June 3, 2014

Superintendent Gary O’Malley
Mount Vernon Community School District
525 Palisades Road SW
Mount Vernon, IA  52314

Dear Superintendent O’Malley

Attached is the report of findings for the Comprehensive School Improvement Site Visit conducted at Mount Vernon Community School District (CSD) on April 15-17, 2014. The report is based upon a variety of interviews conducted with district staff and stakeholder groups during the indicated dates, and review of documents submitted to the Department and on-site.

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

Based on the findings from a comprehensive site visit, including a desk audit, on-site document review, and interviews, the Mount Vernon CSD maintains State of Iowa accreditation upon resolution of non-compliance issues described in the Chapter 12 Non-compliance Matrix and the Outside of Chapter 12 Non-compliance Matrix included in the comprehensive site visit report. The non-compliances revealed as a result of the visit are shared with the superintendent prior to leaving the district at the end of the site visit. The Mount Vernon CSD must complete corrective actions according to the timeline noted on the non-compliance web site at the DE secure log in page. Documentation of corrections must be made available to the Site Visit Team Leader. Department follow-up will be conducted to verify resolution of all noted non-compliance issues.

The report reflects consensus of the following team members:

**Department of Education Representatives:**
- Fred Kinne, Consultant – Bureau of School Improvement
- Kathleen Aller – Special Education Cadre
- Rosanne Malek, Consultant – Bureau of Standards and Curriculum-Fine Arts/Gifted and Talented
- Richard Bartosh, Consultant – Bureau of School Improvement-Title I

**Area Education Agency Representatives:**
- Carrie Manternach, Literacy Consultant – Grant Wood AEA
- Hillary Prall, School Psychologist – Grant Wood AEA
- DeAnne Blanchard, Learning Supports Consultant – Keystone AEA

**Local Education Agency Representatives:**
- Meleah Jones, English Teacher – Springville CSD
- Melissa Murphy, School Counselor – Springville CSD
It is our hope this report will provide guidance to enhance student achievement in the school and support continuing conversations among staff and community members about the local education system, how and what students are learning, and how more students can learn at higher levels.

As part of Mount Vernon CSD’s continuous improvement process, the district must review its current C-Plan and provide revisions as needed. Revisions should be based on the district’s needs assessments (including the attached report), student achievement data, stakeholder input, and established priorities. Recertification of the C-Plan must be completed by September 15, 2014. Directions for revision and submission of the C-Plan can be found at: https://entaa.iowa.gov/entaa/sso?appId=DOE_EFP&callingApp=https://portal.ed.iowa.gov/iowalandingpage/landing.aspx&logo=https://portal.ed.iowa.gov/iowalandingpage/Images/ThemeBlue/banner_top.png#topHeader.

The Department would appreciate the district’s feedback regarding its site visit experience. This feedback will inform the Department’s efforts to continuously improve the comprehensive site visit process. A short online survey has been developed and is available at the following site: https://www.surveymonkey.com/s/School_Improvement_2013-2014_District_Survey The survey will take approximately ten minutes to complete. Responses are confidential and shared in aggregate form with members of the Department’s School Improvement Team.

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

Sincerely,

Fred E. Kinne, School Improvement Consultant
Bureau of School Improvement
Iowa Department of Education

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

cc: Site Visit Team Members
School Board President
Iowa Department of Education Official File
AEA Office
Vision, Mission, and Goals

In an improving district/school, the vision, mission, and goals are clearly communicated in the school and community. Stakeholders understand and share a commitment to the district/school expectations, goals, priorities, assessment procedures, and accountability. The vision guides allocations of time and resources. Evidence includes, but is not limited to, the following:

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

Noted Strengths:

1. None noted at this time

Recommendations for Improvement:

2. The District Vision, To help all students in the Mount Vernon Community School District become lifelong learners, and Mission, To do what is in the best interests of the students of this district while Promoting Excellence in Academics, Art and Athletics, as well as core values were last addressed in 2005.

During the district overview, and in reviewing the district website, the site visit team learned the 2013-14 district goals are to:

- Develop a continuous improvement process for curricular content, instructional method and assessments.
- Develop personalized student learning plans focusing on the whole child - social/emotional and mental health.
- Develop a financial plan to sustain and support the district's programs and facilities.
- Strengthen integration of technology to improve staff and student learning.

During the district overview principals presented school improvement goals established for the 2013-14 school year. The goals shared with the team were:

- Elementary
  - To increase Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills (DIBELS) scores by 3% by 2015
  - To increase Iowa Assessment Test scores by 3% in grades 3 and 4 by 2015
  - To implement Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS)
• Middle School
  o Developing curriculum delivery and remediation time
  o Becoming a 1:1 school per district goal #4
  o Developing an atmosphere for social and emotional connectivity between students and teachers

• High School
  o To create a culture of collaboration
  o To create an atmosphere of creativity and innovation
  o Prepare students for the next step.

Most interview groups could not discuss nor were familiar with the district vision, mission, or goals. Groups mentioning goals referred to them as board goals. The site visit team could not determine, nor could interviewees provide feedback, what data was collected and studied, or what process was used to determine the 13-14 district and individual building goals. It does not appear professional development, curriculum, and learning environment decisions (culture, mental health, behavior management, etc.) are based on district vision, mission, or goals.

The site visit team recommends the district engage the School Improvement Advisory Committee (SIAC) or a similar parallel committee of stakeholders representing the entire district to:

• Collect and study the past three years of:
  o Student enrollment data
  o Disaggregated student achievement data
  o Learning environment data

• Review the current vision, mission and goals to determine if suitable and/or in agreement with data collected and studied
• If needed, update the vision, mission, and goals based on collected data
• Establish building goals based on the updated district vision, mission, and goals
Leadership

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

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

**Noted Strengths:**

3. The superintendent is completing the first year of a three year contract with Mt Vernon CSD. The board of education and superintendent are establishing a relationship focusing on: student achievement, developing concrete areas of data collection and analysis, long term district planning, knowing the roles of each party, and how to best work together to meet the needs of the district.

4. District administrators reported two hour monthly meetings with the superintendent on an individual basis. The first hour addresses professional development and the second hour is designed to discuss pressing issues. Building administrators shared an appreciation for the support and mentoring they receive from the superintendent during these monthly meetings. The superintendent and building administrators meet as a team once a month.

5. Teachers reported vertical teaming opportunities for collaboration and curriculum development is in practice and appreciated. Shared professional conversations are rich and helpful as curriculum and programs are reviewed and updated.
**Recommendations for Improvement:**

6. Middle school students, principal, and teachers reported the Student Activity Team (SAT) at the middle school functions to organize social activities for its students. However, middle school students acknowledged the lack of an organized student council or similar student organization to provide feedback to the building principal with curriculum and program concerns. The middle school is encouraged to consider providing a student leadership group that will allow students to engage building leadership regarding pertinent middle school concerns.

7. High school students shared they have leadership opportunities in student council, National Honor Society, and the Silver Cord program. However, they also shared frustration with the inability of leadership groups to provide formal input concerning course selection, activities, and learning environment. The site visit team recommends the high school principal engage students in an effort to create opportunities and process within student leadership groups allowing for regular dialogue and input with adult leadership.

