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62. Web Hosting</td>
<td>ALL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Percentages**

| 44% | 44% | 32% | 12% | 12% | 36% | 48% | 20% | 28% | 60% |
The overall agency goal and AEA Service Standard alignment has been calculated and Table 19 is presented with the results. All relevant information regarding the 2011-2012 Programs and Services are presented in Appendix B.

**Table 19: Agency Goal and AEA Service Standard Alignment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2011-2012 Programs &amp; Services</th>
<th>Aligned Programs &amp; Services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Agency Goals</strong></td>
<td><strong>78%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AEA Service Standards</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diverse Learners</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Development</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media Services</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Cultural Gender Fair</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Development</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School &amp; Community Planning</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Technology</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Services</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The 2011-2012 review process and future development estimates for goal and service standard alignment has been presented in Table 20. Table 20 is an estimated breakdown to support the Budget and Reorganization Building Blocks.

**Table 20: Future Goal and Service Standards Alignment Estimate**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2012-2013 Programs and Services</th>
<th>Aligned Programs &amp; Services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Agency Goals</strong></td>
<td><strong>90%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AEA Service Standards</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diverse Learners</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Development</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media Services</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Cultural Gender Fair</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Development with Coaching</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School &amp; Community Planning</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Technology</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Services</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 20 has been constructed to drive conversations during the review process to ensure greater integration of services into the development process. For example, leadership, media, and technology need to be integrated into the service delivery to better utilize human resources through communication and learning tools.
Action Plans 281—IAC 72.9(1)(e)

The Agency’s action plan has been developed to implement the Building Blocks presented in Table 3, page 11. The Agency has adopted the following theory of action:

a) If the Agency services support improved teaching and learning at the classroom level, then, student reading, mathematics, and science achievement will increase and the Agency goal subgroup achievement gaps will be reduced.

b) If the Agency stabilizes resources to sustain critical services at the classroom level; then, principals and teachers will have the support needed to learn and sustain their newly learned practices.

c) If the Agency services are integrated and customized to meet the teachers’ needs; then, teachers have the supports (coaching) to effectively implement research based practices.

d) If the Agency has a high quality work force to deliver services; then, principals and teachers have access to effective and efficient support services.

The action plan has been constructed through a comprehensive and inclusive design strategy to increase the likelihood “real” change will occur in teaching and learning.

Comprehensive Improvement Plan’s Outcomes & Strategies

The new Comprehensive Improvement Plan’s adopted outcomes are to: a) increase, if not drastically accelerate, student reading, mathematics, and science achievement (Agency’s Goals); b) improve teaching and learning at the school and classroom level (meeting customer needs); c) stabilize resources to accomplish priority service targets (Budget); d) deliver high quality effective and efficient programs and services to schools and school districts as well as other customers (Reorganization); and e) build workforce capacity to perform at high levels that ensures quality service delivery (CAPS). The following strategies have been selected to accomplish these outcomes: implement research and evidence based practices; develop formal and informal leaders with effective implementation skills; enhance access to media and technology utilization to increase system capacity; use an agency-wide budgeting process, deploying Partnership Agreements, employ an Enhanced Service Delivery System, and embed a
personnel system utilizing every phase of human resource development. The Agency has
constructed four action plans to reach the Plan’s outcomes and implement the Plan’s strategies.

**ACTION PLAN A – Meeting Customer Needs**. The Agency has identified an action plan to focus energy on the expected OUTPUT of the Agency’s CIP efforts. MBAEA resources are expected to support implementation of the Iowa Core/Common Core learning standards so that every child/student has access to a rigorous 21st Century education and teaching to meet those learning standards. It has been identified that high levels of learning impact all stakeholders within the Agency’s service region. The purpose of the action plan is to create and sustain active partnerships with stakeholders to maximize AEA program and service utilization (INPUTS) and leverage efficiencies across the statewide educational system. Action Plan A is the implementation of Table 3, page 11, the Balanced Scorecard Building Block Iowa Core.

**Action Plan A: Meeting Customer Needs (Iowa Core)**

**Objective:** To improve teaching and learning through active partnerships that increase low socioeconomic, minority, and IEP subgroup reading, mathematics, and science performance and/or achievement.

**Measures:**
- Annual Iowa Test Student Data (grades 3-8 & 11 reading and math results, and grades 5, 8 & 11 science results); and increases in low socioeconomic, minority, and IEP subgroup achievement and gap reduction.

**Strategies:**
- Assist in the implementation of effective instructional practices; assist in the development of leadership skills by administrators and teachers; and enhance the access to media and technology at the school level.

**Steps:**
- Sector Coordinators build upon, develop, and establish data-driven relationships with building principals, curriculum directors, and superintendents.
- Agency services support the development and ongoing support for leadership at the district, building, and classroom level. Administrators and teachers have access to professional development that strengthens their knowledge and skills regarding effective implementation, job embedded professional development connected to collaborative data teams, and change management.
- Agency services expand their ability to reach teachers and administrators through media and technology to improve AEA support and coaching access.

**Timeline:** 2015-2016 functional and productive (student achievement results) Partnership Agreements in all schools seeking such a commitment to school reform.
Continued, Action Plan A

Goal Alignment: Action Plan A is designed to meet customer needs (schools, school districts, and other stakeholders) by improving student performance and reducing the achievement gap in reading, mathematics, and science (AEA Goals).

AEA Standards: Curriculum/Instruction/Assessment – school level effective instruction
Diverse Learners – meet the learning needs of all students (differentiation)
Leadership Development – build leadership capacity of principals and teachers
Media Services – provide access to all educators
Multi-Cultural Gender Fair – build an inclusive environment for learning
Professional Development – improve teaching and learning
School & Community Planning – comprehensive planning involving all stakeholders
School Technology – use technology as a communication and learning tool

AEA Services: SeeAppendix B, pages 98-123, Program & Services 1-37, 38, 40, 50, and 51

Responsibility: Chief Administrator, Directors, and Coordinators

ACTION PLAN B – Program Stability: The Agency has identified an action plan to sustain priority programs and services within schools and districts to reach their desired student learning goals and outcomes. MBAEA financial resources are an INPUT. The budgetary process is essential to funding “what works” and ensuring the resources needed are allocated to achieve the Agency goals and mission. The purpose of the budget is to have a quantitative expression of the Comprehensive Improvement Plan’s resource allocation. An agency-wide budgetary process was designed to create more efficiency and monitor allocations to meet the Agency’s identified teaching and learning priorities. Action Plan B is the implementation of Table 3, page 11, the Balanced Scorecard Building Block Budget.

Action Plan B: Program Stability (Budget)

Objective: To sustain quality programs and services through a budgetary process that aids in the coordination, implementation, and measurement of the Agency’s Plan.

Measures: Resource allocation patterns reflecting program & service priorities.

Strategies: Using an agency-wide budgetary process: system priorities; interconnected platform structures supporting the work; and efficiencies.

Strategy is defined as:

- A quantitative expression of a plan of action, for a given period of time, and an aid to the coordination, implementation, and measurement of the plan of action. Also it is a tool for obtaining the most productive use of a company’s total resources.
- Revenues and Expenditures
- A representation of what is valued, supported, and produced.
Continued, Action Plan B

Steps: AEA budget is fully developed using the new agency-wide budgetary process:

1. AUGUST - Support Services calculates the following:
   a. Projected revenues
   b. Project fixed expenditures
2. SEPTEMBER-DECEMBER – Chief Administrator and Directors establish focus and priorities:
   a. Budget parameters
   b. Budget priorities
   c. Stakeholder input
   d. Personnel implications
   e. Policy, regulations, and practices implications
   f. Implementation and communication plan
3. JANUARY-APRIL Directors build platform budgets based on the Agency priorities, parameters, and input from stakeholders
   a. Finalize budget roles and responsibilities, timelines, procedures, and forms
   b. Provide budget development training for supervisors and staff
   c. Develop platform budget within the established Agency parameters
4. MAY-JUNE Budget is finalized and entered into the accounting system
   a. Reviewed for accuracy
   b. Chief Administrator submits to the Board of Directors
   c. Entered into the accounting system

Timeline: 2011-2016 agency-wide budgeting process is used annually and monitored to determine if resource allocations match the budgetary priorities.

Goal Alignment: Action Plan B is designed to fund the programs and services that reach the goals and mission of the Agency.

AEA Standards: Action Plan B supports the Comprehensive Improvement Plan and service standards through funding programs and services.

AEA Services: See Appendix B, pages 98-123, all programs and services listed

Responsibility: Chief Administrator and Support Services Director

**ACTION PLAN C – Quality Service Delivery.** The Agency has identified an action plan to deliver high quality services that meet the needs of all stakeholders. Changes were needed. First change, poverty and cultural diversity issues within schools had increased and the Agency needed more diverse learning expertise and varied teaching and learning strategies. Second change, special education funding had diminished significantly over the past decade and the Agency had fewer people. The Agency responded to these changes through reorganization to maximize its ability to deliver this new expertise and increase specialization among additional staff members. Three strategies were selected because they met the Agency’s needs: Partnership
Agreements, Enhanced Service Delivery System, and Media/Technology Utilization. These strategies targeted active partnerships with schools to support their improvement efforts. Reorganization was designed to utilize high leverage techniques at the school site level through AEA service customization, coaching and collaborative data team support, and integrated services within a school level tiered system of supports (Response to Intervention). Thus, the MBAEA programs and services, see Appendix B, are INPUTS. Action Plan C is the implementation of Table 3, page 11, the Balanced Scorecard Building Block Reorganization.

**Action Plan C: Quality Service Delivery (Reorganization)**

**Objective:** To improve delivery at the classroom level through integrated and customized programs and services.

**Measures:** Federal Special Education Indicators; Partnership Agreement outcomes; and Statewide AEA Satisfaction Survey

**Strategies:** Using Partnership Agreement commitments (training, coaching, and consulting); using the Enhanced Service Delivery System; and connecting and expanding services through media and technology.

**Steps:** Implement Partnership Agreements (see Appendix D) in all schools seeking to make commitment to effective implementation of their improvement efforts.

Implement Enhanced Service Delivery System (see Appendix C) in all schools to deliver the following services:
- Child Find screening
- Child Find evaluation
- Direct services to teachers, children/students, and parents
- System support services

Implement tools and techniques to expand one-on-one coaching through media and technology utilization.

**Timeline:** 2013-2014 Partnership Agreements available to all schools seeking such a commitment to reform and customization; 2012-2013 Enhanced Service Delivery System is fully implemented; and 2014-2015 AEA staff coaching more people through multiple communication tools.

**Goal Alignment:** Action Plan C is designed to deliver high quality services that will improve student performance and reduce the achievement gap in reading, mathematics, and science (AEA Goals).

**AEA Standards:** Curriculum/Instruction/Assessment – provide research-based practices
Diverse Learners – provide strategies and coaching to meet every student’s needs
Leadership Development – deliver quality leadership services
Media Services – provide access to all educators
Multi-Cultural Gender Fair – build an inclusive environment for all learners
Professional Development – train effective techniques such as coaching and learning
Continued, Action Plan C

School & Community Planning – integrate effective change management
School Technology – use technology as a communication and learning tool

AEA Services: See Appendix B, pages 98-123, all programs and services listed

Responsibility: Executive Director of Integrated Services and Assistant Director (Special Education)

**ACTION PLAN D – High Levels of Performance.** The Agency has identified an action plan to develop its people to meet the ever-changing teaching and learning challenges. MBAEA’s capacity building components are INPUTS. The Agency is focused on the following human resource components: recruiting and selecting the best people; inducting and mentoring its people so that they are ready; supervising and evaluating its people to define clear expectations and support staff to meet those expectations; developing its people through effective professional development using job-embedded collaborative teams; and retaining and advancing its talented people through ongoing human resource supports. The Agency’s people are its most valuable resource; thus, Action Plan D is the Agency’s Comprehensive Aligned Personnel System (CAPS). The Agency explored Strategic Management of Human Capital in Public Schools literature and modeled CAPS after this human resource research base. More detail is found in Appendix E and the plan meets the requirements of the Teacher Quality funding. Action Plan D is the implementation of Table 3, page 11, the Balanced Scorecard Building Block Comprehensive Aligned Personnel System (CAPS).

**Action Plan D: High Levels of Performance (CAPS)**

**Objective:** To build internal staff capacity to deliver high quality services through a Comprehensive Aligned Personnel System.

**Measures:** Professional Development staff data displayed as “Science Fair Boards”
Staff surveys are conducted by committees to elicit feedback
TBA – representative committees are creating implementation feedback

**Strategies:** Effective processes to: Recruit and select outstanding candidates
Mentor and induct new staff members
Supervise and evaluate staff
Deliver professional development
Retain and plan for succession
Continued, Action Plan D

Steps: Internal committees with representation from management and the employment groups (Administrative Support, Professional Services Organizations, and Clerical Workers of America) meet regularly to develop and support implementation of all phases of the Comprehensive Aligned Personnel System. Each committee has two designated leaders or co-chairs. The policy development, procedure construction, and satisfaction feedback are reviewed by these committees to ensure human resource quality and effectiveness.

The committees are:
  a. Recruitment & Selection
  b. Mentoring & Induction
  c. Supervision & Evaluation
  d. Professional Development
  e. Retention & Succession Planning

Professional development is designed to provide individual and group learning to improve practices. Departments and workgroups involving their supervisors process needs assessment data and identify professional development to reach the Agency’s goals and attain its mission. October 15 each year is the deadline for AEA staff to submit their professional development plans. The AEA staff meet regularly within a collaborative data team to ensure job-embedded professional development. The professional development plans are displayed in May each year with the outcome data using the Reeves’s Science Fair Board display approach.

Support Services Director is assigned to embed these practices within the Agency and enhance the ability of these representative committees to strengthen CAPS.

Timeline: 2015-2016 CAPS is fully integrated into the Agency’s policies, procedures, and ongoing internal feedback system.

Goal Alignment: Action Plan D is designed to ensure all AEA staff members perform at high levels and their performance translates into improved student performance and reduced achievement gaps in reading, mathematics, and science (AEA Goals). It is an expectation that AEA staff has the ability to perform at high levels while serving children/students, parents, teachers, administrators, other stakeholders, or other AEA staff members.

AEA Standards: Curriculum/Instruction/Assessment – deliver high quality services
  - Diverse Learners – meet the learning needs through diverse strategies
  - Leadership Development – demonstrate effective leadership
  - Media Services – users of media resources
  - Multi-Cultural Gender Fair – create an inclusive climate for working and learning
  - Professional Development – display an ongoing habit of continuous learning
  - School & Community Planning – plan within an implementation mindset
  - School Technology – use technology as a communication and learning tool

AEA Services: See Appendix B, pages 98-123, all programs and services listed

Responsibility: Support Service Director and CAPS Committee Representatives

Action Plan Provisions for Equitable Availability of Services

The Agency’s programs and services are available to all schools, school districts, and appropriate stakeholders. The only exclusionary procedures are:
1. Special education programs are allocated based on a formula. The formula factors are student population, poverty rate, achievement rates, and special needs. The process is equitable to meet student learning needs; it is not an equal per pupil distribution.

2. Programs and services are available to the appropriate audience. A reading workshop, for example, designed for Garfield Elementary is available to all Garfield reading teachers and it would be uncustomary to invite teachers from others school districts to a customized reading training at Garfield Elementary.

3. Programs and services are available to those paying a fee or registration cost. Some AEA services have registration costs to recover a portion of the program’s expenditures and only those individuals registering participate. Another scenario would be a group of districts may organize a cooperative program and only those districts participating through a fee contribution participate.

4. Programs and services are available on a first-come, first-served basis. The AEA does not have sufficient resources or staff to meet every request immediately. The AEA prioritizes its resources and continually seeks to meet requests in a timely manner. The AEA staff and LEA administrators have frequent conversations to ensure timely response to requests and unique needs.

**Action Plan Alignment to Data Sources**

The Comprehensive Improvement Plan and Continuous Improvement Process are aligned to multiple data sources. The action plans have identified measures. Table 3, Balanced Scorecard, on page 11, is presented to illustrate a structure that generates feedback for the Board of Directors and all AEA staff members. Page 21-46, needs assessment section has listed customer feedback, student learning data, and internal feedback.

**Action Plan Agency-Wide Staff Allocations and Funding Resources**

The new Plan’s design has developed Action Plans B, C, and D describing resource INPUTS to produce OUTPUTS described in Action Plan A. It is important through the balanced scorecard strategic management process for the financial, operations, and capacity building to meet the customers’ “wants” and it is equally as important to identify the needs being met. Table 21 is presented to display estimated action plan funding, staff, and time resource allocations. Table 21 has illustrated that 100% of the resources are targeted at meeting customer needs.
Table 21: Agency-wide Funding, Staff, and Time Estimated Resource Allocations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Plan</th>
<th>Agency-Wide Funding Resources</th>
<th>Agency-Wide Staff Allocations</th>
<th>Agency-Wide Time Resources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 21 has been presented to illustrate Action Plan A as the overall output (What does the Agency’s resources produce?). Table 21 has also been presented to illustrate Action Plans B, C, and D as the overall inputs (What are Agency’s resource inputs?). Table 22 has been presented to illustrate the estimated distribution of Agency staff supporting the Action Plans.

Table 22: Agency Estimated Staff Allocations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Structures</th>
<th>FTE</th>
<th>Estimated Percentage Staff Allocation per Action Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Administration</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation &amp; Market Research</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrated Services</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support Services</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Executive Administration has placed the Chief Administrator and Board Secretary responsible for the overall execution of the new Plan and each Action Plan. The Chief Administrator is involved in making connections and relationships needed so that schools, districts, and other stakeholders have access to the programs and services fitting their teaching and learning needs.

Evaluation & Market Research Platform has a Director and staff working with schools and school districts to meet their teaching and learning needs (Action Plan A) and delivering services to schools, school districts and other stakeholders. Other stakeholder activities have included participating with community organizations to develop and implement projects benefiting children and students. Staff is involved in Action Plan C to provide early childhood, Learning Supports, Perkins, preschool, leadership, grant development, and evaluation services.
The Director has the system responsibility for needs assessment, data collection/analysis/evaluation, and reporting. Thus, the Platform has responsibilities to all Action Plans.

Integrated Services Platform has a Director and Assistant Director and the entire General Education and Special Education Staff. These staff are charged with the vast majority of leadership, curriculum/instruction/assessment, diverse learner support, Child Find screening and evaluation, direct support to IEP children/students, system supports, professional development, media, school technology, and planning/implementation/evaluation services. Table 22 has presented Integrated Services as the main service delivery Platform.

Support Services has a Director and staff to provide internal human resource, financial accounting, information technology, maintenance, and communication. Support Services has connected its expertise to assist schools and school districts with technology support, print, cooperative purchasing, legal cooperative, and human resources support. The Platform efforts are related to delivery of programs and services directly or through human resources, technology, financial accounting, building maintenance, and communication.

The Agency has provided all staff with opportunities to further develop their knowledge and skills. It is estimated that 11% of the resources are an INPUT (Action Plan D, Table 22) for all staff members. It is the investment in high performance levels by everyone.

**Action Plan Service Delivery**

Action Plan C is the delivery plan for the 2011-2012 Programs and Services found in Appendix B. Action Plan A presented the steps to improve implementation at the school level. Action Plan B and D are the budgetary and human resources supports to make the new Plan succeed. All these action plans have been created to increase and improve the Agency’s ability to deliver services at the school level and include coaching support (a highly research-based improvement factor). The Agency, five-years ago, moved to more on-site delivery, and it will
seek to increase on-site delivery with additional coaching support systems (adding more technology to increase one-on-one communication frequency).

**Action Plan Measure of Effective Services**

Effectiveness is measured in the following ways: a) by achieving the AEA reading, mathematics, and science goals; b) through customers responses on the statewide AEA customer survey and advisories (see Table 4, page 24); c) through services provided to all schools and school districts using measures found in Table 3, page 11; and d) by attaining full accreditation through the AEA standards of services. Effectiveness is determined using multiple data sources. Decision-Makers have used these sources to design the new Plan. The following are key effectiveness targets:

- Increasing student reading, mathematics, and science performance (Agency Goals) on the state tests is an indicator of effectiveness and reducing the low socioeconomic, minority, and IEP subgroup achievement gaps.

- Maintaining high satisfaction rates on the statewide AEA satisfaction survey and quickly responding to needs addressed during advisories sessions.

- Maintaining and improving AEA performance on the Federal 34 Special Education Indicators.

- Reaching the process outcomes stated on the new Partnership Agreements and regularly monitoring progress toward the school’s improvement goals.

- Having AEA staff demonstrate progress on their professional development plans through the Reeves’s Science Fair Boards displayed annually in May.

- Documenting progress on the Comprehensive Improvement Plan through Annual Progress Report feedback collection, analysis, and evaluation.

- Allocating resources to sustain delivery of priority services to schools and school districts.

**Action Plan Measure of Efficient Services**

Efficiency is measured by MBAEA’s ability to create an economy of scale to provide access to high quality educational supports for all schools, school districts, and other
stakeholders. One strategy MBREA leadership uses to measure efficiency of services is by (annually) assessing each department's execution of programs and services. This assessment includes its allocation of resources (human and management). A second strategy is to assess the placement of special education staff in schools/districts based on a formula the Agency applies. The objective of using these two strategies is to create an economy of scale to provide access to high quality educational supports for all schools, districts, and other stakeholders.

One example of efficiency of services is use of consultants with expertise in specialized fields such as Autism. These consultants may be based out of one Sector of the Agency but travel (as needed) to provide services in all four Agency Sectors. The consultants evidence their practices through their individual portfolios, through department professional development work, and presentation of their work through a data board that displays the strategies used in the school to improve student performance and subsequent inferences and conclusions. Consultants are not merely displaying data but rather using data to inform leadership decision making.

In addition to the information previously described, monitoring internal usage of management resources such as support services (i.e., Media, Technology) and drawing upon the data from the new statewide AEA data capture system will allow the Agency to better plan for current and future needs. These measures of efficiency of services support the Partnership Agreement process the Agency has initiated in districts/schools; data-driven decisions will enhance the ability of the Agency to deliver programs and services customized to the customers’ needs and wants. Employing the aforementioned strategies ensures that monitoring of programs and services is timely, ongoing, focused, and data-driven.

**Action Plan Supervisory Responsibilities**

All Agency staff members are responsible for the success of the new Comprehensive Improvement Plan. Chart 2 is presented to demonstrate the scope of the organization’s
supervisory responsibilities to programs and services. Implementation feedback has been designed into all programs and services. Data gathering, analyses, and evaluation occurs at all levels of the organizations.

