Iowa Teacher Quality Enhancement Grant: Interim Report

November 2007

Submitted to:
Mary Beth Schroeder Fracek
Iowa Department of Education
Grimes State Office Building
Des Moines, Iowa 50319-0146

Melissa Brown-Sims
Cortney Rowland
Kenneth Smith

LEARNING POINT Associates®

1120 East Diehl Road, Suite 200
Naperville, IL 60563-1486
800-356-2735 • 630-649-6500
www.learningpt.org

Copyright © 2007 Learning Point Associates. All rights reserved.

2472_11/07

Contents

Page

Introduction....1

Evaluation Plans and Previous Reports....2

Updates and Findings....5

Research Question 1: To What Extent Has Iowa Strengthened Teaching in the Content Areas for Those Who Seek to Enter the Profession of Teaching?....5

Research Question 2: What Has Iowa Done to Reform Teacher Education Programs to Make Them More Effective Through Rigorous Analysis of Candidates and Program Performance Data?....7

Research Question 3: Through Collaboration, to What Extent Is Iowa Meeting Future Challenges to Help New Teachers Meet the Educational Demands for the 21st Century?....16

Federal Indicators....18

Document Review....19

Document Review Analysis....20

Conclusion and Next Steps....28

Next Steps in the Evaluation Process....28

References....30

Appendixes

Appendix A. Document Review Rubric....31

Appendix B. Interview Protocol for the Assessment Team Grantees....35

Appendix C. Survey Protocol....36

Introduction

The state of Iowa and the Iowa Department of Education recently began the third and final year of implementation on a three-year Teacher Quality Enhancement (TQE) grant sponsored by the U.S. Department of Education. This grant intends to strengthen teacher education through reforms that hold teacher preparation programs accountable, improve prospective teachers' knowledge of academic content, and ensure that teachers are well prepared for the realities of the classroom. Iowa designed its grant specifically to enhance the quality of new teachers entering the profession through Iowa-based colleges and universities.

Learning Point Associates is conducting an external evaluation of grant implementation activities. The evaluation focuses on interventions designed to promote improvements in the quality of new teachers through comprehensive statewide reform activities. At this point, Learning Point Associates submitted a November 2006 Interim Report (Brown-Sims, Rowland, & Sexton, 2006) and a Year 1 Final Report in May 2007 (Brown-Sims, Rowland, Sexton, & Smith, 2007). This November 2007 Interim Report is the third in the evaluation report series and reflects grant implementation activities that have taken place since May 2007.

The report begins by revisiting the overall evaluation plan, some conclusions and recommendations of previous reports, and the specific evaluation plan for this interim report. An extensive section follows, which includes status updates for each of the Iowa TQE teams as well as any recent data collection findings available for those teams, including document reviews. That section is organized by three overarching research questions designed by Learning Point Associates:

- To what extent has Iowa strengthened teaching in the content areas for those who seek to enter the profession of teaching? (The Middle School, Language Arts, and Reading and Writing Teams conduct work in response to this research question.)
- What has Iowa done to reform teacher education programs to make them more effective through rigorous analysis of candidates and program performance data? (The Assessment, Cross-Articulation, and Dispositions Teams conduct work in response to this research question.)
- Through collaboration, to what extent is Iowa meeting future challenges to help new teachers meet the educational demands for the 21st century? (The Collaborative Plus Team [formerly known as Collaboration, Differentiation, and Dispositions (CD2)] conducts work in response to this research question.)

There are a few other efforts in Iowa that contribute to the overall TQE grant goals and objectives but that are not evaluated by Learning Point Associates. The evaluation of the English Language Learner (ELL) Team is conducted by the University of Iowa, and Learning Point Associates works in collaboration with this evaluation team to ensure complementary approaches to the individual evaluations with the intent of jointly presenting feedback and recommendations to the TQE program director. In addition, although the grant implementation team in Iowa has incorporated the work of the state's induction and mentoring program as well as the work of the Iowa Department of Education Student Teaching Evaluation Instrument (IDESTE), these are not included in Learning Point Associates evaluation efforts. The report concludes with a discussion section that incorporates recommendations and then provides next steps in preparation for the annual evaluation report to be delivered in May 2008.

Evaluation Plans and Previous Reports

Overall Evaluation Plan

Learning Point Associates uses a multimethod approach to assess the evaluation questions and the extent to which each team is meeting objectives. Methods include distributing surveys; conducting interviews; monitoring timelines, deliverables, and implementation; and performing document review analysis.

Recommendations From Previous Reports

In its two previous evaluation reports, Learning Point Associates offered a variety of formative evaluation recommendations that are worth revisiting. Two recommendations were included in the 2006 Interim Report, which was based primarily on the TQE teams' development work, background research, and data collection efforts. These included the following (Brown-Sims et al., 2006):

- TQE teams should maintain efforts to meet deadlines, provide updates, and garner feedback from stakeholders.
- Documents developed by the TQE teams should continue to reflect the relevant criteria proposed in the rubric. Team documents up to this point have successfully covered important criteria such as communicating, establishing partnerships, strengthening reading and writing in the content areas, and reforming teacher education programs through analysis of candidates and program performance data. Examples of how team documents could be improved include providing a more specific policy context and supplying more detail as to how respondents' feedback will be reviewed or evaluated.
    - In order to get a more accurate and representative account of the overall quality of documents, TQE teams should plan to include all items (i.e., cover letters, statements of use or purpose, and other materials) that accompany key documents, which are subject to evaluation and review by Learning Point Associates.

For the Year 1 Final Report submitted in May 2007, Learning Point Associates provided four primary formative evaluation recommendations in consideration of the TQE teams' work during the first contract year. These included the following (Brown-Sims et al., 2007):

- It is important for each team to make a concerted effort to promote and facilitate collaborative conversations with other TQE teams when appropriate. Despite the fact that there are more than 30 teacher preparation institutions in Iowa, several individuals and groups are participating in work for more than one team, and available stakeholders will soon become limited. Teams might thoughtfully consider and implement strategies for leveraging one another's work and communicating on behalf of the Iowa TQE grant as a whole.
- Teams should consider developing more explicit short- and long-term goals and performance measures for their work. Relative success of the initiatives will be much more attainable and easier to describe once these have been established.

- Sustainability of this work after the grant ends is paramount to the ongoing improvement of teacher education programs in Iowa. Teams need to craft sustainable development plans to allow their efforts to continue to grow long after the grant funds end. This action planning might include communication plans, responsible person(s) or groups, timelines (including short- and long-term goals), and necessary resources.
- In order to facilitate team meetings as well as convenings for stakeholders, teams should continue thinking about ways to engage and leverage technology in their work. The TQE grant has a technology coordinator who can assist with this planning. Furthermore, details about the TQE grant can be found on the Iowa Department of Education website (www.iowa.gov/educate/index.php?option=com_staticxt&staticfile=default.htm&Itemid=1041).

Reflecting on the recommendations from the 2006 Interim Report, it will be important for the Iowa TQE teams to continue to develop documents that include all of the relevant indicators from the document review rubric (See Appendix A). For example, documents produced as a part of this grant work should detail the purpose, connection to the goals, and policy context and should offer supporting evidence. The sustainability of TQE team efforts even after the contract is complete partly relies on the quality of the supporting documents, resources, and tools that are developed.

The Year 1 Final Report (Brown-Sims et al., 2007) encouraged TQE teams to look for areas of collaboration across teams. There have been some examples of cross-team collaboration, including the Collaborative Plus Team inviting a representative of the Dispositions Team to present at an upcoming workshop. Opportunities to collaborate will continue to arise as teams use this year to roll out some of their work. The Iowa TQE Leadership Team is in a particularly good position to facilitate collaboration of this nature due to the knowledge of work that is taking place across all of the teams. Additionally, the Year 1 Final Report (Brown-Sims et al., 2007) encouraged teams to think about ways to engage and leverage technology in their work. The page on the Iowa Department of Education's website devoted to the work of the TQE grant has been reorganized and updated, so it should be considered among all of the teams as the primary communication vehicle for updates and opportunities available through the grant. During this last contract year, the Learning Point Associates evaluation team will look closely at benchmarks for success and indicators of sustainability. Teams should be in a position to share examples of how their work has met certain goals and objectives as well as cases in which the work will carry on even after the grant funding comes to an end.

