

Gifted Indicator Work Group Meeting Minutes

May 1, 2014

1:00 – 3:00 p.m.

Work Group Members Present

Tom Ash, Colleen Boyle, Matt Cohen, Ann Sheldon, Wendy Stoica, Chris Woolard

Welcome and Approval of Minutes

Chair Chris Woolard called the meeting to order at 1:00 p.m. Chris asked for a motion to approve the April 2, 2014 minutes. Colleen Boyle motioned, and hearing no objection the minutes were approved.

Discussion on Indicator Framework

What should be done when a district or building does not have enough data for Gifted/Value-Added and therefore does not receive a Gifted/Value-Added grade?

Chair Woolard offered two options for addressing this scenario: 1. The district or building is simply not evaluated on the indicator, or 2. Set a threshold at which there would be an expectation for gifted value added. The group discussed various options and considerations including whether to consider a phase-in period, whether smaller districts would be incentivized to identify more kids, and the fact that the purpose of the report card is accountability, not to incentivize.

Decisions agreed-upon:

- To set an ADM threshold for districts
 - Next week – determine what is the threshold
 - Next week – determine whether the threshold will be phased in
- If a district or building is above the threshold and are not rated on Gifted/Value-Added they get a “not met” the indicator
- If a district is below the threshold and not rated on Gifted/Value-Added and only have one other component, the district would not be rated on the indicator
- If a building is below the threshold and not rated on Gifted/Value-Added and only has one other component, they will be either “met” or “not rated”
- A community school will be treated as a building

Which performance measure(s) should be used?

Chris explained the two options for which performance measure to use are 1. Gifted Performance Index, or 2. Index of difference between Gifted PI and Overall PI (or Non-Gifted PI). Colleen Boyle asked about the inclusion of a third option – the percentage of gifted students at “advanced” on the OAA. Chris cautioned that going that route would work at cross purposes against the formal acceleration rating.

Decisions agreed-upon:

- Gifted performance index
- Recommend that the Board revisit prior to 2016 Report Card once we have data
- Decide on thresholds next week

Should “served as percentage of gifted identified” be included in gifted inputs? Gifted inputs already approved are “identified as percentage of all enrolled” and “served as percentage of all enrolled”. Work group members agreed that “served as percentage of gifted identified” should be included.

Should “screened as percentage of all enrolled” and “formally accelerated as percentage of all enrolled (or gifted identified)” should be included? Both of these will be on the 2014 dashboard; are they helpful in determining the indicator in light of the fact that identification, service, and service to identified are already approved. Wendy Stoica gave a short presentation on acceleration and EMIS reporting. Colleen and Ann distributed and reviewed handouts. After some discussion, the work group agreed that these two not be included, and to propose that the Board revisit this for the 2016 report card.

Is the lowest grade band more appropriately K-2 or K-3?

It was previously decided to disaggregate into grade bands for districts, but not for buildings. Chris asked for a decision on the lowest grade band. The group agreed that K-3 should be the lowest grade band.

Should we use the proposed weighting system that rewards service more than identification and lower grades more than higher grades? Do the ranges and relative weights need adjusted?

Chris reviewed a framework showing a proposed weighting system and scoring structure, and Ann and Colleen offered an alternative inputs/scoring system that was reviewed. After much discussion, the group agreed to remove “service to enrolled” and add pieces related to Gifted type, student minority and economically disadvantaged. Additionally, “Identified as total enrollment” should be divided between “super cognitive” and “visual performing”. Matt and his staff will return on May 7th with data based on these decisions.

Chair Woolard adjourned the meeting at 3:04 p.m.

Next meeting – May 7, 2014

Materials reviewed during the April 2, 2014 Gifted Indicator Work Group meeting are available at <http://education.ohio.gov/State-Board/Committees/State-Board-Accountability-Committee-Meetings/Gifted-Indicator-Workgroup>