Chart 2: Action Plan Supervisory Responsibilities

The new employee evaluation system using Teacher Quality Standards has integrated another level of one-on-one conversations between employees and supervisors regarding data-driven individual performance and data related to effectiveness of programs and services. The new dashboard system being developed for the Board of Directors and all employees as well as customers will be another feedback loop for all Decision-Makers.

Action Plan Process for Reporting Progress

The progress on the new comprehensive improvement plan will be reported in the following ways:
a. Annual Progress Report; 72.10(2), All information is available on the MBAEA website.

b. Periodic board dashboard reports; MBAEA staff members report monthly to the Board regarding programs and services related to agency-wide goals.

c. All internal MBAEA staff members; The plan’s implementation has built in sharing of plan progress. All staff members have a meeting every May to hear about agency progress and the plan’s progress data will be shared.

d. Monthly administrative team meeting; The plan’s progress data will be shared monthly within team meetings. Administrators also share the progress data during department and division meetings.

Internally, the new comprehensive plan impacts every staff member. The Building Blocks will require ongoing internal communication regarding the needs assessment and progress data described within the plan. In the near future, the new AEA data gathering system will provide quick access to program and service feedback.

Management Services 281—IAC 72.0(1)(f)

Management services are provided to schools and school districts for the purpose of cost efficiencies related to management support services or programs. Management services are cost-recovery programs and services (generated revenue from users equals MBAEA expenditures). The current management programs and services are:

See Appendix B for a full description of the Programs and Services Listed

39. Communication Audits and Planning
42. Environment Services Program
43. Home Schooling
45. Information Technology (includes print services)
46. Iowa’s Educators’ Consortium
47. Learning Center
48. Legal Cooperative (contract with Lane & Waterman for area-wide legal services)
49. Non-Violent Crisis Intervention
50. Professional Development (license renewal and credit courses)
51. School Bus Driver Training
53. Sexual Harassment Investigator Training
54. Sexual Harassment Training
55. Solution Focused Mediation Center
59. Targeted Services on Request
60. Teacher Job Fair
61. Web Construction and Support
62. Web Hosting
The furnishing of expensive and specialized equipment to schools or school districts is provided if it relates to the mission and agency-wide goals. Identifying these purchases would occur within the needs assessment, planning, and evaluation processes used for all agency-wide goal services. If the purchase does not relate to mission and/or agency-wide goals, it would be considered management service, and the process for identifying and providing management services has previously been stated.

MBAEA has provided, upon request, central office administrative services. Louisa-Muscatine, Preston, and West Liberty have requested either interim superintendent or business manager support. MBAEA has provided these services to meet a short-term need created by an untimely departure of school personnel.

The criteria for performing authorized services within another AEA are: (1) does not diminish AEA 9 services to AEA schools and school districts; (2) capacity exists for AEA 9 to deliver services to other AEAs; and (3) user fees are easily calculated and applied to recover service costs. Currently, we do not have agreements to provide programs and services; except occasionally, we share trainers across AEAs to support unique requests from schools and school districts.

Costs of services to other area education agencies is determined by an easily applied user fee or an employee contractual agreement based on days of service within each AEA. User fees and contractual payments are equal to recovery costs of the service. The service provided must not diminish AEA services to AEA 9 schools and school districts and capacity must exist for AEA 9 to deliver the services. The method of payment may occur as a financial reimbursement or a sharing agreement with each AEA partner. Currently, AEA 9 is not involved in substantial
partnerships with other AEs; except, AEs work cooperatively through the AEA System Unified Budget.

**Cost-Recovery Services**

Mississippi Bend Area Education Agency’s mission and agency-wide goals provide for cost-recovery services. The services are not directly linked to the comprehensive improvement plan’s action steps; however, schools and school districts have found the services to meet their needs. The cost-recovery (customer generated revenues equals MBAEA expenditures) programs and services are:

See Appendix B for a full description of the Programs and Services Listed
- 50. Professional Development (recertification and graduate courses)
- 57. Student Activities and Events
- 58. Student Programs (driver education, AEA 9 Shelter School, Scott Co, Detention Center School)

**CIP Summary Statement**

The new comprehensive improvement plan is designed to meet the demands of educational accountability and expectations for improved teaching and learning. The plan is the result of the needs assessment findings and extensive planning. Therefore, the anticipated outcome in five years is Mississippi Bend Area Education Agency will have improved teaching and learning programs, services, and deliveries that will ultimately result in improved student learning.
Professional Development Plan 281—IA C 72.9(I)(g)

MBAEA professional development which includes Teacher Quality funding has been integrated into the Comprehensive Aligned Personnel System (CAPS). The CAPS process is presented in Appendix E. The 2011-2012 professional development for licensed staff has been divided into the following three groupings:

1. Professional development for all AEA licensed staff
   a. Iowa Core (support strategies)
   b. Adult Science Fair (displaying collaborative PD learning)
   c. Sector and/or department meetings (individualized PD plan work)
   d. CAPS training (delivery of CAPS to staff)

2. Professional development for most AEA licensed staff
   a. Instructional Coaching training
   b. Special education procedures and intervention training
   c. Iowa Core, Response to Intervention, Doug Fisher training
   d. CAPS committees (specific learning within each committee)

3. Professional development for a few licensed staff based on service needs
   a. PBIS Coach training
   b. Mentor training
   c. Google Apps training
   d. Outlook Calendar training
   e. Collaborative data team process training
   f. New evaluation system training for classified staff
   g. Presentation and/or facilitation skill training (Creative Teaching Techniques)

Table 23 has been inserted to provide more detail about the 2011-2012 professional development events and activities. Table 23 has timelines, needs, actions, results, and staff involvement details. The professional development work has been constructed through the involvement of AEA staff, AEA departments, supervisors, CAPS committees, Leadership Team, and executive administrators. The Professional Development CAPS Committee has been responsible for gathering, analyzing, and summarizing their findings into the professional development action plan presented in Table 23. Cindy Swanson, the Head of Staff Development, and Georgie Koenig, Sector I Coordinator, are the committee’s co-chairs.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dates for Learning (What/When)</th>
<th>MBAEA Licensed Staff: Need/Goal</th>
<th>Actions (Now What)</th>
<th>Results (So What)</th>
<th>Who is Involved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PBIS Coach Training:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 3, 2011</td>
<td>PBIS trainer/coaches training for staff members from each sector who support buildings involved in PBIS</td>
<td>* SW PBIS Overview</td>
<td>Develop a process for communication with Sector Coordinators. Design similar data reporting that other coaches are doing such as meetings attended log of support to school, progress of team, etc.</td>
<td>Training done by Molly Conrad, Linda Ryan, Jill Yates. Current PBIS Coaches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:30 am – 4:30 pm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow-up sessions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09-29-11, 2:00-4:00 pm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-01-11, 2:00-4:00 pm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02-16-12, 2:00-4:00 pm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04-19-12, 2:00-4:00 pm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentor Training:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 8 &amp; 9, 2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 19, 2011</td>
<td>10 new staff, 8 current Induction (Mentors &amp; Protégés)</td>
<td>AEA will be compliant with mandates related to mentor training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1:30–3:30 pm)</td>
<td>Mentor Planning (Mentors)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 23, 2011</td>
<td>Induction (Mentors &amp; Protégés)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1:30–3:30 pm)</td>
<td>Mentor Planning (Mentors)</td>
<td>AEA will be compliant with mandates related to mentor training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 28, 2011</td>
<td>Induction (Mentors &amp; Protégés)</td>
<td>AEA will be compliant with mandates related to mentor training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1:30–3:30 pm)</td>
<td>Mentor Planning (Mentors)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 21, 2011</td>
<td>Induction (Mentors &amp; Protégés)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1:30–3:30 pm)</td>
<td>Mentor Planning (Mentors)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 15, 2011</td>
<td>Induction (Mentors &amp; Protégés)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1:30–3:30 pm)</td>
<td>Mentor Planning (Mentors)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 27, 2012</td>
<td>Induction (Mentors &amp; Protégés)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1:30–3:30)</td>
<td>Mentor Planning (Mentors)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 24, 2012</td>
<td>Induction (Mentors &amp; Protégés)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 22, 2012</td>
<td>Mentor Planning (Mentors)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 27, 2012</td>
<td>Induction (Mentors &amp; Protégés)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 25, 2012</td>
<td>Mentor Planning (Mentors)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Coaching (eventually all licensed staff)</td>
<td>○ All MBAEA staff is expected to provide instructional coaching and understand and demonstrate collaborative team skills</td>
<td>Coaches for each sector work with their respective Coordinator on their plans for implementation within each sector. Data for implementation and its impact need to be collected and reviewed on a regular basis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug. 17-18, 2011</td>
<td>AEA has two or more trainers using the state adopted model (Jim Knight)</td>
<td>AEA will be compliant with mandates related to mentor training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 1 Training: Initial 2 days, 3rd half day needed to be scheduled in Dept. meeting – Level 1 Training (current coaches would have priority along with Ed. Consultants dept. to go first) 6 Special Ed. Coordinators plus heads will go to first training and others (Anne, Nancy, Cindy S. &amp; Cindy B., go to QL dept.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan. 25-26, 2012 Level 1 (Repeat)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QL dept. will be trained in August with follow up in October. Ed. consultants will be also trained</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All staff, various years, implement in stages
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dates for Learning (What/When)</th>
<th>MBAEA Licensed Staff: Need/Goal</th>
<th>Actions (Now What)</th>
<th>Results (So What)</th>
<th>Who is Involved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **New Evaluation Workshop –** **Classified Staff**  
August 16, 2011  
½ day = 9:00 am – Noon (rooms scheduled) | **Outlook Calendar Training**  
TBD Currently scheduled for 5/13/2011 | Development of PD Plan  
Staff that needs support in how to use Outlook Calendar will be able to access the 1.5 hour workshop. Will be available at service center.  
Supervisors to determine what staff is consistently expected to do in calendar | | PD CAPS Team  
Classified Staff & Their supervisors |
| **Special Ed STAFF:**  
Friday August 26 & Monday 29, 2011 (8-4 pm)  
September 16, 2011 – All day meeting  
Online Child Find (TBA) Staff to complete before August 25, 2011  
Sector mtg. (8am – noon) Follow up to August Training, Dept. meeting from 1-4 pm  
February follow up training. | **A. Child Find Training:** (Possible use of Adobe connect & staff watch individually)  
**B. Educational Evaluation Report training:**  
Implementation date November 1, 2011  
**C. Standards Based IEP’s Based IEP practices:**  
(Implementation due July 1, 2011) | Staff will be able to support LEA’s with Child Find issues  
Staff will be able to describe the purpose and how to use Electronic Child Find technology  
Staff will be able to train and coach LEA staff on the use of ERR, Alternative Assessment & Child Find Concepts  
X number of Random Child Find Documents will be pulled to determine level of fidelity of implementation each month. Data results will be shared with staff members at sector meetings. Based on the data, appropriate professional development will occur during each sector meeting. Subsequent data will indicate result of training and the next steps for continuous improvement. | | Special Ed Staff & identified trainers (Nancy McGill, Jennifer Hawley, Michelle Martin) |
| **Google Apps**  
1/2 day workshop TBD will be provided as voluntary workshop through staff development. | **Some staff to develop tools for collaboration: document sharing, calendar, website, etc.** | Staff will develop technology skills to make collaborative teaching process more efficient.  
Staff will have new job tools and use as appropriate | | Robert Reppert, Trainer |
| **CAPS Supervision & Evaluation Meeting Dates**  
September 23, 2011  
October 28, 2011  
November 21, 2011  
December 19, 2011  
January 27, 2012  
February 24, 2012  
April 21, 2012  
May 25, 2012. | **CAPS committee establishes their agenda and timeline for support and development supervision and evaluation procedures, protocols, and support.**  
- Facilitate internal coaches training  
- Facilitate evaluation workshops such as artifact collection and preparation | | CAPS Committee Members |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dates for Learning (What/When)</th>
<th>MBAEA Licensed Staff: Need/Goal</th>
<th>Actions (Now What)</th>
<th>Results (So What)</th>
<th>Who is Involved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Iowa Core**  
August 22 AM All Staff (afternoon)  
October 31, 2011 (Waterfront reserved) 1/2 day  
Davenport Special Ed Staff, Other Special Ed Staff as determined by district depending on District’s focus (Clinton, etc.)  
Effective Instruction with Doug Fisher & Davenport School District Staff (Rit) | All special education licensed staff will be responsible for ensuring that IEPs contain goals that match the Iowa Core Standards  
All special education staff will learn and know the Iowa Core Standards  
All special education staff will be able to write IEP goals that match the Iowa Core Standards  
All special education staff will be able to coach LKA staff in writing goals that match the Iowa Core Standards  
Staff will be able to describe, coach, and demonstrate the Gradual Release Model & Effective Instructional strategies (aligned with Rit)  
Staff will be able to describe the components of both the Iowa Core and Common Core and translate the information and intent of the Iowa Core to their daily work with students and coaching LKA staff  
Staff will be able to understand the statewide academic expectations for all K-12 students that take learning to a deeper level by moving students beyond superficial knowledge to deep conceptual and procedural knowledge  
Staff will know and understand the districts Iowa Core Implementation plan in the district(s) they work and how they can contribute to helping the district move forward. | Goal is to have 100% of the IEPs written to have goals that match the Iowa Core Standards by March 2011 – Followup in Sect. and Spec, Ed. Dept. Mgrs.  
AEA staff will support school staff in the development of designing units/lessons that will incorporate the characteristics of effective instruction and promote value in reviewing student work in a data team format to provide supplemental and/or intensive support to students who struggle or need to be challenged at a higher level. The Gradual Release of Responsibility and Productive Group Work will be transparent in classroom instruction.  
School staff will be able to design units that are student centered and where students are actively interacting, cognitively challenging in rigor and relevance assessments are used to inform instruction and to inform learning by students and teaching is focused on applying content knowledge to understand larger concepts. | AEA 9 Iowa Core Team  
Doug Fisher, All AEA QL staff and AEA special ed. staff serving Davenport |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dates for Learning (What/When)</th>
<th>MBAEA Licensed Staff: Need/Goal</th>
<th>Actions (Now What)</th>
<th>Results (So What)</th>
<th>Who is Involved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Presentation/Facilitation Skill Training</strong></td>
<td><strong>June 2012</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| o MBAEA staff is expected to provide presentations and facilitate groups with LEA staff as a Core Skill. | Cost:  
- $120 per person (license/materials)  
- Per diem if not on contract: Average cost $315  
- Instructor Fee—retainer $1,000  
20 Staff (pilot group):  
Salaries = $1750  
Instructor = $1,000  
Fees = $2,400  
Total = $5,150 | Actions:  
Scheduled by instructors | Presented as Common Skill Sets (evidence in portfolio, etc.) | |
| o MBAEA staff indicates a need for more training in this area. | | | | |

- Pilot group to determine impact

Staff members who attend this could become trainers for each sector. Training could occur during sector and department meetings. Part of the training could be how the training applies to use as an AEA team, in case coordination, discipline specific responsibilities/area, etc. Follow up on implementation and effectiveness can occur as part of the ESDS plans.

- Participants will apply creative teaching techniques and strategies that result in higher levels of motivation and participation by those they provide training and coaching.

- Participants will experience training, coaching, reflection, modeling and self-analysis that is supported with various technology tools.

- Participants will be able to describe how they have increased learner-centered participation in their teaching/coaching with specific examples of what it looked like prior to engaging in the training and the modifications made due to their increased understanding of the concepts.

- Participants will select strategies for learning opportunities that are a strong match to content, audience, and need. Thinking behind the decision making is clear and the participant will address thinking on all three levels (audience, content, and need).

Participants will use the results from their self-evaluation and provides evidence about planning for learning opportunities which clearly reveal their plan to adopt, adapt and apply strategies in multiple topic areas with specific examples throughout the school year, all of which are clearly appropriate and attainable. The plan provides details and leads the supervisor to believe it will be followed and can be witnessed if observed by others. Objective behavioral competencies that are determined will be able to be observable.

**Sept. 8th Pre (1-4pm) - CAPS training**

Artifactual Training (January)

Provide Supports as needed to Staff that feel they need additional assistance.

**CAPS Evaluation Team:**

1. Supervision and Evaluation  
   a. Evaluation cycle – staff are still not clear as to what is involved at each Tier and Year. Review of that and documents that support that on AEA manager. This would also include the new “AEA staff input form”
   b. Eportfolio – introduction of forms and how to complete. Let them know this is a pilot for this year and ask for volunteers.

2. Succession and Retention  
   a. Introduction of Desk Manuals and why they are important
   b. Timeline for the development of those manuals.

3. Professional Development  
   a. Time to reflect on decisions made last year and begin the development of 2011/2012 PD plan
   b. Timelines for implementation on AEA manager.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dates for Learning (What/When)</th>
<th>MBAEA Licensed Staff: Need/Goal</th>
<th>Actions (Now What) &amp; Results (So What)</th>
<th>Who is involved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>End of Year Meetings (TBD)</strong> June 14 &amp; 15, 2012</td>
<td>Update on progress of Agency Goals, Building Blocks, and other data points related to dash boards, Value Added and focus for coming school year.</td>
<td>• Staff will understand status of AEA progress on goals and results data, be able to relate to their contribution and value added to agency and where focus will be for 2012-2013 school year. &lt;br&gt;• Challenge areas will be described and what AEA staff will face due to budget restraints, legislative mandates, Iowa Core, and Spec. Ed issues</td>
<td>All staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A. Sector Meetings</strong></td>
<td>• No Sector Meeting in August &lt;br&gt;• September 16 (combination with Special Ed. Dept. Meeting) &lt;br&gt;• October 21, 2011 &lt;br&gt;• December 16, 2011 &lt;br&gt;• February 17, 2012 &lt;br&gt;• April 20, 2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B. Department Meetings</strong></td>
<td><strong>QL:</strong>&lt;br&gt;August 5, 2011 &lt;br&gt;September 2, 2011 &lt;br&gt;October 7, 2011 &lt;br&gt;November 4, 2011 &lt;br&gt;December 2, 2011 &lt;br&gt;January 6, 2012 &lt;br&gt;February 3, 2012 &lt;br&gt;March 2, 2012 &lt;br&gt;April 6, 2012 &lt;br&gt;May 4, 2012</td>
<td>Continued work on discipline specific PD and monthly reviews of data and the necessary adjustments that need to occur based on the data</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Special Ed. Dept. Meeting:</strong> Combined with Sector meeting</td>
<td><strong>Special Ed. Collaborative Team Time:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 19th &lt;br&gt;September 16th &lt;br&gt;October 21st &lt;br&gt;November 18th &lt;br&gt;December 16th &lt;br&gt;January 20th &lt;br&gt;February 17th &lt;br&gt;March 16th &lt;br&gt;April 20th &lt;br&gt;May 18th</td>
<td><strong>OY/PT:</strong>&lt;br&gt;August 5, 2011, 8:30 - Noon &lt;br&gt;October 7, 2011, 8:30 - Noon &lt;br&gt;December 2, 2011, 8:30 - Noon &lt;br&gt;February 3, 2012, 8:30 - Noon &lt;br&gt;April 6, 2012, 8:30 - Noon &lt;br&gt;June 1, 2012, 8:30 - Noon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>QL Collaborative Team Time:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Special Ed. Collaborative Team:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Additional Groups and Dates**

- **Early Childhood**<br>July 1, 2011, 8:30 - Noon <br>September 2, 2011, 8:30 - Noon <br>November 4, 2011, 8:30 - Noon <br>January 6, 2012, 8:30 - Noon <br>March 2, 2012, 8:30 - Noon <br>May 4, 2012, 8:30 - Noon
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dates for Learning (What/When)</th>
<th>MBAEA Licensed Staff: Need/Goal</th>
<th>Actions (Now What) &amp; Results (So What)</th>
<th>Who is involved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>IS Cabinet Meeting dates</strong></td>
<td>July 6, 7, 8 (retreat)</td>
<td>Data from</td>
<td>IS Administrators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 3</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Child Piad</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 7</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Jim Knight Instructional Coaching</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 5</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Data Team Training</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 2</td>
<td>Need to be compiled and discussed during these meetings – what is the data telling us, what is going well, what adjustments need to be made, what steps do we need to take to make sure implementation is occurring and happening with fidelity and are our actions having a positive effect on key areas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AEA Leadership Team Meetings:</strong></td>
<td>September 21st October 19th November December 21st January 18th February 15th March 21st April 18th May 16th</td>
<td></td>
<td>AEA Representative Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IS Coordinators</strong></td>
<td>August 24 September 28 October 25 November 23 December 14 January 25 February 22 March 22 April 26 May 24 June 28</td>
<td>Assistant Director and Coordinators</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix A - 2011 Annual Progress Report

Progress Toward Agency-Wide Goals

Mathematics 2009-2010

Math achievement has increased over the past nine years (2001 baseline year). The three-year trend line (2007-2010) is somewhat flat. Students with IEPs subgroup median (mid-point population score) have increased 3\textperthousand points during the past two years. Minority and low socioeconomic subgroups median (mid-point population score) has remained unchanged for two years. The Agency is implementing Partnership Agreements and Enhanced Service Delivery System to address this flat achievement trend. The Agreements are designed to provide AEA Service Customization aligned to a school’s learning needs. Customization includes specialized professional development training, implementation coaching support, and focused special education services to accelerate IEP student achievement rates. The Enhanced Service Delivery System increases collaboration with schools to differentiate instruction within the general education setting, improves services measured by the federal special education indicators, and accelerates students with disabilities subgroup math achievement.

AEA 9 Mathematics Performance 2009-2010:

62.9\% Low socioeconomic subgroup, in 2009-10, for grades 4, 8, and 11
63.1\% Minority subgroup, in 2009-10, for grades 4, 8, and 11
34.1\% Individual plan (IEP) subgroup, in 2009-10, for grades 4, 8, and 11

The nine-year mathematics proficiency INCREASE:

13.4\% Low socioeconomic subgroup
18.5\% Minority subgroup
6.4\% Individual plan (IEP) subgroup

The Agency’s math efforts are targeted at effectively and efficiently providing teachers and administrators with instructional resources, research-based practice support, system reform capacity building, and Iowa Core implementation training and coaching.

The Agency’s customer feedback analyses indicated teachers and administrators find math services are: high quality and effective; responsive to their teaching and learning needs; address diverse learner needs; current and timely; cost efficient; and support professional development needs.
Reading 2009-2010

Reading achievement has increased over the past nine years (2001 baseline year). The three-year trend line (2007-2010) indicates it has plateaued. During the past two years, subgroup median (mid-point population score) have increased: students with IEPs subgroup increased $3^{\text{rd}}$ points; low socioeconomic subgroup increased $2^{\text{nd}}$ points; and minority subgroup increased $1^{\text{st}}$ point. The Agency is implementing Partnership Agreements and Enhanced Service Delivery System to address this flat trend line. The Agreements are designed to provide AEA Service Customization aligned to a school’s learning needs. Customization includes specialized professional development training, implementation coaching support, and focused special education services to accelerate IEP student achievement rates. The Enhanced Service Delivery System increases collaboration with schools to differentiate instruction within the general education setting, improves services measured by the federal special education indicators, and accelerates students with disabilities subgroup reading achievement.