Evaluation Plan for This Report

For this interim report, the evaluation team used three primary methods of data collection—interviews, a survey, and document review analysis—in order to examine the various activities of the TQE teams as well as to acquire a variety of data to illustrate the extent to which the teams are reaching their individual objectives and contributing to the overall grant goals. Data for this report were collected during the spring and summer of 2007. In addition to the primary methods of data collection, progress monitoring also was used to assess team activities. Details about data collection methods can be found in the findings section for each team. In the event a team does not have a findings section, the evaluation team did not collect data for that team for this interim

report, or too few data points were collected to reliably analyze and discuss in this report. In these cases, the evaluation team will report that information in the Year 2 Final Report in May 2008. For example, the evaluation team attempted to interview members of the Iowa Board of Educational Examiners (BOEE) about the new middle school and language arts endorsement but was only able to acquire interviews with two board members before finalizing this report. Between January and April 2008, the evaluation team will continue to attempt to interview board members and report on their findings in the Year 2 Final Report in May 2008.

Updates and Findings

As previously mentioned, this interim report represents work that has taken place since May 2007, when Learning Point Associates submitted its Year 1 Final Report (Brown-Sims et al., 2007). The Iowa TQE teams have conducted an enormous amount of work in this time span, including hosting workshops, presenting work to the Iowa BOEE, and awarding more grant funds. Below are status updates for each of the teams as well as findings from some of the data collection efforts conducted in the past six months. These status updates and findings are organized by research question.

Research Question 1: To What Extent Has Iowa Strengthened Teaching in the Content Areas for Those Who Seek to Enter the Profession of Teaching?

The Middle School, Language Arts, and Reading and Writing Teams are doing work that contributes to the first research question.

Middle School Team

Status Update. In an effort to strengthen core content requirements for teachers, the Middle School Team is currently conducting two major initiatives: grantee pilot programs and a new middle school endorsement. Four grantees are working on the first piece of work, the pilot programs. In the spring of 2006, approximately $150,000 was awarded across four school/district-university collaborative teams of teacher education professionals and middle grades educators. These grantees are either developing or have developed research-based models for middle school education or professional development programs to improve teacher education or instruction of practicing teachers. Final reports for grantee work were due in the fall of 2007. Two of the grantees, Iowa State University/Gilbert Community School District and Clarke College/Mazzuchelli Middle School, sent in their final reports in June 2007, and at the time of drafting this interim report, the other two grantee final reports had not yet been received by the Middle School Team. One objective of the use of the grant funds is to be able to demonstrate how models can be replicated with other partnerships, so the Middle School Team has been looking for ways in which the four grantees can share the details of their collaborations but has yet to determine an appropriate meeting time and place.

The Middle School Team's work over the past six months has primarily focused on the new middle school endorsement. The Middle School Team's anticipated impact for this new endorsement includes strengthening the content expertise of middle school teachers. In June 2007, the endorsement was filed under notice with the BOEE, and after a period of public comment, the BOEE met on October 5, 2007, to discuss the comments as well as to make a final determination about the future of the endorsement (State of Iowa Board of Educational Examiners, 2007b, 2007c, 2007d). During final discussions about the new endorsement, one of the BOEE's responsibilities was to review implementation implications for institutions of higher education (IHEs), including potential curriculum changes to align with the new endorsement.

The Middle School Team has received relatively positive reactions from stakeholders about the new middle school endorsement. The Middle School Team reported, through update discussions,

that the timeframe for implementing the endorsement should be relatively short, and universities likely will not need to develop new coursework, as the new endorsement will require only an adaptation of coursework that is already in place at most universities. The Middle School Team did mention, however, that one potential consequence some districts might encounter is that they will lose some of their flexibility in terms of teacher recruitment and assignment. In fact, the Learning Point Associates evaluation team received a copy of the transcript from the public comments made at the Administrative Rules Hearing on August 22, 2007, and the public comments reflect this concern. One individual expressed that the increased number of hours for adding a core content area to a middle school endorsement may make it difficult to find teachers to fill positions, particularly for small schools.

Language Arts Team

Status Update. The Language Arts Team, similar to the Middle School Team, seeks to bolster the core content requirements for secondary teachers. The team is approaching this effort via strengthening requirements for an English/language arts endorsement. In June 2007, the new endorsement requirements were filed under notice with the BOEE, and during the October 5 BOEE meeting, they discussed adopting the new section as a rule (State of Iowa Board of Educational Examiners, 2007a, 2007c, 2007d). In update conversations with the Language Arts Team, team members mentioned that this English/language arts endorsement may become effective in January 2008, as some universities already have the entire curriculum in place to move the endorsement forward. Supporting the notion that this endorsement may move forward quickly is the fact that the transcript from the meeting for public comment shows that no comments were expressed in response to this new endorsement.

Reading and Writing in the Content Areas Team

Status Update. The Reading and Writing Team has three primary strategies to achieve its team goals and objectives: (1) determine the current state practices in teaching reading and writing in Grades 5–12 content areas and gaps in knowledge and practice; (2) provide resource materials for Grades 5–12 teachers, teacher educators, and teacher candidates to use in increasing and improving teaching reading and writing in specific content areas; and (3) provide opportunities for professional development that is grounded in research and based on the Iowa Professional Development Model for teams of IHE content methods instructors and Grades 5–12 teachers in using strategies designed to enhance reading achievement through the content areas. In the past six months, the Reading and Writing Team has focused primarily on the third strategy. The team collaborated with Dr. Nance Wilson, assistant professor in the Department of Teaching and Learning Principles at the University of Central Florida–Daytona Beach, to offer a seminar on the Question Answer Relationship (QAR) reading strategy. The purpose of the seminar was to provide participants with the knowledge and resources to implement QAR reading strategies in their respective situations, whether in the school (inservice teachers) or university (teacher candidates) classroom. The Reading and Writing Team notes, however, that the ultimate goal of offering professional development seminars in QAR is to improve student achievement. Approximately 60 participants attended this one-day session, including college professors and school teams comprised of middle and high school principals and teachers, although the majority of participants were teachers. Participants who attended the first seminar are required to attend

four follow-up professional development sessions that will be held throughout 2007–08 to extend and support the learning from the initial training. Dr. Wilson and the Reading and Writing Team also communicate with seminar participants through an online classroom space called Nicenet. There, participants can post questions and assignments, see tools and resources, and receive updates. In addition, at the first professional development seminar, the team had participants fill out a questionnaire about individual implementation of QAR as well as implementation of QAR in their school, district, or region. According to the team, the questionnaire had an 82% completion rate. It will be important for the Reading and Writing Team as well as Dr. Wilson to review these questionnaires carefully and address participants' concerns and considerations in later seminars to encourage successful implementation.

In addition, the Reading and Writing Team has been trying to encourage Iowa universities to visit area schools that use the QAR reading strategy. This work has yielded only one contact, and that contact is through a Reading and Writing Team member. The original school-university partnership arranged through the Reading and Writing Team is no longer in place.

The university component of the Reading and Writing Team's work remains important, and with the low number of university participants at the professional development seminars as well as minimal relationships arranged through personal contact, the team will need to consider ways to enhance the university aspect of its work.

Research Question 2: What Has Iowa Done to Reform Teacher Education Programs to Make Them More Effective Through Rigorous Analysis of Candidates and Program Performance Data?

The Assessment, Cross Articulation, and Dispositions Teams are primarily addressing work toward this evaluation question.

Assessment Team

Status Update. In the past six months, the Assessment Team has been working primarily on one of their several team goals: developing the capacity of teacher education programs to gather, manage, and analyze performance data to improve teacher education. For example, the team completed its second-round Request for Proposal (RFP) to teacher education programs, disseminated and identified the winners of their third-round RFP, and hosted an assessment summit.

As part of the second round of grants, the Assessment Team awarded $292,192 to 20 IHEs, four community colleges, and 16 four-year institutions. Grantees are allowed to use their funds to initiate or sustain such efforts as helping to provide faculty development and training, developing procedures for ensuring the reliability and validity of assessments, or buying database software or hardware to facilitate data management and reporting. To continue toward its goal of helping all institutions in Iowa "gather, manage, and analyze performance data to improve teacher education," the Assessment Team commenced with a third-round RFP, which had a submission deadline of July 1, 2007. To date, the Assessment Team has awarded funds totaling approximately $93,459 to seven IHEs for the third round. Unfortunately, despite the team's

efforts to garner the participation of more community colleges, only four-year institutions submitted proposals, and all seven who applied were awarded in the third round. To help ensure accountability, all grantees in this new round are required to submit both an interim and final report to the Iowa Department of Education.