8. Interviews and provided documents revealed Building Leadership Teams (BLTs) are functioning in each building. However, teachers expressed frustration with the lack of “real purpose” of BLT and envision an active role in data collection and curriculum development. Administrators are encouraged to engage teachers in conversation to gather input and suggestions for how to better use BLT concept and time. Contact your Regional Administrator at Grant Wood AEA if you need assistance.

9. Mount Vernon CSD has created and maintains a district website. However, parent interviews and site visit team observation indicated the website is difficult to navigate, the district vision and/or mission was not prominent on the homepage and current/important information is not accessible on the homepage (example: superintendent notes and newsletter). The site visit team recommends the district review the current website to determine areas perceived as not user friendly, solicit suggestions from all constituents and take measures to amend those areas. Also consider prominently displaying and promoting the district vision and mission statement. The district might consider creating an intentional process to collect feedback about the website from the parents and students.

10. It appears an appropriate staff evaluation cycle is in place in all three buildings. However, teachers and paraeducators reported inconsistencies among buildings concerning cycle of evaluation, use of the evaluation tool, and follow-up. The site visit team recommends district administrators engage in a conversation to review current practices and amend them as necessary to provide a systemic process within the district.

- SIAC has not made recommendations to the board of education concerning:
  - progress achieved with annual improvement goals for the state indicators that address reading, mathematics, and science
  - progress achieved with other locally determined indicators
  - annual improvement goals for the state indicators that address reading, mathematics, and science.
- SIAC has not made the required recommendations to the board about the following components:
  - Major educational needs
  - Student learning goals
  - Long-range goals including, but not limited to, the state indicators that address reading, mathematics and science achievement
  - Harassment or bullying prevention goals, programs, training, and other initiatives.

SIAC’s legislatively mandated function is to collect, study, and make decisions for recommendations based on student achievement and learning environment data concerning the above areas. Frequency of meetings and the process used to obtain recommendations for the board is locally determined. The site visit team recommends the district:

- revisit the rules governing SIAC function
- re-structure the committee according to rules
- review the current SIAC committee membership demographics to be sure it meets compliance
- determine multiple meeting dates and share these dates with committee members.
- prepare a training session for the first meeting to inform the committee of its function
- create a consistent agenda that will allow the director of the SIAC to
  - disseminate collected data
  - process data with the committee
  - formulate recommendations based on the data

Consider contacting Fred Kinne, Department of Education if assistance is needed in this area.
Collaborative Relationships

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

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

Noted Strengths:

12. Many collaborative relationships are in place at Mount Vernon CSD. Examples shared were:

- Alert-Lockdown-Inform-Counter-Evacuate (ALICE) and digital citizenship (social media) training with local law enforcement
- 1:1 initiative supported from Grant Wood AEA technology consultants
- Cornell College professors and students assisting students with Mock Trial, middle school success lab
- Cornell College sharing athletic facilities
- City of Mt. Vernon creating and maintaining trails to schools
- Career and Technical Education (CTE) collaboration with Kirkwood
- Annual Chalk the Walk celebration with the city
- Mental Health Counselors from Life Connections
- Workplace Learning Connection
- Mount Vernon alumni association
- Parent athletic and fine arts booster clubs
- Work experience opportunities for students with local businesses
- Washington Elementary Teachers/Parents (WETP) organization
13. Parents, counselors, and teachers shared an appreciation for transition practices throughout the district and indicated practices are well organized and beneficial to students and parents. Examples of activities responsible for successful transition were:

- Individual visits for special education students prior to large group visits to the new building and/or class
- All students take part in kindergarten round-up
- Step Up Day - take students to next year’s class/school
- Mentor program - middle school students come to elementary school, 3rd grade students are paired with kindergarten students
- 8th grade exploratory classes at the high school
- 8th grade student and parent meeting with high school staff for Schedule Fair Night and 9th grade orientation
- High school students share information with middle school students
- Junior parent meeting to discuss the Free Application for Federal Student Aid (FAFSA) and scholarship opportunities

14. The superintendent has implemented a new communication process, “Community Conversations with Mount Vernon Community School District”. The purpose is to offer small and large group discussions centering on school topics that emphasize positives, negatives, costs, and benefits. Four sessions were scheduled for spring of 2014 to discuss pre-determined topics of interest in the district.

Recommendations for Improvement:

15. Various teacher interview groups described opportunities for teaming and collaborating in classrooms. However, teachers reported they have not received recent professional development with collaborative teaching models. Co-teaching and collaborative/consultative models are effective ways for teaching. These require scheduling options, on-going teacher support/training (e.g. “protected” planning time) and monitoring of student performance to be effective and efficient. The site visit team encourages the district to determine multiple opportunities for K-12 general and special educators to share responsibility for all learners across the district. The district should develop a plan to identify teachers interested in collaboration and/or co-teaching to provide a focus for increased in-class collaboration and reduction of “pull-out” (special education, gifted and talented, at-risk, English Language Learners, etc.) service delivery while maintaining highly qualified teacher requirements. In addition the district is encouraged to formulate a plan to provide professional development for new teachers. For more information contact Josh Lyons, Regional Administrator, Grant Wood AEA. You may also want to consider accessing the Department of Education website for resources related to Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) https://www.educateiowa.gov/multi-tiered-system-supports-mtss
Learning Environment

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

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

**Noted Strengths:**

16. Multiple interview groups shared the alternative school program is highly regarded within the district and community. The director is a personal contact for students who are at risk of dropping out of high school. Parents spoke highly of current personnel. The alternative program is designed to engage students in learning and the teacher uses district teachers as speakers in the school to connect with the students. There is also a life skills component to connect learning in school to real life learning.

17. Multiple interview groups indicated district teachers focus on making connections with students. To ensure students have a trusted adult to confide in if needed, staff at multiple levels continuously seeks ways to engage students in activities and groups to increase their connectedness to school. Some examples shared were:

- Elementary student survey to identify whether they have an adult they trust
- Lunch buddies at the middle school
- Expanded high school clubs including knitting, archery and chess
Recommendations for Improvement:

18. District staff has received Crisis Prevention Institute (CPI) training in past years. However, interviews indicated updating of CPI practices does not occur on a regular basis. The site visit team recognizes the importance of this training and recommends the district provide yearly opportunities for maintaining certification for returning staff and initial training for new staff members.

19. The elementary school is commended for implementing Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS) in an attempt to develop consistent behavioral expectations and improve school climate. However, interviewees stated not all parents and teachers have been informed or included in the planning process. It is recommended the PBIS team seek input from other building staff and keep parents informed to ensure continued support for this program.

20. High school principal, counselors, and high school students believe there is a need and desire for an additional school counselor to help students with social/emotional mental health concerns. They are aware of the discussion of adding a counselor at the high school and are in hopes this potential hire will be afforded the time to address these issues. If this hiring occurs, the site visit team recommends students are engaged in conversation with the new counselor regarding their concerns. If the position is not put into place, engage students with current personnel and reevaluate allocated human resource time to address their issues.