AEA 9 Reading Performance 2009-2010:

60.5% Low socioeconomic subgroup, in 2009-10, for grades 4, 8, and 11
61.5% Minority subgroup, in 2009-10, for grades 4, 8, and 11
27.5% Individual plan (IEP) subgroup, in 2009-10, for grades 4, 8, and 11

The nine-year reading proficiency INCREASE:

15.5% Low socioeconomic subgroup
18.2% Minority subgroup
5.5% Individual plan (IEP) subgroup

The Agency’s reading efforts are targeted at effectively and efficiently providing teachers and administrators with instructional resources, research-based practice support, system reform capacity building, and Iowa Core implementation training and coaching.

The Agency’s customer feedback analyses indicated teachers and administrators find AEA reading services are: high quality and effective; responsive to their teaching and learning needs; address diverse learner needs: current and timely; cost efficient; and support professional development needs.

![MBAEA Reading Goal Trend](image-url)
Science 2009-2010

Science achievement has increased over the past nine years (2001 baseline year). The three-year trend line (2007-2010) is slightly increasing. The Agency is implementing Partnership Agreements with area schools to further support their improvement efforts. The Agreements are designed to provide AEA Service Customization aligned to a school's learning needs. Customization includes specialized professional development training, implementation coaching support, and focused special education services to accelerate IEP student achievement rates.

AEA 9 Science Performance 2009-2010:

67.7% Low socioeconomic subgroup, in 2009-10, for grades 5, 8, and 11
67.5% Minority subgroup, in 2009-10, for grades 5, 8, and 11
44.6% Individual plan (IEP) subgroup, in 2009-10, for grades 5, 8, and 11

The nine-year science proficiency INCREASE:

19.5% Low socioeconomic subgroup
24.7% Minority subgroup
17.6% Individual plan (IEP) subgroup

The Agency's science efforts are targeted at effectively and efficiently providing teachers and administrators with instructional resources, research-based practice support, system reform capacity building, and Iowa Core implementation training and coaching.

The Agency's customer feedback analyses indicate teachers and administrators find AEA science services are: high quality and effective; responsive to their teaching and learning needs; address diverse learner needs; current and timely; cost efficient; and support professional development needs.
Progress with Teacher, School, and School District Needs

Teacher, school, and school district teaching and learning needs are identified by collecting and analyzing needs assessment data from the following sources: surveying school leaders, LEA CSIPs, LEA APRs, building level focus groups, school board advisories, superintendent advisories, district-wide administrator advisories, teacher advisories, and statewide AEA satisfaction survey.

The Agency's needs assessment process has generated the following HIGH PRIORITY teaching and learning service recommendations (2007-2011): (a) planning efforts to fully implement the Iowa Core; (b) reducing initiatives and increasing coherence around the teaching and learning priorities; (c) reaching students not actively engaged in the school's curriculum and connecting students socially and emotionally to school (developing caring learning environments i.e., learning supports); (d) focusing on improving the academic performance, or reducing the achievement gap, of students from poverty and low income households as well as students with disabilities; (e) improving reading/language arts, mathematics, science, and career preparation (evidence-based instruction, rigor and relevance, formative assessment, and summative assessments); and (f) implementing professional development which includes data-driven collaborative teaming, lesson study, and high quality feedback.

An emerging service recommendation is assisting schools with a tiered system of supports to ensure all students are successful. The Agency recently has had an increase in requests from school administrators to establish action plans and training to implement a tiered system. Iowa's Instructional Decision-Making (IDM) Model, Response to Intervention (RTI) materials, and Douglas Fisher/Nancy Frey “Enhancing RTI” through a gradual release model are the foundational theory, concepts, and processes being used for planning and training.

A new Agency comprehensive improvement plan is being developed (2011-2016). The Agency completed an accreditation visit in April 2010 and received full accreditation approval, September 2010, by the Iowa State Board of Education. Students with disabilities (IEP), low socioeconomic, and minority subgroup gaps continue to exist and the Agency's goals to improve these subgroup achievement rates in reading, math, and science are anticipated to remain as goals within the new comprehensive plan.

The needs assessment priorities have led AEA leadership in partnership with schools and school districts to pursue the following actions:

1. Accelerating Student Achievement PARTNERSHIPS [ASAP] – the Agency has completed a three year pilot and is currently developing Partnership Agreements with additional schools. Eleven area schools are participating (4 elementary schools, 4 middle schools, and 3 high schools) plus two school districts. The Partnership Agreements are anticipated to be available to all schools by 2014.

2. Special Education Plan [34 Federal IDEA Indicators] – The Agency has launched the Enhanced Service Delivery System to address the new statewide Special Education Procedures manual and the system targets improving IEP student learning performance.

3. Iowa Core Leadership – The Agency has established the Iowa Core as a foundation for all AEA curriculum, instruction, and assessment services as well as diverse learner and leadership services.

4. Iowa Superintendents' Network - The Agency continues to facilitate a network for superintendents utilizing the Dr. Richard Elmore's Instructional Rounds model. The Network is assisting superintendents with instructional leadership and building capacity for reforming educational practices within their schools.

5. Technology Integration – The Agency is continually assisting schools with technology integration to support 21st Century teaching practices. The Agency, in collaboration with teachers, is expanding teachers' opportunities to access a wide variety of instructional materials and tools to enhance classroom instruction.
Progress with Student Learning Needs

Priority Ranked Student Needs

Student learning needs monitoring includes gathering information from Iowa Testing AEA Student Achievement Data and LEA CSIPs/APRs. Student learning needs are ranked by goal subgroup performance.

AEA 9 regional 2009-10 subgroup student performance in reading, mathematics and science:

27.5% Students with disabilities subgroup reading performance  
34.1% Students with disabilities subgroup math performance  
44.6% Students with disabilities subgroup science performance  
60.5% Low socioeconomic student subgroup reading performance  
61.5% Minority student subgroup reading performance  
62.9% Low socioeconomic student subgroup math performance  
63.1% Minority student subgroup math performance  
67.5% Minority student subgroup science performance  
67.7% Low socioeconomic student subgroup science performance

Priority Educator Feedback

2010 statewide AEA satisfaction survey responses from administrators and teachers (630 respondents) indicated:

a) 96.7% responded that it was an AEA resource allocation priority to assist schools and school districts in their efforts to improve student reading performance, especially students within the low socioeconomic status, minority, and special education subgroups.

b) 95.1% responded that it was an AEA resource allocation priority to assist schools and school districts in their efforts to improve student mathematics performance, especially students within the low socioeconomic status, minority, and special education subgroups.

c) 90.7% responded that it was an AEA resource allocation priority to assist schools and school districts in their efforts to improve student science performance, especially students within the low socioeconomic status, minority, and special education subgroups.

Priority Student Climate and Culture Feedback

2008 Iowa Youth Survey student feedback generated the following climate and culture priorities (Grades 6, 8, & 11 students were surveyed):

a) 61% indicated adults creating supportive school staff and student environments  

b) 57% indicated adults responding and preventing bullying  

c) 34% indicated adults communicating school expectations and boundaries  

d) 34% indicated adults building student capacity to feel self-confident  

e) 27% indicated adults constructing environments to generate student commitment to school and learning
Progress with Improved Teaching — Reading

Reading teachers within AEA 9 region responded to the 2010 statewide AEA customer satisfaction survey. The 2010 results from responding reading teachers (n = 326) are: (survey results represent the percentage of strongly agreeing and agreeing responses)

94.5% Generally, the AEA services that I have received or participated in met my professional needs.
85.6% The AEA is responsive to my school’s student learning needs.
83.1% The AEA provides leadership to meet emerging educational needs. (10.4% had no opinion)
84.6% The AEA delivers current and timely services to meet my district or school’s needs.
73.9% The AEA delivers cost-efficient services to meet my district or school’s needs. (21.3% had no opinion)
81.9% The AEA delivers services that assist our district in meeting federal and state mandates (NCLB, IDEA, etc.). (14.7% had no opinion)
84.7% The AEA services that I have received assisted in improving my students’ achievement.
88.7% The AEA services I have received have assisted in improving my instruction or job-related practices.
89.3% The AEA staff I have contact with have the knowledge and skills needed to have a positive impact on our school(s).
88.9% The AEA staff I have contact with create and maintain good working relationships with people in my school and/or district.

Additional teacher and administrator feedback:

Reading teachers have provided feedback using evaluation surveys following the AEA professional development training. The evaluations indicate high levels of satisfaction by the participating teachers. Teachers have also appreciated the AEA providing professional development at their school site and training aligned to their building reading goals. Furthermore, teachers have indicated support for the following general and special education reading strategies: Reading First, Comprehension Strategies, Read Naturally, Second Chance Reading, KU Strategies, Reading Recovery, and Differentiated Instruction are effective.

**Literacy/Reading Program (165 teachers)**
- 90% responded high quality professional development delivered
- 99% responded assisted in improving instruction/job-related performance
- 98% responded useful student learning ideas and skills presented
- 100% responded gained new knowledge and skills
- 88% responded they implemented their new learning
- 242 students impacted

**Reading First (20 teachers)**
- 100% responded high quality professional development delivered
- 100% responded assisted in improving instruction/job-related performance
- 95% responded useful student learning ideas and skills presented
- 100% responded gained new knowledge and skills
- 95% responded they implemented their new learning
- 1,548 students impacted
Reading Recovery (36 teachers)
100% responded high quality professional development delivered
100% responded assisted in improving instruction/job-related performance
100% responded useful student learning ideas and skills presented
285 students impacted
100% of the students met the grade level reading standard

Second Chance Reading (20 teachers)
100% responded high quality professional development delivered
100% responded assisted in improving instruction/job-related performance
100% responded useful student learning ideas and skills presented
100% responded they implemented their new learning
163 students impacted
55% of the students had a reading achievement gain
Progress with Improved Teaching — Mathematics

Mathematics teachers within AEA 9 region responded to the 2010 statewide AEA customer satisfaction survey. The 2010 results from responding math teachers (n = 275) are: (survey results represent the percentage of strongly agreeing and agreeing responses)

94.9% Generally, the AEA services that I have received or participated in met my professional needs.
85.9% The AEA is responsive to my school’s student learning needs.
84.0% The AEA provides leadership to meet emerging educational needs. (10.2% had no opinion)
85.8% The AEA delivers current and timely services to meet my district or school’s needs.
73.4% The AEA delivers cost-efficient services to meet my district or school’s needs. (22.5% had no opinion)
81.5% The AEA delivers services that assist our district in meeting federal and state mandates (NCLB, IDEA, etc.). (14.2% had no opinion)
83.7% The AEA services that I have received assisted in improving my students’ achievement.
88.7% The AEA services I have received have assisted in improving my instruction or job-related practices.
88.3% The AEA staff I have contact with have the knowledge and skills needed to have a positive impact on our school(s).
86.9% The AEA staff I have contact with create and maintain good working relationships with people in my school and/or district.

Additional teacher and administrator feedback:

Math teachers have provided feedback using evaluation surveys following the AEA professional development training. The evaluations indicate high levels of satisfaction by the participating teachers. Teachers have also appreciated the AEA providing professional development at their school site, training aligned to their building math goals, and technology integration.

Furthermore, teachers have indicated support for the following general and special education math strategies: Every Student Counts, Cognitive Tutor, and Differentiated Instruction.

**Cognitive Tutor (E2T2 – 27 teachers)**

- 100% responded high quality professional development delivered
- 100% responded assisted in improving instruction/job-related performance
- 100% responded useful student learning ideas and skills presented
- 100% responded gained new knowledge and skills
- 69% responded they implemented their new learning
- 1,144 students impacted
- 18% student achievement program gain

**Math Program (57 teachers)**

- 71% responded high quality professional development delivered
- 94% responded assisted in improving instruction/job-related performance
- 94% responded useful student learning ideas and skills presented
- 100% responded gained new knowledge and skills
- 57% responded they implemented their new learning
- 43 students impacted
- 78% student achievement program gain
Progress with Improved Teaching — Science

Science teachers within AEA 9 region responded to the 2010 statewide AEA customer satisfaction survey. The 2010 results from responding science teachers (n = 245) are: (survey results represent the percentage of strongly agreeing and agreeing responses)

96.3%  Generally, the AEA services that I have received or participated in met my professional needs.
86.5%  The AEA is responsive to my school’s student learning needs.
84.1%  The AEA provides leadership to meet emerging educational needs. (10.2% had no opinion)
86.6%  The AEA delivers current and timely services to meet my district or school’s needs.
74.7%  The AEA delivers cost-efficient services to meet my district or school’s needs. (21.6% had no opinion)
82.4%  The AEA delivers services that assist our district in meeting federal and state mandates (NCLB, IDEA, etc.). (14.3% had no opinion)
85.3%  The AEA services that I have received assisted in improving my students’ achievement.
89.4%  The AEA services I have received have assisted in improving my instruction or job-related practices.
89.8%  The AEA staff I have contact with have the knowledge and skills needed to have a positive impact on our school(s).
88.1%  The AEA staff I have contact with create and maintain good working relationships with people in my school and/or district.

Additional teacher and administrator feedback:

Science teachers have provided feedback using evaluation surveys following the AEA professional development training. The evaluations indicate high levels of satisfaction by the participating teachers. Teachers have also appreciated the AEA providing professional development at their school site, training aligned to their building math goals, and technology integration. Furthermore, teachers have indicated support for the following general and special education math strategies: Every Learner Inquiries and Differentiated Instruction are effective.

Science Program (76 teachers)
92%  responded high quality professional development delivered
90%  responded assisted in improving instruction/job-related performance
90%  responded useful student learning ideas and skills presented
100%  responded gained new knowledge and skills
72%  responded they implemented their new learning
93%  student achievement program gain


Progress with Cost Efficiency

Customers (teachers and administrators) within AEA 9 region responded to a statewide AEA customer satisfaction survey. The 2010 AEA cost efficiency results from responding educators is: (survey results represent the percentage of respondents strongly agreeing and agreeing)

71.9% of the 2010 statewide AEA survey respondents (n = 630 customers) indicated that AEA services are cost-efficient. (21.9% had no opinion) Therefore, only 6.2% indicated AEA services were less than efficient.

Non-statewide survey feedback regarding cost efficiency:

a) Regional education cost efficiencies through AEA collaboration with Dr. Richard Elmore, Riverside County Office of Education (California), Lead & Learn, ASCD Differentiated Instruction, and Western Illinois University to implement Partnership Agreements and provide high levels of expertise bringing quality evidence-based practices to individual schools.

b) Statewide educational cost efficiencies through the following AEA services: special education assistance, professional development offerings, leadership development services, media and technology support, grant consortia management, workshops, inservices, driver education, student activities, and home school assistance.

c) Statewide educational cost efficiency achieved through AEA services support of Iowa Department of Education initiatives. For example, the AEA is supporting and leading regional Iowa Core implementation. The efficiencies are school and school districts access to a “point of contact” and statewide initiatives are often delivered at their school site.

d) Iowa Educators Cooperative, an AEA statewide commodity purchasing service, generated $376,225.83 savings for AEA 9 schools.
Progress with Current and/or Timely Services

Customers (teachers and administrators) within AEA 9 region responded to a statewide AEA customer satisfaction survey. The 2010 AEA current and/or timely services result from responding educators is; (survey results represent the percentage of respondents strongly agreeing and agreeing)

84.6% of the 2010 statewide AEA survey respondents (n = 630 customers) indicated that AEA services are current and/or timely services.

Non-statewide survey feedback regarding current and/or timely services:

a) AEA leadership is currently engaged in collaborations with national and international educational experts to bring the latest research and effective strategies to schools and school districts. These collaborations provide an opportunity for area schools and school districts to receive high quality expertise, professional development, coaching, and special education services. These collaborations are being implemented as AEA services through Partnership Agreements and the Enhanced Service Delivery System.

b) Educators frequently respond that they appreciate the AEA’s willingness to provide timely professional development and planning support at their school sites. Educators also respond they appreciate AEA leadership in providing current research-based content area strategies.

c) Educators often acknowledge their appreciation for special education services and the strong relationships between principals, teachers, and AEA staff.

d) Educators frequently respond specifically that media, online database, technology, and assistive technology services are high quality, current, and timely.
Progress with Level of Customer Participation

Customers (teachers and administrators) within AEA 9 region responded to a statewide AEA customer satisfaction survey. The 2010 AEA participation rate results from the responding educators are:

- 20.8% participation in school community planning services
- 77.8% participation in professional development services
- 40.2% participation in curriculum, instruction, and assessment services
- 33.7% participation in diverse learning services
- 6.9% participation in multicultural, gender fair services
- 64.7% participation in media services
- 36.9% participation in technology services
- 15.9% participation in leadership services
- 3.2% participation in management services

Additional customer participation data:

Improving Teaching & Learning

- 642 Teachers involved in “Differentiated Instruction”
- 57 Teachers involved in the “Math Program”
- 165 Teachers involved in the “Reading Program”
- 76 Teachers involved in the “Science Program”
- 154 Administrators and teachers involved in the “Principals’ Leadership Academy”
- 98 Counselors involved in the “Counseling Academy”
- 27 Teachers involved in “Cognitive Tutor”
- 166 Teachers involved in “Content Area Teachers’ Networks”
- 55 Media Specialists involved in the “Media Academy”
- 20 Teachers involved in “Reading First”
- 36 Teachers involved in “Reading Recovery”
- 20 Teachers involved in “Second Chance Reading”

Professional Development

Credit Courses – 63 administrators, 1,261 teachers, and 270 other school staff
Trainings – 549 administrators, 3,006 teachers, 177 students, and 18 parents
Inservice – 444 administrators, 7,022 teachers, and 3 other school staff
Workshops – 146 administrators, 502 teachers, 178 other school staff, and
580 community members

Project Development and Grant Writing

- 384 Administrators
- 55 Staff
- 792 Parents
- 35,850 Students
- 1,878 Teachers
- 42 Community members
Progress with Customer Satisfaction

Customers (teachers and administrators) within AEA 9 region responded to a statewide AEA customer satisfaction survey. The 2010 results from responding educators are: (survey results represent the percentage of respondents strongly agreeing and agreeing)

94.1% Generally, the AEA services that I have received or participated in met my professional needs.
84.0% The AEA is responsive to my school’s student learning needs.
82.1% The AEA provides leadership to meet emerging educational needs. (10.4% had no opinion)
84.6% The AEA delivers current and timely services to meet my district or school’s needs.
71.9% The AEA delivers cost-efficient services to meet my district or school’s needs. (21.5% had no opinion)
82.6% The AEA delivers services that assist our district in meeting federal and state mandates (NCLB, IDEA, etc.). (14.7% had no opinion)
81.1% The AEA services that I have received assisted in improving my students’ achievement.
86.4% The AEA services I have received have assisted in improving my instruction or job-related practices.
88.0% The AEA staff I have contact with have the knowledge and skills needed to have a positive impact on our school(s).
88.6% The AEA staff I have contact with create and maintain good working relationships with people in my school and/or district.