On June 1, 2007, the Assessment Team held a two-day summit that provided stakeholders an opportunity to share ideas for improving the assessment of teacher candidates. Assessment system grantees and other individuals responsible for the development of the assessment systems at various Iowa IHEs shared ideas, distributed materials, and researched ways to enhance the assessment of teacher candidates. The summit garnered the participation of 75 individuals representing 27 four-year institutions and seven community colleges. Results from a survey conducted by the Assessment Team at the summit revealed that funds from the grant had significantly helped these stakeholders begin the process of developing and, in some cases, sustaining their assessment systems. The survey also uncovered the need for additional program assessment support from the Assessment Team and revealed the lack of understanding and need for clarity regarding how to conduct assessment at the program level. To provide this assistance, the team leader for the Assessment Team was granted partial leave from his position as professor at a four-year institution to provide consultation to institutions in need. As of August, the team leader has met with at least three institutions to provide technical assistance.

Interview Findings for the Assessment Team. To determine whether the Assessment Team is accomplishing the goal of reforming and improving teacher education programs through rigorous analysis of candidate and program performance data, the evaluation team attempted to conduct interviews with a subset of second- and third-round Assessment Team grantees. Due to a low rate of response to the requests for interviews, the evaluation team was only able to interview two grantees. The interview protocol used with these two grantees can be found in Appendix B. Despite the low number of interviews, the evaluation team decided to share some of the findings as important themes and considerations for the Assessment Team.

Of the two grantees that were interviewed, one applied for and was awarded two rounds of funding; the other was a first-time grantee. Both interviewees highlighted the accomplishments, setbacks, facilitators and challenges, and next steps surrounding the implementation of their respective assessment systems. Table 1 highlights many of these details.

Table 1. Interview Responses Regarding Various Aspects of Assessment Fund Use

Interviewee 1	Interviewee 2
Number of grants: 1	**Number of grants:** 2
How funds will be utilized: Assist in streamlining the multitude of data collected at the student and program level. This will help the education department "identify critical assessment data needed to drive decisions within the program." Additionally, funds will be used to hire adjunct faculty to help provide release time for those implementing the assessment system.	**How funds will be utilized:** Continue training of faculty on the use and implementation of the system, and help reduce the cost to students who will be required to purchase a license to use the electronic portfolio system.
Collaboration with other groups or departments: College assessment committee; information technology (IT) department; advisory committee comprised of local teachers, administrators, and legislators.	**Collaboration with other groups or departments:** Mathematics department, four other colleges of education programs.
Facilitators to implementation: • Availability of grant funds • Meeting with the Iowa TQE Assessment Team leader to get additional support, feedback, and advice • Supportive administration • Attendance at the IACTE Conference September 27–28, 2007	**Facilitators to implementation:** • Availability of grant funds • Attendance at the Assessment Summit on June 1, 2007 • Proposed meeting with the Iowa TQE Assessment Team leader
Barriers to implementation: • Time constraints	**Barriers to implementation:** • Bureaucracy • Unavailability of funds for this new round • Underestimating the time needed to implement the system
Biggest accomplishment to date: Obtaining grant funds and beginning to implement the work.	**Biggest accomplishment to date:** Learning how to properly use the electronic portfolio system more effectively and efficiently.
Next steps/future work: To improve student learning and inform changes within their teacher education program.	**Next steps/future work:** Implementing and integrating the electronic portfolio system within teacher education and mathematics classes.

Both grantees are using the funds to help improve and assess the progress of their teacher education candidates and have made efforts to collaborate with stakeholders within and outside their institutions despite facing such barriers as time constraints and bureaucracy. Both interviewees noted that the support they received—financially and in-person—from the Assessment Team has been critical to their success. On the other hand, one challenge for the grantees has been the underestimation of the amount of time it would take to implement and tackle the learning curve related to developing and understanding assessment systems. Finally, both interviewees noted that they are working diligently toward creating and implementing an

assessment system that will not only sustain after the funds have diminished but also afford them the ability to share details about the quality of their programs.

Cross-Articulation Team

Status Update. The Cross-Articulation Team has been working on a variety of team objectives since the Year 1 Final Report (Brown-Sims et al., 2007) including the following: the development of the Model of Excellence for Iowa Teacher Education Transfers (formerly called the Associates of Arts in Teaching) articulation agreement proposal, the potential survey to address facilitators and barriers faced by education transfer students, a collection of tests and respective cutoff scores from every Iowa institution, and materials to encourage the participation of arts and science faculty members in teacher education at two- and four-year institutions. The Cross-Articulation Team discussed all of these issues at a three-day retreat in June 2007.

Despite some discussion about dropping the strategy related to the Model of Excellence for Iowa Teacher Education Transfer proposal, the work is now continuing as planned. The goal of the Model of Excellence is to raise standards for all teacher education students in Iowa and allow institutions to sign a voluntary agreement to offer the degree.

The team has been working closely with Learning Point Associates to arrange for a data collection effort potentially focusing on the barriers and facilitators that exist for transfer students going from two- to four-year institutions as well as coursework across programs. The target population for this data collection will likely include university staff who assist transfer students. Discussions to finalize this potential work are still underway.

In addition to the Model of Excellence Iowa Teacher Education Transfer proposal and the prospective survey, the team also developed a new format for collecting information about testing requirements (e.g., Praxis) and test cutoff scores from all IHEs. In the past, a member of the Cross-Articulation Team electronically circulated a spreadsheet among IHEs in order to request information about all testing requirements (names of tests and cutoff scores), but the number of IHEs filling out the spreadsheet and returning it to the team was low. In an effort to secure a higher response rate, the form will now be circulated by the Iowa Department of Education with a request for feedback. While completion of the form is still optional, the team is hoping for a higher response rate. Eventually, information regarding university test acceptance will be shared with university advisors who assist transfer students, both for transparency purposes and to ease the transfer process. Additionally, the Cross-Articulation Team and the Iowa Department of Education will keep the university-by-university test cutoff scores data internal to prevent transfer students from “shopping around.”

The team also developed a slide presentation that addresses the involvement of arts and sciences faculty in teacher education at two- and four-year institutions, which was delivered at the Iowa Association of Colleges of Teacher Education (IACTE) conference in September 2007. The presentation highlights the necessary content and general courses for transfer students and was designed as a tool for participants to take back to their respective institutions and initiate discussion on the topic. For those individuals who volunteer to use the slide presentation in a

meeting at their IHE, the Cross-Articulation Team requests that they report back to the team with details about meeting attendance, goals, and outcomes.

Dispositions Team

Status Update. Since the Year 1 Final Report (Brown-Sims et al., 2007) was submitted in May 2007, the Dispositions Team has made considerable progress in terms of achieving their goal of initiating effective techniques for assessing ethical and professional behaviors (dispositions) of teacher education candidates. The team refined and finalized the components of their conceptual framework and assessment tool and began the process of piloting these tools at a small subset of two- and four-year institutions across Iowa.

The conceptual framework was redefined and is now called the "Four Cs Plus Model." It consists of four larger sets of dispositions that can be used in teacher education programs to assess the dispositions of preservice teacher candidates. These four categories—caring, communicative, creative, and critical—include a subset of supporting dispositions on which preservice teacher candidates should be assessed. Two additional features of the framework include contextual and professional dispositions, which make up the "plus" component of the model. The inclusion of the contextual disposition will allow institutions to use this category to emphasize and assess components or qualities unique to their mission and purpose. For example, faith-based institutions may want to include dispositions that other institutions would not include. In contrast, professional dispositions consist of ethical behaviors such as integrity, professionalism, and confidentiality that teachers must exhibit.

The Dispositions Team also designed an assessment tool that can be used to assess preservice student teacher candidates in three different educational settings: introductory courses, field experience, and student teaching. Eventually, the assessment tool should be used to document the progress of student teachers over time.

