

# What is Gifted High Quality Professional Development?

THE OAGC'S POSITION  
(updated February 2017)



## CONTENTS

Executive Summary	3
Position Overview	5
The Importance of Training	6
High-Quality Professional Development for Gifted Educators	8
Current Ohio Issues	10
205 Service Codes	10
Lack of Clarity and Oversight on Gifted HQPD	12
The OAGC's Position	13
References	15
Appendix A: Teaching the Gifted Certificate Proposal	17
Appendix B: Professional Development Plan for General Education Teachers Providing Gifted Services in the Regular Classroom: Learning Outcomes	20
Appendix C: Professional Development Plan for General Education Teachers Providing Gifted Services in the Regular Classroom: Assessments and Performance Levels	25



## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

On the basis of both national research and evidence from Ohio, the Ohio Association for Gifted Children (OAGC) holds the position that teachers responsible for providing gifted services in a general education classroom should have at least a minimal level of high-quality professional development (HQPD) specific to the needs of gifted students. Research and best practices indicate that classroom teachers who do not have the support of a trained gifted education professional should either hold a gifted intervention license or possess at least the minimum levels of high-quality professional development (HQPD) based on the Gifted Education Teacher Preparation Standards developed by the National Association for Gifted Children (NAGC)/Council for Exceptional Children and the Association for the Gifted (CEC-TAG) and the Council for Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP) (2013, NAGC /CEC-TAG).

According to ODE data, the vast majority of gifted students in Ohio are taught in a general education classroom by a teacher who has not had any specific training in nature or needs and appropriate instruction of gifted students. This situation often results in instructional practices that are not in the best interest of gifted children.

Because inadequately trained and unsupported personnel are insufficient to provide services to any student with specific learning needs, the OAGC proposes that general education teachers providing services under the general classroom (205047 and 205062 EMIS service codes) should earn a certificate from an institute of higher education that documents such specific training as a prerequisite to providing services to gifted students in a regular classroom. For details, see Appendix A. This certificate should incorporate those elements of the gifted intervention specialist license necessary for classroom instruction including the following elements in sequence:

- A three-credit course on the nature and needs of gifted students offered in an existing gifted endorsement or master's program *or* a three-credit-hour course on the cognitive characteristics and special academic needs of gifted students offered by an institution of higher education with an approved Teaching the Gifted certificate program.
- A three-credit-hour course on curriculum and instruction for gifted students offered by an institution of higher education with an approved gifted endorsement or Teaching the Gifted certificate program.
- A three-credit practicum course supervised by a local gifted coordinator or intervention specialist trained and designated as a practicum supervisor by an institution of higher education with an approved gifted endorsement or Teaching the Gifted certificate program.

Because the Teaching the Gifted certificate program would *not* address more than half the standards for gifted endorsement programs (covering critical skills such as gifted program design and leadership, gifted identification, social and emotional aspects of giftedness, family and community issues, gifted education professional development design and leadership, and long-range academic planning and career exploration), the OAGC recommends that to be designated as a provider of gifted services in the regular classroom, a teacher with the Teaching the Gifted certificate must be supported by a named and fully licensed or endorsed gifted coordinator or gifted intervention specialist.

Only if such a credential were created would the OAGC support the continued use of the 205047 and 205062 gifted service codes. Unless stronger parameters are set with regard to initial teacher preparation, ongoing HQPD, and support and planning from trained gifted professionals, these service options should be removed.

In addition, until standards for an intermediate gifted certificate are established, the OAGC has outlined a position of the minimum level of HQPD for general educators providing gifted services in the classroom. This position is supported by research-based best practices. The specifics of this position can be viewed in Appendix B and Appendix C. The OAGC will not endorse any training, quality or otherwise, that does not meet at least these criteria and discourages the use of the term “high-quality professional development” for anything less.

The OAGC proposes that the revised gifted operating standards should reflect these changes and that they should constitute the criteria for monitoring service compliance in on-site reviews and other mechanisms. The OAGC maintains that only appropriately trained personnel can provide gifted services and that the elements of HQPD described above are essential components of that training.

This document is a product of the Ohio Association for Gifted Children based on the work of an OAGC committee committed to ensuring that teachers providing services to gifted students are properly prepared. This committee was composed of members from higher education, practitioners in school districts and educational service centers, as well as public policy analysts. The OAGC governing board members voted unanimously to accept this document as the position of the governing board in March of 2016.

## POSITION OVERVIEW

On the basis of both national research and evidence from Ohio, the Ohio Association for Gifted Children (OAGC) holds the position that teachers responsible for providing gifted services in a general education classroom should have at least a minimal level of high-quality professional development (HQPD) specific to the needs of gifted students. Research and best practices indicate that classroom teachers who do not have the support of a trained gifted education professional should either hold a gifted intervention license or possess at least the minimum levels of HQPD based on the Gifted Education Teacher Preparation Standards developed by the National Association for Gifted Children (NAGC)/Council for Exceptional Children and the Association for the Gifted (CEC-TAG) and the Council for Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP) (2013, NAGC /CEC-TAG). These standards cover, at a minimum,

1. The nature and needs of gifted students,
2. Curriculum and instructional strategies for teaching gifted students,
3. Guidance and counseling of gifted students,
4. Educating special populations of gifted students, and
5. Theory and development of creativity.

Furthermore, the NAGC and CEC-TAG standards recommend that *all educators* who teach and guide gifted students should be able to

1. Recognize the learning differences, developmental milestones, and cognitive/affective characteristics of gifted and talented students, including those from diverse cultural and linguistic backgrounds, and identify their related academic and social-emotional needs;
2. Design appropriate learning and performance modifications for individuals with gifts and talents that enhance creativity, acceleration, depth, and complexity in academic subject matter and specialized domains; and
3. Select, adapt, and use a repertoire of evidence-based instructional strategies to advance the learning of gifted and talented students.

Nonspecialist teachers working with gifted students must be supported by specialists and gifted service administrators with more advanced training and skills, including effective identification practices, service structures, professional development strategies, and strat-

egies for supporting special populations of gifted students, such as those who are twice exceptional; who are racially, culturally, or linguistically diverse; or who are exceptionally advanced beyond age peers.

Because inadequately trained and unsupported personnel are insufficient to provide services to any student with specific learning needs, the OAGC proposes that general education teachers providing services under the general classroom 205047 and 205062 EMIS service codes should earn a certificate from an institute of higher education that documents such specific training as a prerequisite to providing services to gifted students in a regular classroom (see Appendix A). This certificate should incorporate those elements of the gifted intervention specialist license necessary for classroom instruction. *The OAGC otherwise opposes these service options.* In addition, all service providers for gifted education should be required to have regular HQPD in gifted education (see Appendix B). The OAGC opposes the 205040/206040 guidance-only service code, because guidance should be incorporated into every written education plan and should not be considered a stand-alone service. Finally, there should be discussion about coding for general classroom settings taught by credentialed gifted intervention specialists. Currently, gifted intervention specialists who teach in a general education classroom are coded as 205. The OAGC believes that this code inadequately defines the level of support that those teachers provide to students and misrepresents the level of teacher training. Defining a new code—such as 206, for example—might alleviate this problem.

The OAGC proposes that the revised gifted operating standards should reflect these changes and that they should constitute the criteria for monitoring service compliance in on-site reviews and other mechanisms. The OAGC maintains that only appropriately trained personnel can provide gifted services and that the elements of HQPD described above are essential components of that training. The continued absence of Ohio Department of Education (ODE) oversight makes this change of particular importance.

## THE IMPORTANCE OF TRAINING

In the absence of HQPD for gifted educators, research clearly indicates that gifted students will be poorly served in a regular classroom. Although teachers try to challenge all students, they frequently are unfamiliar with the needs of gifted children and do not know how to serve them in the classroom, whether in teaching academic subjects, in encouraging cognitive complexity, or in supporting social-emotional needs. VanTassel-Baska and Stambaugh (2005) cite research that indicates the rarity of real differentiation for gifted learners in regular classrooms. This research describes several barriers, including the lack of content knowledge, lack of classroom management, attitudes and beliefs about learning, lack of differentiation knowledge, inadequate responses to diverse populations, ineffective location and use of resources, lack of planning time, lack of administrative support, and lack of relevant pedagogy.