21. Although bullying and harassment does not appear to be a major issue throughout the district, multiple interview groups expressed a concern for the lack of a systemic response to bullying/harassment behaviors and support. There appears to be superficial efforts at each building, but successful research based programs are not implemented with fidelity district-wide. Such programs promote common language, expectations, and consistency of supports. Middle school students and teachers expressed disappointment the Olweus Bullying Prevention Program was no longer in place. The site visit team recommends the district consider reinstating the Olweus program at the middle school and study ways to implement it district wide.
22. Review of provided At Risk program materials generated concerns in the following required three areas of an at risk program:

- **Valid and systematic procedures and criteria to identify at-risk students throughout the district's school age population (non-compliant: A1 and A2)**
  - Elementary identification criteria are not defined with specific thresholds. For example, what does "low academic achievement" mean? Does the district define percentile ranking cut scores for not meeting benchmarks? "Early aggression" is used for describing behavioral concerns. Districts should define early aggression with data points that can be tracked and improved.
  - The middle school and high school are using criteria to define potential and returning dropouts only (as shown on the dropout prevention website). This is too limiting as students could be at risk of failure but not at the level of a potential dropout. At risk is a broader scope in nature and should capture students prior to becoming potential dropouts. Data needs to be specific and measurable. Therefore, specific thresholds should be used during the review process or the district may end up over-identifying students.

- **Determination of appropriate ongoing educational strategies for alternative options education programs provided as required in Iowa Code 280.19A**
  - Alternative options at Washington Elementary indicated classroom guidance is provided to all students. Services for all students should not be part of an at risk program. The district should define specific programming or strategies for students identified as at risk in the areas of academics, personal/social and college/career.
  - It was not clear who is screening students or what process is being used.
  - It was indicated Section 504 services are being used as a supplemental service at the high school. Section 504 is a federal civil rights law that prohibits discrimination against individuals with disabilities. It is not an instructional program. A student does not have to meet the threshold of qualifying for at risk services to be served under Section 504, nor does a student identified as at risk always meet the criteria for a Section 504.

- **Evaluation of effectiveness of provisions for at-risk students**
  - It was not clear what goals and outcomes have been set for the at risk program.
  - It was not clear who is responsible for the evaluation of the effectiveness of the program.
    - What information is being collected to assure effectiveness?
    - Who is responsible for collecting the information?
    - What modifications to the program occur with the information collected?

While addressing non-compliance items the site visit team recommends a complete review of at risk services at Mount Vernon CSD. Consider contacting your Grant Wood AEA Regional Administrator for assistance.
Curriculum and Instruction

In an improving school, curriculum challenges each student to excel, reflects a commitment to equity, and demonstrates an appreciation of diversity. There is an emphasis on principles of high quality instruction, clear expectations for what is taught, and high expectations for student achievement. Educators have a common understanding of quality teaching and learning. Instruction is designed to accommodate a wide range of learners within the classroom. Teachers have knowledge and skills need to effectively implement characteristics of effective instruction. The staff accepts responsibility for the students’ learning of the essential curriculum (e.g., Iowa Core). Instructional time is allocated to support student learning. Evidence includes, but is not limited to, the following:

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

**Noted Strengths:**

23. Parents and students reported teachers are using multiple instructional strategies to engage students in learning. Processes are in place for early intervention and remediation for struggling learners. High school and middle school students talked positively about differentiated instruction and project based instructional opportunities present in some classes. Students were able to articulate these instructional opportunities had a positive impact on their learning and they were able to apply their learning in a way other than paper and pencil.

24. In a collaborative effort media and technology staff have used the Iowa Core and national standards to develop a list of specific technology skills essential for learning at different grade levels. Skills were then developed at the elementary level into “I Can” statements. Media and technology staff also indicated they use Iowa Core curriculum standards to integrate technology and media into the core curriculum skills.

25. Parents reported satisfaction with inclusionary practices and accommodations provided for students with special needs. Also, general education and collaborative teachers believe education is enhanced because they review the accommodations listed in the Individualized Education Program (IEP) prior to the beginning of each semester to ensure they are provided.
**Recommendations for Improvement:**

26. It appears district social studies educators have developed a process for successful articulation of their curriculum. However, it appears other curricular areas have not fully implemented a process. The site visit team suggests principals engage district social studies teachers to assist in the replication of this process for all curricular areas.

27. Advanced Placement courses are not offered at the high school. Advanced Placement courses allow high school students to experience freshman level college courses with the support and instruction of the high school teacher. Advanced Placement courses introduce writing and critical thinking skills needed for successful college careers for increasing the likeliness of degree attainment. Mount Vernon students applying to colleges/universities are competing for admission with students across the nation who have completed multiple Advanced Placement courses. To provide equitable access and opportunity for college readiness, consider offering Advanced Placement courses at the high school with College Board approved syllabus, or online, to ensure an even playing field for Mount Vernon students competing for admission with students across the nation.

28. The district overview shared Response to Intervention (RtI) practices are being implemented, in particular at the middle school. As the district moves forward, the site visit team recommends the district revisit the philosophy and purpose of RtI and provides core instruction and appropriate interventions for all students in the district (including English Language Learners, Gifted and Talented, Special Education and At-Risk).

29. Section 504 accommodations are provided to students district wide. Student file review and teacher interviews indicated a lack of consistent implementation, review and evaluation within the program. The site visit team recommends the district:
   - appoint a Section 504 coordinator
   - review Section 504 rules and regulations for
     - student qualification
     - appropriate accommodations
     - disseminating accommodation information to teaching staff
     - follow-up and review

30. As the district continues to develop its CTE program advisory committees, a resource to use is “Advisory Groups Manual” available on the Iowa Department of Education website: [https://www.educateiowa.gov/documents/technical-assistance-cte/2013/10/advisory-groups-manual-113009](https://www.educateiowa.gov/documents/technical-assistance-cte/2013/10/advisory-groups-manual-113009). Issues common to district participation on advisory committees include:
   - Little or no non-traditional gender member participation
   - Little or no minority representation
   - Little focus on best practice of Program of Study components

Advisory committee members should provide programs with advice on the six Program of Study (POS) criteria. See [https://www.educateiowa.gov/documents/technical-assistance-cte/2013/10/pos-guidance-022211](https://www.educateiowa.gov/documents/technical-assistance-cte/2013/10/pos-guidance-022211) for assistance on Programs of Study. For additional assistance, please contact Fidelis Ubadiqbo at fidelis.ubadiqbo@iowa.gov.
Numerous concerns with the district Gifted and Talented program were realized during interviews and document review.

- The gifted and talented teacher has been diligent in providing community support and collaboration for elementary gifted students. There appears to be a lack of similar support at the middle school and high school. Considering the size of the district and number of identified students district wide, the single staff appropriation does not appear to be enough time to support the needs of so many advanced learners.

- Many issues within the required articulated K-12 gifted program were identified during document review and interviews.
  
  o IDENTIFICATION (non-compliant: GT3 and GT4)
    - Identification at the high school level is indicated by a single standardized score. Iowa Code requires multiple selection criteria for identification for gifted services.

After the district reviews and determines multiple selection criteria for secondary students, consider providing additional professional development for secondary teachers in secondary differentiated instruction targeted to the specific needs of the student. Data reported 105 students at the high school level are identified for gifted programming. This appears to be 25% of the high school population. Since identification is for students whose needs are above and beyond the regular school classroom, perhaps a curriculum review is needed at the secondary level to determine if courses are rigorous enough for the regular student population.

  o PROGRAM GOALS (non-compliant: GT1)
    - The documentation shows program goals, however there is not an indication of how the goals are measured and the results of a program evaluation.