Additional customer satisfaction data:

Differentiated Instruction (642 teachers)
97% responded high quality professional development delivered
94% responded assisted in improving instruction/job-related performance
98% responded useful student learning ideas and skills presented
100% responded gained new knowledge and skills

Cognitive Tutor (E2T2 - 27 teachers)
100% responded high quality professional development delivered
100% responded assisted in improving instruction/job-related performance
100% responded useful student learning ideas and skills presented
100% responded gained new knowledge and skills
69% responded they implemented their new learning
1,144 students impacted
18% student achievement program gain

Math Program (57 teachers)
71% responded high quality professional development delivered
94% responded assisted in improving instruction/job-related performance
94% responded useful student learning ideas and skills presented
100% responded gained new knowledge and skills
57% responded they implemented their new learning
43 students impacted
78% student achievement program gain
Literacy/Reading Program (165 teachers)
90% responded high quality professional development delivered
99% responded assisted in improving instruction/job-related performance
98% responded useful student learning ideas and skills presented
100% responded gained new knowledge and skills
88% responded they implemented their new learning
242 students impacted

Reading First (20 teachers)
100% responded high quality professional development delivered
100% responded assisted in improving instruction/job-related performance
95% responded useful student learning ideas and skills presented
100% responded gained new knowledge and skills
95% responded they implemented their new learning
1,548 students impacted

Reading Recovery (36 teachers)
100% responded high quality professional development delivered
100% responded assisted in improving instruction/job-related performance
100% responded useful student learning ideas and skills presented
285 students impacted
100% of the students met the grade level reading standard

Second Chance Reading (20 teachers)
100% responded high quality professional development delivered
100% responded assisted in improving instruction/job-related performance
100% responded useful student learning ideas and skills presented
100% responded they implemented their new learning
163 students impacted
55% of the students had a reading achievement gain

Science Program (76 teachers)
92% responded high quality professional development delivered
90% responded assisted in improving instruction/job-related performance
90% responded useful student learning ideas and skills presented
100% responded gained new knowledge and skills
72% responded they implemented their new learning
93% student achievement program gain

Media Academy (55 teachers)
100% responded high quality professional development delivered
97% responded assisted in improving instruction/job-related performance
97% responded useful student learning ideas and skills presented

Content Area Teachers’ Network (166 teachers)
96% responded high quality professional development delivered
96% responded assisted in improving instruction/job-related performance
97% responded useful student learning ideas and skills presented
### AEA Chapter 72 Dropout Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ALL DROOUTS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number Dropouts</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>533</td>
<td>588</td>
<td>566</td>
<td>567</td>
<td>788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number Students</td>
<td>23,136</td>
<td>24,126</td>
<td>24,696</td>
<td>23,806</td>
<td>23,540</td>
<td>23,638</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Dropouts</td>
<td>2.03%</td>
<td>2.21%</td>
<td>2.38%</td>
<td>2.41%</td>
<td>2.41%</td>
<td>3.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FEMALE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number Dropouts</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number Students</td>
<td>11,322</td>
<td>11,830</td>
<td>12,089</td>
<td>11,453</td>
<td>11,416</td>
<td>11,492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Dropouts</td>
<td>1.90%</td>
<td>2.14%</td>
<td>2.22%</td>
<td>2.06%</td>
<td>1.89%</td>
<td>2.82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MALE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number Dropouts</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number Students</td>
<td>11,814</td>
<td>12,296</td>
<td>12,607</td>
<td>12,033</td>
<td>12,124</td>
<td>12,146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Dropouts</td>
<td>2.16%</td>
<td>2.28%</td>
<td>2.54%</td>
<td>2.74%</td>
<td>2.90%</td>
<td>3.82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WHITE</strong> (not of Hispanic origin)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number Dropouts</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>568</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number Students</td>
<td>19,720</td>
<td>20,278</td>
<td>20,577</td>
<td>19,768</td>
<td>19,063</td>
<td>18,998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Dropouts</td>
<td>1.82%</td>
<td>1.78%</td>
<td>1.75%</td>
<td>1.95%</td>
<td>2.17%</td>
<td>2.99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BLACK</strong> (not of Hispanic origin)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number Dropouts</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number Students</td>
<td>1,467</td>
<td>1,701</td>
<td>1,815</td>
<td>1,874</td>
<td>1,962</td>
<td>2,025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Dropouts</td>
<td>4.91%</td>
<td>5.94%</td>
<td>7.22%</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>3.82%</td>
<td>5.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HISPANIC</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number Dropouts</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number Students</td>
<td>1,436</td>
<td>1,620</td>
<td>1,741</td>
<td>1,802</td>
<td>1,942</td>
<td>1,990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Dropouts</td>
<td>2.23%</td>
<td>3.02%</td>
<td>4.88%</td>
<td>3.11%</td>
<td>3.66%</td>
<td>4.32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AMERICAN INDIAN OR ALASKAN NATIVE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number Dropouts</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number Students</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Dropouts</td>
<td>4.46%</td>
<td>11.94%</td>
<td>7.41%</td>
<td>7.94%</td>
<td>5.13%</td>
<td>5.15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ASIAN OR PACIFIC ISLANDER</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number Dropouts</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number Students</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>393</td>
<td>423</td>
<td>436</td>
<td>456</td>
<td>489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Dropouts</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>1.78%</td>
<td>0.23%</td>
<td>0.92%</td>
<td>0.64%</td>
<td>1.84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DISABLED/TPF</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number Dropouts</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number Students</td>
<td>3169</td>
<td>3065</td>
<td>3057</td>
<td>2902</td>
<td>2779</td>
<td>2888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Dropouts</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>3.66%</td>
<td>4.05%</td>
<td>1.73%</td>
<td>2.48%</td>
<td>2.88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS (ELL)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number Dropouts</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number Students</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>416</td>
<td>441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Dropouts</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>3.79%</td>
<td>2.45%</td>
<td>1.68%</td>
<td>1.59%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## AEA Chapter 72 Indicators of Post-Secondary Success

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students Indicating POSTSECONDARY SUCCESS</th>
<th># Probable Postsecondary Measure (ACT)</th>
<th># Probable Success Scores</th>
<th>% Probable Success Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2003–2004</td>
<td>1,962</td>
<td>1,378</td>
<td>70.23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004–2005</td>
<td>2,010</td>
<td>1,351</td>
<td>67.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005–2006</td>
<td>2,557</td>
<td>1,779</td>
<td>69.57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006–2007</td>
<td>2,870</td>
<td>2,091</td>
<td>72.86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007–2008</td>
<td>2,892</td>
<td>2,087</td>
<td>72.16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008–2009</td>
<td>3,121</td>
<td>2,238</td>
<td>71.71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009–2010</td>
<td>3,355</td>
<td>2,369</td>
<td>70.65%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students Intending to Pursue POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION/TRAINING</th>
<th># HS Seniors Pursuing</th>
<th># HS Seniors Pursuing</th>
<th>% HS Seniors Pursuing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2003–2004</td>
<td>3,390</td>
<td>2,724</td>
<td>80.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004–2005</td>
<td>3,397</td>
<td>2,662</td>
<td>78.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005–2006</td>
<td>3,395</td>
<td>2,844</td>
<td>83.77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006–2007</td>
<td>3,532</td>
<td>2,952</td>
<td>83.58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007–2008</td>
<td>3,460</td>
<td>2,791</td>
<td>80.66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008–2009</td>
<td>3,355</td>
<td>2,714</td>
<td>80.89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009–2010</td>
<td>3,476</td>
<td>2,917</td>
<td>83.92%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students Completing a CORE PROGRAM</th>
<th># HS Seniors</th>
<th># HS Seniors Core Complete</th>
<th>% HS Seniors Core Complete</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2003-2004</td>
<td>3,216</td>
<td>1,655</td>
<td>51.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004-2005</td>
<td>3,243</td>
<td>1,792</td>
<td>55.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-2006</td>
<td>3,373</td>
<td>1,902</td>
<td>56.39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-2007</td>
<td>3,489</td>
<td>2,046</td>
<td>58.64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-2008</td>
<td>3,401</td>
<td>2,193</td>
<td>64.48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-2009</td>
<td>3,362</td>
<td>2,263</td>
<td>67.31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-2010</td>
<td>3,451</td>
<td>3,314</td>
<td>96.03%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B
2011 Programs & Services

2011 Programs and Services are a tentative list. All programs and services are scheduled to be reviewed during 2011-2012 as a Comprehensive Improvement Plan action step. Following the review process, the programs and services are scheduled to be presented to the AEA Board of Directors and LEA representatives early 2012. The review process will include aligning programs and services to the Agency’s Iowa Core services and Partnership Agreement process.

Tentative 2011-2012 List
(Pending Potential 2011 Legislative Funding Cuts)

Proposed Programs and Services for 2011-12 are tentative given the potential for legislative funding cuts during the 2011 session. The programs and services are listed below in alphabetical order. Each program/service listing includes:

1. Primary Contact – the AEA staff member(s) primarily responsible for the program
2. Description – brief description of the program
3. Standards for Services – the AEA accreditation standard(s) addressed by the program
4. Alignment to AEA Goals –
   1) Reading
   2) Math
   3) Science
5. Districts Served – local school districts served or participating in a particular program
6. Data Collection – information to determine program success
7. Recommendation: Add, Retain, Modify, or Delete – recommendation based on the Agency’s Needs Assessment process, the agency-wide goals identified to meet these needs, and the action plans developed to meet the goals

Standards for Service:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Curriculum, Instruction, &amp; Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DL</td>
<td>Diverse Learners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LD</td>
<td>Leadership Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Media Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCGF</td>
<td>Multi-Cultural Gender Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS</td>
<td>Management Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PD</td>
<td>Professional Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC</td>
<td>School and Community Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST</td>
<td>School Technology</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Accelerating Student Achievement Partnership (ASAP) – Glenn Pelecky, Julie Schendel, Kristine Wolzen, Edward Gronlund

This program is the implementation of a new AEA service delivery system. The new service delivery system is focused on accelerating student achievement for all students at school building level. Partnership Agreements are developed and implemented with explicit outcomes, actions and monitoring. The Agreements are focused on supporting school level reform.
Standards for Service: C, DL, LD, M, MCGF, MS, PD, SC, ST
Alignment to AEA Goals: All
Districts: Bellevue, Bettendorf, Central, Clinton, Columbus, Davenport, Delwood,
      Durant, Louisa-Muscatine, North Scott, Northeast, Wilton
Data Collection: Student achievement, AEA service alignment
Recommendation: Retain

2. **Instructional Decision Making (IDM)** – Edward Gronlund, Julie Schendel, Jill Yates
   ASAP sites are engaged in developing, implementing, and monitoring IDM. The IDM
   begins with the Core Instruction cycle and includes a supplemental and intensive cycle.
   Core Instruction uses a guaranteed and viable curriculum that the district has adopted for
   use with all students, assessment and screening, and instructional strategies.
   Standards of Service: C, DL, LD, MCGF, PD, SC
   Alignment to AEA Goals: All
   Districts: ASAP sites and DE grant sites
   Recommendation: Retain

3. **Learning Supports** – Edward Gronlund, Julie Schendel, Mary Cashman, Mollie Conrad,
   Cindy Swanson, Jill Yates
   Services are designed to help schools remove social, emotional, behavioral, and academic
   barriers to learning for all students. The learning support program includes:
   - Framework for Understanding Poverty
   - PBS – Positive Behavior Supports
   - PBS – Positive Behavior Supports (preschool)
   - Olweus Program – anti-bullying strategy
   - Second Step Curriculum – social skills and violence prevention strategies
   - CPI – non-violence crisis intervention
   - Therapeutic Crisis Intervention
   - Counseling Academy
   - Too Good For Drugs Prevention Program
   - Transition Planning
   - Specialized Teams – assistive technology, behavior intervention, and Autism
   Standards of Service: C, DL, LD, MCGF, PD, SC
   Alignment to AEA Goals: All
   Districts: All
   Recommendation: Retain

4. **Mathematics** – Sandra Campie, Linda Mannhardt, Heather Cousins, Eldon Bird
   This program provides support to districts/schools to improve student mathematics
   performance. Professional development and consultation is provided to educators to
   meet district/school mathematics curriculum development, implementation, and/or
   evaluation needs as well as the alignment of effective instruction and appropriate
   assessment. The program provides workshops and consultations on scientifically
   researched math instructional strategies or interventions to improve student learning. The
   math program has the following current ongoing initiatives:
• **Assessment** – Provide district level assessment support in using the Iowa Collaborative Assessment Modules as well as other school formative and summative assessments.

• **Cognitive Tutor—E2T2** – The two goals for the E2T2 grant are to improve the quantitative and technological abilities of all middle and high school students and teachers and to improve the quality of math instruction. Schools will focus on the math standards/benchmarks for Algebra and Geometry. The Agency provides workshops and consultations for schools implementing the Cognitive Tutor Algebra/Geometry program from Carnegie Learning. The two goals for the E2T2 grant are to improve the quantitative and technological abilities of all middle and high school students and teachers and to improve the quality of math instruction in use. Schools will focus on the math standards/benchmarks for Algebra and Geometry.

• **Every Student Counts**—Facilitating the Iowa Department of Education’s statewide middle school math project aimed at improving math instruction.

• **Mathematics**—Iowa Core Curriculum implementation which includes: problem based instruction, meaningful distributed practice, teaching for understanding, modeling, and technology.

• **MBAEA Integrating Standards in Classrooms (website)**—Updating the standards webpage with current and relevant information to support ongoing district/school standards development.

• **Textbook Selection** – Provide consultation regarding textbook adoption.
  Standards for Service: C, DL, LD, M, MCGF, PD, ST
  Alignment to AEA Goals: Goal 2
  Districts: Open to All
  Data Collection: Service counts, satisfaction, and implementation data
  Recommendation: Retain

5. **Reading/Language Arts** – Janet Stos, Mary Beilke, Pat Upchurch, Bruce Bufe

This program provides support to districts/schools to improve student reading/language arts performance. Professional development and consultation are provided to educators to meet district/school reading/language arts curriculum development, implementation, and/or evaluation needs as well as the alignment of effective instruction and appropriate assessment. The program provides workshops and consultations on scientifically researched reading/language arts instructional strategies or interventions to improve student learning. The reading/language arts program has seven current initiatives:

• **Reading Recovery**—Provide an intensive reading and writing intervention to districts and schools that have identified first graders who are at risk of failure in reading and writing. The assistance includes ongoing support of current Reading Recovery programs; (b) providing ongoing professional development for Reading Recovery teachers and training for new Reading Recovery teachers.

• **Second Chance Reading**—Reading program for secondary students with reading deficits to supplement a language arts curriculum. The program targets reading skills so that students can meet the demands of the secondary curriculum.

• **Secondary Reading Initiative**—Examine student reading performance using the Iowa Professional Development Model. Participants examine their own classroom or building reading data, study the data, and implement instructional activities and
strategies to improve reading achievement. Participants learn how to use professional development as an ongoing process to improve student reading performance.

- **Elementary Reading Initiative**—Examine elementary student comprehension, vocabulary, and fluency performance using the Iowa Professional Development Model. Participants examine their own classroom or building reading data, study the data, and implement explicit instructional activities and strategies to improve reading achievement. Participants learn how to use professional development as an ongoing process to improve student reading performance.

- **Read Naturally**—The program is focused on daily practice to improve student reading fluency and comprehension. It combines three research-based strategies: teacher modeling; repeated reading; and self-monitoring. AEA Read Naturally trainers provide the theory, demonstration, and practice for participants.

- **KU Learning Strategies**—The program is focused on instructional strategies that assist students with how to learn, use what they have learned, and demonstrate competence. The Kansas University Learning Strategies are research based. These strategies are aimed at: reading skills; storing and remembering; expressing information; demonstration and comprehension; social interaction and motivation; and math skills.

- **KU Content Enhancement Routines**—The program is focused on instructional strategies for a diverse group of students. The routines involve lesson planning and translating content into format understood by students. The approaches include: thinking deeply about what students need to know; selecting the central ideas and concepts that make the details and facts hang together; selecting and constructing instructional devices (e.g., graphic organizers); and presenting the content in a way that actively involves the student. The routines include: planning and leading learning; exploring text, topics, and details; teaching concepts; and increasing student performance.

- **Learning to Write – Writing to Learn**—The program assists teachers with instructional methods so that they may write, model, and demonstrate effective writing strategies with their students. The program uses action research so that participants may monitor student growth: 1) how well students write; 2) how well students use writing to learn.

- **MBAEA Integrating Standards in Iowa Classrooms (website)**—Provide support in use of the content included on the webpage with current and relevant information for ongoing district/school standards’ development.

- **Textbook Selection**—Provide consultation in textbook adoption.

- **Assessment**—Provide district level support using Iowa Collaborative Assessment Modules (ICAM), as well as other school formative and summative assessments.
  
  Standards for Service: C, DL, LD, MCGF, PD
  
  Alignment to AEA Goals: Reading
  
  Districts: Open to All
  
  Data Collection: Service counts, satisfaction, implementation data, and student achievement data

  Recommendation: Retain
6. **Science** – Sandra Campie, Linda Mannhardt

   This program provides support to districts/schools to improve student science performance. Professional development and consultation is provided to educators to meet district/school science curriculum development, implementation, and/or evaluation needs as well as the alignment of effective instruction and appropriate assessment. The program provides workshops and consultations on scientifically-based instructional strategies or interventions to improve student learning. The science program includes:

   - **Assessment** – Provide district level support using school formative and summative assessments.
   - **Every Learner Inquires (ELI)** – The Every Learner Inquires is Iowa’s statewide science initiative. The ELI project is a four year K-12 professional development model. The AEA has an ELI leadership team composed of LEA elementary/secondary teachers.
   - **MBAEA Integrating Standards in Classrooms** – Provide support in use of the content included on the webpage with current and relevant information for ongoing district/school standards’ development.
   - **Textbook Selection** – Provide consultation in textbook adoption.
   - **Using Kits as Tools in Inquiry-Based Science** – Training for districts interested in exploring the use of kits to teach science in the elementary grades will occur in fall and spring of 2006-2007. Lynne Bleske provides expert instruction in the rationale, practice and maintenance of kits in classrooms as well as guidance in using guided inquiry.
   - **V.A.S.T. Project** – The V.A.S.T. Project will provide leadership and support for exemplary science teaching using kit-based science in elementary grants. Two pilot schools will participate in 2006-2007. Participation includes training in effective science instruction and access to science kits housed at the V.A.S.T. center in Cedar Rapids.
   - **Workshops and consultations** – Provide workshops and consultations on scientifically research-based Science instructional strategies or interventions to improve student learning.

   **Standards for Service:** C, DL, LD, MCGF, PD, ST  
   **Alignment to AEA Goals:** Science  
   **Districts:** Open to All  
   **Data Collection:** Service counts, satisfaction, and implementation data  
   **Recommendation:** Retain

### Programs & Services Related to LEA Priorities and Accountability Measures

Programs and services 7 – 15 are services to meet the student learning priorities identified by local schools and school districts. The school priority needs addressed are:

- Meeting the learning needs of diverse learners
- Providing quality professional development
- Assisting districts with program evaluation services
- Improving student reading performance
- Improving student mathematics performance
• Extending educational opportunities as system of learning supports from birth to postsecondary success
• Improving student science performance
• Developing leaders with skills to improve student learning (board members, superintendents, administrators, principals, teachers, and community)

The programs and services are also aligned to Iowa Code Chapter 12 for schools and school districts, U. S. Department of Education Performance Indicators for students with disabilities, No Child Left Behind, and Iowa Standards of Service for area education agencies.

7. Closing the Achievement Gap – Mary Bielke, Linda Mannhardt, Nicole Peterson, Ann Craig

• Curriculum Mapping – Curriculum Mapping is a recommended sequence for creating and working with curriculum maps. The mapping process includes the analysis and the alignment of the “taught curriculum” to the district’s “adopted curriculum”, i.e., standards and benchmarks. Curriculum maps lead educators and their community to ask and answer the questions that improved instructions and promote achievement.

• Differentiated Instruction – Using the work of Carol Ann Tomlinson, Differentiated Instruction will guide teachers and administrators through a way of thinking about teaching and learning that will in turn shape what is learned by students, how students process what is learned, how students demonstrate their learning, and also addresses the learning environment.
  Standards for Service: C, DL, LD, M, PD, ST
  Alignment to AEA Goals: All
  Districts: Open to All
  Data Collection: Service counts, satisfaction, implementation data, and student achievement data
  Recommendation: Retain

8. Comprehensive School Improvement Support & Program Evaluation –
   Cindy Swanson, Julie Schendel, Steve Fuglsang, Amy Wichman

This program supports district and school efforts to exceed and/or comply with Iowa's strategic plan for improving student performance (Iowa Code—Chapter 12, and Iowa’s plan for meeting the requirements of “No Child Left Behind”). The assistance includes:

• Workshops and Consultations – Develop, implement, and/or evaluate comprehensive school improvement plans for districts and schools.
• Program Evaluation – Assist school districts with CSIP program evaluation needs and provide professional development to build local capacity for evaluating programs and professional development.
• Curriculum School Improvement Network (CSIN) – Networking opportunities for educational leaders responsible for curriculum and school improvement leadership through CSIN.
• Co-Teaching – Provide technical assistance to districts/buildings to support the Consultative Model For Collaborative Service Provision under NCLB and IDEA 2004 High Qualified Teacher Legislation.
• Schools In Need of Assistance (SINA/DINA) – Support for “schools-in-need-of-assistance” and “districts-in-need-of-assistance” identified by the Iowa Department of
Education (Iowa NCLB Support System). Schools labeled as “schools-in-need-of-assistance” will receive ongoing assistance to exceed and/or meet the Iowa’s NCLB expectations. The Iowa NCLB Support System includes the following phases:

- **Audit phase**—Collect existing school data, create a profile, determine areas of concern, and develop relevant questions;
- **Diagnosis phase**—Work with a building leadership team to conduct in-depth data collection and analysis to clearly understand the current learning environment (strengths and weaknesses);
- **Design phase**—Continue working with a building leadership team to identify a desired state for student learning, complete gap analysis, develop a two-year action plan based on scientifically researched interventions, and process the developed two-year action plan through a peer review;
- **Implementation phase**—Assist building leadership teams in the monitoring of implementation data to ensure fidelity of the interventions;
- **Monitoring & Assessment phase**—Conduct formative evaluations semi-annually to determine the effectiveness of the intervention, communicate semi-annual evaluation results to all stakeholders, and update the two-year action plan.

- **High School/Middle School Reform**—Provide awareness on the key concepts of effective high schools and strategies for change; serve as a “Critical Friend” to schools that wish to examine their current status and engage in the change process; and act as an informational resource between high schools that are engaged in reform.
- **Walk-Throughs**—Provide assistance to district in the training and implementation of walk-throughs.
- **Teacher Quality**—The professional development program supports the Iowa Teacher Quality legislation by providing workshops and consultations regarding:
  - **Career Development Plans**—Provide assistance for schools to link their professional development to teacher career development plans.
  - **Mentoring and Induction**—Provide assistance to meet Iowa’s teacher mentoring and induction program requirements.
  - **Iowa Professional Development Model**—Provide assistance to schools regarding the professional development model rolled out by Iowa Department of Education.
  - **Teacher Evaluation**—To provide assistance to districts regarding Teacher Evaluation plans.

- **Iowa Core Curriculum (ICC)**—The professional development program that supports the implementation of the ICC in Iowa schools as per Iowa code. ICC identifies essential skills and concepts in literacy, math, science, social studies, and 21st century learning skills which include employability, financial literacy, health literacy, civic literacy, and technology literacy. In addition to core content, aligned teaching and assessment essential ICC components.

  Standards for Service: C, DL, LD, M, MCFG, PD, SC, ST
  Alignment to AEA Goals: All
  District: Open to All
  Data Collection: Service counts, satisfaction, implementation data, and student achievement data
  Recommendation: Retain
9. **Early Childhood Services**—Tori Lindeman, Jennifer Jansen

This program provides services to support districts and schools in the development, implementation, and evaluation of early childhood programs. Professional development and consultations are available to educators to effectively establish programs that enhance a child’s opportunity to be successful in school. The program, in partnership with community agencies including the Empowerment Zone, provides new parents with a packet (Baby Packets) that has information about child development and services available to infants and parents. The initiatives currently supported:

- **Primary Program (State Initiative)**—Facilitate the Iowa Department of Education’s Iowa and Nebraska adaptation of The British Columbia Primary Program. It is a document to serve as a resource for school improvement in providing a developmentally appropriate education for every K-3rd grade child in the State of Iowa.

- **Every Child Reads Birth to Kindergarten (State Initiative)**—Facilitate the Iowa Department of Education’s reading initiative for children birth to age five. The program builds capacity for specialists who work with the birth to kindergarten age group. Language, reading, and writing related skills are the emphasis of this program. It is a collaborative effort with community-based agencies.

- **Quad City Early Childhood Conference**—Collaborate with early childhood related agencies from Iowa and Illinois to provide early childhood conference each year for area educators.

- **Services to Students with Disabilities**—Support and related services are provided to children from age 3 to 5 who have disabilities. Services include transition from Early Access Services to services provided by local school districts, screenings and evaluations, speech therapy, occupational therapy, physical therapy, behavior interventions, parent education and consultation to preschools and daycare centers.

- **Statewide Voluntary Preschool Program**—The program supports district efforts and collaboration with private preschool providers, accreditation process, professional development, and program management.
  
  Standards for Service: C, DL, LD, PD, ST
  
  Alignment to AEA Goals: All
  
  Districts: Open to All
  
  Data Collection: Service counts and satisfaction
  
  Recommendation: Retain

10. **English Language Learners-ELL**—Martha Yerinton

This program is to support districts as they comply with the state mandates and specific needs of the ELL population in districts/schools. Consultations are available to design programs and strategies to meet the learning needs of English Language Learners as well as assessment support to determine appropriate instruction.