The Dispositions Team began to pilot the revised conceptual framework and the assessment tool in fall 2007 at six institutions—three state universities and three private colleges. Participating institutions will assess their student teachers on the caring, communicative, creative, and critical dispositions while they are enrolled in an introductory course. To help ensure consistency in implementation across institutions, members of the Dispositions Team who are employees of these participating institutions and heading the pilot program will train their colleagues on the purpose, use, and administration of the assessment tool and conceptual framework. At the end of the semester-long pilot, instructors and student teachers who took part in the pilot will be asked to provide feedback on the utility of the tools. The feedback will be analyzed and provided to the advisory board members for review and next steps.

Results for the Dispositions Team Advisory Board Survey. Between September 18, 2007, and October 2, 2007, the evaluation team at Learning Point Associates conducted an online survey of the Dispositions Team's advisory boards. The team has two advisory boards, one focused on the work around the conceptual framework and one focused on the development of the assessment tool. These individuals provided feedback and guidance to the Dispositions Team over the last two years on several of the team's initiatives. A survey was administered to ascertain members'

experiences and perspectives regarding the development and implementation of the conceptual framework and assessment tool created by the Dispositions Team. The survey consisted of multiple choice, open-ended, and several Likert-scaled questions that asked participants about the following:

- The effectiveness of the conceptual framework and assessment tool in assessing the ethical and professional behaviors of teacher education candidates.
- The level of support and buy-in for use of the tools among two- and four-year institutions.
- The barriers and facilitators to implementing the conceptual framework and assessment tool within teacher education programs.
- The level of difficulty, if any, the team may face in sustaining their work after the completion of the grant.

The complete survey protocol can be found in Appendix C. The 17-item survey was created using Zoomerang, an online survey software package. Using e-mail, the evaluation team sent a link for the survey to approximately 13 individuals. Prior to receiving the link to participate in the survey, however, the chairs of the Dispositions Team notified all participants of the upcoming survey and asked for their cooperation. The survey completion rate was 62 percent ($n = 8$). The remaining 38 percent ($n = 5$) were identified as nonresponders. Two follow-up e-mails were sent in order to remind and encourage participants to complete the survey. At the end of the survey, participants were asked whether they would be willing to participate in a 10-minute phone interview so that the evaluation team could obtain more in-depth feedback on their experiences. The evaluation team plans to follow up with survey participants who are willing to be interviewed as part of another data collection effort for the Year 2 Final Report. These interviews will likely take place in February and March of 2008.

The following section summarizes the findings from the online survey assessing the work and implementation of the Dispositions Team's two key initiatives—the conceptual framework and the assessment tool. Because of the small sample size ($N = 8$), these results are not generalizable and should be considered with caution. Although the individuals who participated in this survey play an integral role as members of the advisory board and represent some of the key constituents that may be impacted by the Dispositions Team's work, they are not intended to provide a representative view of all stakeholders and general viewpoints about the work of the Dispositions Team and its initiatives. Rather, the results should be used to help provide a snapshot of the situation in which the Dispositions Team does its work. Survey respondents represent a wide variety of professionals from different sectors of education. Respondents hold positions varying from regional administrators, superintendents, and adjunct faculty. Furthermore, many respondents had experiences in such arenas as teacher evaluation, professional development, leadership, curriculum, special education, literacy, speech, and school improvement.

To assess the extent to which the conceptual framework and assessment tool are based in research, respondents were asked to agree or disagree with the following two statements: "The conceptual framework is grounded in research" and "The assessment tool is grounded in research." More than 86 percent of respondents stated that they "strongly agreed" that the

conceptual framework is embedded in research. This is in contrast to the 50 percent who believed this was the case for the assessment tool. The remaining 14 percent and 50 percent of respondents, respectively, stated that they "somewhat agreed" with the statement.

When asked to rate the potential effectiveness of the conceptual framework and assessment tool in their ability to initiate effectual techniques for assessing the ethical and professional behaviors of teacher education candidates, over 50 percent of respondents believed the conceptual framework would be "very effective" in comparison to 29 percent who gave this same rating for the assessment tool. None of the respondents deemed either tool to be ineffective. Results are shown in Tables 2 and 3, respectively.

Table 2. Effectiveness of the Conceptual Framework to Assess the Dispositions of Teacher Education Candidates

How effective will the Conceptual Framework be in initiating effective techniques for assessing the ethical and professional behaviors (dispositions) of teacher education candidates?	Percentage	*N*
Very effective	57%	4
Somewhat effective	43%	3
Somewhat ineffective	0%	0
Very ineffective	0%	0

Note. Total *N* is only 7 because one respondent did not answer this question.

Table 3. Effectiveness of the Assessment Tool to Assess the Dispositions of Teacher Education Candidates

How effective will the Assessment Tool be in initiating effective techniques for assessing the ethical and professional behaviors (dispositions) of teacher education candidates?	Percentage	*N*
Very effective	29%	2
Somewhat effective	71%	5
Somewhat ineffective	0%	0
Very ineffective	0%	0

Note. Total *N* is only 7 because one respondent did not answer this question.

Results of this survey also reveal that the majority of respondents are optimistic that there will be support and buy-in among two- and four-year institutions across Iowa for the conceptual framework and the assessment tool. As Table 4 illustrates, 38 percent of respondents "strongly agree" that there will be buy-in and support for these tools, and 50 percent somewhat agree with the notion. Only 12 percent (n = 1) "strongly disagreed."

Table 4. Buy-In and Support of the Conceptual Framework and Assessment Tools Across Two- and Four-Year Institutions

How strongly do you agree or disagree with the following statement: "There will be support and buy-in of the Conceptual Framework and Assessment Tool across two- and four-year institutions in Iowa."	Percentage	*N*
Strongly agree	38%	3
Somewhat agree	50%	4
Somewhat disagree	0%	0
Strongly disagree	12%	1

Although two- and four-year institutions in Iowa are already mandated to assess the dispositions of their teacher education candidates, respondents were asked to rate the extent to which they believed the framework and assessment tool would provide consistency and uniformity to the process. According to Table 5, all of the respondents either "strongly agreed" or "somewhat agreed" that using these two tools would provide consistency across institutions.

Table 5. Providing Consistency and Uniformity Across Two- and Four-Year Institutions

Universities across Iowa already are required to assess dispositions. How strongly do you agree or disagree that the Conceptual Framework and Assessment Tool will provide consistency and uniformity to this process?	Percentage	*N*
Strongly agree	50%	4
Somewhat agree	50%	4
Somewhat disagree	0%	0
Strongly disagree	0%	0

Despite the fact that the majority of survey respondents currently believe that there will be strong support of the Dispositions Team initiatives across the various Iowa institutions, most of the respondents (75 percent) believe that the Dispositions Team may face some difficulty in sustaining the work of the conceptual framework and assessment tool once the grant has ended. Table 6 highlights these findings. Specifically, respondents identified numerous components needed to help ensure sustainability. These elements include continued financial support, use of a common language surrounding the use and purpose of the tools, embedded leadership across the universities to help maintain the change, commitment of faculty personnel and time across institutions, and continued buy-in among two- and four-year institutions.

Table 6. Level of Difficulty in Sustaining the Work of the Conceptual Framework and Assessment Tool

How difficult do you believe it will be for the Dispositions Team to sustain the work of the Conceptual Framework and Assessment Tool once the Iowa TQE grant has ended?	Percentage	*N*
Very difficult	0%	0
Difficult	50%	4
Somewhat difficult	25%	2
Not at all difficult	25%	2

Barriers to Implementing the Conceptual Framework and Assessment Tool. When asked open-ended questions to describe barriers to implementing the conceptual framework and the assessment tool within teacher education programs in Iowa, respondents provided the following information:

- The perceived inability to provide consistent implementation across institutions—both public and private—as well as the apparent difficulty in getting stakeholders such as faculty and teacher education students to understand the importance and purpose of the tools.
- Limited time and personnel at institutions to deliver training on how to use and help enforce the use of the framework and tool.
- Lack of continuous funding.
- Pressure from the federal government to compel the Iowa Department of Education to create and implement more tests.

Facilitators to Implementing the Conceptual Framework and Assessment Tool. On the other hand, respondents shared what might be helpful in implementing the conceptual framework and assessment tool. These suggestions included the following:

- Active participation and support from the various school entities—from the supervising teachers, college advisors, and teacher education students. According to one of the respondents, these stakeholders as well as other parties have the "drive…and eagerness…to see Iowa graduates be…successful."
- The proper implementation of these tools will help ensure teacher preparation program accountability and uniformity as well as ameliorate the vagueness that surrounds the assessment of dispositions.

