

Gifted Indicator Work Group Meeting

March 18, 2014

1:00 – 3:00 p.m.

Work Group Members Present

Tom Ash, Colleen Boyle, Matt Cohen, Jamie Meade, Ann Sheldon, Wendy Stoica, Michael Tefs, Chris Woolard

Welcome and Introductions

Chair Chris Woolard called the meeting to order at 1:00 p.m. Chris welcomed everyone and thanked work group members for their time and effort toward this important work. Group members introduced themselves and explained which entity they represent.

Work Group Logistics

Chris outlined a tentative timeline for work group meetings, explaining that the goal for the March 26th meeting is to continue discussions and begin to put together a recommendation for the framework. At the April 2nd meeting, the work group will continue the discussion on framework and review the dashboard as it currently stands. The May 1st meeting is tentatively scheduled at this point, but will be held if needed. On May 7th the group will finalize all recommendations in preparation for Chris to present to the Accountability Committee during the May Board meeting. While unanimous consent would be ideal, this group will vote on decisions if necessary. Lastly, Chris asked that group messages, data requests and all other communications having to do with the work group come through his office.

Priorities and Goals

Work group members were asked to speak briefly about their priorities for the Gifted Indicator. Responses included:

- The work group must think in terms of what product needs to come from this work, bearing in mind that the State Board needs a yes/no indicator.
- Our recommendations must fit into the larger structure of the report card and in particular must fit into the Percentage of Indicators Met.
- Gifted students are among most underserved, due to the fact that they are among the most underfunded groups. For that and many other reasons, this group faces a unique and important challenge.
- School faculty and communities are faced daily with the emotional side of this issue. Accountability affects districts, communities and teachers. We must provide time for field to get good at this.
- We need to focus on accountability measures that can be used by people to get better, and we must focus on how to use the measurement to make a difference.
- As we are trying to move toward results, we must be mindful to look across diverse learners.
- This work is about not only accountability, but also how can we improve good practices, utility and application.
- This work is exciting because no state has ever done this before. We may help alleviate the push/pull between what schools want and what parents want, and perhaps even begin to clean up reporting data.
- The outcome of this work group must fit with what we have in place with the report card; it can't feel like an add-on.

Background

In 2011, ORC 3302.02 required the State Board of Education to establish a gifted indicator reflecting the level of services provided to students identified as gifted and the performance of students identified as gifted. The SBOE then created a resolution recommending these components:

- Percentage of students identified as gifted
- Percentage of IDENTIFIED students receiving gifted services
- Percentage of ALL students receiving gifted services
- Percentage of gifted students scoring at each achievement level on state tests

The SBOE resolution also specified the following timeline:

- Indicator to be reported on 2013 and 2014 Report Cards
- A dashboard to be developed
- The indicator to be reviewed and revised by the State Board no later than December 31, 2013 to include measures of student growth.
- The indicator to be included in district and school ratings on 2015 Report Card

House Bill 59 included a requirement for rankings. These rankings were released for the 2013 report card.

They include the following components:

- Percentage of students identified as gifted (All categories)
- Percentage of IDENTIFIED students receiving gifted services (All categories)
- Percentage of ALL students receiving gifted services (All categories)
- Percentage of gifted students scoring at each achievement level on state tests (subject specific and superior cognitive)
- Value-Added of Gifted Students (Math, Reading, superior cognitive)

In late 2012, HB 555 outlined the requirements of the new A-F Report Card. This included a separate Value-Added component for students identified as Gifted.

- Board decisions and subsequent rules specified that this would include the following gifted students
 - Math Value-Added: Math and superior cognitive
 - Reading Value-Added: Reading and superior cognitive
- HB 555 updated 3302.02 to specify that the gifted indicator shall include the performance of students identified as gifted on state assessments *and value-added growth measure disaggregated for students identified as gifted.*

Information Provided to the Board for Previous Discussions

Chris reviewed a PowerPoint presentation with the group. The goals of the Gifted Indicator framework are to:

- Simplify—Make the indicator easy to compute and the system difficult to manipulate
- Accommodate additional measures of results as available in the future
- Differentiate grade level inputs
- Make incentives explicit
- Assure fairness for all types of districts regardless of demographics

Matt Cohen reviewed for the group the requirements of an indicator, then discussed the Input Measure – a point system that includes both Gifted identification and Gifted service. The incentives of the Input Measure are structured to reward 1) Service more than identification, and 2) K-3 more than higher grades. In order to meet the Gifted Indicator, schools must attain a minimum number of points. The goal of the work group is not to set that number; the Board will provide guidance in setting the minimum threshold. Matt and Chris reviewed issues and questions around Gifted Value-Added grades and the Gifted performance index. Lively discussion followed the PowerPoint presentation.

Next Steps and Adjournment

Work group members requested several data sets for review at the next meeting, including economically disadvantaged, advanced level gifted data, a breakout of superior cognitive vs subject area demographics data, percent of gifted kids who achieved the state level, focused acceleration and more.

Chair Woolard adjourned the meeting at 2:54 p.m.

Next meeting dates: March 26, April 2, May 1, May 7 – all meetings are scheduled for 1:00 to 3:00 p.m.

Materials reviewed during the March 18, 2014 Gifted Indicator Work Group meeting are available at <http://education.ohio.gov/State-Board/Committees/State-Board-Accountability-Committee-Meetings/Gifted-Indicator-Workgroup>