Standards for Service: C, DL, LD, MCGF, PD

Alignment to AEA Goals: All

Districts: Open to All

Data Collection: Service counts and satisfaction

Recommendation: Retain
11. **Media Materials Distribution Center (Media Services)** - Cindy Blinkinsop
- K-12 Lending Library
- Professional Library
- Curriculum Laboratory
- Production Services (walk-in)

This program is available to educators and students within the boundaries of the Mississippi Bend Area Education Agency. Clients have access to K-12 classroom media materials in a variety of formats, professional educational resources, online databases, both basic and supplemental curriculum materials in all academic areas, and production services to enhance the continuing education of all learners.

- Standards for Service: C, M, PD
- Alignment to AEA Goals: All
- Districts: Open to All
- Data Collection: Service counts and satisfaction
- Recommendation: Delete — See Media Services

12. **Media Services** - Nancy McInire, Cindy Blinkinsop

This program provides assistance to schools in the acquisition, application, and integration of media resources to support and enhance curriculum and instruction.

- **Copyright** — Provide consultation and presentations on the implications of the Copyright law for K-12 education.
- **ERIC search** — (Educational Resources Information Center) Educators may request a search that may yield several educational documents or journals on a variety of educational topics.
- **IEC media and technology** — (AEA Collaborative for Educational Media) State-wide cooperative purchasing agreements to obtain the best possible prices on products in order to maximize the purchasing power of Iowa schools.
- **Media Specialists’ Academy** — Provide a professional development opportunity for LEA media specialists to enhance their leadership, knowledge, and skills to improve student learning.
- **Media Materials Distribution Center** — Provide access to K-12 classroom media materials in a variety of formats, professional educational resources, online databases, both basic and supplemental curriculum materials in all academic areas, and production services to enhance the continuing education of all learners through a K-12 Lending Library, Professional Library, Curriculum Laboratory, and Production Services.
- **Online databases** — Provide high quality, authoritative, electronic databases to all students and educators.

- Standards for Service: C, DL, LD, M, MCGF, PD, SC, ST
- Alignment to AEA Goals: All
- Districts: Open to All
- Data Collection: Service counts and satisfaction
- Recommendation: Retain
13. **Paraeducator Training** – Cindy Swanson  
Training is provided to paraeducators employed by local school districts. The topics of roles and responsibilities, conflict management, instruction, and discipline are emphasized. Regional and local conferences are held.  
- Standards for Service: PD, DL  
- Alignment to AEA Goals: Support 1, 2 and 3  
- Districts: All  
- Data Collection: # of paraeducators who receive training  
- Recommendation: Retain

14. **Principals’ Leadership Academy (Leadership Development)** - Kris Wolzen  
This program provides professional development experiences designed for area principals to network with colleagues for the purposes of (1) building professional knowledge, skills and expertise; (2) discussing current issues; and (3) solving problems.  
- Standards for Service: C, DL, LD, PD  
- Alignment to AEA Goals: All  
- Districts: Open to All  
- Data Collection: Service counts, satisfaction and implementation data  
- Recommendation: Retain

15. **School and Community Planning** – Julie Schendel, Nancy McIntire, Cindy Swanson  
This program also provides assistance in the following ways: (a) planning processes outlined within Iowa Code—Chapter 12 for K-12 districts/schools, (b) collaborative planning activities by regional public agencies connected to K-12 education; and (c) planning activities to meet the systemic needs of K-12 districts/schools.  
- Standards for Service: LD, PD, SC  
- Alignment to AEA Goals: Supports All  
- Districts: Open to All  
- Data Collection: Service counts and satisfaction  
- Recommendation: Retain

**Program & Services Related to U.S. Department of Education (USDOE) Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) Accountability**

Programs and services 16 – 37 are services provided to students with disabilities as well as proactive interventions for general education students. **These services are being reviewed during 2011-2012 to align with the new Enhanced Service Delivery System.** The services are focused on identifying and assisting the education program so that students with disabilities are successful. The services are aligned to the U.S. Department of Education and Iowa Department of Education expectations for services to students with disabilities.

16. **ACCESS Program** – Jane Rock  
The ACCESS Program involves the Mississippi Bend AEA, the Eastern Iowa Community College District and the local school districts to provide vocational training to high school students with disabilities.  
- Standards for Service: C, DL  
- Alignment to AEA Goals: None
Districts: All with high school students
Recommendation: Retain

17. **Alternate Assessment** – Julie Schendel
The progress of students with significant disabilities is assessed through the Iowa Alternate Assessment Process developed by the Iowa Department of Education. Training for teachers and others in this process is provided by a team consisting of both Mississippi Bend AEA and local school district staff. Scoring of portfolios is completed by the members of training teams on a regional basis.
   Standards for Service: C, DL
   Alignment to AEA Goals: 1, 2 and 3
   Districts: All
   Recommendation: Retain

18. **Assistive Technology Team** - Cindy Cavanagh and Teresa Wyant
The assistive technology team supports IFSP/IEP teams as they provide assistive technology devices and services for individuals 0-21 by serving as a resource to teams as they work to integrate assistive technology into the student’s life. The team also provides assessment of individuals with disabilities, including a functional evaluation of the individual in the learning environment, to determine if assistive technology is needed by the individual. The team provides information related to the purchase, lease or other means of obtaining assistive technology. The team provides training related to the use of assistive technology.
   Standards for Service: C, DL, ST
   Alignment to AEA Goals: Support 1, 2 and 3
   Districts: All
   Recommendation: Retain

19. **Audiological Services** – Brian Foy
Comprehensive audiology services for infants, preschoolers and school-age children are provided. This involves hearing screening and testing and consultation with school personnel, parents and children regarding the educational programs and assistive technology needed by children with hearing loss. The service includes increasing the knowledge students have of their own hearing loss and its effect on their learning, interpersonal communications and relationships (Knowledge is Power).
   Standards for Service: DL, ST
   Alignment to AEA Goals: Support 1, 2 and 3
   Districts: All
   Recommendation: Retain

20. **Autism Resource Team** - Kathy Sivil, Claire Anthony
The autism resource team provides training and consultation to teachers, AEA staff, staff from other agencies and parents in the design, implementation and evaluation of programs and services for children and students with autism.
   Standards for Service: C, DL
   Alignment to AEA Goals: Support 1, 2 and 3
   Districts: All
   Recommendation: Retain
21. **Brain Injury Resource Team** – Sue Wood
The team provides consultation to educators and parents who are planning and delivering educational programs to students who have incurred a traumatic brain injury. A resource library of articles, videotapes, pamphlets and books which are available to educators and parents is provided.

- Standards for Service: PD, DL
- Alignment to AEA Goals: Support 1, 2 and 3
- Districts: All
- Recommendation: Retain

22. **Compliance Monitoring** – Julie Schendel
Services are provided to each school district every five years to help assure that each district is in compliance with federal and state law, regulation and rule with regard to the provision of special education to children with disabilities. All activities emphasize education and training of those involved with the provision of special education.

- Standards for Service: PD, DL
- Alignment to AEA Goals: Support 1, 2 and 3
- Districts: All
- Recommendation: Retain

23. **Counseling Services** – Julie Schendel and Cindy Swanson
Special education support staff provides individual and group counseling to students who have interests and needs that can be appropriately addressed through this service. Counseling may be provided as part of a formal Intervention Plan or as a part of an Individualized Education Program for students with a disability.

- Standards for Service: D, DL
- Alignment to AEA Goals: Support 1, 2 and 3
- Districts: All
- Recommendation: Retain

24. **Early ACCESS** – Terri Lindeman, Kathy Cameron
This is a multi-agency collaborative program to provide services to children with developmental delays who are ages birth through two and their families. An Individual Family Service Plan (IFSP) is written to document what the child and the family will receive, who will provide the services, and a time line for evaluation and review.

- Standards for Service: SC, PD, C, DL and ST
- Alignment to AEA Goals: Support 1, 2 and 3
- Districts: All
- Recommendation: Retain

25. **Educational Consultant Services** – Julie Schendel
Ongoing support to instructional programs for children requiring special education is provided. Consultants assist with the development of curriculum and instruction which is provided to students with disabilities in both the special and general education settings. Consultants are members of the team that conducts evaluations, designs interventions for general education students, determines if a child requires special education and develops
the Individualized Education Program. Consultants assist with improving the academic achievement of students with disabilities.
  Standards for Service: C, DL, ST  
  Alignment to AEA Goals: Support 1, 2 and 3  
  Districts: All  
  Recommendation: Retain

26. **Hospital and Home Instruction** – Rachel Peña

Students who receive special education whose health prevents them from attending school are provided appropriate special education instruction and services either at home or in the hospital.
  Standards for Service: D, DL  
  Alignment to AEA Goals: Goals 1, 2 and 3  
  Districts: All  
  Recommendation: Retain

27. **Independent Evaluations** - Rachel Peña

Independent evaluations are provided when parents disagree with the results of the evaluation provided by the school and the Mississippi Bend AEA, or when the IEP team determines additional information is needed to plan and implement an appropriate program for a student.
  Standards for Service: C, DL, ST  
  Alignment to AEA Goals: Support 1, 2 and 3  
  Districts: All  
  Recommendation: Retain

28. **Itinerant Hearing Services** – Brian Foy

Instructional services are provided to students with hearing loss. Students remain in their home schools and receive instruction from an itinerant teacher. Such instruction may be in addition to other special education instruction and services.
  Standards for Service: C, DL  
  Alignment to AEA Goals: Goals 1, 2 and 3  
  Districts: All  
  Recommendation: Retain

29. **Itinerant Vision Services** – Brian Foy

Instructional services are provided to students with vision loss. Students remain in their home schools and receive instruction from an itinerant teacher. Such instruction may be in addition to other special education instruction and services.
  Standards for Service: C, DL  
  Alignment to AEA Goals: Goals 1, 2 and 3  
  Districts: All  
  Recommendation: Retain
30. **Occupational Therapy** – Tori Lindeman  
Evaluations, consultation and therapy are provided to students so they may access and participate in their educational program and activities of daily living. Occupational therapists work with primarily fine motor functions.  
  Standards for Service: C, DL  
  Alignment to AEA Goals: Support 1, 2 and 3  
  Districts: All  
  Recommendation: Retain

31. **Orientation and Mobility Services** – Brian Foy  
Evaluations, consultation and direct services are provided related to the mobility of students with visual impairments. Services are itinerant in nature so that students may remain in their home schools.  
  Standards for Service: C, DL  
  Alignment to AEA Goals: Support 1, 2 and 3  
  Districts: All  
  Recommendation: Retain

32. **Parent-Educator Connection** – Brian Foy  
This program is designed to enhance relationships between parents of students and educators. Parent coordinators implement project activities which include consultation with parents and educators, training, and the provision of a resource library. A steering committee of parents and educators provides direction to the program.  
  Standards for Service: PD, DL  
  Alignment to AEA Goals: Support 1, 2 and 3  
  Districts: All  
  Recommendation: Retain

33. **Physical Therapy** – Tori Lindeman  
Evaluations, consultation and therapy are provided to students so they may access and participate in their educational program and activities of daily living. Physical therapists work primarily with gross motor functions.  
  Standards for Service: C, DL  
  Alignment to AEA Goals: Support 1, 2 and 3  
  Districts: All  
  Recommendation: Retain

34. **School Psychology Services** – Julie Schendel  
Evaluation, counseling, and consultation services are provided to preschool and school-age children who may be experiencing academic, cognitive, behavioral, or social/emotional learning issues. Services focus on individual, group, and systemic needs, with interventions designed to maximize student learning.  
  Standards for Service: PD, C, DL  
  Alignment to AEA Goals: Support 1, 2 and 3  
  Districts: All  
  Recommendation: Retain
35. **School Social Work Services** – Mary Cashman
   Evaluation, intervention, counseling and consultation services are provided to preschool and school-age children, teachers, administrators and families.
   - Standards for Service: PD, C, DL
   - Alignment to AEA Goals: Support 1, 2 and 3
   - Districts: All
   - Recommendation: Retain

36. **Speech and Language Services** – JoAnn Dixson
   Diagnostic and therapy services are provided to address the communication problems experienced by preschool and school-age children. Parent and teacher training is also provided.
   - Standards for Service: PD, C, DL
   - Alignment to AEA Goals: Support 1, 2 and 3
   - Districts: All
   - Recommendation: Retain

37. **Transition Services** – Jane Rock
   Services are available to schools, students, families and community agencies to establish and implement coordinated programs leading to the successful transition of students with disabilities from school to adult life.
   - Standards for Service: PD, C, DL
   - Alignment to AEA Goals: Support 1, 2 and 3
   - Districts: All
   - Recommendation: Retain

### Additional Programs & Services

Programs and services 38 – 62 are services to meet the varied needs of schools and school districts. The programs are aligned to Iowa Standards of Service for area education agencies. These services provide efficiencies within the statewide educational system.

38. **Administrative Services and Support** – Edward Gronlund, Julie Schendel, Kris Wolzen
   Administrative services and support are provided at the agency, division and department levels to provide leadership and support for agency services with special emphasis on planning, implementation and continuous improvement.
   - Standards for Service: All
   - Alignment to AEA Goals: All
   - Districts: Open to All
   - Data Collection: Counts and Satisfaction
   - Recommendation: Retain

39. **Communication Audits and Planning** – Whitney Smith
   Tools that will help improve communication and build trust and support between schools and community are provided. The Mississippi Bend AEA will analyze current programs, including internal and external communications, and perform a Communication Audit.
Results of the Audit will be studied and a Communication Plan will be created which will serve as a blueprint for future communication. There is no charge for this service. There is an hourly charge for administration of Communication Plans.

Standards for Service: MCGF, MS
Alignment to AEA Goals: None
Districts: All
Data Collection: Number of participants
Recommendation: Retain

40. **Content Area Teacher Networks** – Cindy Swanson
This program provides professional development opportunities and networks for educators in academic or program areas that are not included in the state or federal student performance mandates. Consultations may include: to develop and articulate K-12 standards and essential learnings, implement, and evaluate curriculum and the alignment of instruction and assessment. Family and Consumer Sciences – Heather Cousins, Fine Arts – Cindy Swanson, Foreign Language – Bruce Buie and Linda Mannhardt, Gifted & Talented – Sandra Campie, Guidance – Cindy Swanson, Physical Education & Health – Pat Uphurgh, Social Studies and Global Education – Bruce Buie

Standards for Service: C, DL, PD
Alignment to AEA Goals: All
Districts: Open to All
Data Collection: Service counts and satisfaction
Recommendation: Retain

41. **Crisis Intervention** – Julie Schendel
Special education staff is available for consultation and direct service to students in crisis situations such as the sudden death of a student.

Standards for Service: C
Alignment to AEA Goals: Support 1, 2 and 3
Districts: All
Recommendation: Retain

42. **Environmental Services Program** – Denise Zimmer
The Environmental Services Program assists local school districts with compliance programs in Asbestos, OSHA, and other environmental and facility issues. Services are also available and used by districts/schools outside Mississippi Bend AEA borders.

Standards for Service: PD, MS
Alignment to AEA Goals: None
Districts: 16 public/12 non-public
Data Collection: School district participation
Recommendation: Retain

43. **Home Schooling** – Sandi Campie
This program provides information to home school parents on assessment/testing as outlined by Iowa Code for those home-schooled children needing a standardized assessment as designated on their Competency Private Instruction Form.

Standards for Service: None
Alignment to AEA Goals: All
Districts: Open to All
Data Collection: Service counts
Recommendation: Retain

44. **Information Management System (IMS)** – Teresa Stabler
An ongoing data base of students who receive special education is maintained to provide
the information needed to generate funding for both support and instructional services.
The data base also contains other information necessary to complete required reports and
to assist school districts with program planning. IMS is required by the Iowa Department
of Education and the federal Office of Special Education Programs.
Standards for Service: DL
Alignment to AEA Goals: None
Districts: All
Recommendation: Retain

45. **Information Technology** – Joe Coon
Support to Area 9 school districts in the areas of e-rate, data collection, hardware and
software purchases, infrastructure, wide/local network support and computer repair
service are offered.
Standards for Service: MS, ST
Alignment to AEA Goals: Supports All
Districts: Open to All
Data Collection: Participation (Use data – counts)
Recommendation: Retain

- **Computer Repair Service**– George Coles, Dennis Pluym
  The AEA repairs Macintosh and PC computers and their peripherals. Equipment may
  be sent by the AEA van, dropped off at the Bettendorf Service Center, or, for an
  hourly rate of $35.00 per hour, a technician will be sent out to your site.
  Standards of Service: MS, ST

  For this service contact:
Pam Schroder (pschroder@aea9.k12.ia.us), Information Technology Secretary: 563-
344-6310 or 1-800-947-AEA9, Ext. 6310

- **Data Collection** – Jeff Hoskins
  This service is designed to assist schools and districts in their data driven decision-
  making processes. The types of data collected include everything from classroom
demographic data to district wide needs assessments. The AEA provides support by
creating paper based and web-based surveys, and developing reports. We can also
take your existing data such as ITBS/ITED results, demographic data, student
assessments and APR data and format it into user-friendly charts and graphs.
  Standards for Service: C, LD, MCGF, PD

- **Print Services** - Joe Coon
The Print Services Department provides desktop publishing, graphic services, freehand drawing, full-service printing, color copies, digital scanning, posters, banners, and engraving. The print department staff turns your ideas and information into quality finished products.

Your originals can be reproduced in a variety of sizes ranging from 2" x 2" up to 11" x 17" for printed materials, and 24" x 100" for posters. We carry many paper colors, weights and styles ranging from 20# bond to gloss coated stock and offer the ink color of your choice.

Your copies, files, records, teaching lessons, etc. can be digitally scanned and returned to you in a variety of formats. This is an excellent opportunity to have your large files burned onto a CD or disk. The files can also be returned to you via email.

The Print Services Department provides Digital Video Editing. This service takes images from VCR tapes or still pictures and edits them onto a CD or DVD.

Standards of Service: MS, ST

- Wide Area Network/Local Area Network Support (previously Network – Wide Area/Local Area) – Joy Huffman
  This area provides a WAN for school districts located in AEA 9 by supporting district routers and servers that provide connection to the Internet and other district internal network needs. LAN support is given to the school districts when requested.
  Standards of Service: MS, ST

46. Iowa’s Educators’ Consortium – TBA
This program provides local school districts an opportunity to pool purchasing power into a statewide, cooperative buying unit. Through this service, schools are able to obtain quality products and equipment at significant savings.
Standards for Service: MS
Alignment to AEA Goals: None
Districts: All
Data Collection: LEA participation
Recommendation: Retain

47. Learning Center – Amy Noble
The Mississippi Bend AEA has a full-service Learning Center with four large rooms that will seat up to seventy people with break-away walls that allow a combination of rooms for seating up to 400 people. An Iowa Communication Network meeting room and Mobile Technology Lab provide additional services to customers. Each room is equipped with an LCD projection, DVD/VCR player, digital presenter system, computer, softboard, and marker board. Satellite down link is also available. The Learning Center also provides food service.
Standards for Service: PD, MS, ST
Alignment to AEA Goals: None
Districts: All
Data Collection: Participant Survey
Recommendation: Retain
48. **Legal Cooperative — TBA**
Collectively, members of the Legal Cooperative contract legal services with Lane & Waterman, a law firm in Davenport, Iowa. Lane & Waterman provides Level I (verbal consultation) and Level II (general legal services) at discounted prices. Legal Cooperative fees for school districts are determined by student population and past usage of services; and can be paid monthly, quarterly, or annually, as determined by the school district.

A Law Conference is held annually. Attorneys from Lane & Waterman and other selected professionals present diverse topics chosen from suggestions by area school personnel. The conference is free; participants include board members, superintendents, teachers, principals, counselors, and other school staff.
- Standards for Service: PD, MS
- Alignment to AEA Goals: None
- Districts: 11
- Data Collection: Participant survey
- Recommendation: Retain

49. **Non-violent Crisis Intervention — TBA**
This training is provided to local school districts to assist with the management of violent and potentially violent students.
- Standards for Service: SC, PD, MS, DL, MCGF
- Alignment to AEA Goals: None
- Districts: N/A
- Data Collection: Participant survey, attendance
- Recommendation: Retain

50. **Professional Development — Cindy Swanson**
Provides assistance to districts and schools to develop, implement, and evaluate effective professional development programs. The assistance to districts and schools include the following:
- To design plans aligned with goals and effective practices (districts/schools).
- To offer opportunities for clients to engage in staff development that is research-based and incorporates best practices in teaching and learning.
- To offer opportunities for clients to be engaged in specific leadership topics and skill sets.
- To offer opportunities that support district mentor programs (teacher induction).
- To provide needed information regarding licensure procedures and offer opportunities for clients to renew their licenses.