Teachers and districts seldom have differentiated curricula or materials to support their gifted learners. For instance, surveys returned by more than 2,000 3rd- and 4th-grade teachers to the National Research Center on the Gifted and Talented at the University of Connecticut indicated that they made only minor curricular changes for gifted learners. Even well-meaning educators often are ill-equipped to meet the needs of gifted children when using differentiated materials without the training required to understand those students. Friedman and Lee (1996) examined three models of in-class differentiation designed for use by general education teachers (Enrichment Triad, Multiple Talent, and Cognitive-Affective Interaction) and found that none had a significant impact on the cognitive complexity of teacher-student interaction. Even so, Azano and colleagues (2011) contend that teacher adherence to a gifted education curriculum depends on attitudes regarding student abilities and that adherence and fidelity of implementation correlate to student outcomes. In this regard, a differentiated curriculum implemented by untrained, unreceptive, or even hostile staff will be ineffective. Lack of training, time, skill, or motivation are the major reasons why in-class differentiation does not work (Hertberg-Davis, 2009).

Research also indicates that implementing so-called gifted models is not effective without specific understanding of gifted children and how to differentiate learning experiences for them. Program evaluations of districts using clustering found that differentiation was not common and that teachers characterized these strategies as only “somewhat effective.” Recommendations included increasing support and providing developed materials (Dolph, 2009). Teno’s work (2000) discusses the pros and cons of clustering. His research demonstrates that a teacher’s desire to be a cluster teacher and having the time to collaborate with the gifted intervention specialist (GIS) are key components to successful cluster-based differentiation.

Unfortunately, research shows that few districts prioritize training to help staff members better understand their gifted populations. VanTassel-Baska (2006) observed in a multidistrict analysis of staff development practices that districts often favor general professional development (PD) over gifted-specific PD, a preference that correlates to lack of program implementation in general education classrooms.

Significant research underscores the importance of adequate training and support to appropriately identify and educate gifted students. Siegle and Powell (2004) found that trained gifted educators were more likely to focus on students’ areas of strength when referring them for gifted education screening, whereas teachers without gifted education training were more likely to focus on students’ deficit areas. This difference may contribute significantly to the disproportionate underrepresentation of students with disabilities, economically disadvantaged students, and students whose first language is not English. Speirs-Neumeister and colleagues (2007) reported that “in order to successfully refer students to undergo the identification procedure for participation in gifted programs, teachers need a solid understanding of characteristics found in gifted children.” They noted that in the absence of training, teachers de-

velop their own concepts of giftedness that are likely to be influenced by stereotypical thinking about race, gender, and family social and economic status.

In a comprehensive research review by the Institute of Education Sciences and the U.S. Department of Education, Yoon and colleagues (2007) examined more than 1,300 studies of general education teachers to determine how teacher professional development affects student academic achievement in mathematics, science, reading, and English language arts. Following the rigorous What Works Clearinghouse procedures, the researchers determined that teachers who received substantial professional development (an average of 49 hours) boosted their students' achievement level by about 21 percentage points above that of the control groups. A minimum of 14 hours of professional development was needed to show any positive effect on student achievement. In the area of mathematics, researchers reported that four studies that averaged an effect size of 0.57, with an improvement index of 22 percentage points, had professional development contact hours ranging from 30 to 83 over a period of four months to one year. Guskey and Yoon (2009) also reported in their research synthesis for Phi Delta Kappa that time for professional development is a crucial factor and that 30 or more contact hours are required to show positive effects.

Hansen and Feldhusen (1994) compared classroom practices of trained (operationally defined as having three to five graduate courses in gifted education) versus untrained teachers working with gifted students. The trained teachers were found to be significantly more likely to make use of instructional practices shown to be effective with gifted students, including increased use of higher-order questioning, incorporation of above-grade-level materials, and encouraging learning activities that require abstract reasoning. The authors also noted significant differences in classroom climate and relationships between gifted students and their teachers. Teachers in the trained group were more tolerant of student engagement in debate and more comfortable with and supportive of students who had knowledge or skills more advanced than their own in specific areas.

## HIGH-QUALITY PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT FOR GIFTED EDUCATORS

Research in the gifted education field indicates that specific levels of training are required in order for teachers to be effective. VanTassel-Baska and colleagues (2008) found positive changes in teacher behaviors and student outcomes after three years of implementation of Integrated Curriculum Model (ICM)/William and Mary Gifted Units. Teachers were immersed in a three-day summer institute as well as a one-day midyear institute for three years in a row. Positive differences in instruction became evident after only two years of the training. The research assumes consistency in staffing and no shifts in assign-



ment. The NAGC *State Policy Guidebook* (2007) cited as exemplary the state of Texas policy requiring a minimum of 30 clock hours of HQPD before assigning gifted students to a teacher's classroom.

The main principles of HQPD state that training is (1) substantial and ongoing, (2) instructionally focused, and (3) role specific. This is true not only for gifted education but for other areas as well. The U.S. Department of Education English Learners Toolkit notes that the core principles for professional development of teachers of English language learners are as follows:

**Principle 1:** Build on a foundation of skills, knowledge, and expertise.

**Principle 2:** Engage participants as learners. Professional development should include rich and varied opportunities that engage educational personnel as learners and offer the opportunity to apply new skills and knowledge.

**Principle 3:** Provide practice, feedback, and follow-up.

**Principle 4:** Measure changes in teacher knowledge and skills manifested by measurable increases in participant knowledge and skills.

**Principle 5:** Measure changes in student performance.

Based on the guidelines from the National Association for Gifted Children and the Council of Exceptional Children (NAGC/CEC-TAG, 2013), the following elements are essential to HQPD for teachers of gifted students:

- Advanced content knowledge in subject area,
- Classroom management skills necessary to support differentiation (e.g., different students doing different things at the same time),
- Understanding of differences in how students learn,
- Specific instructional strategies for differentiation,
- Awareness of diverse learning resources that support students at different levels of development vis-à-vis content standards, and
- Knowledge of how to access leadership support and expert resources. (This assumes, of course, that someone in the district possesses a level of expertise higher than that accessible to nonspecialist teachers).

The OAGC has long held the position that in order to prepare all educators to support the needs of gifted children in the classroom, all classroom teachers should receive preservice training in gifted education. At a minimum, all preservice education programs should provide a three-credit-hour course to address gifted education basics.

## CURRENT OHIO ISSUES

According to ODE data, the vast majority of gifted students in Ohio are taught in a general education classroom by a teacher who has not had any specific training in nature or needs or appropriate instruction of gifted students. This situation often results in instructional practices that are not in the best interest of gifted children. For example, many gifted children, instead of being provided with work sufficient to their needs, are simply given more worksheets of concepts that they mastered long before. Others are used as tutors for struggling students, a practice that is inappropriate on both academic and social-emotional levels. In fact, some beliefs held by general educators regarding gifted students have a negative effect on both their learning and their social and emotional well-being. Although the Ohio Revised Code requires all teacher preparation programs to include some gifted education training for all preservice teachers, very few, if any, actually comply with the law.

The new gifted performance indicator (GPI) has initiated some positive behaviors in school districts, most notably increased awareness of gifted identification and the need to document services. There have been, however, negative changes in district behavior as well. Many districts seeking to increase gifted service points without improving quality are finding loopholes in the EMIS code for descriptions of gifted service settings to undermine any notion of ensuring that qualified, trained educators are providing gifted services commensurate with students' learning and affective needs. Specifically, districts feeling pressure to increase service points on the gifted performance indicator are increasingly moving toward use of the so-called 205 code services.

## 205 SERVICE CODES

The 205 codes are Educational Management Information System (EMIS) codes that describe service options for gifted children in the regular classroom. Some options are clearly legitimate, such as subject or grade acceleration or courses with advanced content (for example, Advanced Placement courses). Some districts, however, are seeking other ways to gain service points on the gifted performance indicator. Some, for example, are using the 205047 service option, which has no basis in Ohio Revised Code, and the 205062 code. The 205047 option is a gifted service in a classroom with no cluster grouping and no support from a gifted intervention specialist. The 205062 code is gifted service in a classroom with cluster grouping but no ongoing support from a gifted intervention specialist. Use of these service codes has increased steadily over the past few years. Data from the 2012–13 and 2013–14 school years indicated a 10% increase in the use of these service codes. In the 2014–15 school year, there was an 107% increase in use of the 205047 option and a 35% increase in the 205062 option. Recent survey responses provided to the OAGC anticipate an even more significant increase in these service settings for the 2015–16 school year. Unfortunately, there are signs that the lack of real support for gifted students in these

settings is commonplace. In a recent survey of districts, more than 50% of respondents expressed concerns about the increased use of these settings with no true service actually being provided. Many of the 205 services are services in name only, and the system lacks accountability. There is little evidence that classroom teachers are providing gifted students with anything beyond what is provided to other students in the classroom.