The Mount Vernon Gifted Programming (ELP) Philosophy and Goals provided in documentation are not reflected in middle school and high school programming. To create a seamless gifted and talented program structure guided by K-12 gifted programming goals and educational opportunities, consider using a team-based self-audit approach to evaluating the gifted program. Iowa schools have access to The Gifted and Talented Self-Audit/Reflection Tool that is designed to compare and align district/building practice with Chapter 12 General Accreditation Standards and current best practice. The Self-Audit/Reflection Tool uses a collaborative, peer approach to encourage rich discussions, and support consensus-based decisions, and revised program goal setting. The self-audit tool is available electronically on the Heartland AEA 11 website: http://www.heartlandaea.org/instructional-services/cia/gifted--talented/self-audit--reflection-tool/
- PROGRAMMING (non-compliant: GT5)
  - The support of identified student interests, research, and independent learning opportunities are to be embedded into their daily academic courses, not added on as an extra-curricular option, or as a choice that students can opt to do, or not. The burden of instructing academically challenged students is the responsibility of the teachers to provide the pace and depth in the academic courses in which the students are enrolled on a daily basis, not an additional choice to classes that are not challenging, or a parallel course work burden on the students.

In determining student readiness for acceleration for content or grade skipping in K-8, consider using the Iowa Acceleration Scale (IAS) to subject skip or grade skip students who require academic instruction to meet the pace and depth of their academic abilities. AEA gifted consultants were trained on using the IAS in 2007. The Iowa Department of Education provided AEAs with IAS manuals and forms for their professional libraries. Consider contacting Grant Wood AEA for IAS materials. Materials can also be obtained through Great Potential Press.

- PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT
  - The purpose of requiring identification of students whose needs are above and beyond the regular academic program is to assure that advanced learners are supported in the pace and at the depth of their cognitive processing. Although professional development has focused on differentiation, elementary classroom teachers and secondary content teachers may need to be educated about the unique learning abilities of identified gifted students. They may need to be presented and supported with materials and instructional differentiation in providing relevant and challenging academic opportunities in the daily academic instruction of identified gifted students.

- STAFF QUALIFICATIONS (non-compliant: GT6)
  - Board Policy 511.11 indicates the superintendent is responsible to develop the gifted program, develop guidelines for identification of students, develop guidelines for program evaluation, and develop guidelines for professional development training. Licensure requires the person administering the program have a gifted endorsement and this policy is causing the district to be non-compliant as the superintendent does not have an endorsement. The school district may want to review Chapter 98 categorical funding requirements, to determine salary and benefits to extend a gifted teacher staff position. While it is the school district’s decision in deciding who is to provide guidance for the implementation of K-12 gifted programming, staff that holds a building or district administrator position is an inappropriate use of funds. Providing an administrator’s salary using categorical funding to implement gifted programming is inappropriate. Contact Su McCurdy, School Finance Administrator, Iowa Department of Education, for clarification.
PROGRAM EVALUATION

- The documentation provided for program evaluation appears to be a student evaluation for gifted services.

Gifted and Talented program evaluation appears to be non-existent. Please refer to #41 in this report for further detail.

For assistance in the re-building of the gifted programming and meeting noncompliant requirements, consider contacting Heather Freurhelm, Gifted Programming Consultant, Grant Wood AEA, or Rosanne Malek, Gifted Program Consultant, Iowa Department of Education.
In an improving district/school, staff is qualified for assignments and engages in ongoing learning opportunities to improve effectiveness. Student achievement and other sources of data are used to set goals for professional development. The district provides professional learning opportunities that include theory, demonstration, practice, and coaching. Evidence includes, but is not limited to, the following:

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

**Noted Strengths:**

32. High school staff, in particular CTE and special education teachers, reported they have been allowed many opportunities for PD outside the district. There is a sense the PD attended has been beneficial to their work.

**Recommendations for Improvement:**

33. Evidence provided through document review and the district overview indicated professional development was determined by using 2013-14 district goals. A Wednesday early out schedule was developed and used for the 13-14 year. However, the site visit team shares the following concerns regarding district professional development:

- It appears professional development is building determined and not designed as a district.
- There was little indication of how professional development activities were determined or evaluated.
- Vertical teaming was mentioned during professional development questioning, and while teachers seem to appreciate meeting with like-subject colleagues both within their buildings and across the district, they articulated to the team more structure is needed to support the focus of the teams: content area planning and programming and vertical articulation.
- There appears to be inconsistent practice for allowing professional development outside the district. While teachers are grateful for professional development opportunities, the site visit team believes out-of-district opportunities should be tied to teachers’ professional development plans.
- Those interviewed mentioned professional learning communities (PLC), but could not articulate the goals and processes of PLCs.
The site visit team recommends the district:

- Develop an overarching vision to guide professional development at the district and building level. Consider revisiting the Iowa Professional Development model found on the Department of Education website for assistance.
- Develop a process to assess current and future professional development to help determine its effectiveness for student improvement. See #41 of this report for further information.
- Incorporate procedures allowing an equitable share of out-of-district professional development opportunities for all educators. Professional development opportunities valuable to one teacher may be valuable to many. Utilize individuals who attend out-of-district professional development by allowing them to share their learning with others in the district.
Monitoring and Accountability

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

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

**Noted Strengths:**

34. The district provides a Targeted Assistance Title I program serving kindergarten through second grade. Multiple sources of student data are used within the Title I program. Students with the greatest needs are initially identified with scores from DIBELS (kindergarten and grade 1), Reading Recovery (grades 1) assessments, Gates-MacGinitie Reading Test (grades 1 and 2), and “Core Phonics” (grade 2). In addition, classroom performance information is received from classroom teachers. Students identified with the greatest needs receive priority for services. Students are re-assessed at mid-year to monitor progress. The Title I teacher has a well-defined procedure for collecting and monitoring student data to determine if students have met their goals. This information is used to regroup students, modify the instruction provided to students, as well as to decide when students are exited from the Title I program.

35. Middle school and high school students gave many examples of formative assessments used by teachers to check for understanding and guide instruction. Examples include:

- Pre/Post assessment
- Probes
- Check-ups (student/teacher conferencing)
- Non-graded quizzes
- Self learning checks
- Daily reviews

36. The percentage of Mount Vernon CSD students in the proficient range of achievement on the 2012-2013 Iowa Assessments is higher than Grant Wood AEA and State of Iowa Averages in all demographic groups in the following areas:

- Reading – grades 3-8 and 11
- Mathematics – grades 3-8 and 11
- Science – grades 3-8 and 11

See Appendix A, Accreditation Site Visit Data Report, pages 6-23 for additional information.
Recommendations for Improvement:

37. Interviews indicated Iowa Test security is inconsistent and not compliant throughout the district. Iowa test booklets are to be secured in one specific area on a daily basis. Locking tests in individual classrooms is not an option. Answer sheets and test booklets are to be collected at the end of each testing day, secured and locked in one specific area and redistributed the next day.

38. It appears Mount Vernon students perform well on standardized test measures when compared to counterparts in the AEA and state (see #36). The site visit team concurs with this, yet encourages the district to strive to increase rigor and opportunities for greater individual performance and achievement. The district is encouraged to provide more opportunities for students to take advanced placement courses, enhance enrichment for already high-achieving students to reach their full potential (including but not limited to ELL), and strive to have the highest expectations possible for each student. Structured feedback from students on post-secondary performance, standardized assessments, and satisfaction surveys from parents and students may be useful additional resources to support continuous improvement.