Provides specific professional development opportunities to educators:
- **Leadership-On-Going Development**—Provide stand-alone classes and workshops focused on specific leadership topics and skill sets.
- **Staff Development Courses/Workshops**—Provide adult learning opportunities (individual and organizational) to improve instructional practices. Licensure, certification, and graduate credit courses will have 2006-07 fee increases.
- **Learning Teams**—Facilitate building level learning teams that focus on school improvement topics and provide credit opportunities.
- Teacher/Administrator Licensure Center—Provide information to districts regarding licensure and certification.
  Standards for Service: C, DL, LD, M, MCGF, PD, ST
  Alignment to AEA Goals: All
  Districts: Open to All
  Data Collection: Service counts and satisfaction
  Recommendation: Retain

51. **School Bus Driver Training** – Denise Zimmer
The Environmental Services Program assists local school districts in meeting Department of Education training mandates by providing both the initial school transportation operator’s program (STOP) and annual inservices.
  Standards for Service: PD, MS
  Alignment to AEA Goals: None
  Districts: All
  Data Collection: Number of participants
  Recommendation: Retain

52. **School Technology** – Robert Reppert
This program provides technical support related to integrating technology within the classroom to improve instruction, diversify the curriculum and expand the capacity of students to learn. This service may include, but is not limited to, technology curriculum integration, software training applicable to teachers and students, application troubleshooting, answering technology-related questions, and developing lessons for various training events. School technology services are enhanced by providing the following collaborative networks:
- **Technology Coordinators**—Facilitate a monthly meeting with the morning session devoted to training in new technologies and the afternoon session devoted to information gathering and sharing, as well as some demonstrations of new technology.
- **Technology Leaders**—Facilitate a series of workshops designed to provide teachers with the tools, resources, and support to affect change in ways teachers in their schools deliver instruction.
- **Iowa Learning Online**—Facilitate online learning experiences statewide for high school students.
  Standards for Service: C, DL, PD, ST
  Alignment to AEA Goals: Supports All
  Districts: Open to All
  Data Collection: Service counts and satisfaction
  Recommendation: Retain

53. **Sexual Harassment Investigator Training** – TBA
Effective training methods for sexual harassment investigations are paramount. Mississippi Bend AEA staff members will train district employees on investigation procedures and appropriate policy and regulation development.
  Standards for Service MCGF, MS
  Alignment to AEA Goals: None
54. **Sexual Harassment Training — TBA**
   Training on what constitutes Sexual Harassment asks: What about your staff members? Does your school/organization have a Sexual Harassment Policy? Do employees know about your policy? Do you understand your liability regarding Sexual Harassment? How do you conduct an investigation? Mississippi Bend Area Education Agency inservices address these questions.
   Standards for Service: DL, PD
   Alignment to AEA Goals: None
   Districts: All
   Data Collection: Number of participants
   Recommendation: Retain

55. **Solution Focused Mediation Center — TBA**
   Mediation services are available to all schools to assist in finding solutions to issues among staff, student, parents, and community.
   Standards for Service: SP, SC, MS, DL, MCGF
   Alignment to AEA Goals: None
   Districts: All
   Data Collection: Participant survey
   Recommendation: Retain

56. **Statewide On-Deck Services — Edward Gronlund, Kris Wolzen**
   This program provides a response to trends and initiatives identified by the Iowa Department of Education for investigation and/or implementation statewide.
   Standards for Service: TBA
   Alignment to AEA Goals: All
   Districts: Open to All
   Data Collected: Service Counts
   Recommendation: Retain

57. **Student Activities and Events**
   The Mississippi Bend Area Education Agency sponsors student events and activities throughout the year.
   Standards for Service: C, MCGF, DL
   Alignment to AEA Goals: Supports All
   Districts: Open to All
   Data Collection: Participation Data (Use counts)
   Recommendation: Retain
Student Activities – Denise Tatoian

- Art Core (Grades 5-8)
  The program is for students in grades 5, 6, 7, and 8 who are talented artists. Local school art teachers are asked to recommend students for the program. Certified teachers work with the students in two nine-day sessions. One session is for two-dimensional art projects and one session is for three-dimensional art projects.
  Districts: Open to All
  Data Collection: Participation Data (Use counts)
  Recommendation: Retain

- College for Kids (Grades 5-7)
  A nine day enrichment program for highly self-motivated students in grades 5, 6 and 7. Students may register for a wide variety of courses and enjoy stimulating, activity-oriented classes from experienced teachers. The program is offered at three sites and is offered three times in the summer.
  Districts: Open to All
  Data Collection: Participation Data (Use counts)
  Recommendation: Retain

- Computer Camp (Computer Classes)
  Computer Camp (Grades 1-4)
  Computer Camp is an introduction to computer graphics. Students in grades 1, 2, 3 and 4 complete various projects.

  Computer Graphics Class (Grades 5-8)
  Students currently enrolled in grades 5, 6, 7 and 8 will learn computer graphic skills using “Photoshop” and “imovie.” Various projects will be completed.
  Districts: Open to All
  Data Collection: Participation Data (Use counts)
  Recommendation: Retain

- FLEX—Foreign Language Exploration (Grades 1-6)
  Two different forms of this program are offered. A Saturday program is offered during the fall and winter. Students register for Spanish, French, German or Sign classes and parents may attend class with the students. Two eight-week sessions are offered each school year. Foreign language classes are also offered in an after-school format where the classes are held at individual schools. Schools may request the AEA to facilitate classes at their building. Frequency of class offerings is determined by what the school requests.
  Districts: Open to All
  Data Collection: Participation Data (Use counts)
  Recommendation: Retain

- Home School Assistance Program (Grades K-12)
  The AEA facilitates a Home School Assistance Program for interested districts. Home school students that register are assigned a supervising teacher who makes 16
contacts with the student during the school year and assists the parent with lesson planning, curriculum choice, and assessment.
Districts: Open to All
Data Collection: Participation Data (use counts)
Recommendation: New

- Iowa Student Senate (Grades 11-12)
This program, funded by the William Randolph Hearst Foundation, awards an all-expense paid trip to Washington, DC and a $5000 scholarship to the two students from Iowa that are selected through an application and political science examination process. Each Iowa high school may nominate one student for the program. Nominated students submit their applications to the AEA.
Districts: Open to All
Data Collection: Participation Data (Use counts)
Recommendation: Retain

- Kid University (Grades 3-4)
A five day enrichment program for students in grades 3 and 4. Students may register for a wide variety of courses and enjoy stimulating activity oriented classes from experienced teachers. The program is offered at two sites in the summer.
Districts: Open to All
Data Collection: Participation Data (Use counts)
Recommendation: Retain

- SUN Camp (Grades 1-3)
Students Understanding Nature is a five-day program for students in grades 1, 2 and 3. The program is held at Scott County Park. The purpose of the program is to explore and learn about the science of the environment. It is an activity-oriented program with the emphasis on doing, and most lessons are done outside at the pond or along the Nature Trail.
Districts: Open to All
Data Collection: Participation Data (Use counts)
Recommendation: Retain

- Supplemental Services (Grades 3-8)
The AEA offers an after-school group tutoring program in the areas of reading or math. Classes are held at individual schools. Schools may request the AEA to facilitate classes at their building.
Districts: Open to All
Data Collection: Participation Data (use counts)
Recommendation: Retain

Student Activities – Denise Tatoian

- Future Problem Solving (Grades K-12)
Future Problem Solving is a creative problem-solving program. Students work with a coach during the year to learn a six-step problem-solving model and to work on
practice problems. Trained evaluators review student work and teams have the opportunity to advance to state, national and international levels. Four different events—Team Problem Solving, Community Problem Solving, Scenario Writing and Action-based Problem Solving—are offered.

- **Invent Iowa (Grades K-12)**
  Invent Iowa teaches creativity to students through invention. Using the invention process, students design and build inventions to solve problems or make life better. The K-8 program is coordinated through AEA 9s under the direction of the Belin-Blank Center. The high school program is coordinated directly by the Belin-Blank Center.
  
  Districts: Open to All
  Data Collection: Participation Data (Use counts)
  Recommendation: Retain

- **Math Bee (Grade 6)**
  Math Bee is open to 6th grade teams of four from all Area 9 schools. Math Bee teams work on skills and practice problems with their coaches during the school year. Then teams attend the regional bee. The top three-five teams and individuals go on to state.
  
  Districts: Open to All
  Data Collection: Participation Data (Use counts)
  Recommendation: Retain

- **Read N Rap (Grades 4-6 and 9-12)**
  (previously listed separately)
  A collaborative email project in which pairs of girls from different schools read the same books and discuss them via email.
  Standards for Service: C, MCGF, ST
  Districts: Open to All
  Data Collection: Participation Data (Use counts)
  Recommendation: Retain

58. **Student Programs**

- **AEA 9 Shelter School**
  This program is for students living in Family Resources Kinsman Emergency Youth Shelter. Students residing at the shelter home have all been identified as Children in Need of Assistance - CHINA -- and are referred to the shelter home for a variety of reasons, the most common being neglect, physical/sexual abuse, chronic runaway, and delinquency. AEA 9 Shelter School differentiates academic instruction to accommodate the varied needs of the students.
  Standards for Service: C, MCGF, DL
  Alignment to AEA Goals: All
  Districts: Open to All
Data Collection: Participation data (Use counts)
Recommendation: Retain

- Driver Education
The Mississippi Bend Area Education Agency provides a State of Iowa approved Driver Education program for 14 school districts at 18 different sites. Yearly, during the summer, and after school programs are offered at various district sites to accommodate the districts and student needs.
  Standards for Service: C, MS
  Alignment to AEA Goals: Not aligned with goals.
  Districts: Open to All
  Data Collection: Participation data (Use counts)
  Recommendation: Retain

- Scott County Juvenile Detention Center School
A juvenile may be placed in the Center (a 16-bed facility) if he/she has committed or is alleged to have committed a serious criminal act. Students arriving at the Detention Center vary greatly in terms of ability, age, grade level, maturity, and school history. In order to respond to these needs, academic instruction is highly individualized.
  Standards for Service: C, MCGF, DL
  Alignment to AEA Goals: All
  Districts: Open to All
  Data Collection: Participation data (Use counts)
  Recommendation: Retain

59. **Targeted Services on Request - All Consultants**
This program provides support and service to districts and schools in response to their unique or emerging needs. Customer needs not directly related to other programs may be provided if they fit within the mission of the Agency.
  Standards for Service: C, DL, LD, M, MCGF, MS, PD, SC, ST
  Alignment to AEA Goals: All
  Districts: Open to All
  Data Collection: Service counts and satisfaction
  Recommendation: Retain

60. **Teacher Job Fair – TBA**
Each year the Mississippi Bend Area Education Agency and the Rock Island County Regional Office of Education, holds a Quad City Area Teacher Job Fair. The purpose of the Fair is to bring school districts looking for teachers together with teachers looking for jobs.
  Standards for Service: MS
  Alignment to AEA Goals: None
  Districts: All
  Data Collection: Number of participants
  Recommendation: Retain
61. **Web Construction & Support** – Whitney Smith
The Mississippi Bend Area Education Agency offers district web site consulting and construction for schools in Area 9. The Communication Department will design and implement a web site design that is unique and applicable to individual schools or districts. Should a customer require ongoing maintenance, design, or updates, the Mississippi Bend Area Education Agency will bill the customer an hourly rate to be determined at the time of the request.
- Standards for Service: MS
- Alignment to AEA Goals: None
- Districts: All
- Data Collection:
- Recommendation: Retain

62. **Web Hosting** – Whitney Smith
The Mississippi Bend Area Education Agency offers district web site hosting for districts in Area 9. Services include: Domain Name and Web Site Hosting, 50 Mb of disk space, FTP Access, MySQL Database Access, Webalizer Web Logs, and PHP. Technical support of the Mississippi Bend Area Education Agency Web Hosting Services comes in two categories: (1) The Mississippi Bend Area Education Agency actively monitors, updates, upgrades and runs backups on the hosting server. If any issues arise that are directly related to one of the above, then the Mississippi Bend Area Education Agency will resolve that issue as part of the hosting service. (2) If a customer requires custom web design, web site updates, custom or non-standard applications, or other similar services, the Mississippi Bend Area Education Agency will bill the customer an hourly rate to be determined at the time of the request.
- Standards for Service: MS
- Alignment to AEA Goals: None
- Districts: All
- Data Collection:
- Recommendation: Retain
APPENDIX C

Background and Context for
AEA 9's Special Education Service Delivery Model
and
Key Components of Service

Purpose
The purpose of this document is to provide a rationale and vocabulary for the revision of
Mississippi Bend AEA 9's Special Education Service Delivery Model. The document addresses the
following areas:
1) Background/Context for AEA responsibilities as defined in the Iowa Rules of Special
2) Characteristics of Service Delivery that must be accounted for as plans for future service
delivery are developed and implemented;
3) The three Core Functions related to AEA services focused on individual students,
4) A description of a fourth Core Function related to systems-level support for buildings
   and districts.
5) The three broad categories of Responsibilities related to the Core Functions.

1) Background/Context

AEA Responsibilities

According to the Iowa Rules of Special Education, "it is the responsibility of each local
education agency (LEA) to provide or make provision for appropriate special education and
related services to meet the requirements of state and federal statutes and rules" [...]. In
addition, "the AEA shall support and assist LEAs in meeting their responsibilities for
providing appropriate special education and related services" [281—41.400(1)]. Although
the AEA and LEAs share responsibility for the compliant implementation of procedures and
services, there are some specific functions for which the AEA is primarily responsible.
Those functions include (but are not limited to)

- **child find** which includes
  - the Disability Suspected process and
  - the evaluation and eligibility determination process, and

- **provision of and support for IEP services** (e.g., development, implementation,
  review and revision of IEPs for children and youth ages three to 21).

In addition, the AEA is responsible for services to children ages birth to three including

- **identification,**
- **evaluation** and
- **provision of services** ongoing development, review and revision of IFSPs.
2) Characteristics of Service Delivery

- **Student and Systems Level Focus**
  - The majority of services provided by the AEA are student-focused. In other words, they are focused on processes for individual students related to functions such as identification, evaluation and the provision of services.
  - Other required AEA services have a systems-level focus that fulfills administrative or general supervision functions. Examples of such systems-level services include responsibility to monitor compliance with rules and procedures at an individual classroom, building, district, or Agency-wide level, and the coordination of services between the AEA identification process and the LEA delivery systems for instructional services.

- **Direct Service to Students and Indirect Service to Parents, Teachers, Administrators and other Adults**
  - AEA staff provide direct services to students in their efforts to identify, evaluate and provide instructional and support services to individuals with IFSPs and IEPs.
  - In addition, some AEA staff provide indirect services to other adults who work with students such as teachers, administrators, parents and others. These indirect services include consultation, training, the provision of resources, etc.

- **Shared Responsibilities and Specific Responsibilities for Service Delivery**
  - All AEA staff, regardless of assignment, are expected to have knowledge of federal and state statute and rules as well as AEA policy and procedures. All staff must be able to properly implement procedures related to identification, entitlement determination and the provision of IFSP/IEP services and to document that implementation properly on special education forms.
  - All staff have specific responsibilities based on their assignment and their areas of licensure and expertise. These specific responsibilities relate to the three broad categories of identification, entitlement determination and provision of services.

- **Part C and Part B Responsibilities**
  - Federal special education legislation describes responsibilities related to services for infants and children ages birth to 3 under Part C of the Act. In collaboration with a variety of community partners, AEA staff are primarily responsible for Early ACCESS services including the identification, evaluation and service delivery for children in this age range. Services are provided under the auspices of Individualized Family Service Plans or IFSPs.
  - Federal special education legislation describes responsibilities related to services for children and youth ages three to 21 under Part B of the Act. In collaboration with local districts, AEA staff are primarily responsible for the identification and evaluation of students in this age range, as well as supporting districts in the development, implementation, review and revision of Individualized Education Plans or IEPs.
3) **AEA Responsibilities relate to Three Core Functions for Individual Students**

The three core areas of AEA responsibility related to individually-focused services are the following:

1. *Child Find-Screening* (e.g., supporting Early ACCESS screening for birth to 3 and the Disability Suspected process for ages 3-21),
2. *Child Find-Evaluation and Placement* (e.g., conducting Comprehensive Evaluations for birth to 3 and Full and Individual Evaluations and re-evaluations for ages 3-21),
3. *Support for Services* (e.g., supporting the development, implementation, review and revision of IFSPs for ages birth to 3 and IEPs for ages 3-21).

4) **AEA Responsibilities related to a Fourth Core Function related to Systems-Level Supports**

AEA responsibilities relate to a fourth Core Function that involves systems-level support to buildings/districts or regions within the AEA catchment area. Most typically, systems-level supports are provided by Indirect Service Providers such as School Social Workers, Educational Consultants or School Psychologists. Examples of systems-level supports include support for the implementation of the Instructional Decision-Making (IDM) model, efforts related to SINA/DINA planning or other school improvement efforts.

5) **AEA Responsibilities relate to Three Broad Categories of Responsibility:**

The three broad categories of responsibility are the following:

1. *Shared Responsibilities* for procedural compliance and documentation
   a. All AEA staff must be able to understand, interpret and implement procedural requirements and document their efforts in the correct fashion
2. *Specific Responsibilities* related to assignment, licensure and expertise.
   a. AEA staff have responsibility for specific functions related to their assignment, licensure and expertise. For example, Early Childhood Home Intervention teachers provide screening, evaluation and services to children ages birth to 3. Occupational therapists provide identification, evaluation and services related to motor or sensory-motor functions.
3. *Specialized Responsibilities* related to specific service delivery needs.
   a. Some AEA staff have assignments that require specialized expertise to serve specific targeted student populations. Examples include Autism Team members who have specialized expertise related to services for individuals on the Autism spectrum, or Transition consultants who provide consultative services and training related to transition issues for secondary students.
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Mississippi Bend Area Education Agency (MBAEA)
Partnership Agreements
February 9, 2011

Introduction

A Partnership Agreement is a commitment of effort, time and resources by the Mississippi Bend Area Education Agency (AEA 9) that explicitly describes an AEA Customization of services to a school. AEA Customization includes specialized supports aligned to specific learning needs of students in that building and targeted instructional supports to ensure fidelity to implementation that will result in improved student learning. The design of the Partnership Agreement (PA) is cost effective for an education service unit to reach economy of scale at the classroom implementation level. The PA process allows AEA 9 to leverage its expertise and resources to school sites where these services are most needed and where school commitment to reform efforts is the most profound.

Significant evidence (insert author) suggests schools need a “critical friend” in order to drastically accelerate upward movement of a persistently low or stagnant student performance trend line. Use of a Partnership Agreement incorporates the role of the critical friend and is designed to produce the following outcomes: improved student learning results; integrated AEA Customization of services in order to maximize resource effectiveness and efficiency; and execution of a data-driven system focused on ensuring fidelity of implementation of the defined research/evidence-based teaching practices and ongoing monitoring of formative and summative student progress. Partnership Agreements are commitments to accelerate student learning gains.

A Partnership Agreement differs from a Service Plan. A Service Plan is a list of services and an allocation of those services to a building. Examples of services for which a Service Plan is written may include Media, Technology, Print, Driver Education, and Co-op Purchasing. In contrast to a Service Plan, the Partnership Agreement focuses on a school’s Special Education direct services to teachers and students as well as their professional development needs for teachers to meet the learning needs of General Education and Special Education students.

A cornerstone of a Partnership Agreement is the AEA Customization to meet each school’s teaching and learning needs at every stage in the school’s reform efforts. AEA Customization may include such supports as having AEA coaches provide support for teachers in the implementation of new instructional practices and or delivery of Special Education Child Find interventions designed to improve student performance among the Individual Education Plan (IEP) student population. A Partnership Agreement is developed to coincide with a district’s comprehensive school improvement plan process (a five-year cycle) that is reviewed and updated on an annual basis.

Partnership Agreement Process

The Partnership Agreement process is designed to implement effective school reform and improve teaching and learning. An AEA Sector Coordinator will sit down with a principal (may
include a building leadership team) and align AEA services to the school's improvement effort. Other statewide mandates and templates already exist to complete school level improvement planning activities within a larger district improvement process. Partnership Agreements are implementation commitments and they do not represent another planning effort or document. The ultimate outcome is to accelerate student learning through effective implementation of evidenced-based practices and collaborative data-driven teaming.

The Partnership Agreement is an AEA tool for service alignment and customization. It is explicit actions and monitoring of commitments to implement and sustain effective teaching and learning. The AEA service alignment and customization process has three outcomes: 1) AEA services provided are highly effective, evidenced-based, and "what works" practices; 2) AEA services result in accelerated student learning through implementing effective teaching and learning practices; and 3) AEA services fit into a realistic expectation that the school has the time and resources to actually implement the identified improvement practices. The Partnership Agreement summative measure is how many improvement practices have been effectively implemented and sustained.

AEA Sector Coordinators have the responsibility to create relationships with principals to commit AEA service resources to improving teaching and learning practices. It is their responsibility to translate the commitment into actions (Partnership Agreement) to accelerate student learning. It is a responsibility of AEA staff in collaboration with teachers and principals to monitor and use effective data-driven decision-making to implement and sustain the improvement practices. Annually, it is the AEA Sector Coordinator's responsibility to review and adjust actions in collaboration with all stakeholders (Partnership Agreement) to ensure
success and improved student learning. A key underlying assumption is: It is more important to “get started” building relationships through impacting classroom practices immediately and adjusting practice using collaborative data-driven teams continually modifying practice than “getting it perfect” through exhaustive planning conversations, admiring the problem, and elaborate action plans. The Partnership Agreement process has been designed to be iterative so that each year principals, teachers, and AEA staff learn how to get better at implementation and sustainability.

Partnership Agreement Commitments

1. Partnership Agreements are a commitment to improved student learning results. A Partnership Agreement is a mutual promise between a school’s administrator(s) and teachers and AEA administrator(s) and consultants who serve that building. This promise is in the form of an explicitly agreed on commitment that defines how we will work together in the design and execution of school improvement that will improve teacher and student learning results. AEA 9 has intentionally integrated into the design and delivery of the Partnership Agreement an alignment with four state-mandated frameworks developed by the Iowa Department of Education and described below.

Iowa Comprehensive School Improvement Plan (CSIP) – The CSIP is a process whereby stakeholders identify and prioritize teaching and learning needs through a data-driven process; establish specific student achievement goals; implement research or evidence-based strategies; use data-driven decision-making to monitor student learning and the degree of teacher implementation; and evaluate impact. District CSIP are updated and submitted to the Iowa Department of Education every five years.

Iowa Professional Development Model (IPDM) – The IPDM provides guidance to implement the professional development established by the Teacher Quality Act in the requirements of the Iowa Code. The Iowa Professional Development Model follows the Iowa Professional Development Standards and is aligned with the National Staff Development Council Standards for Professional Development. It follows an action research framework. The IPDM process includes prioritizing student achievement needs based on data; selecting research or evidence-based strategies or interventions; conducting professional development training and collaborative teaming (that includes practice, coaching and feedback); and evaluating impact.

Instructional Decision-Making (IDM) – The IDM process is Iowa’s version of the nationally-recognized Response to Intervention (RTI) process. IDM is a data-driven framework used by teachers and administrators for decision-making. The process includes core, supplemental and intensive cycles in which teachers differentiate instruction to meet specific students’ learning needs. The IDM process is applied to academic and social/emotional learning and is adopted by Iowa Schools and districts.

Iowa Learning Supports Initiative – This initiative encompasses classroom research-based interventions to help students overcome barriers that interfere with their ability to be engaged learners. It supports school-based routines that elicit the parent as an active participant in a child’s education. Positive Behavior Intervention Supports (PBIS) is one example of such an initiative.
2. Partnership Agreements are a commitment to integrated AEA services. A Partnership Agreement defines the AEA services DIRECTLY supporting the improvement of student learning. The definition of "integrated AEA services" is a seamless delivery system at the school site. For example, an AEA General Education Reading Consultant "integrating" the struggling reader strategies used by AEA Special Education Consultants during school site professional development sessions. It could also be an AEA Special Education School Psychologist providing special education teachers within a school coaching support for School-wide Positive Behavior Intervention Supports (PBIS) training. It does not mean distributing the few General Education Consultants regionally or assigning those consultants to specific Special Education Teams. Thus, "integration" is found inside the AEA service delivery at a school.

AEA Customization of services is described in a Partnership Agreement and may include consultants providing instructional supports such as special education services, coaching of PD at the classroom level, training in effective use of data, or training in implementation of successful collaborative teams. The AEA Customization will enhance a Building CSIP and is found within the plan. The AEA Customization process integrates General and Special Education service supports within a school to provide efficiency of service with the highest level of expertise targeted to greatest impact at the classroom level. To improve partnership success rates, AEA staff members are held accountable for the agreement's outcomes as it relates to their part in the delivery of services, data-driven processes, and results of the work to produce improved teacher practices and improved student learning.