A national study by the Fordham Institute (Farkas & Duffet, 2008) found that 58% of teachers have received no professional development on teaching academically advanced students in the past few years, and 73% of teachers agreed that “[t]oo often, the brightest students are bored and under-challenged in school—we’re not giving them a sufficient chance to thrive.” This is also true in Ohio, where very little HQPD is available to classroom teachers responsible for gifted services. The ODE has issued guidelines, but they are few and lax. Districts have reported (OAGC survey) that almost two-thirds of classroom teachers now responsible for gifted student services receive five or fewer clock hours of training in gifted education. Because the ODE guidelines are optional and provide only loose direction at best, there are no official standards by which to evaluate the quality of the professional development in terms of topics covered, qualifications of the provider, or assessment of impact. There is a vast difference between a classroom teacher working toward a gifted endorsement and one who participates in a “lunch bunch” or views documents on the ODE Web site or engages in discussion on general differentiation topics. Some districts provide so-called HQPD in one-hour sessions or through articles e-mailed from the building principal, while others require all classroom teachers with clustered gifted students to work toward a gifted endorsement license (OAGC survey).

The 2013–14 district gifted education self-report further indicates that gifted professional development is minimal. When asked whether “[t]he school district provides professional development for teachers that models how to develop environments and instructional activities that encourage students to express diverse characteristics and behaviors that are associated with giftedness,” of 598 responses, almost half said “not at all” or “rarely,” and only 10% said “to a great extent.” It appears that districts already dismiss the value of meaningful professional development in understanding the nature and needs of their gifted students. Interestingly, however, 90% of these districts reported that “a change in our practices on this item [would] increase access or the academic achievement of our students” to some or a great extent, noting that making such a change should “be a priority requiring immediate action steps.” When asked whether “[e]ducators participate in professional development that is sustained over time and that includes regular follow-up and seeks evidence of impact on teacher practice and on student learning,” only 143 respondents indicated “to a great extent.” When asked whether a change in practices would increase the academic achievement of students and should be a priority, 244 indicated “to a great extent.” It is clear that districts know that their efforts to provide gifted HQPD are inadequate, but they do not appear to know how to remedy the situation.

In a recent survey by the OAGC, respondents indicated that only 15% of regular classroom teachers responsible for gifted services had a gifted intervention specialist license. More than two-thirds had received almost no professional development in gifted education. In addition, 70% reported that they had no coplanning time with any gifted professionals on how to implement the written education plan (WEP). For those classroom teachers who received professional development, fewer than half received any training in how to tailor instruction for superior cognitive students or in social-emotional issues. Fewer than 30% received any training in how to challenge under-achieving gifted students.

## LACK OF CLARITY AND OVERSIGHT ON GIFTED HQPD

While the ODE has issued one (relatively) new guideline on the provision of gifted HQPD, it is entirely void of specifics, is completely optional, and fails to provide the level of assistance required at the district level. The agency's reduction of guidance on this point from a ten-page document in 2008 to the current four-page template and simple rubric underscores a lack of concern about quality professional development for otherwise unqualified educators serving students with exceptional needs, that is, the gifted. Furthermore, the department provides no oversight of what districts have indicated is "appropriate" PD nor has it required any corrective plan for inadequate PD. This laxity has allowed districts to report minimal, disconnected, and simplistic activities that contribute nothing to a teacher's understanding of gifted students or how to serve them as HQPD.

The decline of ODE guidance about what constitutes gifted HQPD together with the lack of oversight (for example, the department conducted only one on-site review of gifted education service in 2014–15) makes the 205 codes almost meaningless in determining whether true services are being offered in many districts. In fact, in the OAGC survey, respondents overwhelmingly indicated that no changes in curriculum were provided in regular classroom settings when there was no support from a gifted intervention specialist. Respondents reported that almost 70% of classroom teachers had inadequate HQPD to provide gifted services as indicated on a WEP. Fewer than 30% reported any co-planning time between gifted intervention specialists and classroom teachers related to implementing WEP services, and fewer than half indicated that there was a monitoring process in place to ensure that services specified on the student WEPs were delivered effectively.

This lack of clarity regarding what constitutes qualified gifted personnel contradicts specific requirements in other programs. This practice would be unacceptable for teachers of students with disabilities, teachers of English to speakers of other languages, Title 1 school teachers, and teachers in grades K–3 with at-risk readers according to the Third Grade Reading Guarantee. Granted, some of these students fall under federal guidelines, but that is not the case with at-risk readers. The requirements to be a 3rd-grade reading instructor are

very specific (ODE, 2015). A teacher of a grade-3 student who has been retained or is on a reading improvement plan must have at least one year of teaching experience and must meet at least one of the following qualifications: a K–12 reading endorsement on the teaching license; a master’s degree with a major in reading or literacy; a rating of “most effective” for reading instruction consecutively for the most recent two years based on state-approved tests of student growth; a rating of “above expected value added” in reading instruction consecutively for the most recent two school years; a passing score on a rigorous test of principles of scientifically research-based reading instruction; an educator license for teaching grades pre-K–3 or 4–9 issued on or after July 1, 2017; an alternative qualification approved by the department or successful completion of training based on principles of scientifically research-based reading instruction and approved by the department (expires July 1, 2016); or a license issued by the Board of Speech-Language Pathology and Audiology under Chapter 4753 of the Ohio Revised Code and a professional pupil services license as a school speech pathologist issued by the State Board of Education (expires July 1, 2016).

Requirements for certain other teachers are even stricter. First Year Teachers: A teacher who does not have at least one year of teaching experience may serve as the teacher of record as long as the teacher holds one of the above-mentioned qualifications and is assigned a mentor who also meets the qualifications. For instruction of students who are English language learners and have been in the United States for three years or less or for a student who has an individualized education program (IEP): The teacher must hold an alternative qualification approved by the department or have successfully completed department-approved reading instruction training for working with such students.

## THE OAGC’S POSITION

Information from annual district gifted self-reports provided to the Ohio Department of Education, surveys from the Ohio Association for Gifted Children, and other evidence, including gifted staffing data, gifted service reports, and the gifted performance indicator, provide very strong evidence that many districts are misusing the gifted 205 codes and other flexible service elements for reasons having little to do with promoting gifted student academic success. The OAGC has in the past supported the outright elimination of the 205047 service option (gifted service in a classroom with no cluster grouping and no support from a gifted intervention specialist) and the 205062 code (gifted service in a classroom with cluster grouping but no ongoing support from a gifted intervention specialist). However, recent conversations with the Buckeye Association of School Administrators (BASA) Legislative Committee as well as the results of an OAGC superintendent survey have prompted the association to develop an alternative recommendation.

The new OAGC position is that the establishment of specific criteria to define “high-quality professional development” must be a prerequisite for authorizing service in the nonaccelerated regular classroom, that is, service provided by someone without

gifted specialist credentials. It is clear that piecemeal professional supports are inadequate and that specific and sequenced coursework would better prepare teachers to work with gifted students. In this regard, the OAGC proposes that the ODE and the Ohio Department of Higher Education (ODHE) institute an intermediary gifted education teaching credential that ensures the necessary training for teachers responsible for providing gifted services in the regular classroom (Appendix A). This credential would require a three-credit-hour course on the nature and needs of gifted students, a three-credit-hour course on curriculum and instruction for gifted students, and a three-credit-hour practicum course supervised by a local gifted coordinator or gifted intervention specialist. Because such a certificate program would *not* address more than half the standards for gifted endorsement programs (covering critical skills such as gifted program design and leadership, gifted identification, social and emotional aspects of giftedness, family and community issues, gifted education professional development design and leadership, and long-range academic planning and career exploration), the OAGC recommends that to be designated as a provider of gifted services in the regular classroom, a teacher with the intermediary certificate must be supported by a named and fully licensed or endorsed gifted coordinator or gifted intervention specialist and that mandatory coplanning time and ongoing professional development be required.

Only if such a credential were created would the OAGC support the continued use of the 205047 and 205062 gifted service codes. Unless stronger parameters are set with regard to initial teacher preparation, ongoing HQPD, and support and planning from trained gifted professionals, these service options should be removed.

In addition, until standards for an intermediate gifted certificate are established, the OAGC has outlined a position of the minimum level of HQPD for general educators providing gifted services in the classroom. This position is supported by research-based best practices. The specifics of this position can be reviewed in Appendix B and Appendix C. The OAGC will not endorse any training, quality or otherwise, that does not meet at least these criteria and discourages the use of the term “high-quality professional development” for anything less.

In addition, the OAGC recommends the following changes in gifted service codes:

- The 205040/206040 guidance should be removed as a stand-alone option. Guidance services should be included as part of every gifted student’s WEP.
- Honors classes, as distinguished from 205047/205062 and not meeting criteria for 205050 (Regular Classroom with Grade Acceleration), should have their own code and must have a documented advanced curriculum.
- The department should establish a new 206 code specifying that a licensed gifted teacher is the teacher of record in a general classroom providing services and that he or she would therefore not need external support.