39. Administrator interviews indicated Thrive Program and Olweus survey data is collected. However, administrators shared frustration of the frequency of data collection and the lack of using data to provide supports. It was noted “nothing has changed”. The site visit team recommends forming an ad hoc committee to discuss the collection and use of survey information and consistently address needs identified from survey results.

40. The District Developed Service Delivery Plan (DDSDP) for Special Education needs to be reviewed. Special educators were not able to describe or share how the plan was developed or what impact it has had on their programs/services in the last 5 years. Following the site visit the district needs to invite stakeholder representatives to assist in a review of the existing plan in order to develop a current DDSDP which reflects a:
   - full continuum of services for students ages 3 to 21.
   - means for determining and reviewing teacher caseloads.
   - system for review of the plan to include decisions regarding service delivery for students with IEPs and school building level service delivery.
   - support to teachers in interpreting and meeting the expectations of the plan and its delivery (which may include designated shared planning time, e.g. aligned with data to support evaluation of its effectiveness for student learning).
41. The Mount Vernon CSD has many programs, services and initiatives in place or in the implementation stage. Examples of these include:

- Professional Development
- Gifted and Talented
- At-Risk
- Comprehensive school counseling
- English Language Learner
- Alternative Education
- Equity data review
- PBIS at the elementary
- Senior Year Plus opportunities at the high school (concurrent enrollment, PSEO)
- RtI/MTSS
- Student leadership groups
- Hiring process and protocol

It was not evident to the site visit team how these and similar programs are evaluated based on data from student performance. Administrators and instructional staff are encouraged to establish procedures and practices to develop and use program evaluation for professional development, curriculum, and other school programs and initiatives. For each program or initiative, consider setting clear program goals that ask:

- What do we want as a result of the program, initiative, or support service?
- Are there clear, aligned measurable goals?
- Are there processes and procedures for monitoring progress and evaluating program impact?

Determine which programs to sustain, modify, abandon or replace. The district is encouraged to review the use of data to:

- build leadership capacity in the collection and analysis of multiple sources of data
- determine and provide professional learning on the elements necessary to create collaboration
- provide training on the frequent and accurate use of pre K-12 data to inform instructional improvement
- create protocols to ensure data analysis translates to classroom practice
- use data to nurture a culture of equity and trust which includes protocols for collaborative inquiry used by faculty and documented use of evidenced-based instructional strategies to address cultural proficiency
**Mount Vernon District’s Compliance Status for Applicable Federal Programs:**

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

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

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

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

This district does not whole grade share.

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

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

Figure 4: Annual Instructional Minutes

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>Total Annual Instructional Minutes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4554</td>
<td>Mount Vernon High School (4554-0109)</td>
<td>66,540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4554</td>
<td>Mount Vernon Middle School (4554-0209)</td>
<td>66,540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4554</td>
<td>Washington Elementary School (4554-0409)</td>
<td>66,540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>State Average</td>
<td>66,791</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 5: Average Daily Attendance
Data Source: Spring EASIER/SRI
Definitions: Total number of student days present divided by total number of student days enrolled.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2008-2009</th>
<th>2009-2010</th>
<th>2010-2011</th>
<th>2011-2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rate</td>
<td>75.00%</td>
<td>80.00%</td>
<td>85.00%</td>
<td>90.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K-12 Attend Rate</td>
<td>96.20%</td>
<td>94.92%</td>
<td>95.30%</td>
<td>95.50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>School Name</th>
<th>Title 1 Status</th>
<th>Math AMO</th>
<th>Reading AMO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4554</td>
<td>Mount Vernon Community School District (4554)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>MET</td>
<td>MET</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4554</td>
<td>Mount Vernon High School (4554-0109)</td>
<td>No Value</td>
<td>MET</td>
<td>MET</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4554</td>
<td>Mount Vernon Middle School (4554-0209)</td>
<td>No Value</td>
<td>SINA-1</td>
<td>SINA-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4554</td>
<td>Washington Elementary School (4554-0409)</td>
<td>Targeted</td>
<td>Watch</td>
<td>MET</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>School Name</th>
<th>Title 1 Status</th>
<th>Math Part.</th>
<th>Reading Part.</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4554</td>
<td>Mount Vernon Community School District (4554)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>MET</td>
<td>MET</td>
<td>MET</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4554</td>
<td>Mount Vernon High School (4554-0109)</td>
<td>No Value</td>
<td>MET</td>
<td>MET</td>
<td>MET</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4554</td>
<td>Mount Vernon Middle School (4554-0209)</td>
<td>No Value</td>
<td>MET</td>
<td>MET</td>
<td>MET</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4554</td>
<td>Washington Elementary School (4554-0409)</td>
<td>Targeted</td>
<td>MET</td>
<td>MET</td>
<td>MET</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 7: Percent of Kindergarteners Scoring At Benchmark on DIBELS/DIBELS Next Initial/First Sounds Fluency

Data Source: Fall EASIER/SRI

Definitions: Districts are required to assess all kdg students using a literacy assessment by October 1st. If a district uses DIBELS/DIBELS Next for this assessment, scores are reported below.

At benchmark is equivalent to a score greater than 7 on DIBELS and greater than 9 on DIBELS Next.

![Graph showing percent of kindergarteners scoring at benchmark over years 2009-2013.]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2009-2010</th>
<th>2010-2011</th>
<th>2011-2012</th>
<th>2012-2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% At Benchmark</td>
<td>79.07%</td>
<td>84.21%</td>
<td>80.41%</td>
<td>80.90%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Figure 8**

**Percent of Students in Grade 3 Proficient in Reading**

Data Source: AYP Assessment File

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

![Graph showing percent of students proficient in reading for grades 2008-2009 to 2012-2013.]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grade 03, DISTRICT</td>
<td>82.80%</td>
<td>87.78%</td>
<td>88.68%</td>
<td>90.22%</td>
<td>89.66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 03, AEA</td>
<td>74.58%</td>
<td>75.68%</td>
<td>77.46%</td>
<td>76.78%</td>
<td>76.09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 03, STATE</td>
<td>76.08%</td>
<td>75.56%</td>
<td>77.32%</td>
<td>75.89%</td>
<td>75.50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 9**

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

Data Source: AYP Assessment File

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

![Graph showing percent of students proficient in reading for grades 2008-2009 to 2012-2013.]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grade 04, DISTRICT</td>
<td>97.92%</td>
<td>87.37%</td>
<td>85.87%</td>
<td>86.67%</td>
<td>88.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 04, AEA</td>
<td>79.25%</td>
<td>78.58%</td>
<td>80.97%</td>
<td>74.83%</td>
<td>75.36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 04, STATE</td>
<td>80.36%</td>
<td>77.66%</td>
<td>81.58%</td>
<td>73.48%</td>
<td>74.63%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Figure 10** Percent of Students in Grade 5 Proficient in Reading

Data Source: AYP Assessment File

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Grade 05, DISTRICT</th>
<th>Grade 05, AEA</th>
<th>Grade 05, STATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008-2009</td>
<td>86.54%</td>
<td>81.13%</td>
<td>79.53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-2010</td>
<td>88.89%</td>
<td>79.16%</td>
<td>77.61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-2011</td>
<td>89.90%</td>
<td>80.55%</td>
<td>79.85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-2012</td>
<td>80.61%</td>
<td>75.02%</td>
<td>73.42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-2013</td>
<td>86.67%</td>
<td>75.72%</td>
<td>74.76%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 11** Percent of Students in Grade 6 Proficient in Reading