Summary of Survey Responses. The results of this survey reveal that participants believe that both the conceptual framework and the assessment tool are grounded in research. Moreover, 57 percent and 29 percent of respondents, respectively, also believe that both tools will be "very effective" in assessing the ethical and professional behaviors (i.e., dispositions) of teacher education candidates. In order to assure the successful use and sustainability of the conceptual framework and the assessment tool, respondents think that the Dispositions Team must overcome several barriers. These barriers include insufficient time and personnel at institutions

willing to participate in the implementation process, the possibility of misunderstanding or misinterpreting the purpose or use of the tools, and the potential lack of enforcement at both public and private institutions. In order to surmount these challenges, respondents feel that greater communication from the Dispositions Team as well as active participation among university stakeholders is essential.

Research Question 3: Through Collaboration, to What Extent Is Iowa Meeting Future Challenges to Help New Teachers Meet the Educational Demands for the 21st Century?

The third research question is being addressed primarily through the work of the Collaborative Plus Team as well as through some of the work of the Dispositions Team.

Status Update. The Collaborative Plus Team seeks to provide professional learning opportunities for teacher educators, preservice teachers, and new teachers focused on the knowledge, skills, and dispositions necessary to work with four specific student populations: (1) those who are considered or have the potential to be considered at risk, (2) students with disabilities, (3) gifted and talented students, and (4) ELLs in a collaborative setting. In the past six months, the team has worked on a variety of efforts to achieve this goal.

On June 4, 2007, the team hosted a higher education Collaborative Plus competency writing meeting to discuss and develop detailed instructional competencies for all teachers of the four student populations. The meeting was an opportunity for methods experts from the four subgroups to come together to identify the necessary knowledge, skills, and dispositions for teachers who work with these subgroups. The Collaborative Plus Team has been working to revise and validate the content of the four subgroup competencies. For example, the team presented their work, including the competencies, at the IACTE conference in September 2007. Conference participants were given the opportunity to provide feedback on the competencies as well as on the prospect of their implementation in methods courses throughout the state. The Collaborative Plus Team will incorporate feedback from conference participants to the four sets of instructional competencies. In addition to garnering feedback on the competencies, the IACTE conference also gave the Collaborative Plus Team an opportunity to conduct needs-sensing sessions with teacher educators for a two-day workshop to be held in January 2008. This workshop will serve as a part of the team's goal to develop biannual two- to three-day workshops for teacher educators. The workshop entitled, "Experts, Learning and Sharing" will be a professional development opportunity for teams of higher education experts in methods and content to share ideas and identify the preparation needs of new teachers to meet the varied needs of the four student populations. The results from the need-sensing sessions will be used to help determine workshop topics.

The Collaborative Plus Team has also been working on revisions to the Chapter 79 administrative rules. Each college and university in Iowa that is engaged in teacher preparation must meet the standards outlined in the Iowa Administrative Code, Chapter 79, Standards for Practitioner Preparation Programs (Iowa Administrative Code, 2001). The goal of the revisions to Chapter 79 is to strengthen the practices of teacher preparation to help teachers in the four subgroups: at-risk, ELL, gifted and talented, and students with disabilities. The team provided

recommendations for the revisions to the board on June 6, 2007 (Iowa General Assembly, 2007). The process of revising the administrative rules has included a public hearing on June 26, 2007, as well as a meeting with the BOEE. The Collaborative Plus Team revised the recommended changes with the public feedback, presented the revised recommendations, and received approval from the board. A print copy of the approved changes was shared with the evaluation team, but all online sources for Chapter 79 of the Iowa Administrative Code still list the version enacted in 2001.

Federal Indicators

As a reminder, the work of the Iowa TQE grant includes individual team goals and objectives that must be met as well as several overall program goals outlined in the federal TQE grant legislation. These overall program goals relate to student achievement, raising standards, core academic subjects, and teacher shortages. As stated in previous reports, the Learning Point Associates evaluation will not include student achievement results as a measure of success. Targets for meeting the other program goals include data such as the following:

- The percentage of community college teacher preparation programs establishing an associate of arts in teaching degree.
- The percentage of teacher preparation programs that articulate introductory core education courses between and among two- and four-year institutions.
- The percentage of secondary teachers who are participating in grant-funded models who demonstrate competence in teaching reading, mathematics, and science.
- The percentage of secondary teachers who plan to stay in the teaching profession who will increase the total percentage of teachers in two of Iowa's shortages areas, mathematics and science.

The extent to which the work of the Iowa TQE teams contributes to meeting these benchmarks is not able to be calculated at this time and will be included in later evaluation report(s).

Document Review

The evaluation team reviewed 15 key documents generated and submitted by the Reading and Writing in the Content Areas, Middle-School, Assessment, Cross-Articulation, Dispositions, Collaborative Plus, and Language Arts Teams.

The evaluation team continued to utilize the rubric that was revised for the May 2007 Final Report. A copy of this rubric can be found in Appendix A. The rubric was used to review the following documents:

- Assessment Team: Third-Round RFP for Iowa Community College Performance Assessment System Funds
- Assessment Team: Third-Round RFP for Iowa Four-Year College/University Performance Assessment System Funds
- Assessment Team: Scoring Rubric for Four-Year Colleges/Universities Assessment System Proposals
- Collaborative Plus Team: The Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions Competencies for Teachers of All Students
- Cross-Institutional Articulation Team: Basic Competency Tests for Teacher Education Programs
- Cross-Institutional Articulation Team: Arts and Sciences–Teacher Education: The Essential Role of General Education Curriculum in Teacher Education (PowerPoint)
- Dispositions Team: Conceptual Framework
- Dispositions Team: Assessment Tool
- Dispositions Team: Pilot Instructions
- Language Arts Team: Language Arts Endorsement
- Middle-Level Content Team: Middle Grades Endorsement
- Middle-Level Content Team: Final Report from Gilbert Middle School
- Middle-Level Content Team: Final Report from Clark College
- Reading and Writing in the Content Areas Team: Question Answer Relationships (QAR) Handouts Part 1 (PowerPoint)
- Reading and Writing in the Content Areas Team: Question Answer Relationships (QAR) Handouts Part 2 (PowerPoint)

Criteria in the rubric represent TQE grant goals as well as individual team objectives, both of which the evaluation team expects to see reflected in team documents. Rubric criteria on which documents were evaluated include the following:

- Communication.
- Establishing partnerships.

- Practical and/or feasible implementation.
- Strengthening teaching in the content areas.
- Reform teacher education programs through analysis of candidates and program performance data.
- Raises standards and/or accountability for institutions of higher education, administrators, students, or teachers.
- Professional development.
- Assessment.

Some criteria in the rubric are not relevant for some TQE teams and the teams' respective documents. In this case, criteria were marked as not applicable (N/A) and did not apply to the final review score. To ensure interrater reliability, two members of the evaluation team evaluated each document individually using the rubric and then compared results and worked to obtain consensus on rating scores.

Document Review Analysis

Following are findings from the document review conducted on 15 key documents generated and submitted by all of the TQE teams. Each area was assessed according to the following scoring rubric: 0 = no coverage, 1 = minimal coverage, 2 = extensive coverage (See Appendix A).

Communication

Documents were assessed on five indicators related specifically to communication.

Indicator: The expressed purpose of the document reflects Iowa TQE grant goals: strengthen teaching in the content areas, improve teaching for diverse populations, reform improvement through analysis, and meet future challenges through collaboration.

Rating: Extensive Coverage

- Under this criterion, the documents clearly reflected the Iowa TQE grant goals. Some of the articulated purposes of the documents included "to support assessment of student outcomes for courses and programs leading to transfer to four-year programs and eventual teaching license" or "begin a dialogue about what would assist candidates at your institution in meeting the requirements of increased rigor and meeting national/state standards" or "analysis of implementation data including student performance data to determine gains."

Indicator: Clearly establishes TQE team goals or objectives.

Rating: Extensive Coverage

- Under this criterion, there is notable evidence in several documents that the TQE team goals or objectives are clearly established. For example, the pilot instructions for the Dispositions assessment tool states that this initiative "comprises a framework or model for use in teacher education programs to assess dispositions in preservice candidates" and that the "model reflects two years of work by… [the] Dispositions Team. …"

Indicator: States clearly and precisely the purpose of the document.