3. Partnership Agreements are commitments to execution. An aspect of a Partnership Agreement is the explicit detail stating expected outcomes, participants' responsibilities to implementation of PD strategies/ interventions, and the degree to which data will be utilized to monitor and evaluate results. Participants involved in the Partnership Agreement agree to meet on a regular basis to review data, review actions to date, and based on progress-to-date towards the defined outcomes, may adjust the timing/elements of PD training or delivery of PD or enhance the AEA supports, as necessary.

The Partnership Agreement has as its underlying foundation a "what works" philosophy. AEA consultants deliver research/evidence-based strategies and interventions, have expertise in their assigned fields, and use data on a regular basis to improve AEA services.

The Partnership Agreement is developed with a school focus. However, school-level Partnership Agreements within one school district maybe combined and captured as a district Partnership Agreement. In this case, the district's Partnership Agreement will be aligned to and an enhancement to the district's CSIP.

The Partnership Agreement will likely be most effective if it is aligned to the components of IPDM and includes the following processes: a highly-supported professional development process for teachers that includes use of collaborative data-driven teaming; a well-defined core curriculum for all students that includes supplemental and intensive instruction to ensure success at every level; frequent collection and analysis of formative assessments that will inform changes in teachers' instructional practices; and continuous monitoring of teacher implementation of PD and increase in improved student learning towards the desired outcome.
The Theory of Change for the Partnership Agreement is based upon the following three assumptions. The first assumption is that a Partnership Agreement will result in successful outcomes if the school has a defined school improvement process. In Iowa, this process is outlined for use in the Iowa Professional Development Model (IPDM). The IPDM process includes the collection and analysis of student data; (SMART) goal setting and student learning; selection of content that is research or evidence-based and aligned to the goal(s); and a design process for professional development that includes training and learning opportunities for staff to collaborate and to study implementation of formative data.

The second assumption is that a Partnership Agreement will be more effective if services include AEA Customization to meet a school’s teaching and learning needs. This will likely include instructional coaching support in the area of professional development. According to Knight (2007), effective instructional coaches are more likely to promote increased teacher fidelity to implementation, foster a higher degree of principal involvement, and provide support for a teacher-led data-driven process to monitor student progress for the purpose of modifying classroom instruction to better meet students’ learning needs.

The third assumption is that a Partnership Agreement will result in successful outcomes if the school and AEA collaboratively evaluate and monitor the effectiveness of the professional development initiative(s). This evaluation must include to what degree the use of defined processes, procedures, and monitoring of movement towards defined outcomes was effective.

The Partnership Agreement has five elements. The first element is the summative student learning goal that will be achieved through the mutual actions established between the school and AEA 9. The goal is measured by student performance on the state’s academic accountability assessment (and/or other appropriate assessments directly linked to the goal).
The second element of the Partnership Agreement is an explicit description of the school’s professional development strategy or intervention that will be supported through the partnership. For example, if a school has launched an initiative (Pearson’s Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol (SIOP®), ASCD’s Differentiated Instruction (DI), Carnegie Learning’s Cognitive Tutor, Second Chance Reading, or Positive Behavior Intervention Supports (PBIS)), the PA will define the purpose and state the rationale as to why that particular invention was selected.

The third element includes the statements of commitment between the school and AEA 9. These statements identify systems’ actions the school and AEA 9 will undertake to support the school’s improvement strategies and efforts.

The fourth element includes the explicit outcomes and actions. This element outlines explicit roles and responsibilities for teachers, administrators, and AEA consultants who serve in that school on a regular basis and as related to professional development.

The fifth element of the Partnership Agreement is the Monitoring Plan. The plan must include to what degree agreed-upon commitments were completed by the school administrators/teachers and by AEA consultants/administrators and to what degree the defined student outcome(s) were met.

Examples of each of the five elements are described:

**Element 1: Goal Statement**

By 2015, 95% of the students in grades 9, 10, and 11 are academically proficient in language arts, reading, math, and science using the State’s ESEA Assessments and 75% of the special education students are proficient using the same ESEA Assessment process.

**Element 2: Strategy or Intervention Statement**

Engage ALL students in a differentiated teaching and learning environment within a positive climate conducive to learning. The statement becomes operationalized through implementation of Core Curriculum in reading comprehension, delivery of training and support for implementation of Differentiated Instruction (DI), use of data-driven, teacher-led collaborative teams, and delivery and support for implementation of Positive Behavior Intervention Supports (PBIS).

**Element 3: Commitment Statements**

Anywhere High School commits to a school improvement process and implementation of effective system improvement strategies. The commitment includes the following systems-level actions.

1. Create and sustain a process at the teacher team level to collect, monitor, adjust instruction, and evaluate student formative and summative reading performance data.
2. Organize teachers into data-driven collaborative teams with at least 45 minutes of uninterrupted team time every 10 school days.
3. Train teachers using the Iowa Professional Development Model process that is directly aligned to improving reading performance. Provide teachers with time and access to coaching support from one/more of the following persons: district coaches, principals, AEA 9 coaches, and/or AEA 9 trainers. The professional development must be directly aligned to each the Individual Teacher’s Career Development Plan (ITCDP). (The ITCDP is a state mandate.)
4. Evaluate and monitor progress of the reform strategies (DI and PBIS) and the degree of effective execution of the Partnership Agreement. Principals will share this information monthly with partnership participants and interested stakeholders and gather feedback as appropriate.

**Mississippi Bend Area Education Agency** commits to supporting the school’s improvement strategies and efforts. The commitment includes the following systems-level actions.

1. Align AEA 9 services to each school’s teaching and learning needs.
2. Deliver integrated services of consultants from the departments of Quality Learning and Special Education. AEA 9 trainers and AEA 9 coaches involved in the reform strategies of Differentiated Instruction and Positive Behavior Intervention Supports collaborate to maximize teacher planning and teacher implementation time in order to maximize efforts to improve student reading performance.
3. Coach AEA 9 consultants serving the schools in processes and procedures that will enhance principal and teacher efforts in the collection, analysis, and monitoring of student data that will inform instructional practices.
4. Evaluate and monitor progress of the two reform strategies (DI, PBIS) and the degree of effective execution of the Partnership Agreement. An designated AEA 9 administrator (Sector Coordinator) will share this information monthly with partnership participants and interested stakeholders.

Anywhere High School and Mississippi Bend Area Education Agency agree explicit commitments are vital to achieving the summative student reading goal.

The Partnership Agreement’s set of commitments are designed to accelerate school reforms efforts to effectively and efficiently reach the desired student achievement goals. Within the Partnership Agreement, the outcomes and actions define the professional development delivery and degree of teacher implementation and the necessary AEA Customization of services to support these efforts to achieve success. Partnership Agreements are similar to action research projects in that they quantify and qualify administrator and teacher actions and student performance that leads to improved outcomes. This information is then used to inform future research in the continuous school improvement cycle, creating a win-win situation for everyone involved in the process.

**Element 4: Commitment Outcomes & Actions**

**Differentiated Instruction**

Anywhere High School and Mississippi Bend Area Education Agency (MBAEA) agree to implement Differentiated Instruction at the middle and high schools.

**Process Outcomes**

1. **June 2011:** Teachers complete DI workshop assignments, develop at least two DI units, and collect pre/post unit student data on the implemented units; coaches and principals meet regularly with teachers and collaborative teams to support DI learning and collect/analyze teacher DI artifacts (assignments, units, and student data).
2. **June 2012:** Teachers differentiate instruction and assessments to meet middle and high school students’ learning needs; coaches and principals meet regularly with teachers and collaborative teams to support DI implementation and collect/analyze teacher units and pre/post unit student data.
3. **June 2013:** Teachers differentiate instruction through an instructional decision-making system (Response to Intervention); teachers, coaches, and principals analyze student data quarterly to determine if 80% of the students are successful within the core, supplemental and intensive instruction processes. (80% is the number defined in IDM guidance.)
### Mississippi Bend Area Education Agency WILL:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AEA Service Description</th>
<th>Field Delivery Responsibilities</th>
<th>Coordination Responsibilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deliver twice monthly a total of fifteen professional development DI trainings (approximately 2 trainings per month)</td>
<td>AEA DI Trainer</td>
<td>AEA Sector Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitate, twice monthly, fifteen 45-minute DI coaching sessions for Administrators and Instructional Coaches (approximately 2 trainings per month)</td>
<td>AEA DI Trainer</td>
<td>AEA Sector Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide monthly coaching support to district coaches</td>
<td>AEA Coach Trainer</td>
<td>AEA Sector Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide teachers with strategies aligned to DI that support Special Education student reading and math learning IEP goals</td>
<td>AEA Special Education Staff</td>
<td>AEA Sector Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide monthly training/coaching for administrators in the collection and analysis of DI implementation data (integrated into the district’s teacher evaluation program)</td>
<td>AEA Coach Trainer</td>
<td>Director of Evaluation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Anywhere High School WILL:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher Implementation Activities</th>
<th>Formative Student Data</th>
<th>Principal Implementation Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attend monthly DI workshops and complete the DI monthly implementation assignments</td>
<td>Collect reading data</td>
<td>Attend monthly DI workshops, assist teachers with completing the DI assignments, and collect DI artifacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access AEA 9 and district coaches during the school day to assist with completing the DI assignments and creating a set of students' reading profiles</td>
<td>Create reading profile</td>
<td>Attend coaching training sessions, monitor coaching efforts, and assist coaches with collecting and analyzing the coaching data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engage in weekly collaborative team meetings to process DI learning</td>
<td>Share reading profiles</td>
<td>Participate in collaborative team meetings to facilitate effective teaming among teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assist teachers with DI integration into their individualized career development plans</td>
<td>Science Fair Board</td>
<td>Assist teachers through the district’s evaluation process with artifact development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Element 5: Monitoring Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Data Collection &amp; Analysis</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Facilitator</th>
<th>Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Collect grades 7-12 student reading profiles aligned to teacher assignments.</td>
<td>Set individual student performance goals for non-proficient students</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Sector Coordinator Principal Asst. Principal 2 - Teacher Leaders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Identify students by subgroups and proficiency levels set</td>
<td>Create a protocol to share with collaborative teams to generate a plan to address student reading needs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Add a complete timeline for meetings during the school year.
APPENDIX E

Comprehensive Aligned Personnel System (CAPS)

Quality people supported by quality systems produce quality results.

Professional Development Plan – Plan to Plan

Approved – September 22, 2008
Glenn Pelecky, Chief Administrator
Revised – October 22, 2008

"The aim of leadership should be to improve the performance of man and machine, to improve quality, to increase output, and simultaneously to bring pride of workmanship to people.”

W. Edwards Deming
Out of the Crisis: For Industry, Government, Education
MIT Press, 2000, p. 248
**Introduction**

MBAEA’s personnel system is being designed to select, develop, and support quality administrators and staff for the purposes of effectively and efficiently realizing the mission of the Agency and meeting its goals through the programs, services, leadership and customized supports offered to its external customers (See Appendix I).

The Agency’s personnel system is intended to be aligned and comprehensive in its design. The system will include five (5) components each interfacing with the other. These components include the following:

1. Recruitment and Selection
2. Mentoring and Induction
3. Supervision and Evaluation
4. Professional Development (Internal)
5. Retention and Succession Planning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MBAEA Personnel System</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project Timeline for System Design, Implementation and Continuous Improvement</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recruitment and Selection</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mentoring and Induction</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supervision and Evaluation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Professional Development (Internal)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Retention and Succession Planning</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Agency’s leadership team will begin work on the design and implementation of this comprehensive system during the 2008-09 school year. The Agency anticipates that the time required to move from design to full implementation of all components will be five (5) years (2008-2013). Continuous monitoring and improvement of the personnel system will be driven by data and led by internal expert teams that will insure effectiveness and efficiency of the system beyond 2013.
The projected timeline for the five year development and implementation process is included below. This timeline reflects current legislative mandates and Agency needs, however, will be adjusted to better meet external and internal demands and expectations as environmental changes occur and progress is made toward system completion.

**Important Dates:**

Mentoring and Induction as required by Teacher and Administrator Quality Program (Chapter 831AC) is currently implemented in the Agency. The program will be re-examined during 2008-09. A revised design will be completed no later than July 1, 2009 with implementation to follow.

Supervision and Evaluation as required by Teacher and Administrator Quality Program will be implemented beginning July 1, 2009.

Professional Development Plan as required by Teacher and Administrator Quality Program will be submitted to the Iowa Department of Education in the form of a “Plan to Plan” on or before October 1, 2008. The long range plan that results from the 2008-09 study and design work will be submitted to the Iowa Department of Education on or before October 1, 2009.

**Component 4: Professional Development (Internal)**

Professional development is the fourth component of the MAEA personnel system and serves a specific function within that system – the development of human capacity to advance the mission of the Agency. Professional development connects to policies, procedures, and legislation; delivery of programs and services; and monitoring and evaluation of performance. Therefore, internal professional development should not be examined in isolation or without regard to the other parts of the larger system in which and through which it connects and operates.

During the 2008-09 school year MAEA will create the Agency’s professional development plan that will be technically adequate and artfully implemented over time. The “plan to plan” that is outlined in this document will be submitted to the Iowa Department of Education on or before October 1, 2008. The Agency’s professional development plan resulting from the study and design work will be submitted on or before October 1, 2009 to the Department.

**MBAEA Professional Development**  
**Plan to Plan**  
**September 2008-June 2009**

**Purpose:**

The purpose of the Agency’s Professional Development Plan is to add value to the organization through the continuous improvement of performance by all of its members. The value added through professional development will be quantifiable. Data will be collected systematically and used to inform and enhance performance of individuals, groups, and the entire Agency.
Who:

The study and creation of a coherent system of professional development for the Agency will require involvement of individuals from all divisions and representative of various job responsibilities/classifications. Members of the initial professional development team will commit to a term of three (3) years. To insure system quality (fidelity), a professional development team comprised of representative internal customers will be maintained over time with each member serving staggered terms of two (2) years or three (3) years.

Qualifications: Professional Development team members should have a passion for learning, an interest in leading, a willingness to be a collaborative team member, possess a results and data driven orientation, and have a desire to become internal professional development experts.

Membership: Agency Leadership Team member(s) will fulfill the roles of professional development team chair(s) as well as team members. They will identify staff that have leadership potential, are key communicators, are respected by their peers and meet the qualifications above. Staff identified will then be invited to participate as members of the team by the chair(s). Total Team: Maximum of 10.

Resourcing: Adequate time will be made available for team members to fully participate in activities associated with the study, design, and implementation of the professional development component. Time will either be included as part of their work schedule or additional days/work time considered necessary to meet the responsibilities outlined may be offered. Funding options may include:

- Agency Division budgets
- Teacher Quality – Professional Development Funds

Teacher Quality Committee: The committee will be informed of the development process, provide recommendations to the Professional Development Team regarding the plan, and follow legislation/guidelines related to resourcing the finalized plan.

Outside Expert: To provide on-going support of the professional development team, an outside professional development expert will be identified. This expert will bring process/content knowledge and skills to the work, provide an external point of view, and serve as a critical friend to the team. Deb Hansen, Department of Education, is currently assigned as the Agency’s Iowa Core Curriculum (ICC) liaison. Given Deb Hansen’s ICC assignment, her state and national professional development expertise, and her familiarity with related legislation and with the Agency, she was invited and has agreed to serve in this role (9-25-08). The Professional Development Team will work with Deb Hansen to more clearly define her responsibilities, term of service, logistics related to her involvement, etc.

What:

The Professional Development Plan will be designed around and reflect the following non-negotiables: 
1. The Professional Development Plan will be *technically sound*. The rules pertaining to area education Agency professional development that were established in the Teacher and Administrator Quality Program (Chapter 83 1AC) will be used to guide development and will be reflected in the final product. (See Appendix II — Requirements for Area Education Agency Professional Development Plans — Iowa Department of Education)

2. **The Iowa Professional Development Model** will be used to develop and deliver training and other learning opportunities targeted at instructional improvement. (See Appendix IIib: Appendix III – Iowa Professional Development Model Executive Summary; and http://www.iowa.gov/educate/pdmtm/state.html)

3. The Professional Development Plan will be *artfully implemented*. The plan will define expectations/outcomes, responsibilities, pacing, procedures, timelines and monitoring practices of *implementation*. For example, a rubric for the development of collaborative teams may be identified to define expectations for all collaborative teams, but also used as a mechanism for data collection around the implementation of the collaborative team element of IPDM. (See an example of a rubric, Appendix IV – Mississippi Bend AEA Data Team)

4. The Professional Development Plan will specify *monitoring and evaluation practices* that will be used 1) to monitor and assess plan’s effectiveness and efficiency in producing results and 2) to use data collected and analyzed to drive improvements.

5. The Professional Development Plan will reflect *additional non-negotiables established by the Chief Administrator* (PPT, Leadership Team, 9-17-08) including:
   a. Choice (within established parameters)
   b. Job Specific Element

**How:**

In order to not only accomplish the task of designing a plan, but also to create a plan that can be effectively implemented and produce results, team action and accountability must be foundational to the “HOW” of this effort. The team will be required to design a plan of action that is detailed and strategic, using human and other resources in a way that will maximize effort and produce quality results. *A sample outline of action steps* with a *sample* timeline is included below:

1. Select team members and clarify expectations/outcomes of the team and roles and responsibilities of team members in accomplishing the work.
   a. Secure an outside expert to support the team.
   b. Establish a meeting schedule and procedures.
2. Develop a list of study and design tasks and set a timeline. Task/time *examples* are included below:
   a. By November 1, 2008
      i. Determine current status of internal professional development in the Agency and summarize findings.
ii. Determine ideal state of internal professional development for the Agency and create a written document.

b. By December 1, 2008
   i. Identify gaps between current and ideal state
   ii. Identify priorities, actions and divide assignments
      1. Use common template provided by Personnel System leadership team to guide planning and provide framework for reporting. The template may include:
         a. Description of the Personnel System Component
         b. Outcomes/Expectations for the Component and the Team
         c. Monitoring and Evaluation of Procedures and Results
         d. Plan of Action including Tasks, Timelines and Assignments
         e. Resource Allocation Plan
         f. Communication Plan
         g. Implementation Plan
      2. Communicate with leaders from other Personnel System teams; seek feedback, and make changes as appropriate.

c. December 17, 2008 – Leadership Team Meeting
   i. Report on progress to date, next steps, and gather input from the Leadership Team membership.
   1. Note: Members of the Teacher Quality Committee will report to the full Committee on progress and request recommendations throughout development.

d. January-April 2009 – Design work continues with ongoing cycle of sharing and gathering feedback.

e. April 15, 2009 – Leadership Team Meeting
   i. Final draft of MBAEA Professional Development Plan is presented to the Leadership Team. Implementation section of the report is emphasized and resourcing of the plan is recommended.

f. May 4, 2009 – Administrative Cabinet
   i. Review plan/recommendations by Cabinet
   ii. Cabinet adopts the plan/recommendations

g. May 20, 2009 – Leadership Team
   i. Adopted plan is presented to leadership team.
   ii. Monitoring and Evaluation of plan implementation is finalized.
   iii. Team tasks and timeline for 09-10 are defined and meeting schedule is set.

h. No later than October 1, 2009 the MBAEA Professional Development Plan is submitted to the Iowa Department of Education

3. As a Team develop an understanding of the Change Process and incorporate actions into the plan that will increase the likelihood that the Professional Development Plan will result in system change rather than produce only islands of excellence.

4. Team members will be required a) to collect data regarding their individual contributions to the successful completion of plan development and b) to review this documentation with their supervisors during evaluation meetings conducted in Spring 2009.
2008-2009 Professional Development - Agency Priorities:

Although the Agency’s Professional Development Plan is in the design phase in 2008-09, there are several Professional Development priorities that have been identified by the state and Agency. These priorities should be supported and the results used to inform plan development and implementation in the future. Therefore, the Agency supports the following professional development priorities for 2008-09. The Teacher Quality Committee should consider the priorities for 2008-09 as the adopted professional development plan for the Agency for which the committee can allocate funding.

1. Agency wide:
   a. Content: Iowa Core Curriculum
   b. Content: Personnel System Development

2. Groups/Teams (e.g. region, zone, role group, content area, department):
   a. Content: Iowa Core Curriculum
      i. Developing understanding of the Iowa Core Curriculum (ICC)
      ii. Clarifying how ICC will affect program/service job responsibilities.
      iii. Defining how group/teams will most effectively support the implementation of ICC within the schools that they serve (e.g. ICC content, instruction, assessment and systems that support realization of high levels of learning for ALL students such as Instructional Decision Making model).
   b. Process: Collaborative Teams (Data Teams)
      i. Develop an understanding of IPDM
      ii. Pilot the process which includes identifying need, determining content (research based), using collaborative teams to learn and apply content, collecting data to demonstrate effectiveness.
      iii. Share results (change in practice and outcomes realized) with other teams at a spring event. (e.g. Spring All Staff)

3. Individual
   a. Content: Effective Professional Development
      i. Provide support for staff to serve on the Professional Development team for the purpose of developing professional development design and implementation expertise.
      ii. Other Personnel Team memberships may also be supported.

Conclusion:

The plan to plan outlined in this document represents the intention of MBAEA to create a comprehensive and aligned Personnel System through which the capacity and effectiveness of administrators and staff to meet its goals will be evident. The Professional Development Plan, the fourth component of the system, is critical to the realization of this vision.
APPENDIX F

Mississippi Bend Area Education Agency Response to Accreditation Recommendations

Mississippi Bend Area Education Agency has MET all 8 Iowa Area Education Agency Service Delivery Standards for the 3rd consecutive time (2000, 2005, and 2010) through the statewide Iowa Department of Education Accreditation Process mandated within Iowa Code. The comprehensive improvement planning process has already begun. Dr. Pelecky and his Cabinet have identified actions to address the recommendations by the 2010 Iowa Department of Education Accreditation Site Team. The following actions have been identified:

1. Develop Partnership Agreements (PA) with area schools that commit agency resources to a school's reform efforts.

   The PA process has been designed to:
   a. Include an effective monitoring component to address data collection and analysis, and data-driven decision making.
      i. Example: Supporting IDM or RTI implementation through effective data-driven decision-making
   ii. Example: Gathering program and service data around specific programs such as PBIS
   b. Integrate diversity support and the agency Equity Plan to ensure agency staff members have the skills and LEAs have fully supported processes to address cultural competency, multicultural education, ELL, and gender fair practices.
      i. Integrate service delivery to impact internal and external beliefs and behaviors through embedded support within the school improvement service delivery model.
      ii. Pilot the new diversity integration support with the Columbus Community School District during the Partnership Agreement planning process.
   c. Involve a communication component so that teachers within the schools with Partnership Agreements fully understand the scope of the work and outcomes.
      i. Linked to agency goals and diversity
      ii. Linked to agency program and service decision-making
      iii. Linked to agency resource allocations and staff assignments.
      iv. Linked to multi-approaches to connecting agency staff and LEA educators across distances through various technology options.
   d. Build a centralized database so that agency staff and LEAs have quality decision-making information. The centralized database will have a link to the statewide AEA standards of service database being developed in partnership with the Iowa Department of Education.
2. Implementing the new Enhanced Service Delivery System for Special Education (ESDS) to focus on direct service and team-based planning, implementation, and monitoring.