Data Source: AYP Assessment File

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Grade 06, DISTRICT</th>
<th>Grade 06, AEA</th>
<th>Grade 06, STATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008-2009</td>
<td>74.67%</td>
<td>71.89%</td>
<td>68.86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-2010</td>
<td>85.44%</td>
<td>71.61%</td>
<td>69.45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-2011</td>
<td>77.45%</td>
<td>71.44%</td>
<td>69.11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-2012</td>
<td>73.47%</td>
<td>65.37%</td>
<td>63.53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-2013</td>
<td>65.66%</td>
<td>65.81%</td>
<td>65.03%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Figure 12** Percent of Students in Grade 7 Proficient in Reading

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>AEA</th>
<th>State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008-2009</td>
<td>75.00%</td>
<td>72.88%</td>
<td>71.91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-2010</td>
<td>85.90%</td>
<td>73.09%</td>
<td>73.09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-2011</td>
<td>86.92%</td>
<td>75.17%</td>
<td>74.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-2012</td>
<td>81.25%</td>
<td>69.02%</td>
<td>66.48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-2013</td>
<td>78.22%</td>
<td>68.79%</td>
<td>67.57%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 13** Percent of Students in Grade 8 Proficient in Reading

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>AEA</th>
<th>State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008-2009</td>
<td>79.07%</td>
<td>75.63%</td>
<td>73.26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-2010</td>
<td>82.02%</td>
<td>73.40%</td>
<td>72.61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-2011</td>
<td>92.41%</td>
<td>76.26%</td>
<td>74.34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-2012</td>
<td>81.13%</td>
<td>68.17%</td>
<td>64.98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-2013</td>
<td>72.22%</td>
<td>68.03%</td>
<td>65.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 14: Percent of Students in Grade 11 Proficient in Reading

Data Source: AYP Assessment File

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

![Graph showing the percent of students in Grade 11 proficient in reading from 2008-2009 to 2012-2013 for different categories, including District, AEA, and STATE.]

Table 1:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>AEA</th>
<th>STATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008-2009</td>
<td>83.91%</td>
<td>78.47%</td>
<td>75.73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-2010</td>
<td>88.35%</td>
<td>80.79%</td>
<td>77.49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-2011</td>
<td>87.50%</td>
<td>79.79%</td>
<td>76.77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-2012</td>
<td>88.54%</td>
<td>85.31%</td>
<td>82.49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-2013</td>
<td>87.91%</td>
<td>84.45%</td>
<td>81.70%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Data Source: AYP Assessment File

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

![Graph showing the percent of students proficient in reading by subgroup from 2008-2009 to 2012-2013 for All Students, IEP, FRL, ELL, and Minority.]

Table 2:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>All Students</th>
<th>IEP</th>
<th>FRL</th>
<th>ELL</th>
<th>Minority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008-2009</td>
<td>83.30%</td>
<td>25.80%</td>
<td>67.85%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>56.52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-2010</td>
<td>86.60%</td>
<td>43.75%</td>
<td>79.31%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>66.66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-2011</td>
<td>86.77%</td>
<td>47.27%</td>
<td>77.68%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>75.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-2012</td>
<td>83.02%</td>
<td>24.59%</td>
<td>66.66%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>75.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-2013</td>
<td>80.87%</td>
<td>39.47%</td>
<td>65.42%</td>
<td>75.00%</td>
<td>71.79%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 16: Percent of Students with Disabilities in Grades 3-8, 11 Proficient in Reading
Data Source: AYP Assessment File
Definitions: Student achievement data in this report is based on attending district and includes students taking an Iowa Assessment or Iowa Alternate Assessment. Proficiency in Reading, Math, and Science on the ITBS/ITED through 2010-2011 is defined as at or above the 41st percentile. In 2011-12, the proficiency definition was changed to a minimum National Standard Score that varies by subject, grade level, and when the student is assessed. Students’ inclusion in subgroup(s) is as of the date they were assessed.

Figure 17: Percent of Free/Reduced Lunch Students Grades 3-8, 11 Proficient in Reading
Data Source: AYP Assessment File
Definitions: Student achievement data in this report is based on attending district and includes students taking an Iowa Assessment or Iowa Alternate Assessment. Proficiency in Reading, Math, and Science on the ITBS/ITED through 2010-2011 is defined as at or above the 41st percentile. In 2011-12, the proficiency definition was changed to a minimum National Standard Score that varies by subject, grade level, and when the student is assessed. Students’ inclusion in subgroup(s) is as of the date they were assessed.
**Report Definition**

**Figure 18:** Percent of English Language Learner Students Grades 3-8, 11 Proficient in Reading

Data Source: AYP Assessment File

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DISTRICT</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>75.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AEA</td>
<td>44.72%</td>
<td>42.16%</td>
<td>42.81%</td>
<td>34.48%</td>
<td>32.31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATE</td>
<td>43.00%</td>
<td>42.94%</td>
<td>43.18%</td>
<td>35.11%</td>
<td>36.39%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Data Source: AYP Assessment File

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DISTRICT</td>
<td>56.52%</td>
<td>66.66%</td>
<td>85.71%</td>
<td>73.17%</td>
<td>71.79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AEA</td>
<td>58.25%</td>
<td>58.91%</td>
<td>60.45%</td>
<td>56.28%</td>
<td>56.81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATE</td>
<td>56.94%</td>
<td>59.05%</td>
<td>60.04%</td>
<td>54.25%</td>
<td>55.72%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 20: Percent of Students in Grade 3 Proficient in Math
Data Source: AYP Assessment File
Definitions: Student achievement data in this report is based on attending district and includes students taking an Iowa Assessment or Iowa Alternate Assessment. Proficiency in Reading, Math, and Science on the ITBS/ITED through 2010-2011 is defined as at or above the 41st percentile. In 2011-12, the proficiency definition was changed to a minimum National Standard Score that varies by subject, grade level, and when the student is assessed.

![Graph showing percent of students in Grade 3 proficient in Math from 2008-2009 to 2012-2013.](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Grade 03, DISTRICT</th>
<th>Grade 03, AEA</th>
<th>Grade 03, STATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008-2009</td>
<td>82.61%</td>
<td>74.90%</td>
<td>76.14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-2010</td>
<td>81.11%</td>
<td>76.15%</td>
<td>76.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-2011</td>
<td>81.13%</td>
<td>78.02%</td>
<td>77.71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-2012</td>
<td>84.78%</td>
<td>78.16%</td>
<td>78.48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-2013</td>
<td>80.46%</td>
<td>76.17%</td>
<td>77.02%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 21: Percent of Students in Grade 4 Proficient in Math
Data Source: AYP Assessment File
Definitions: Student achievement data in this report is based on attending district and includes students taking an Iowa Assessment or Iowa Alternate Assessment. Proficiency in Reading, Math, and Science on the ITBS/ITED through 2010-2011 is defined as at or above the 41st percentile. In 2011-12, the proficiency definition was changed to a minimum National Standard Score that varies by subject, grade level, and when the student is assessed.