Rating: Extensive Coverage

- Under this criterion, the exact purpose of each document varied greatly. For example, the purpose of the Cross-Institutional Articulation PowerPoint was to address the importance of including general education faculty, specifically, arts and science professors, in the discussion of what courses are needed of teacher education students. In contrast, the purpose of the Collaborative Plus competency document is to identify the specific knowledge, skills, and competencies teacher education students must exhibit in order to properly teach all students.

Indicator: Document content and language is directed toward key stakeholders.

Rating: Extensive Coverage

- Under this criterion, the language and content of the various documents were directed at several key stakeholders, such as community colleges and four-year institutions, BOEE members, teachers, administrators, and faculty members.

Indicator: Clear deadlines are articulated.

Rating: Extensive Coverage

- Under this criterion, deadlines for submission of proposals and the implementation of various professional development activities were clearly articulated in the majority of the documents.

Establishing Partnerships

Documents were assessed on three indicators or criteria related specifically to establishing or supporting partnerships.

Indicator: Specifically identifies IHEs, administrators, or other key stakeholders as support mechanisms in achieving team goals or objectives.

Rating: Extensive Coverage

- Under this criterion, several documents identified the important stakeholders that are or will become support mechanisms or partners in achieving team goals. These stakeholders include the community colleges that partner with four-year institutions to provide data on their transferring teacher education students; teachers who work with special education,

gifted, ELL, and at-risk students; BOEE members; arts and science faculty; and administrators.

Indicator: States clearly and precisely the intent, goals, or expectations for the partnership.

Rating: Extensive Coverage

- Under this criterion, some documents, such as the Dispositions Team's pilot instructions, state that the aim of the pilot and assessment tool is to "nurture teacher candidates' growth throughout their preservice preparation….[and] provide the [team] with important information regarding the use and possible revision of the tool."

Indicator: States clearly and precisely whether there are any consequences for breaking the contract, agreement, or partnership.

Rating: No Coverage

- Under this criterion, none of the documents discussed consequences for not following through with partnership expectations.

Practical and Feasible Implementation

Documents were assessed on six indicators or criteria related to practical or feasible implementation.

Indicator: Document provides detailed policy background or context.

Rating: Minimal Coverage

- Under this criterion, only a minimal amount of policy background or context was provided within some of the documents. For example, although one document mentions the use of No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act, PRAXIS II, Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC), and IDESTE standards, no detailed policy background about each was given. Other documents, in contrast, did not articulate a clear policy background or context within the document.

Indicator: Gives detailed description of initiatives/activities.

Rating: Extensive Coverage

- Under this criterion, the descriptions of the initiatives and activities often were found throughout the documents. For example, the Language Arts and Middle Grades endorsement provided stakeholders with detailed descriptions as to how the endorsement should be implemented.

Indicator: Sets clear guidelines as to how and when details of the document will be implemented.

Rating: Extensive Coverage

- Under this criterion, some documents, such as the Assessment Team's RFPs, provided timeframe details mandating that third-round winners submit their interim and final

reports to the Iowa Department of Education on December 15, 2007, and June 15, 2008, respectively.

Indicator: Establishes guidelines for how to use or implement suggested policies, practices, initiatives, or activities.

Rating: Extensive Coverage

- Under this criterion, some documents—such as the Assessment Team's RFPs require that applicants submit an action plan and budget narrative. Additionally, the RFP specifies items and activities for which the award funds can be used: faculty development and training, design or modification of performance tasks, procedures for assuring reliability and validity of assessments, programming support, and database software or hardware to facilitate data management and reporting.

Indicator: There is a focus on sound educational research and practice.

Rating: Minimal Coverage

- Under this criterion, there was a range in the amount of focus on sound educational research and practice. For instance, some documents overlooked and neglected the discussion of what a sound educational system, program, or initiative should consist of; others, such as the Reading and Writing Team's PowerPoints go into great detail as to the components of the QAR learning activity.

Indicator: Has clearly defined plan to utilize respondent feedback results, such as guidelines for reviewing or evaluating work.

Rating: Extensive Coverage

- Under this criterion, several documents, such as the Collaborative Plus competencies, QAR PowerPoints, and the final reports submitted by Clarke College and Gilbert Middle School, articulated precise strategies for the support of new teacher candidates. They included such activities as sending the list of competencies to experts in the field for review and validation and utilization of the feedback to revise the list appropriately.

Strengthening Teaching in the Content Areas

Documents were assessed on two indicators or criteria related specifically to strengthening teaching in the content areas.

Indicator: Clearly defined strategies for building both content knowledge and pedagogical knowledge in mathematics, reading, writing, and science.

Rating: Extensive Coverage

- Under this criterion, some of the documents had clear and wide-ranging strategies for building both content knowledge and pedagogical knowledge in mathematics, reading, writing, and science. Some strategies that were recommended included participating in a professional development workshop and a series of follow-up workshops that address

how to implement the QAR strategy and the continuing discussion among arts and science faculty about the importance of their general education courses for teacher education students.

Indicator: Focus on curriculum alignment with national/state/district standards or performance indicators.

Rating: Minimal Coverage

- Under this criterion, there is minimal discussion within the documents regarding alignment with the national, state, or district standards; however, according to the final report submitted by Gilbert Middle School, they have begun to implement regularly scheduled time for special education teacher and core teachers in Grades 5–6 to come together and discuss such topics as "individual student needs," "use of student data for instructional decisions," and "curriculum implementation."

Reform Teacher Education Programs Through Analysis of Candidates and Program Performance Data

Documents were assessed on four indicators or criteria related specifically to reforming teacher education programs through analysis of candidates and program performance data.

Indicator: Clearly identifies which competencies, practices, courses, policies, or procedures need to be taught, assessed, or monitored.

Rating: Extensive Coverage

- Examples of some of the courses, competencies, and practices that need to be taught, assessed, or monitored for teacher education candidates include coursework for teacher education candidates in literacy, language arts, statistics, geometry, and art. In addition, the Dispositions Team has developed and disseminated a framework that identifies four key behaviors or skills that teacher education students should exhibit and on which they should be assessed: the caring, communicative, creative, and critical dispositions.

Indicator: States specific minimum and/or maximum cutoff or acceptance criteria (e.g., cutoff scores, grade-point average, course credits).

Rating: Extensive Coverage

- The Cross-Articulation PowerPoint, for example, details the criteria that all potential teacher candidates must meet before they are accepted into a teacher education program in Iowa. These criteria include having a minimum 2.5 grade point average (GPA) out of 3.0; earning a grade of C or higher in specific coursework, such as developmental psychology, speech, and mathematics; and passing the Praxis I, C-Base, or CAAP entry exams.

Indicator: Establishes guidelines for reporting data on teacher candidates.

Rating: Minimal Coverage

- Under this criterion, the documents varied in the extent to which they established guidelines for reporting data on teacher candidates. Some documents, such as the Assessment Team's RFP, encourage four-year institutions that enroll large numbers of teacher education transfer students to provide feedback to community colleges on the status and performance of these graduates. In contrast, other documents did not cover or provided little detail as to how teams would be collecting data on teacher candidates as a part of their work.

Indicator: Establishes clear strategies to help in the development of teacher educators.

Rating: Extensive Coverage

- Under this criterion, there was extensive coverage of strategies that will be used to help in the development of teacher educators. These strategies include the participation in the QAR professional development summit and collaboration between an IHE and middle school to improve the preparation of teacher candidates by focusing on their pedagogical and content knowledge with the aim of preparing these individuals to obtain their middle school endorsement.

Raises Standards and/or Accountability for Institutions of Higher Education, Administrators, Students, or Teachers

Documents were assessed on one indicator or criterion related specifically to raising standards or accountability for IHEs, administrators, students, or teachers.

Indicator: Requires clearly defined formative or summative strategies for tracking the effectiveness of work.

Rating: Extensive Coverage

- Under this criterion, some documents, such as the Assessment Team's RFPs, mandate that awardees submit both an interim and final report, whereas other documents, such as the Gilbert Middle School final report, state that teachers must submit implementation logs, team meeting notes, and individual career development plans as evidence of their participation in professional development activities.

Professional Development

Documents were assessed on three indicators or criteria related specifically to establishing or supporting professional development initiatives for student teachers.

Indicator: Components of professional development are clearly aligned with state and national standards.