Finally, the OAGC believes that all preservice programs should require gifted-specific coursework and that all programs should require a three-credit-hour course that covers the following items:

- Knowledge of the nature and needs of gifted children, including social and emotional aspects,
- Knowledge of the laws and administrative rules regarding the identification of gifted children,
- Understanding of the common myths and misconceptions surrounding gifted children, including those that tend to discriminate against children who should be referred for assessment but frequently are not,
- The ability to use strategies to adjust the depth, breadth, and pace of curricula through appropriate methods of differentiated instruction, appropriate grouping, pre- and postassessment, and acceleration, and, finally,
- The ability to understand that a gifted intervention specialist or coordinator should be consulted when a gifted student's needs are beyond what the classroom teacher can meet.

The OAGC provided an outline for such a course to the ODHE five years ago at the request of that agency. Unfortunately, it was never implemented.

To provide Ohio's gifted students with services that are meaningful and effective, it is of utmost importance for state policy makers to implement the above recommendations, which are based on research, best practices, and experience from the field.

## REFERENCES

- Archambault, F. A., Jr., Westberg, K. L., Brown, S. W., Hallmark, B. W., Emmons, C. L., & Zhang, W. (1993). Regular classroom practices with gifted students: Results of a national survey of classroom teachers (Research Monograph 93102). Storrs, CT: National Research Center on the Gifted and Talented, University of Connecticut.
- Azano, A., Missett, T. C., Callahan, C. M., Oh, S., Brunner, M., Foster, L. H., & Moon, T. R. (2011). Exploring the relationship between fidelity of implementation and academic achievement in a third-grade gifted curriculum: A mixed-methods study. *Journal of Advanced Academics*, 22(5), 693–719. doi: 10.1177/1932202X11424878
- Dolph, K. A. (2009). An evaluation study of the curriculum and instructional approaches employed in the Norfolk Public Schools Gifted Program. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest. (UMI Number: 3357533)
- Farkas, S., & Duffet, A. (2008). Results from a national teacher survey. In Thomas B. Fordham Institute, *High achieving students in the era of NCLB* (p. 78). Retrieved from <http://www.edexcellence.net/publications/high-achieving-students-in.html>
- Friedman, R. C., & Lee, S. W. (1996). Differentiating instruction for high-achieving/gifted children in regular classrooms: A field test of three gifted-education models. *Journal for the Education of the Gifted*, 19(4), 405–436. doi: 10.1177/016235329601900403

- Guskey, T. R. (2002). Does it make a difference? Evaluating professional development. *Redesigning Professional Development*, 59(6), 45–51.
- Guskey, T. R., & Yoon, K. S. (2009). What works in professional development? *Phi Delta Kappan*, 90(7), 495–500.
- Hansen, J. B., & Feldhusen, J. F. (1994). Comparison of trained and untrained teachers of gifted students. *Gifted Child Quarterly*, 38(3), 115–121.
- Hertberg-Davis, H. (2009). Myth 7: Differentiation in the regular classroom is equivalent to gifted programs and is sufficient. *Gifted Child Quarterly*, 53(4), 251.
- NAGC State Policy Guidebook (2007).
- NAGC/CEC-TAG. (2013). Gifted Education Teacher Preparation Standards.
- Ohio Association for Gifted Children. Survey.
- Ohio Department of Education. (September, 2015). *Third Grade Reading Guarantee Guidance Manual*. Retrieved from <http://education.ohio.gov/getattachment/Topics/Early-Learning/Third-Grade-Reading-Guarantee/TGRG-Guidance-Manual.pdf.aspx>
- Siegle, D., & Powell, T. (2004). Exploring teacher biases when nominating students for gifted programs. *Gifted Child Quarterly*, 48(1), 21–29.
- Speirs-Neumeister, K. L., Adams, C. M., Pierce, R. L., Cassady, J. C., & Dixon, F. A. (2007). Fourth-grade teachers' perceptions of giftedness: Implications for identifying and serving diverse gifted students. *Journal for the Education of the Gifted*, 30(4), 479–499.
- Teno, K. M. (2000). Cluster grouping elementary gifted students in the regular classroom: A teacher's perspective. *Gifted Child Today*, 23(1), 44–49, 53. doi: 0.4219/gct-2000-717
- U.S. Department of Education, Office of English Language Acquisition. (2015). Staffing and supporting an EL program. In *English Learners Toolkit*. Retrieved from <http://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/oela/english-learner-toolkit/chap3.pdf>
- VanTassel-Baska, J. (2006). A content analysis of evaluation findings across 20 gifted programs. *Gifted Child Quarterly*, 50(3), 199–215. doi: 10.1177/001698620605000302
- VanTassel-Baska, J., & Stambaugh, T. (2005). Challenges and possibilities for serving gifted learners in the regular classroom. *Theory into Practice*, 44(3), 211–217. doi: 0.1207/s15430421tip4403\_5
- VanTassel-Baska, J., Feng, A. X., Brown, E., Bracken, B., Stambaugh, T., French, H., . . . & Bai, W. (2008). Study of differentiated instructional change over 3 years. *Gifted Child Quarterly*, 52(4), 297–312. doi: 10.1177/0016986208321809
- Yoon, K. S., Duncan, T., Lee, S. W., Scarloss, B., & Shapley, K. (2007). *Reviewing the Evidence on How Teacher Professional Development Affects Student Achievement* (Issues & Answers Report, REL 2007–No. 033). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Regional Educational Laboratory Southwest. Retrieved from <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/edlabs>



## APPENDIX A

# Teaching the Gifted Certificate Proposal

### RATIONALE

1. Gifted students, like students with educationally significant disabilities, are a special population with special learning needs. Therefore, teaching them effectively requires specialized instructional knowledge beyond the training provided in pre-service teacher training programs.
2. Ohio's "differentiation in a regular classroom" service setting was originally intended to be analogous to inclusion models in special education in which *some* needs of *some* students with disabilities are addressed in regular classrooms under the supervision of an intervention specialist and in which specific accommodations and supports prescribed in an IEP or 504 plan are developed and monitored by an intervention specialist.
3. However, the Ohio gifted service setting of "differentiation in a regular classroom" has been frequently abused by reporting gifted students as "served," when they are, in reality, being taught by teachers who have had minimal or no training to meet their needs and who receive little or no support from a trained gifted intervention specialist or gifted education coordinator. In many cases, regular education teachers who have had as little as one day of workshop training and who rarely if ever have opportunities for collaboration with a licensed or endorsed gifted education specialist have been designated as gifted service providers.
4. While the OAGC strongly supports maintaining and strengthening the gifted performance indicator, the incentive to report more gifted students as "served" may motivate more schools to use this service option without investing in the level of training and support necessary to make it effective.

### RECOMMENDATIONS

Therefore, the OAGC proposes that the definition for this service option be modified as follows:

Require that teachers without gifted education licenses or endorsements complete a Teaching the Gifted certificate program prior to being designated as a provider of gifted services in the "differentiation in the regular classroom" service setting. (This requirement should not apply to Advanced Placement courses for which the teacher has completed College Board AP Institute training in that subject or to courses in which a student has been placed through formal subject acceleration following the district's approved local acceleration policy.

The OAGC recommends that the requirements for earning a Teaching the Gifted certificate be based on elements of the standards for gifted endorsement licensure programs that focus specifically on academic needs of gifted students, curriculum design, and differentiated instruction and assessment. Teaching the Gifted certificate programs should be required to include the following elements in sequence:

- A three-credit-hour course on the nature and needs of gifted students offered in an existing gifted endorsement or master's program *or* a three-credit-hour course on the cognitive characteristics and special academic needs of gifted students offered by an institution of higher education with an approved Teaching the Gifted certificate program.
- A three-credit-hour course on curriculum and instruction for gifted students offered by an institution of higher education with an approved gifted endorsement or Teaching the Gifted certificate program.
- A three-credit-hour practicum course supervised by a local gifted coordinator or intervention specialist trained and designated as a practicum supervisor by an institution of higher education with an approved gifted endorsement or Teaching the Gifted certificate program.

Because the Teaching the Gifted certificate program would *not* address more than half the standards for gifted endorsement programs (covering critical skills such as gifted program design and leadership, gifted identification, social and emotional aspects of giftedness, family and community issues, gifted education professional development design and leadership, and long-range academic planning and career exploration), the OAGC recommends that to be designated as a provider of gifted services in the regular classroom, a teacher with the Teaching the Gifted certificate must be supported by a named and fully licensed or endorsed gifted coordinator or gifted intervention specialist.