![Graph showing percent of students in Grade 4 proficient in Math from 2008-2009 to 2012-2013.](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Grade 04, DISTRICT</th>
<th>Grade 04, AEA</th>
<th>Grade 04, STATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008-2009</td>
<td>92.71%</td>
<td>80.15%</td>
<td>80.31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-2010</td>
<td>84.21%</td>
<td>79.57%</td>
<td>79.16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-2011</td>
<td>81.52%</td>
<td>81.53%</td>
<td>81.32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-2012</td>
<td>78.10%</td>
<td>78.63%</td>
<td>77.21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-2013</td>
<td>87.23%</td>
<td>79.16%</td>
<td>78.02%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 22: Percent of Students in Grade 5 Proficient in Math

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

Figure 23: Percent of Students in Grade 6 Proficient in Math

Data Source: AYP Assessment File
Definitions: Student achievement data in this report is based on attending district and includes students taking an Iowa Assessment or Iowa Alternate Assessment. Proficiency in Reading, Math, and Science on the ITBS/ITED through 2010-2011 is defined as at or above the 41st percentile. In 2011-12, the proficiency definition was changed to a minimum National Standard Score that varies by subject, grade level, and when the student is assessed.
Figure 24: Percent of Students in Grade 7 Proficient in Math
Data Source: AYP Assessment File
Definitions: Student achievement data in this report is based on attending district and includes students taking an Iowa Assessment or Iowa Alternate Assessment. Proficiency in Reading, Math, and Science on the ITBS/ITED through 2010-2011 is defined as at or above the 41st percentile. In 2011-12, the proficiency definition was changed to a minimum National Standard Score that varies by subject, grade level, and when the student is assessed.

![Bar Chart for Grade 7 Proficiency in Math](chart.png)

- 2008-2009:
  - District: 84.09%
  - AEA: 81.31%
  - State: 78.36%

- 2009-2010:
  - District: 89.74%
  - AEA: 78.42%
  - State: 76.39%

- 2010-2011:
  - District: 90.74%
  - AEA: 81.15%
  - State: 78.92%

- 2011-2012:
  - District: 87.50%
  - AEA: 81.17%
  - State: 77.77%

- 2012-2013:
  - District: 85.15%
  - AEA: 79.50%
  - State: 77.11%

Figure 25: Percent of Students in Grade 8 Proficient in Math
Data Source: AYP Assessment File
Definitions: Student achievement data in this report is based on attending district and includes students taking an Iowa Assessment or Iowa Alternate Assessment. Proficiency in Reading, Math, and Science on the ITBS/ITED through 2010-2011 is defined as at or above the 41st percentile. In 2011-12, the proficiency definition was changed to a minimum National Standard Score that varies by subject, grade level, and when the student is assessed.

![Bar Chart for Grade 8 Proficiency in Math](chart.png)

- 2008-2009:
  - District: 84.88%
  - AEA: 78.12%
  - State: 75.83%

- 2009-2010:
  - District: 82.02%
  - AEA: 77.97%
  - State: 75.25%

- 2010-2011:
  - District: 84.81%
  - AEA: 79.59%
  - State: 76.45%

- 2011-2012:
  - District: 84.91%
  - AEA: 77.93%
  - State: 73.30%

- 2012-2013:
  - District: 87.04%
  - AEA: 77.12%
  - State: 73.16%
**Figure 26:** Percent of Students in Grade 11 Proficient in Math

Data Source: AYP Assessment File

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

![Graph showing percent of students in Grade 11 proficient in Math from 2008-2009 to 2012-2013.](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Grade 11, DISTRICT</th>
<th>Grade 11, AEA</th>
<th>Grade 11, STATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008-2009</td>
<td>87.36%</td>
<td>82.12%</td>
<td>76.59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-2010</td>
<td>85.44%</td>
<td>80.31%</td>
<td>76.78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-2011</td>
<td>85.23%</td>
<td>80.67%</td>
<td>76.41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-2012</td>
<td>90.63%</td>
<td>85.97%</td>
<td>81.35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-2013</td>
<td>94.51%</td>
<td>85.42%</td>
<td>80.47%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Data Source: AYP Assessment File

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

![Graph showing percent of students proficient in Math by subgroups from 2008-2009 to 2012-2013.](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>All Students</th>
<th>IEP</th>
<th>FRL</th>
<th>ELL</th>
<th>Minority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008-2009</td>
<td>86.58%</td>
<td>39.34%</td>
<td>73.80%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>72.72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-2010</td>
<td>86.01%</td>
<td>46.87%</td>
<td>80.17%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>66.66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-2011</td>
<td>85.28%</td>
<td>42.59%</td>
<td>72.72%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>78.57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-2012</td>
<td>83.42%</td>
<td>30.00%</td>
<td>67.25%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>82.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-2013</td>
<td>85.69%</td>
<td>47.36%</td>
<td>67.28%</td>
<td>75.00%</td>
<td>74.35%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 28: Percent of Students with Disabilities in Grades 3-8, 11 Proficient in Math

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

Figure 29: Percent of Free/Reduced Lunch Students in Grades 3-8, 11 Proficient in Math

Data Source: AYP Assessment File
Definitions: Student achievement data in this report is based on attending district and includes students taking an Iowa Assessment or Iowa Alternate Assessment. Proficiency in Reading, Math, and Science on the ITBS/ITED through 2010-2011 is defined as at or above the 41st percentile. In 2011-12, the proficiency definition was changed to a minimum National Standard Score that varies by subject, grade level, and when the student is assessed. Students’ inclusion in subgroup(s) is as of the date they were assessed.
Figure 30: Percent of English Language Learner Students in Grades 3-8, 11 Proficient in Math

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

Figure 31: Percent of Minority (Non-White) Students in Grades 3-8, 11 Proficient in Math

Data Source: AYP Assessment File
Definitions: Student achievement data in this report is based on attending district and includes students taking an Iowa Assessment or Iowa Alternate Assessment. Proficiency in Reading, Math, and Science on the ITBS/ITED through 2010-2011 is defined as at or above the 41st percentile. In 2011-12, the proficiency definition was changed to a minimum National Standard Score that varies by subject, grade level, and when the student is assessed. Students’ inclusion in subgroup(s) is as of the date they were assessed.
**Figure 32:** Percent of Students in Grade 3 Proficient in Science

**Data Source:** AYP Assessment File

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>DISTRICT</th>
<th>AEA</th>
<th>STATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008-2009</td>
<td>91.11%</td>
<td>76.77%</td>
<td>80.29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-2010</td>
<td>88.46%</td>
<td>79.52%</td>
<td>81.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-2011</td>
<td>91.30%</td>
<td>81.62%</td>
<td>82.92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-2012</td>
<td>89.66%</td>
<td>71.85%</td>
<td>77.09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-2013</td>
<td>86.81%</td>
<td>82.92%</td>
<td>80.62%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

**Data Source:** AYP Assessment File

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>DISTRICT</th>
<th>AEA</th>
<th>STATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008-2009</td>
<td>No Value</td>
<td>88.30%</td>
<td>83.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-2010</td>
<td>86.81%</td>
<td>86.81%</td>
<td>82.46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-2011</td>
<td>88.57%</td>
<td>79.63%</td>
<td>83.42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-2012</td>
<td>89.36%</td>
<td>81.37%</td>
<td>83.42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-2013</td>
<td>89.36%</td>
<td>81.80%</td>
<td>80.62%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 34: Percent of Students in Grade 5 Proficient in Science
Data Source: AYP Assessment File
Definitions: Student achievement data in this report is based on attending district and includes students taking an Iowa Assessment or Iowa Alternate Assessment. Proficiency in Reading, Math, and Science on the ITBS/ITED through 2010-2011 is defined as at or above the 41st percentile. In 2011-12, the proficiency definition was changed to a minimum National Standard Score that varies by subject, grade level, and when the student is assessed.

