

OAGC Concerns Regarding the New ODE List of Approved Assessments for Gifted Identification

May 16, 2019

Issues with the process:

- Time consuming – RFQ promised in “early fall” (per ODE’s FAQ page), not released until beginning of March, results due March 29, not released until April 26
- No one with expertise in gifted assessments on committee reviewing assessments (despite requests from OAGC and 3 verbal/1 written request from ODE’s very own gifted advisory committee to do so)
- Uses same review process/application for all types of assessments despite different purposes, formats, and technical specification
- Requires vendors who already have been approved by an even larger, more experienced team to reapply

Issues with the outcomes:

- Fewer assessments than before (used to have 55, now only 24 – this is contrary to the request of State Superintendent’s Advisory Committee)
- Very few assessments for use with special populations (students with disabilities or English learners who may also be gifted)
- Inconsistent application of technical criteria (one assessment with outdated norms approved, another declined; one assessment allowed to remain on list without validity evidence; reliability standard inconsistently applied to various tests)
- Absolutely no instruments available to fulfill legal requirement for identification in visual/performing arts (only rubrics, no checklists – both required by law)
- List hard to read and hard to locate information needed to properly use instruments for gifted identification (new coordinators reporting confused by new list)
- No clear FAQs about use of tests with unique properties (likely due to lack of expertise among staff, removed former FAQ list)
- Late delivery created financial hardship for some districts not prepared to replace test inventories with instruments removed from approval list (too late for purchase this year, likely too late to include in budget for next year)

Issues reported by vendors:

- Did not hear about the RFQ from ODE and was unaware until heard about it from a practitioner
- Turnaround time was too short to submit RFQ for one or more assessments (released March ½, intent due on March 6, full RFQ due March 15)
- RFQ was too cumbersome to complete in given time frame
- RFQ is too cumbersome and sales in the state too small to devote the amount of manpower needed to complete the RFQ
- Unable to figure out how to submit multiple assessments in the RFQ

Request:

- Reinstate entire 2017-2018 list – not as a grandfathered situation but permanent reinstatement (would address increasing choice, instruments for arts, and instruments for special populations)
 - Can remove tests as requested by vendor due to revision, discontinuation, or outdated norms
- Revise process to make gifted assessment review separate, specific to needs of gifted, and including individuals with expertise in gifted assessment

- Revise process to not require vendors to reapply unless norms are becoming outdated or form/assessment is revised
- Remove assessments that have not met technical specifications until evidence of such is provided (i-Ready validity for gifted, Inview updated norms)