- At least ten hours of annual coplanning time between the gifted coordinator or gifted intervention specialist and the nonendorsed teacher providing gifted service in the regular classroom should be documented.
- At least 0.5 CEUs in ongoing professional development focused specifically on teaching and supporting gifted students should be earned in each year in which a nonendorsed teacher is designated as a provider of gifted services in a regular classroom and should be documented by a local professional development committee (LPDC).

## NOTES

- This model makes use of existing standards and structures for credentialing and documenting professional learning.
- This model would allow institutions of higher education to apply credits earned in pursuit of the Teaching the Gifted certificate toward earning a full endorsement or

master's degree. Therefore, this model may also help address the statewide shortage of qualified gifted coordinators and intervention specialists over time.

- By using local gifted coordinators and gifted intervention specialists as practicum supervisors and by emphasizing ongoing collaboration between gifted specialists and regular classroom teachers, this model would help address the original intent of the “differentiation in the regular classroom” service option and support best practices.

## APPENDIX B

# Professional Development Plan for General Education Teachers Providing Gifted Services in the Regular Classroom

*Learning Outcomes (Based on 2013 Gifted and Talented Teacher Preparation Standards)*

The general education teacher will

- know and understand issues in gifted education
- create learning environments that promote growth and development of gifted learners
- apply learning strategies to meet gifted students' needs and interests as well as promote gifted students' learning
- construct and use varied assessments to inform instruction and evaluate progress
- communicate with students and families to support student learning
- view professional development in gifted education as a career-long effort and responsibility

### ***Year One: 30 hours of professional development***

General education teachers would participate the year before gifted students would be counted as served in the regular classroom with ongoing support from a licensed gifted intervention specialist or coordinator with gifted licensure.

Content	NAGC/CEC Teacher Preparation Standards in Gifted and Talented Education (2013)	PD hrs
Identification of Gifted Students	<p><b>4.1</b> Beginning gifted education professionals understand that some groups of individuals with gifts and talents have been underrepresented in gifted education programs and select and use technically sound formal and informal assessments that minimize bias in identifying students for gifted educational programs and services.</p> <p><b>4.2</b> Beginning gifted education professionals use knowledge of measurement principles and practices to differentiate assessments and interpret results to guide educational decisions for individuals with gifts and talents.</p> <p><b>4.3</b> Beginning gifted education professionals collaborate with colleagues and families in using multiple types of assessment information and learning process decisions and to minimize bias in assessments and decision making.</p>	1.5 hrs

<p>Characteristics of Gifted Students</p>	<p><b>1.1</b> Beginning gifted education professionals understand how language, culture, economic status, family background, and/or area of disability can influence the learning of individuals with gifts and talents.</p> <p><b>1.2</b> Beginning gifted education professionals use understanding of development and individual differences to respond to the needs of individuals with gifts and talents.</p> <p><b>2.1</b> Beginning gifted educational professionals create safe, inclusive, culturally responsive learning environments that engage individuals with gifts and talents in meaningful and rigorous learning activities and social interactions.</p> <p><b>5.5</b> Beginning gifted education professionals use instructional strategies that enhance the affective development of individuals with gifts and talents.</p>	<p>3.5 hrs</p>
<p>Higher-Level Thinking and Complexity</p>	<p><b>3.1</b> Beginning gifted education professionals understand the role of central concepts, structures of the discipline, and tools of inquiry of the content areas they teach and use their understanding to organize knowledge, integrate cross-disciplinary skills, and develop meaningful learning progressions within and across grade levels.</p> <p><b>5.1</b> Beginning gifted education professionals know principles of evidence-based, differentiated, and accelerated practices and possess a repertoire of instructional strategies to enhance the critical and creative thinking, problem solving, and performance skills of individuals with gifts and talents.</p> <p><b>5.2</b> Beginning gifted education professionals apply appropriate technologies to support instructional assessment, planning, and delivery for individuals with gifts and talents.</p>	<p>10 hrs</p>
<p>Lesson Design for Diverse Learners: Application of Complexity to Curriculum</p>	<p><b>2.2</b> Beginning gifted education professionals use communications and motivational and instructional strategies to facilitate understanding of subject matter and to teach individuals with gifts and talents how to adapt to different environments and develop ethical leadership skills.</p> <p><b>3.3</b> Beginning gifted education professionals use assessments to select, adapt, and create materials to differentiate instructional strategies and general and specialized curricula to challenge individuals with gifts and talents.</p> <p><b>3.4</b> Beginning gifted education professionals understand that individuals with gifts and talents demonstrate a wide range of advanced knowledge and performance levels and modify the general or specialized curriculum appropriately.</p>	<p>15 hrs</p>

## ***Year Two: 20 hours of professional development***

General education teachers would participate the year gifted students are first counted as served in the regular classroom with ongoing support from a licensed gifted intervention specialist or coordinator with gifted licensure.

<b>Content</b>	<b>NAGC/CEC Teacher Preparation Standards in Gifted and Talented Education (2013)</b>	<b>PD Hrs</b>
Differentiation in the Regular Classroom	<p><b>2.2</b> Beginning gifted education professionals use communications and motivational and instructional strategies to facilitate understanding of subject matter and to teach individuals with gifts and talents how to adapt to different environments and develop ethical leadership skills.</p> <p><b>2.3</b> Beginning gifted education professionals adjust their communication to an individual's language proficiency and cultural and linguistic differences.</p> <p><b>3.1</b> Beginning gifted education professionals understand the role of central concepts, structures of the discipline, and tools of inquiry of the content areas they teach, and use their understanding to organize knowledge, integrate cross-disciplinary skills, and develop meaningful learning progressions within and across grade levels.</p> <p><b>3.2</b> Beginning gifted education professionals design appropriate learning and performance modifications for individuals with gifts and talents that enhance creativity, acceleration, depth, and complexity in academic subject matter and specialized domains.</p> <p><b>3.3</b> Beginning gifted education professionals use assessments to select, adapt, and create materials to differentiate instructional strategies and general and specialized curricula to challenge individuals with gifts and talents.</p> <p><b>3.4</b> Beginning gifted education professionals understand that individuals with gifts and talents demonstrate a wide range of advanced knowledge and performance levels and modify the general or specialized curriculum appropriately.</p> <p><b>5.2</b> Beginning gifted education professionals apply appropriate technologies to support instructional assessment, planning, and delivery for individuals with gifts and talents.</p>	15 hrs
Development of Written Educational Plans	<p><b>4.3</b> Beginning gifted education professionals collaborate with colleagues and families in using multiple types of assessment information to make identification and learning progress decisions and to minimize bias in assessment and decision making.</p> <p><b>4.4</b> Beginning gifted education professionals use assessment results to develop long- and short-range goals and objectives that take into consideration an individual's abilities and needs, the learning environments, and other factors related to diversity.</p> <p><b>4.5</b> Beginning gifted education professionals engage individuals with gifts and talents in assessing the quality of their own learning and performance and in setting future goals and objectives.</p> <p><b>5.3</b> Beginning gifted education professionals collaborate with families, professional colleagues, and other educators to select, adapt, and use evidence-based strategies that promote challenging learning opportunities in general and specialized curricula.</p>	5 hrs

### ***Year Three: 10 hours of professional development***

General education teachers who have had both Year One and Year Two of professional development would participate so that students in their classrooms could be counted as served in the regular classroom with ongoing support from a licensed gifted intervention specialist or coordinator with gifted licensure.

<b>Content</b>	<b>NAGC/CEC Teacher Preparation Standards in Gifted and Talented Education (2013)</b>	<b>PD Hours</b>
Acceleration	<p><b>2.4</b> Beginning gifted education professionals demonstrate understanding of the multiple environments that are part of a continuum of services for individuals with gifts and talents, including the advantages and disadvantages of various settings, and teach students to adapt to these environments.</p> <p><b>5.1</b> Beginning gifted education professionals know principles of evidence-based, differentiated, and accelerated practices and possess a repertoire of instructional strategies to enhance the critical and creative thinking, problem solving, and performance skills of individuals with gifts and talents.</p>	10 hours: distribution based on the need of professional learning community
In-depth or Independent Study	<p><b>2.4</b> Beginning gifted education professionals demonstrate understanding of the multiple environments that are part of a continuum of services for individuals with gifts and talents, including the advantages and disadvantages of various settings, and teach students to adapt to these environments.</p> <p><b>5.4</b> Beginning gifted education professionals emphasize the development, practice, and transfer of advanced knowledge and skills across environments throughout the lifespan leading to creative, productive careers in a multicultural society for individuals with gifts and talents.</p>	
Mentorships	<p><b>2.4</b> Beginning gifted education professionals demonstrate understanding of the multiple environments that are part of a continuum of services for individuals with gifts and talents, including the advantages and disadvantages of various settings, and teach students to adapt to these environments.</p>	
Professional Growth	<p><b>6.1</b> Beginning gifted education professionals use professional ethical principles and specialized program standards to guide their practice.</p> <p><b>6.4</b> Beginning gifted education professionals are aware of their own professional learning needs, understand the significance of lifelong learning, and participate in professional activities and learning communities.</p> <p><b>6.5</b> Beginning gifted education professionals advance the profession by engaging in activities such as advocacy and mentoring.</p>	

### ***Year Four and Beyond: 10 hours per year***

To remain current in gifted education and to allow students in a teacher's classroom to be counted as served, general education teachers must have ongoing professional development in gifted education and the continued support of a licensed gifted intervention specialist or coordinator with gifted licensure.