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

Data Source: AYP Assessment File

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade 07, DISTRICT</th>
<th>2008-2009</th>
<th>2009-2010</th>
<th>2010-2011</th>
<th>2011-2012</th>
<th>2012-2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Value</td>
<td>97.44%</td>
<td>93.40%</td>
<td>81.25%</td>
<td>82.18%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 37: Percent of Students in Grade 8 Proficient in Science

Data Source: AYP Assessment File

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade 08, DISTRICT</th>
<th>2008-2009</th>
<th>2009-2010</th>
<th>2010-2011</th>
<th>2011-2012</th>
<th>2012-2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Value</td>
<td>88.76%</td>
<td>96.15%</td>
<td>86.79%</td>
<td>87.04%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Figure 38: Percent of Students in Grade 11 Proficient in Science

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

Figure 39: Percent of Students in Grade 3 - 8, 11 Proficient in Science by Subgroups: All students, Minority, FRL, ELL IEP

Data Source: AYP Assessment File
Definitions: Student achievement data in this report is based on attending district and includes students taking an Iowa Assessment or Iowa Alternate Assessment. Proficiency in Reading, Math, and Science on the ITBS/ITED through 2010-2011 is defined as at or above the 41st percentile. In 2011-12, the proficiency definition was changed to a minimum National Standard Score that varies by subject, grade level, and when the student is assessed. Students' inclusion in subgroup(s) is as of the date they were assessed.
SI 2.5 - School Improvement Data Report
Mount Vernon Community School District (4554)

**Report Definition**

**Figure 40:** Percent of Students with Disabilities in Grades 3-8, 11 Proficient in Science

Data Source: AYP Assessment File

Definitions: Student achievement data in this report is based on attending district and includes students taking the alternate assessment. Proficiency in Reading, Math, and Science on the ITBS/ITED in 2008-2009 to 2010-2011 is at or above the 41st percentile. In 2011-12, proficiency is defined by a minimum National Standard Score that varies by subject and grade level. Student demographic data is pulled from the district student information system to create the bar code. Missing data indicates there are fewer than 10 students who tested in the subgroup.

![Bar chart showing percent of students with disabilities proficient in Science from 2008-2009 to 2012-2013](image)

**Figure 41:** Percent of Free/Reduced Lunch Students in Grades 3-8, 11 Proficient in Science

Data Source: AYP Assessment File

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

![Bar chart showing percent of free/reduced lunch students proficient in Science from 2008-2009 to 2012-2013](image)
Figure 42: Percent of English Language Learner Students in Grades 3-8, 11 Proficient in Science
Data Source: AYP Assessment File
Definitions: Student achievement data in this report is based on attending district and includes students taking an Iowa Assessment or Iowa Alternate Assessment. Proficiency in Reading, Math, and Science on the ITBS/ITED through 2010-2011 is defined as at or above the 41st percentile. In 2011-12, the proficiency definition was changed to a minimum National Standard Score that varies by subject, grade level, and when the student is assessed. Students' inclusion in subgroup(s) is as of the date they were assessed.

Figure 43: Percent of Minority (Non-White) Students in Grades 3-8, 11 Proficient in Science
Data Source: AYP Assessment File
Definitions: Student achievement data in this report is based on attending district and includes students taking an Iowa Assessment or Iowa Alternate Assessment. Proficiency in Reading, Math, and Science on the ITBS/ITED through 2010-2011 is defined as at or above the 41st percentile. In 2011-12, the proficiency definition was changed to a minimum National Standard Score that varies by subject, grade level, and when the student is assessed. Students' inclusion in subgroup(s) is as of the date they were assessed.
Figure 44: Percent of Students in Grade 11 College Ready in Reading, Math, Science

Data Source: AYP Assessment File
Definitions: College ready is defined as the Iowa Assessment National Standard Score that predicts to the ACT benchmark for college readiness.

![Chart showing percent of students in Grade 11 college ready for Reading, Math, and Science from 2008-2009 to 2012-2013.]

- **Reading:**
  - 2008-2009: 49.43%
  - 2009-2010: 51.46%
  - 2010-2011: 52.27%
  - 2011-2012: 48.96%
  - 2012-2013: 41.76%

- **Math:**
  - 2008-2009: 44.83%
  - 2009-2010: 46.60%
  - 2010-2011: 50.00%
  - 2011-2012: 54.17%
  - 2012-2013: 49.45%

- **Science:**
  - 2008-2009: No Value
  - 2009-2010: 34.95%
  - 2010-2011: 45.56%
  - 2011-2012: 42.71%
  - 2012-2013: 30.77%

Figure 45: School Year 2012-2013 High School Carnegie Units Offered by District

Data Source: Winter EASIER/SRI
Definitions: The number of Carnegie Units across the district offered for all courses in each accreditation area.

![Chart showing Carnegie Units offered for various subjects in the 2012-2013 school year.]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>ELA</th>
<th>Fine Arts</th>
<th>Foreign Language</th>
<th>Health</th>
<th>Math</th>
<th>PE</th>
<th>Science</th>
<th>Social Studies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>DISTRICT</strong></td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>7.50</td>
<td>5.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>STATE</strong></td>
<td>8.51</td>
<td>7.75</td>
<td>5.59</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>8.63</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>7.50</td>
<td>6.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>REQUIRED</strong></td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 46: By Subgroup, High School Graduation Rate for Class of 2012
Data Source: Spring EASIER/SRI
Definitions: The percentage of students who start 9th grade in year 1 and graduate at the end of year 4.

![Graph showing graduation rates by subgroup from 2009-2010 to 2012-2013.]

- All Students: 89.36%, 93.14%, 88.64%, 96.81%
- IEP: 53.85%, 54.55%, 30.00%, 85.71%
- FRL: 92.31%, 80.00%, 71.43%, 94.74%

Figure 47: Percent of Students Receiving Disciplinary Removals
Data Source: Fall/Spring EASIER/SRI
Definitions: The number of PK-12 students removed during the school year divided by the district's Fall BEDS enrollment.

![Graph showing disciplinary removal rates from 2009-2010 to 2012-2013.]

- In School Susp.: 0.97%, 0.77%, 2.44%, 1.49%
- Out of School Susp.: 0.97%, 0.69%, 0.99%, 0.52%
- Expulsions: 0.00%, 0.00%, 0.00%, 0.07%
Figure 48: Percent of Students with Positive Responses to Questions in the Construct

Data Source: Iowa Youth Survey

Definitions: The percent of students who answered the majority of questions in each construct with positive responses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bullying</td>
<td>50.19%</td>
<td>41.86%</td>
<td>62.55%</td>
<td>52.66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Support</td>
<td>40.07%</td>
<td>32.22%</td>
<td>53.49%</td>
<td>61.21%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**REPORT PURPOSE**
The SI 2.5 – School Improvement Data Report allows users to display district-level data on many different topics that are commonly reviewed during school improvement site visits. When available, five years of historical data are displayed in the report.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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