Rating: Minimal Coverage

- Under this criterion, documents only minimally described whether the various professional development activities they are offering to teacher candidates are aligned with state or national standards. An exception was the assessment tool, which linked

several components of the instrument to the INTASC standards and the professional requirements needed to be exhibited by teacher candidates in order to receive licensure.

Indicator: Learning activities are clearly described and are relevant and rigorous.

Rating: Extensive Coverage

- Under this criterion, some of the documents, such as the QAR PowerPoint, cite examples of relevant and rigorous learning activities. For example, the school teams that worked together at the QAR seminar are required to administer Part 1 of the Stanford Diagnostic Reading Test to their students and analyze the test results prior to their mandated attendance at the follow-up QAR workshops. This test will help teachers assess their students' reading comprehension, vocabulary, and ability to scan for information.

Indicator: Establishes guidelines or strategies for ensuring that professional development translates into effective classroom strategies.

Rating: Extensive Coverage

- Under this criterion, several documents, such as the final report submitted on behalf of Gilbert Middle School and Clarke College, establish clear strategies for ensuring that professional development translates into effective classroom strategies. For example, the teachers at Gilbert Middle School participate in a monthly professional development workshop that focuses on a variety of topics such as collaboration, coteaching, and effective teaming; differentiated instruction; and use of student achievement data to make instructional decisions.

Assessment

Documents were assessed on three indicators or criteria related specifically to assessing and tracking the effectiveness of the various initiatives or programs.

Indicator: Clearly defined strategies to evaluate and monitor the effectiveness of teacher education programs.

Rating: Minimal Coverage

- Under this criterion, some documents do not state how their data will be mapped back to measure the effectiveness of teacher education programs or whether the data will be used to evaluate or monitor the success of the teacher education programs. Two documents, the assessment RFPs, require applicants to submit statements of assurances.

Indicator: Utilizes various tools (i.e., assessments, rubrics) to monitor the success of policies, programs, or initiatives.

Rating: Minimal Coverage

- Under this criterion, some of the documents required applicants to submit an interim and final report detailing the progress of their work before any additional funds would be dispersed. Unfortunately, the majority of the documents did not mention or require

stakeholders to utilize more than one main method for monitoring the success of their policies, programs, or initiatives.

Indicator: Use of multiple assessments for diagnostic and reteaching purpose.

Rating: No Coverage

- Under this criterion, the majority of the documents failed to describe or use multiple methods of assessment for diagnostic and reteaching purposes.

Conclusion and Next Steps

An enormous amount of cumulative effort has been put forth by the Iowa TQE teams in order to meet individual team goals and objectives. This interim report details team efforts that have taken place since the Year 1 Final Report was submitted in May 2007. Through interviews, document reviews, a survey, and some progress monitoring, the Learning Point Associates evaluation team continues to assess the extent to which the teams are meeting their goals and objectives particularly as they relate to the three research questions. As a result of the information presented in this report, two ongoing areas for continuous improvement emerge:

- Sustainability is one of the highest priorities for most of the TQE teams. If a team does not yet have a plan for how to sustain the work once the grant funds dissolve, it should focus on developing one over the next year. For example, much of the Assessment Team's work as well as the work of the Assessment Team grantees has focused on specific plans that detail how efforts will continue once the grant funds are no longer available. Additionally, the Dispositions Team might consider adding the results of the survey conducted for this report to its sustainability plans—the team could meet to discuss survey responses pertaining to the facilitators and barriers to implementing and sustaining their efforts over the past two years.
- Implementing new programs or requirements takes time, requires technical assistance, and includes a learning curve. Some data collection efforts indicate that these factors continue to be underestimated at the "practice" level. Each team that implements new work should provide stakeholders with realistic information about implementation factors. For example, in addition to outreach efforts already put forth by the Middle School and Language Arts Teams, they might also consider collaborating with the BOEE to offer (on both the BOEE website and the Iowa Department of Education website) helpful tools and resources for universities, teachers, schools, and districts as they respond to the new endorsements. These tools and resources might include examples of how others are responding (or are planning to respond) to the new endorsements; teacher recruitment and retention strategies for schools and districts, particularly those in rural locales (especially in terms of the middle school endorsement); and frequently asked questions. Furthermore, both the Assessment Team and Learning Point Associates found that assessment grantees need more guidance on how to conduct assessment at the program level, about the time commitment necessary in order implement assessment programs, about who should be involved in the process, and about the kinds of decisions that need to be made every step of the way. The Assessment Team might consider developing a high-level checklist that any university can use as they consider implementing an electronic assessment system.

Next Steps in the Evaluation Process

For the remainder of the school year until the Year 2 Final Report is delivered in May 2008, the Learning Point Associates evaluation team will continue to use a multimethod approach for gathering information about the extent to which the TQE teams are meeting their objectives and how the evaluation questions are being addressed. The Year 2 Final Report will include information on the following data collection efforts:

- Assessment Team: The evaluation team will continue to do extensive interviews with a subset of first-, second-, and third-round Assessment Team awardees.
- Collaborative Plus Team: The evaluation team will review the four subgroup competencies as well as the Iowa Administrative Code Chapter 79 recommendations. The evaluation team will also work closely with the Collaborative Plus Team to plan for data collection around the January workshop.
- Cross-Articulation Team: The evaluation team will continue to work with the Cross-Articulation Team to plan a large-scale survey of transfer students and other university administrators who work with transfer students.
- Dispositions Team: The evaluation team will follow up with survey respondents who agreed to participate in an interview. The team also plans to interview professors and students who participated in the pilot program.
- Language Arts Team: The evaluation team will interview a variety of stakeholders affected by the new language arts endorsement, including more members of the BOEE, teacher candidates, school administrators, and representatives from IHEs.
- Middle School Team: The evaluation team will interview individuals working on the pilot programs as well as a variety of stakeholders affected by the new middle school endorsement, including more members of the BOEE, teacher candidates, school administrators, and representatives from IHEs.
- Reading and Writing Team: The evaluation team plans to conduct an online survey of the professional development seminar series participants. There will be an option for them to participate in an in-depth follow-up phone interview.

References

Brown-Sims, M., Rowland, C., & Sexton, S. (2006). *Iowa teacher quality enhancement grant: Interim report.* Naperville, IL: Learning Point Associates.\

Brown-Sims, M., Rowland, C., Sexton, S., & Smith, K. (2007). *Iowa teacher quality enhancement grant: Year 1 final report.* Naperville, IL: Learning Point Associates. http://www.iowa.gov/educate/content/view/1046/1163/

Iowa Administrative Code, Education Department, Chapter 79: Standards for Practitioner and Administrator Preparation Programs, 2001.

Iowa General Assembly. (2007, June 6). *Iowa Administrative Bulletin, 29*(25), 1537–1668. Retrieved November 19, 2007, from http://www.legis.state.ia.us/Rules/Current/Bulletin/IAB070606.pdf

State of Iowa Board of Education Examiners. (2007a). *ARC 6102B: Educational Examiners Board [282]: Notice of intended action.* Retrieved November 19, 2007, from http://www.boee.iowa.gov/newrules/not_rl163.pdf

State of Iowa Board of Education Examiners. (2007b). *ARC 6103B: Educational Examiners Board [282]: Notice of intended action.* Retrieved November 19, 2007, from http://www.boee.iowa.gov/newrules/not_rl162.pdf

State of Iowa Board of Education Examiners. (2007c, June 22). *Minutes.* Retrieved November 19, 2007, from http://www.boee.iowa.gov/oldmins/Jun_07.pdf

State of Iowa Board of Educational Examiners. (2007d, October 5). *Minutes*. Retrieved November 19, 2007, from http://www.boee.iowa.gov/oldmins/Oct_07.pdf

Appendix A. Document Review Rubric

Scoring Rubric

—2— **Extensive Coverage** • Information is clearly articulated, apparent, and easily located within the document. • Information provided within the document sufficiently addresses the targeted indicator under this thematic area.
—1— **Minimal Coverage** • Information is not directly apparent within the document. • Information inadequately addresses the targeted indicator under this thematic area.
—0— **No Coverage** • There appears to be no coverage of required information in the document that addresses the targeted indicator under this thematic area.