<b>Content</b>	<b>NAGC/CEC Teacher Preparation Standards in Gifted and Talented Education (2013)</b>	<b>PD Hours</b>
Professional Growth	<p><b>7.1</b> Beginning gifted education professionals apply elements of effective collaboration.</p> <p><b>7.2</b> Beginning gifted education professionals serve as a collaborative resource to colleagues.</p> <p><b>7.3</b> Beginning gifted education professionals use collaboration to promote the well-being of individuals with gifts and talents across a wide range of settings, experiences, and collaborators.</p>	Professional development hours must be specific to gifted education.



## APPENDIX C

# **Professional Development Plan for General Education Teachers Providing Gifted Services in the Regular Classroom – Assessment Chart**

OAGC believes that general classroom teachers who have gifted students in the classroom reported as served in that setting must receive high quality professional development regarding the needs and nature of gifted children. Based on the research on the effectiveness of ongoing professional development with a plan of continuous improvement that is aligned with district and building goals, OAGC recommends a minimum of three years of high quality professional development aligned to 2013 NAGC/CEC teacher preparation standards, as required by NCATE and ODE\* for a gifted intervention specialist license. Beginning in Spring 2016, programs submitting NCATE reports must use the new 2013 NAGC/CEC Standards. All standards referenced in the assessment block are listed following the Professional Development Plan chart.

\*<https://www.ohiohighered.org/education-programs/standards-requirements>

\*<http://ncate.org/Standards/ProgramStandardsandReportForms/tabid/676/Default.aspx>

<b><i>Year One: 30 hours of professional development</i></b>				
General education teachers would participate the year before gifted students would be counted as served in the regular classroom with ongoing support from a licensed gifted intervention specialist or coordinator with gifted licensure.				
<b>Assessments</b>	<b>Performance Levels</b>			
	<b>Emerging</b>	<b>Developing</b>	<b>Skilled</b>	<b>Accomplished</b>
<p style="color: green;">Standards 4.1 and 4.2</p> <p>The educator will analyze case studies for gifted identification and service based on Ohio rules and laws.</p>	<p>The subject of the case study is identified according to district procedures but the case study does not provide any reference to the state law.</p>	<p>The subject of the case study is identified correctly with some reference to the state law but provides little rationale or understanding of the identification law.</p>	<p>The case study subject is correctly identified and includes the rationale for each test selected as well as how that test is appropriate for each area of identification.</p>	<p>The case study subject is correctly identified and includes the rationale for each test selected as well as how that test is appropriate for each area of identification. The case study goes on to make recommendations for further testing or articulates why no further testing will be needed.</p>

Assessments (cont.)	Year One Performance Levels (cont.)			
	Emerging	Developing	Skilled	Accomplished
<p><b>Standard 4.3</b></p> <p>Using the data in case studies, the educator will make appropriate recommendations for a student without bias.</p>	The educator makes recommendations which may not be based on the data.	The educator makes appropriate recommendations without bias that are based on the data.	The educator makes appropriate short term recommendations for services without bias and based on data as well as student interests and needs.	The educator makes appropriate short and long term recommendations without bias and based on data as well as student interests and needs
<p><b>Standard 4.1</b></p> <p>The educator will be able to provide step by step procedures for the district's gifted identification process.</p>	The educator demonstrates little understanding of the referral process. Steps are out of sequence or might communicate incorrect information.	The educator provides a clear and correct sequence of district procedures but is unable to provide rationale for the process.	The educator has a complete understanding of the district identification procedures and accurately explains procedure to others.	The educator has a complete understanding of the district identification procedures and can explain to others how the procedures align with the state law.
<p><b>Standard 1.2</b></p> <p>The educator will be able to provide an example of asynchronous development and how it impacts the gifted learner.</p>	The example does not demonstrate evidence of asynchronous development.	The example provided demonstrates asynchronous development. There is some support data to demonstrate an understanding of how asynchronous development impacts the gifted student.	The example provided demonstrates asynchronous development, all data presented supports solid understanding of how asynchronous development impacts the gifted student.	The example provided demonstrates asynchronous development, all data presented supports solid understanding of how asynchronous development impacts the gifted student. Recommendations for accommodations are provided to help address the demonstrated asynchronous development
<p><b>Standard 2.1</b></p> <p>The educator will be able to recognize and provide examples of gifted students' ability to successfully approach given tasks in a non-traditional manner.</p>	The educator recognizes that gifted learners may need opportunities for learning in a non-traditional manner.	The educator is receptive to student suggestions for non-traditional process and /or product.	The educator provides multiple opportunities for non-traditional process and /or product.	The educator facilitates students' generation of ideas for alternative process / products and advocates for acceptance of non-traditional approaches in other educational settings.

Assessments ( <i>cont.</i> )	Year One Performance Levels ( <i>cont.</i> )			
	Emerging	Developing	Skilled	Accomplished
<p><b>Standard 5.5</b></p> <p>When provided with an example of cultural or economic diversity, the educator will determine what additional information is needed and then be able to recommend an educational program for the diverse student.</p>	The educator makes recommendations for the collection of additional information but is unable to make proposals on an appropriate educational program.	The educator makes recommendations for the collection of additional information and is able to make some proposals on an appropriate educational program.	The educator makes recommendations for the collection of additional information and is able to make short term proposals on an appropriate educational program based on student needs and interests.	The educator makes recommendations for the collection of additional information and is able to make short term and long term proposals on an appropriate educational program based on student needs and interests.
<p><b>Standard 1.1</b></p> <p>The educator will articulate how instruction is impacted by variations in beliefs, traditions, and values across and within cultures.</p>	The educator establishes a classroom community and trusting relationship with students of all backgrounds.	The educator establishes a classroom community and trusting relationship with students of all backgrounds and plans curriculum and instruction that incorporates student culture	The educator establishes a classroom community and trusting relationship with students of all backgrounds and plans curriculum and instruction that incorporates student culture. The educator is able to connect curriculum with the lives of students both in and out of school and resists curriculum that is disempowering.	The educator establishes a classroom community and trusting relationship with students of all backgrounds and plans curriculum and instruction that incorporates student culture. The educator is able to connect curriculum with the lives of students both in and out of school, resists curriculum that is disempowering, and successfully focuses curriculum and instruction to help students develop strategies and hope/optimism for overcoming academic and social barriers.
<p><b>Standard 5.5</b></p> <p>The educator will address the academic and affective characteristics of gifted individuals and the impact of exceptionalities that may result in sensory, motor, or learning needs.</p>	The educator notes the affective characteristics that are impacting the student in a case study but has not addressed the impact on their learning needs.	The educator notes the affective characteristics that are impacting the student in the case study and proposes one strategy to address the impact on the student's learning needs.	The educator notes the affective characteristics that are impacting the student in the case study and recommends several strategies to address the impact on the student's learning needs. A monitoring system is in place to gauge progress in addressing the exceptionality.	The educator notes the affective characteristics that are impacting the student in the case study and involves the student, the family, and other educators to propose several strategies to address the impact on the student's learning needs. A monitoring system that includes student self-monitoring is in place to gauge progress in addressing the exceptionality.