ESDS has been designed to:

a. Create a direct service delivery supported by a team of AEA staff experts to meet the varied diverse learner specialties to fully support the development, implementation, and evaluation of IEPs.

b. Allocate effectively and efficiently agency resources with a greater emphasis on communicating to LEAs how their allocated resources match their teaching and learning needs.

c. Integrate the new centralized agency database protocols for decision-making.

d. Develop multiple approaches to connecting agency staff and LEA educator across distances through various technology options.

3. Coordinate a new internal and external communication plan and its delivery to address educator awareness and access to AEA services.

a. The plan has the following content outcomes:

i. Communicate the decision-making protocol used to develop, implement, and evaluate Partnership Agreements.

ii. Communicate the diversity support within the agency goals, changes in data trends, and support through specific actions.

iii. Communicate agency planning processes, service delivery priority setting, resource allocations, and decision-making processes through the new comprehensive improvement plan being developed by April 2011.

iv. Communicate agency diversity training and support to schools for such topics as cultural competence, multicultural education, ELL support, and gender fair practices.

b. The plan must include clear multiple approaches to communicating how the agency supports internal staff members and LEA educators through training and services to meet their diverse needs such as cultural competency, multicultural, ELL, and gender fair.

c. The plan has the following process outcomes:

i. Use multiple approaches to frequently communicate with internal and external customers so that they retain the information and understand how the agency supports their school improvement work and goals.

ii. Use multiple approaches to connecting agency staff and LEA educators across distances through various technology options.
4. **Implement the Comprehensive Aligned Personnel System (CAPS) to support agency staff delivery of service to customers.**
   
a. An internal review has already begun and the agency has added the following expectations to the review of licensed staff job descriptions:
   
   i. Presentation skills
   
   ii. Diversity skills and supports for LEAs such as cultural competence, multicultural, ELL, and gender fair

b. Coaching training for agency staff to support high quality interactions with Agency colleagues as well as with LEA staff that will lead to improved student learning.

5. **Add specific processes to enhance the new Comprehensive Improvement Plan's development, implementation, and evaluation.**
   
a. Enhance the communication process to address customer awareness of:
   
   i. Agency goals, data trends, and outcomes
   
   ii. Agency response to diversity
   
   iii. Partnership Agreement protocols for internal and external actions that address needs assessment, priority setting, service delivery, decision-making, resource allocation, and articulation to school level teaching and learning needs

b. Initiate a review process by Dr. Gronlund, Dr. Wolzen, Dr. Wirtz, Nancy McIntire, Trampus Budde, Margaret Van Fossen, Cindy Swanson, and Martha Yearington to ensure the plan:
   
   i. Integrates school improvement support and diversity
   
   ii. Integrates internal and external professional development linked to diversity supports
   
   iii. Monitors feedback related to internal and external diversity needs

c. Implement a data process to build an effective centralized database to support agency decision-making protocols, individual staff member data-driven needs, and LEAs feedback about AEA effectiveness.

The recommendations also have some very specific recommendations related to agency processes. The agency's responses to those specific suggestions have been shared within the narrative that follows. The action steps have also been coded within the narrative to provide readers with an alignment between the actions steps and the suggested recommendations by the Iowa Department of Education Accreditation Site Team.

The alignment code: 1PA – partnership agreements; 2ESDS – Enhance Service Delivery System for Special Education; 3COM – new internal and external communication plan; 4CAPS – Comprehensive Aligned Personnel System; and 5CIP – Comprehensive Improvement Plan work due April 2011. The code has been provided so that readers can quickly identify the action steps addressing the suggestion or recommendation.
Iowa Department of Education Accreditation
Agency-Wide Suggested Areas of Improvement

1. Although most LEA interviewees expressed satisfaction with agency services, others expressed concerns over how services are allocated across the area served by the agency. The agency is encouraged to communicate the process by which allocation decisions are made to agency personnel and LEAs and explore ways to ensure services are consistently and transparently provided to all parts of the agency. Although some concerns might be addressed/clarified through the planned expansion of the ASAP process, the agency is encouraged to consider the following actions:
   • Develop a timeline for LEAs to communicate needs to the agency to better inform the agency's planning process.
   • Develop a decision-making flow chart or similar tool to provide greater clarity regarding how internal decisions regarding service offerings are made.

Response: [3COM] AEA 9 has initiated efforts to develop a new internal and external communication plan. The new communication plan will have components to intensify the sharing of service planning processes and decision-making. Communication has been an ongoing priority of the agency and it will continue to be a priority. The recent agency restructuring efforts have been extensive so it appears warranted that renewed communication efforts to keep internal and external customers informed would be helpful.

2. Agency and LEA interviewees expressed concerns about communication between the agency and LEAs. Examples topics included:
   • changes in agency staff assignments to buildings
   • loss of ASAP facilitators
   • agency responsibilities (i.e., required staff meetings for agency personnel) and the impact on services to LEAs
   • inconsistency of agency responses (i.e., one question gets different answers)

Response: [3COM] The new internal and external communication plan had been identified to address these recommendations. The agency has already anticipated potential future staff reductions resulting from the statewide budget crisis. The new internal and external communication plan development has been identified to address informing internal and external customers about the changes related to statewide funding cuts.

Agency interviewees also expressed concerns about communication within the agency. Examples included:
   • awareness of agency-wide goals and progress toward meeting these goals
   • agency responsibilities and the impact on services to LEAs
   • inconsistency of information shared with and among internal staff
   • cross-integrated services platforms communication
Response: [3COM & 5CIP] The new communication plan has been identified as a process to communicate to internal and external customers information regarding the planning, implementation, and evaluation of the new agency Comprehensive Improvement Plan (CIP). The new CIP process has already been changed to include a communication action plan to address the recommendations.

As the agency shifts to its new delivery model, clear, consistent, and frequent communication will be critical. The team recommends that the agency review its communication process and develop a communication plan to address both internal and external concerns. The agency might also consider developing a decision making protocol to help staff prioritize LEA needs with agency needs. Contact Sue Daker, Director of Comprehensive Improvement at Keystone Area Education Agency (AEA 1) for an example protocol (sdaker@aeai1.k12.ia.us or 563-245-1480).

Response: [1PA, 2ESDS, and 3COM] The agency has already included the development of a new decision-making protocol within the Partnership Agreements and Enhanced Service Delivery System for Special Education roll-out. The Dr. Pelecky has requested the new communication plan include sharing the new decision-making protocols.

3. Few LEA and agency interviewees were able to articulate the agency-wide goals beyond improved proficiency in reading, math, and science. The team recommends the agency explore ways to better communicate its goals to all stakeholders, review implications of the goals on agency decision making, and facilitate understanding of the goals as they relate to job roles of agency personnel. In addition, analysis of goal-related data should indicate what difference agency services have made for the student populations specified within the goals.

Response: [3COM & 4CAPS] The agency has decided the new internal and external communication plan and CIP communication plan will address articulation issues regarding agency-wide goals, decision-making, and job role responsibilities of agency staff. The newly implemented Comprehensive Aligned Personnel System (CAPS) along with its professional development, supervision, and evaluation components has addressed the development of agency staff understanding of agency-wide goals, AEA services, and their job role responsibilities. Furthermore, the Agency has revised job descriptions to identify and align essential job functions to agency-wide goals established as a 2010-2011 task.

Iowa Department of Education Accreditation
School and Community Planning Areas of Recommendations

1. Multiple agency interview groups stated, “We never say no” regarding providing services; however, some LEA interviewees indicated this may not be the case. This might contribute to a feeling expressed by agency and LEA interviewees that agency personnel are “stretched too thin.” The team recommends the Agency consider reviewing its policy for providing services in order to determine when it might be appropriate to guide
districts in a direction more closely aligned with agency goals and services. The agency might also benefit from the following:

- Maintain a focus on building LEA capacity.
- Clarify, internally and externally, agency expectations regarding provision of agency services to LEAs.
- Review the number of services provided in relation to the staff available to provide ongoing support of these services. Practice “selective abandonment” of services that lack evidence of effectiveness and low or decreasing levels of LEA participation.
- Clearly communicate to internal staff and LEAs the rationale for adopting new or discontinuing past services.
- Continue to be sensitive to the perception held by some LEAs that differences exist regarding service availability and support depending on the LEA’s location.

Response: [1PA, 2ESDS, & 3COM] First, Dr. Pelecky has directed the Dr. Wirtz and Dr. Gronlund to oversee that the new internal and external communication plan and CIP address these recommendations. All communication methods will be reviewed. Embedded within the development of Partnership Agreements is an LEA and AEA commitment component to support AEA resource allocation. The new Enhanced Service Delivery System for Special Education also includes a component for special education resources for direct service and case coordination through team-based delivery being implemented this year.

**Iowa Department of Education Accreditation**
**Professional Development Areas of Recommendation**

1. Agency and LEA interviewees reported inconsistencies in how the agency gathers and analyzes implementation data following professional development (e.g., type, amount, and use of data). It is recommended the agency conduct deeper data analysis to determine if the strategies it is supporting through professional development are effective in improving student achievement with the specific subgroups identified within its agency-wide goals.

Response: [1PA] The Partnership Agreements have within their development of consistent data gathering and analysis processes as a priority for LEA and AEA work. The new CIP development process includes the development of a centralized Agency data process; and Agency centralized data have also been a goal of the restructuring process. The Statewide System of AEs has just initiated a project to address AEA standards and data collection. In addition, Cindy Swanson, Head of Staff Development, has reviewed professional development processes regarding internal staff and initiated necessary internal modifications.

2. LEA interviewees reported a lack of consistency among the individuals within the agency responsible for delivery of professional development (e.g., presentation skills, respect for participants, professionalism, and depth of knowledge). A common comment was, “We check to see who the presenter will be and then decide about participation.” The agency
is encouraged to implement measures to ensure professional development is consistently delivered by quality providers; those demonstrating depth of knowledge and experience with the given topic, presentation skills appropriate to adult learners, effective use of technology for distance learning, and understanding of the change process. This might be accomplished, in part, through mentoring of new trainers and development and use of a consistent set of training materials across the agency.

Response: [1PA] The agency has scheduled a job description review of responsibilities and expectations for this year. The delivery of professional development expectations has been included in the job description review process. The agency has been aware that some LEAs select professional development using a “menu” approach or “picking things they like.” The Partnership Agreement process has been designed to address the “menu” problem. Its design has been constructed to connect AEA professional development services to a school’s teaching and learning needs. The design includes building the capacity of AEA staff to effectively deliver services as a key internal professional development component.

3. Multiple LEA and agency interview groups indicated a desire for the agency to allocate personnel and resources to match those with the greatest needs. The agency might benefit from development and implementation of a systematic approach to match data-based district needs to professional development at the agency, region, district, building, and teacher levels. This would assist in determining how needs can be met collaboratively by LEA and agency staff through identifying priorities and necessary resources, as well as ensuring sustainability.

Response: [1PA] The Partnership Agreement process has been designed to match district and school needs to AEA services. The process also has been designed to match AEA resource allocation to district and school needs. The agency has a plan to roll-out Partnership Agreements during the next 2011-2016 CIP.

**Iowa Department of Education Accreditation**

**Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment Areas of Recommendation**

1. Although agency and LEA interview groups noted LEAs receive help with data analysis, LEA groups also reported a need for additional assistance with determining strategies that have the highest likelihood to improve student achievement in the areas indicated by these data. Specifically, LEAs expressed a need for help in addressing needs of various demographic subgroups, specifically English Language Learners, students at risk, students receiving special education services, and minority populations. Due to changing demographics across the region, it is recommended the agency clarify connections between the strategies selected and results of data analysis.

Response: [1PA] The Principals’ Leadership Academy has provided data team training for LEAs and AEA consultants. The training has continued for LEAs and AEA consultants into this year. Davenport Community School District has decided to use AEA consultants to support their building principals in
additional data team training for 2010-2011. The Partnership Agreement roll-out process has been initiated, first, in the highest diversity districts within the AEA region. The special population learning needs have been the priority for matching AEA services to LEA teaching/learning needs through the agreement development process. This has included Davenport, Columbus, and West Liberty as priorities for partnership agreement efforts. Plus, Columbus and West Liberty have agreed to participate in a potential coaching proposal submitted to the USDOE to address their diverse learner populations.

**Iowa Department of Education Accreditation**

**Diverse Learner Needs Areas of Recommendation**

1. Concerns were noted by multiple interview groups (LEA and agency) with respect to English as a Second Language (ESL) services and supports. Interviews and a review of documents indicated the agency does have a consultant with approximately thirty percent (30%) their time allocated to address ESL issues. Some districts reported having to seek outside resources to support their needs. Districts would like assistance with being proactive in preparation for the increasingly diverse student population. The team is concerned about the level of staff support to meet LEAs’ ESL needs. The agency is encouraged to be mindful of the changing demographics of their student population and be more proactive in terms of instructional practices and support services. To assist in building agency staff capacity to assist LEAs, the agency might consider providing Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol Model (SIOP) training and training regarding strategies to increase involvement of families/parents of English Language Learners (ELL) in the learning process. Refer to the agency’s Equity Report for additional comments regarding this issue (i.e., statements 31 and 32)

**Response:** [1PA, 2ESDS, 3COM, 4CAPS, & 5CIP] The agency has initiated actions to address this recommendation. The following actions have been implemented:

a. The agency hired a full time ELL consultant July 2009 to provide more ELL, equity, and multicultural education support to LEAs.
b. The agency provided content teachers with strategies to address ELL learning.
c. The ELL consultant engaged ELL coordinators in capacity building efforts involving instructional strategies, differentiated formative and summative assessments, and English language acquisition techniques.
d. The agency has involved AEA staff in SIOP training with districts.
e. The ELL consultant and AEA reading consultants have initiated collaboration with Columbus elementary for AEA reading support.
f. The agency has begun Partnership Agreement design efforts with the high diversity districts first.
g. The ELL consultant has been involved with Muscatine administrators to develop explicit instructional strategies and use IDM to address ELL needs.
2. Internal interviewees reported a G/T consultant provides guidance and technical assistance with LEA site visit preparation. Agency G/T services also provide for periodic updates with resources through a listserv and professional development (e.g., CATN). LEA interviewees, however, described limited agency support in meeting the needs of G/T students and, as a result, they seek support from outside resources (e.g., University of Iowa’s Belin-Blank Center). LEA interviewees expressed that needs of highly proficient students are often not addressed within the context of general classroom instruction. The agency is encouraged to support LEA staff in providing learning opportunities for G/T students within the general classroom setting. This might be accomplished by including explicit reference to meeting the needs of high proficiency students within the agency’s various initiatives (e.g., Differentiated Instruction). Refer to the agency’s Equity Report for additional comments regarding G/T supports (i.e., statement 47).

Response: The agency has a strong Gifted and Talented Content Area Teacher Network. The AEA consultant and area teachers have been addressing strategies districts could use so that G/T students have differentiated options within the general education classroom to meet their accelerated learning needs. The network has worked on differentiation strategies, acceleration decision-making, and available Belin-Blank support at the University of Iowa. The new internal and external communication plan includes the development of communication methods to inform LEAs about AEA resources to address these needs.

3. Limited information was provided by interview groups or in the document review on what the agency is specifically doing to address the unique needs of diverse learners: those identified in the two agency-wide goals. Interviewees did address a number of professional development initiatives focusing on instructional practices which are effective for all students; however, it did not appear implementation or ongoing formative data are being analyzed for specific subgroups to determine if the instructional practices being implemented are effective. There is a need to utilize disaggregated data to make effective instructional decisions. In addition, the agency could assist LEAs with analyzing their disaggregated data and reporting progress to its stakeholders (e.g. internal and external).

Response: [IPA & 2ESDS] The new Enhanced Service Delivery System for Special Education (ESDS) and Partnership Agreements include the development, implementation, and utilization of an AEA system-wide data gathering and analysis process. Instructional decision-making (IDM or RTI) protocols have been embedded in these new AEA efforts to align AEA services to LEA needs. The ESDS has been developed with components that address the unique needs of diverse learners by focusing on such activities as student-related functions of screening, evaluation, and support for services, shared accountability for outcomes, among other efforts. The agency has implemented an ongoing monitoring and data collection system for Special Education Indicator B13:
Transition IEPs and has plans to implement a similar system for goal writing and progress monitoring.

4. Several interviewee groups (agency and LEA) reported concerns about the changing roles and responsibilities of special education staff in the following areas:
   - Working with at-risk students
   - Assignments/re-assignments (e.g., formula and communication)
   - General education interventions
   - Child Find
   - Inconsistency between staff member abilities and the skills/competence needed to fulfill assigned roles
   - Providing professional development
   - Professionalism (interviewees expressed concern regarding dress code, hours, and absences)
   - Prioritizing attendance when conflicting duties arise
   - Meeting the needs of students on the autism spectrum

Agency leadership is encouraged to develop a communication plan to address the above areas of concern; not only with agency staff, but also with the districts/buildings they serve. In addition, participation on special education statewide committees (e.g., Child Find, professional development, compliance, and IEP) would provide current and accurate information which may guide discussions and procedural decisions.

Response: [1PA & 3COM] The agency has the new internal and external communication plan, Partnership Agreements, and ESDS to address these suggested recommendations. Furthermore, the CAPS PD committee has addressed agency actions regarding internal AEA professional development. AEA internal coaches are in place to support staff new learning, and an improved supervision and evaluation system has assisted AEA staff with methods and examples to evidence meeting agency expectations. The agency has representatives on statewide committees; and Child Find and other special education procedures training has been conducted related to last year’s changes to ensure consistency of implementation.

5. The issue of sustainability, high caseloads, and adequate staffing levels for Early ACCESS were identified by AEA interviewees. Interviewees indicated a short term plan for addressing these concerns is in place. The agency is encouraged to supplement this plan through initiation of long term sustainability planning.

Response: The agency has a new Early ACCESS Coordinator who has addressed these issues within her short term action plan and, in partnership with her Director has begun involving internal and external stakeholders in addressing these needs long-range. She has immediately involved AEA staff in gathering data; and they have initiated during staff meetings an analysis process to identify current status and practices. The coordinator has facilitated conversations to clarify consistent agency practices.
6. The site visit team was concerned about the lack of cohesiveness, shared knowledge, and collaboration shown by the Early ACCESS (Part C) interviewees during the interview. It is recommended that agency special education leadership regularly communicate about Early ACCESS, review and “drill down” Early ACCESS data, identify the “story behind the baseline,” and conduct necessary improvement planning.

Response: The agency’s new Early ACCESS Coordinator has begun Early ACCESS (Part C) training, updates, and uniform implementation. The revised data collection system is in its piloting stage; and AEA staff members also have begun efforts to identify uniform protocols and procedures within the department.

Iowa Department of Education Accreditation
Multicultural, Gender Fair Areas of Recommendation

1. While the agency has adopted a policy supportive of MCGF education and has updated its non-discrimination policy, comments from agency and LEA interviewees indicated additional work is needed in this area. Responses to questions regarding MCGF topics tended to be limited in scope, focusing on poverty training and Olweus. Agency staff would benefit from deeper understanding of various aspects of diversity (e.g., race/ethnicity, sexual orientation, gender identity, and socio-economic status) and cultural competence. Consider expanding the experiences available to agency staff through the following suggestions:

- Create a common definition for cultural competence and discuss implications for the agency and its practices.
- Develop a broader view of diversity, including a thorough examination of the demographics of the LEAs served by the agency.
- Develop list of supports and resources available to agency staff (including websites such as http://cecp.air.org/cultural/Q_integrated.htm).

These actions would better prepare agency staff to meet the needs of LEAs by infusing aspects of diversity and cultural competence into trainings related to effective instructional practices and leadership.

Response: [3COM] The Equity Plan has been under review during the accreditation process and it has been identified to be updated following the accreditation visit. (The agency practice has been to update the Equity Plan after each accreditation visit.) The new communication plan has been identified as a tool to communicate Equity Plan updates and AEA Multicultural Gender Fair services to all AEA staff, districts, and schools.

Iowa Department of Education Accreditation
Media and Standard VII-School Technology Areas of Recommendation

1. LEA interviewees reported the agency’s technology staff has been proactive in many ways, including finding cutting edge tools and bringing these new technologies to the attention of the district technology staff. Interviewees noted, however, the recent Microsoft settlement brought several issues to their attention, such as the need for improved technology planning. It is recommended the agency continue to be proactive by
assisting districts and schools to purposefully plan for the integration of instructional technology. The planning process might include topics such as predicting LEA bandwidth needs, one-to-one laptop initiatives, use of interactive white boards, technology audits, and early childhood center technology needs.

Response: [1PA, 2ESDS, 3COM, & 5CAPS] The agency has asked Joe Coon and Robert Reppert to emphasize and address LEA technology planning needs during the monthly Technology Coordinators meetings. Such needs communicated to superintendents and curriculum directors have potential to support regional collaboration through AEA support. The agency has identified multi-communication tools to share this information. (i.e., Communicator, Listserv’s, and staff development announcements)

Iowa Department of Education Accreditation
Leadership Areas of Recommendation

1. LEA interviewees expressed an appreciation for distance learning and collaboration when it was offered; however, concerns were expressed about the cost of travel to agency sponsored events and the amount of time LEA staff members must be out of their schools to attend. While the agency has been cognizant of and responsive to these concerns, it is encouraged to investigate further use of technology to provide professional learning and collaboration opportunities. In addition, to support the use of these technologies, the agency is encouraged to continue providing training on the use of distance learning tools to increase the skills of agency and LEA staffs.

Response: [1PA, 2ESDS, 3COM, & 5CAPS] The agency has asked Joe Coon and Robert Reppert to address distance learning access by LEA staff members to AEA services or meetings during their monthly Technology Coordinators meetings. Robert Reppert has begun these efforts and he has identified it as a priority to continue his promotion of distance learning use and accessing tools with agency staff members and LEA educators.