Communication

Indicator	Rating	Document Number(s)	Page Number(s)	Notes
The expressed purpose of the document reflects Iowa Teacher Quality Enhancement grant goal(s): • Strengthen teaching in the content areas. • Improve teaching for diverse populations. • Reform improvement through analysis. • Meet future challenges through collaboration.				
Clearly establishes TQE team goals or objectives.				
States clearly and precisely the purpose of the document.				
Document content and language is directed toward key stakeholders.				
Clear deadlines are articulated.				
OVERALL RATING (Sum of Item 1 through Item 5) (Range 0–10):				

Establishing Partnerships

Indicator	Rating	Document Number(s)	Page Number(s)	Notes
Specifically identifies IHEs, administrators, or other key stakeholders as support mechanisms in achieving team goals or objectives.				
States clearly and precisely the intent, goals, or expectations for the partnership.				
States clearly and precisely if there are any consequences for breaking the contract, agreement, or partnership.				
OVERALL RATING (Sum of Item 1 through Item 3) (Range 0–6):				

Practical/Feasible Implementation

Indicator	Rating	Document Number(s)	Page Number(s)	Notes
Document provides detailed policy background or context.				
Gives detailed description of initiatives/activities.				
Sets clear guidelines as to how and when details of the document will be implemented (funding, reporting—e.g., RFP).				
Establishes guidelines for how to use or implement suggested policies, practices, initiatives, or activities (implementing product—e.g., IDESTE).				
There is a focus on sound educational research and practice.				
Has clearly defined plan to utilize respondent feedback results, such as guidelines for reviewing or evaluating work.				
OVERALL RATING (Sum of Item 1 through Item 6) (Range 0–12):				

Strengthen Teaching in the Content Areas

Indicator	Rating	Document Number(s)	Page Number(s)	Notes
Clearly defined strategies for building both content knowledge and pedagogical knowledge in mathematics, reading, writing, and science.				
Focus on curriculum alignment with national/state/district standards or performance indicators.				
OVERALL RATING (Sum of Item 1 through Item 2) (Range 0–4):				

Reform Teacher Education Programs Through Analysis of Candidates and Program Performance Data

Indicator	Rating	Document Number(s)	Page Number(s)	Notes
Clearly identifies which competencies, practices, courses, policies, or procedures need to be taught, assessed, or monitored.				
States specific minimum and/or maximum cutoff or acceptance criteria (i.e., cutoff scores; GPA, course credits).				
Establishes guidelines for reporting data on teacher candidates.				
Establishes clear strategies to help in the development of teacher educators.				
OVERALL RATING (Sum of Item 1 through Item 4) (Range 0-8):				

Raises Standards and/or Accountability for IHEs, Administrators, Students, or Teachers

Indicator	Rating	Document Number(s)	Page Number(s)	Notes
Requires clearly defined formative or summative strategies for tracking the effectiveness of work.				
OVERALL RATING (Sum of Item 1) (Range 0–2):				

Professional Development

Indicator	Rating	Document Number(s)	Page Number(s)	Notes
Components of professional development are clearly aligned with state and national standards.				
Learning activities are clearly described and are relevant and rigorous.				
Establishes guidelines or strategies for ensuring that professional development translates into effective classroom strategies.				
OVERALL RATING (Sum of Item 1 through Item 3) (Range 0–6):				

Assessment

Indicator	Rating	Document Number(s)	Page Number(s)	Notes
Clearly defined strategies to evaluate and monitor the effectiveness of teacher education programs.				
Utilizes various tools (assessments, rubrics) to monitor the success of policies, programs, or initiatives.				
Use of multiple assessments for diagnostic and reteaching purposes.				
OVERALL RATING (Sum of Item 1 through Item 3) (Range 0–6):				

Appendix B. Interview Protocol for the Assessment Team Grantees

1. Please tell me your current title and position. How long have you been in your role?
2. Is your institution a community college, regent university, or four-year institution?
3. Has your institution applied for and won additional funding in response to submitting a proposal to more than one Assessment System RFP? If yes, how many times has your institution been awarded funds, and how have these additional funds been used to help supplement your current assessment system?
4. What has been your role in terms of implementing the current performance assessment systems at your institution?
5. Is your institution collaborating with an outside institution or another department within your school as part of this work? If yes, with whom and what is their role?
6. Can you describe the type of performance assessment system that your school is trying to implement or improve? Who is its intended audience, and how do you expect this new assessment system will help them?
7. How have the grant funds affected the implementation of your electronic data collection and management systems?
8. Is your electronic data collection and management system completely implemented and working? If yes, how are you measuring this success? If no, why not?
9. Please explain any challenges or setbacks you have encountered since you were awarded these funds.
10. Are there examples of factors that have facilitated your work since you started working on this initiative?
11. In your opinion, what were the greatest accomplishments made in 2007 in terms of this work?
12. Did your institution complete and submit an interim report to the Assessment Team? What about a final report to the Assessment Team?
13. In your opinion, do you believe the Assessment Team is providing adequate support of your initiative? If yes, how? Provide examples. If no, why not?
14. For this upcoming 2007–08 year and keeping in mind this work, please identify at least one or two goals your institution hopes to accomplish.
15. Is there anything else that you can tell us that will help us understand in more depth the changes and improvements made to implement or sustain your data collection and management system?

Appendix C. Survey Protocol

1. **What is your current job title or position?** (*open-ended)*
2. **What is your area of expertise?** (*open-ended)*
3. **For which subgroup of the Dispositions Team do you actively provide feedback?**
    a. Dispositions East Team
    b. Dispositions West Team
    c. Both teams
    d. Neither team
4. **On which Dispositions Team initiative have you provided feedback or advice?**
    a. Conceptual framework
    b. Assessment tool
    c. Both
    d. Neither
5. **How strongly do you agree or disagree with the following statement: "The Conceptual Framework is grounded in research"?**
    a. Strongly agree
    b. Somewhat agree
    c. Somewhat disagree
    d. Strongly disagree
6. **How strongly do you agree or disagree with the following statement: "The Assessment Tool is grounded in research"?**
    a. Strongly agree
    b. Somewhat agree
    c. Somewhat disagree
    d. Strongly disagree

7. **In addition to research and the knowledge and experience of Advisory Board Members, what other resources did you access to inform the development of the Conceptual Framework and Assessment Tool?** (*Select all that apply).*
    a. Board of Educational Examiners
    b. Former and current administrators
    c. K–12 administrators
    d. Outside consultants
    e. INTASC Standards
    f. Teacher preparation students
    g. Iowa Department of Education
    h. None of the above
    i. Other. Please specify:

8. **How effective will the Conceptual Framework be in initiating effective techniques for assessing the ethical and professional behaviors (dispositions) of teacher education candidates?**
    a. Very effective
    b. Somewhat effective
    c. Somewhat ineffective
    d. Very ineffective

9. **How effective will the Assessment Tool be in initiating effective techniques for assessing the ethical and professional behaviors (dispositions) of teacher education candidates?**
    a. Very effective
    b. Somewhat effective
    c. Somewhat ineffective
    d. Very ineffective

10. **How strongly do you agree or disagree with the following statement: "There will be support and buy-in of the Conceptual Framework and Assessment Tool across two- and four-year institutions in Iowa"?**
    a. Strongly agree
    b. Somewhat agree
    c. Somewhat disagree
    d. Strongly disagree

11. Universities across Iowa already are required to assess dispositions. How strongly do you agree or disagree that the Conceptual Framework and Assessment Tool will provide consistency and uniformity to this process?

a. Strongly agree

b. Somewhat agree

c. Somewhat disagree

d. Strongly disagree

12. How difficult do you believe it will be for the Dispositions Team to sustain the work of the Conceptual Framework and Assessment Tool once the Iowa TQE grant has ended?

a. Very difficult

b. Difficult

c. Somewhat difficult

d. Not at all difficult

13. Why or Why Not? (*Open-ended)*

14. In your opinion, what are the top three barriers that exist to implementing the Conceptual Framework or Assessment Tool within teacher education programs in Iowa? (*Open-ended)*

a. Barrier 1:

b. Barrier 2:

c. Barrier 3:

15. In your opinion, what are the top three facilitators for implementing the Conceptual Framework or Assessment Tool within teacher education programs in Iowa? (*Open-ended)*

a. Facilitator 1:

b. Facilitator 2:

c. Facilitator 3:

16. May we contact you to participate in a short 10-minute phone interview?

a. Yes

b. No

17. Any Additional Comments (*Open-ended)*