Assessments (cont.)	Year One Performance Levels (cont.)			
	Emerging	Developing	Skilled	Accomplished
<p><b>Standard 3.1</b></p> <p>The educator can adapt a general classroom lesson to add the complexity depth necessary for gifted learners.</p>	<p>The classroom plan is different for the gifted learners but appears to add more on-level activities instead of complexity and/or depth.</p>	<p>The classroom plan adds activities for the gifted learners that provide some depth and complexity.</p>	<p>The classroom plan provides learning activities for gifted learners that consistently provide depth and complexity and replace typical assignments</p>	<p>The classroom plan provides learning strategies for gifted learners that provides depth and complexity and replace typical assignments. The gifted learners help construct the learning activities.</p>
<p><b>Standard 3.3</b></p> <p>The educator will design and administer traditional and non-traditional pre-assessments for the students in the classroom and provide examples of adjusted curriculum based on the results.</p>	<p>The need for pre-assessment of content is recognized and a pre-assessment tool is sometimes used. There is no evidence of curriculum adjustment based on the results.</p>	<p>Use of pre-assessment of content is inconsistent. Traditional tools are used, with no non-traditional methods employed. There is some evidence of curriculum adjustment based on results.</p>	<p>Pre-assessments of content to be taught is consistent using both traditional and non-traditional methods with extensive evidence of curriculum adjustment based on pre-assessment results.</p>	<p>Pre-assessments of content to be taught is consistent. Students may choose between traditional and non-traditional methods. There is extensive evidence of curriculum adjustment.</p>
<p><b>Standard 3.1</b></p> <p>Given the district approved curriculum, the educator will adapt a variety of differentiated curricula that incorporate advanced, conceptually challenging, in-depth, distinctive, and complex content.</p>	<p>Few adaptations were made to lessons but were inconsistent, with little evidence of challenging, in depth, distinctive and complex content.</p>	<p>Adaptations were made to lessons but were inconsistent. There was evidence of some challenging, in depth, distinctive and complex content.</p>	<p>Adaptations were made on a regular basis which incorporate advanced conceptually challenging, in-depth distinctive and complex content. The changes were well aligned with district approved curriculum.</p>	<p>Adaptations were made on a regular basis. The educator made changes based on data, and cited a selected research based theory. When appropriate, adaptations incorporate advanced conceptually challenging in depth distinctive and complex content The changes were well aligned with district approved curriculum. Students also had a voice in some adaptations</p>

Assessments (cont.)	Year One Performance Levels (cont.)			
	Emerging	Developing	Skilled	Accomplished
<p><b>Standard 5.1</b></p> <p>The educator will adapt a general curriculum lesson making it open ended so that students are able to demonstrate critical and creative thinking, problems solving and performance Skills.</p>	<p>The lesson adaptations do not provide opportunities for students to be critical or creative thinkers, problem solvers or performers. but appears to parallel the original lesson.</p>	<p>The lesson adaptations provide opportunity for one or two of the following: critical and creative thinking, problem solving or performance.</p>	<p>The lesson adaptations provide opportunity for all of the following: critical and creative thinking, problem solving and performance.</p>	<p>The lesson adaptations provide opportunity for students to identify how they used critical and creative thinking, problem solving and used performance as a learning tool.</p>
<p><b>Standard 5.2</b></p> <p>The educator will apply appropriate technologies which promote higher level thinking and</p>	<p>The use of technology has little or no impact on higher level thinking or complexity.</p>	<p>There is some evidence that the use of technology enhanced higher level thinking and complexity but the stretch is not significant for the gifted student.</p>	<p>There is evidence that the use of technology enhanced higher level thinking and complexity and the stretch is reaching the zone of proximal development for the gifted students.</p>	<p>Students are comfortable using technology and seek new applications to enhance higher level thinking and complexity beyond current capacity</p>
<p><b>Standard 2.1</b></p> <p>The educator should be aware of and be able to articulate district demographics and the impact it may have on gifted learners.</p>	<p>The educator is aware of district demographics but is not able to accurately articulate the data nor explain how the demographics could impact gifted learners.</p>	<p>The educator is aware of and able to articulate district demographics but is not able to articulate how the demographics could impact gifted learners.</p>	<p>The educator is aware of and able to articulate district demographics, as well as articulate how the demographics could impact gifted learners.</p>	<p>The educator is aware of and able to articulate district demographics as well as articulate how the demographics could impact gifted learners. The educator is able provide examples of the demographic impact in the classroom and how those challenges were met.</p>
<p><b>Standard 5.1</b></p> <p>The educator will adapt a lesson designed for gifted learners in order to accommodate the needs of a twice exceptional student.</p>	<p>The lesson adaptations include all accommodations on the exceptional student's IEP or 504 plan but do not include evidence of differentiation needed for the gifted learner</p>	<p>The lesson adaptations include accommodations on the exceptional student's IEP or 504 plan, but provide inconsistent evidence of differentiation needed for the gifted learner's area(s) of strength.</p>	<p>The lesson adaptations consistently include accommodations on the exceptional student's IEP or 504 plan and include evidence of differentiation needed for the gifted learner's area(s) of strength.</p>	<p>The lesson adapted draws on student abilities rather than disabilities using any accommodations available, whether or not they are on the IEP or 504 plan, in order for the twice exceptional student to access challenging in depth distinctive and complex content.</p>

Assessments ( <i>cont.</i> )	Year One Performance Levels ( <i>cont.</i> )			
	Emerging	Developing	Skilled	Accomplished
<p><b>Standard 2.2</b></p> <p>The educator will design a plan for teaching students how to learn in environments that encourage independence, interdependence and positive peer relationships.</p>	<p>The educator plans lessons involving independence and interdependence, and which encourage positive peer relationships. However, the students are not provided with clear expectations or practice.</p>	<p>The educator plans lessons involving independence, interdependence, and which encourage positive peer relationships. The plan provides students with clear expectations and time to practice. However, the plan does not include any interventions for students who struggle working with others and/or independently.</p>	<p>The educator actively teaches students how to learn in environments that encourage independence, interdependence and positive peer relationships through consistent opportunities and exposure to varied learning scenarios. Interventions are in place for students who may struggle working with others or independently.</p>	<p>The educator gathers data regarding the learning styles and preferences of the students and uses that data to create a plan which will provide students clear expectations and instruction regarding independent learning, interdependent learning and developing peer relationships. Students reflect on their experiences and a plan for intervention is in place for students who may struggle working with others or independently. A community of learners emerges in the classroom.</p>
<p><b>Standard 3.3</b></p> <p>After comparing and contrasting two or more theories of learning which form the basis of curriculum development and instructional practice for gifted learners, choose one to create a unit of study that engages individuals with gifts/talents from all backgrounds that is challenging and appropriately paced to meet individual needs.</p>	<p>The unit of study satisfies either engaging individuals from all backgrounds in a manner that is challenging and appropriately paced to meet individual needs OR it is created based on a chosen theory of learning and instructional practice for gifted learners, but does not meet both requirements.</p>	<p>Both requirements are met for the unit but one or more aspects of the unit are constructed in a superficial manner without a logical flow and demonstrated understanding.</p>	<p>Both requirements of theory selection and engaging all learners are met for the unit.</p>	<p>The unit strongly follows a theory of learning for gifted learners. It is engaging and addresses individual needs. The construction and format of the lessons are such that the basic design could be replicated for a variety of topics. The educator also indicates why a particular theory was chosen and how this theory best serves the needs of the students.</p>

<p><b>Standard 3.4</b></p> <p>Using the best practice pedagogy for the regular classroom as well as pedagogy for gifted learners, the educator will devise a series of lessons which differentiate from the general curriculum to meet the needs of the range of students in the educator's classroom.</p>	<p>The series of lessons does not consistently differentiate from the general curriculum to meet the needs of all students in the educator's classroom</p>	<p>The series of lessons consistently differentiates from the general curriculum, but does not meet the needs of all students in the educator's classroom</p>	<p>The series of lessons reflects best practices and consistently differentiates from the general curriculum to meet the needs of the full ability and achievement range of students in the educator's classroom.</p>	<p>The series of lessons reflects best practices and differentiates from the general curriculum to meet the needs of the range of students in the educator's classroom. Evidence of attention to ability and achievement as well as sensitivity to cultural or socio-economic differences within the classroom exists in lesson plans and student products.</p>
--	--	---	---	---

### ***Year Two: 20 hours of professional development***

General education teachers who have completed 30 hours of Year One of professional development would participate so that gifted students could be counted as served in the regular classroom with ongoing support from a licensed gifted intervention specialist or coordinator with gifted licensure

<b>Assessments</b>	<b>Performance Levels</b>			
	<b>Emerging</b>	<b>Developing</b>	<b>Skilled</b>	<b>Accomplished</b>
<p><b>Standard 2.3</b></p> <p>Given previous knowledge of district demographics the educator should be able to assess the similarities and differences within the classroom and provide specific content changes within regular lesson plans and in student products, which would recognize diversity and promote maximum growth for gifted learners.</p>	<p>Evidence of addressing diversity among the gifted learners appears to be present by chance rather than planning.</p>	<p>Some evidence of specific content changes which recognize the diversity among the gifted learners is present.</p>	<p>Evidence of purposeful content changes which recognize the diversity among the gifted learners appear at times but is not consistent.</p>	<p>There is consistent evidence of purposeful content changes which recognize the diversity among the gifted learners and maximizes their opportunities for growth on a regular basis.</p>

Assessments (cont.)	Year Two Performance Levels (cont.)			
	Emerging	Developing	Skilled	Accomplished
<p><b>Standards 3.4 and 4.5</b></p> <p>Planning should provide evidence that students use self-assessment tools (i.e. personality types, or learning style assessments) and set personal goals for affective and social behaviors both at home and at school. Option to involve family members in goal setting.</p>	<p>There is some evidence that affective and social needs of students are being addressed although self-assessment is not used.</p>	<p>Evidence that affective and social needs of students are being addressed by the use of some self-assessment tools but little or no evidence of goal setting.</p>	<p>Evidence that affective and social needs of students are being addressed by the use of self-assessment tool(s) and goals have been set.</p>	<p>There is consistent evidence that affective and social needs of students are being addressed by the use of self-assessment tool(s) and goals have been set, and is fully integrated into planning with a monitoring system.</p>
<p><b>Standard 2.2 and 3.2</b></p> <p>Create a list of potential community resources from which the educator can support differentiation. Use of these resources should be reflected in lesson plans and student products.</p>	<p>Little evidence that the educator is aware of available community resources to support differentiation.</p>	<p>A list of community resources to support differentiation has been created.</p>	<p>The educator uses an extensive list of community resources to support differentiation.</p>	<p>The educator consistently uses and expands on the community resources which are used to support differentiation.</p>
<p><b>Standard 5.2</b></p> <p>Lesson plans and student products should reflect evidence of the use of technology to facilitate learning.</p>	<p>Technology is used sporadically with little evidence of planning.</p>	<p>There is evidence that the technology being used and facilitates learning.</p>	<p>The use of technology is integral to the learning process.</p>	<p>Technology not only facilitates the learning process but new opportunities are recognized and adopted on a regular basis.</p>



Assessments (cont.)	Year Two Performance Levels (cont.)			
	Emerging	Developing	Skilled	Accomplished
<p>Standard 3.1 and 3.3</p> <p>The content, process, and product in lesson plans should reflect a curriculum that is differentiated in pace, depth, and breadth.</p>	Evidence of differentiation in curriculum is only present in one area (content, process or product).	Educator demonstrates the use of differentiation in the areas of content, process or product but struggles to appropriately match the type of differentiation with the given lesson or need of students.	Educator demonstrates the use of differentiation in the areas of content, process or product and appropriately matches the type of differentiation with the given lesson or need of students.	The use of differentiation in the areas of content, process and product is fully integrated into the classroom culture.
<p>Standard 4.3 and 4.4</p> <p>When writing a WEP the educator is aware of student interests, long term student goals, the student's current standing in progress toward that goal, and what next steps are needed.</p>	The WEP goal(s) is not student specific. The same goal is repeated on numerous WEPs. The next steps for achieving the goal are not included.	The WEP is student specific and reflects individual student interests and long term goals	The WEP goal is student specific and provides the student with the next steps the student must achieve to obtain the goal.	The WEP goal is student specific and provides the student with the next steps to obtain the goal, and is written to include the affective needs and values of the student.
<p>Standard 4.4</p> <p>WEPs reflect the use of accommodations in order to enhance the learning experiences of gifted learners.</p>	Few if any accommodations for the gifted learner are present on the student's WEP.	There is evidence on the WEP that accommodations are being made for the gifted learner.	The use of accommodations enhances the individual learning experience and is integral to the WEP process.	The use of accommodations enhances the individual learning experience, is integral to the WEP process, the WEP is updated as needed.

Assessment (cont.)	Year Three Performance Levels (cont.)			
	Emerging	Developing	Skilled	Accomplished
<p><b>Standard 5.3</b></p> <p>The educator consults with school personnel and advocates for the education of gifted students</p>	Regular communication with parents and others about the characteristics and educational needs of gifted students is established.	The educator serves as a liaison among students who are gifted, school personnel, parents, community members, and other stakeholders	The educator assists school personnel and other stakeholders in the evaluation of gifted education services and consults with school personnel about ways to develop and adapt curriculum, materials, and teaching strategies for gifted learners.	The educator assists in the design of gifted education services and consults regarding gifted education issues in the district strategic planning processes. The educator develops gifted curriculum, offers staff development, and models appropriate teaching practices for gifted learners

### ***Year Three: 10 hours of professional development***

General education teachers who have completed both years One and Two of professional development would complete 10 hours of ongoing professional development so gifted students could be counted as served in the regular classroom with ongoing support from a licensed gifted intervention specialist or coordinator with gifted licensure.

Assessment	Performance Levels			
	Emerging	Developing	Skilled	Accomplished
<p><b>Standards 2.4 and 5.1</b></p> <p>The educator is aware of the benefits of acceleration and is supportive of the acceleration process</p>	The educator demonstrates awareness of the research of the benefits of subject or whole grade acceleration but expresses resistance counter to researched evidence.	The educator demonstrates awareness of the benefits of subject or whole grade acceleration but is hesitant to initiate the process.	The educator, under the guidance of a licensed gifted coordinator or gifted intervention specialist gathers data as indicated in the Iowa Acceleration Plan to initiate support for subject or whole grade acceleration. Stakeholders are fully integrated into the process as evidenced in the Written Acceleration Plan.	The educator, under the guidance of a licensed gifted coordinator or gifted intervention specialist consistently considers students for subject or whole grade acceleration. The educator is well versed the Iowa Acceleration Plan process and takes great care to make sure the process is carefully followed. Stakeholders are fully integrated into the process and as evidenced in the Written Acceleration Plan.

Assessment (cont.)	Year Three Performance Levels (cont.)			
	Emerging	Developing	Skilled	Accomplished
<p><b>Standard 2.4 and 5.4</b></p> <p>The educator is aware that gifted learners are capable of independent study that leads the student to discovery and provides time and support for the student to reflect on and share what the student has learned with an authentic audience.</p>	<p>The educator is aware that gifted learners are capable of in depth above grade level or accelerated study in their areas of passion but does not provide a process or time for students to do the research and application of knowledge.</p>	<p>The educator is aware that gifted learners are capable of in depth above grade level or accelerated study in their areas of passion and encourages investigations and provides students with a process.</p>	<p>The educator is aware that gifted learners are capable of in depth above grade level or accelerated study in their areas of passion and encourages investigations and provides students with a process and time. Students are provided with an opportunity to share what they have learned with an authentic audience.</p>	<p>The educator is aware that gifted learners are capable of in depth above grade level or accelerated study in their areas of passion. The educator provides students with time, a variety of frameworks to choose from, for their study, teaches correct research procedures, helps students create deadlines and has a regular check in schedule. Students are provided with an opportunity to share what they have learned with an authentic audience.</p>
<p><b>Standard 2.4</b></p> <p>The educator collaborates with all stakeholders and maintains communication with services, networks and organizations to meet the needs of gifted students.</p>	<p>The educator understands the benefits of a mentorship experience for gifted learners and makes some attempt to put a process in place for mentoring experiences.</p>	<p>The educator understands the benefits of a mentorship experience for gifted learners and creates a process for the mentoring experiences and begins to create a community network.</p>	<p>The educator collaborates with all stakeholders and maintains communication with services, networks and organizations to meet the needs of gifted students.</p>	<p>The educator collaborates with all stakeholders and maintains communication with services, networks and organizations to meet the needs of gifted students. Community stakeholders come to the educator asking for students to mentor and gifted students often select mentors on their own. The experience is fully integrated into the culture of the school and community.</p>

<p><b>Standard 6.4</b></p> <p>The educator engages in professional activities, reads current publications, and uses evidence-based best practice research as part of a well-developed professional development path.</p>	<p>The educator attends a conference each year or acquires additional course work but there is no evidence of changes made to their practice or any sharing of new research and practice.</p>	<p>The educator attends a conference each year or acquires additional course work. There is evidence that new knowledge is integrated into the classroom as evident in lesson plans</p>	<p>The educator engages in professional activities, reads current publications, and uses evidence-based best practice research as part of a well-developed professional development path as evident by changes in practice or ideas.</p>	<p>The educator engages in professional activities, reads current publications, and uses evidence-based best practice research as part of a well-developed professional development path, and shares knowledge of best practices with other stakeholders.</p>
<p><b>Standard 6.1 and 6.5</b></p> <p>The educator reflects on instructional practices to improve teaching and guide professional development in gifted education.</p>	<p>The educator does reflect on their practice when prompted but does not have a reflection plan with personal goal setting and an action plan.</p>	<p>The educator reflects on instructional practices to improve teaching and sets goals for improvement.</p>	<p>The educator reflects on instructional practices to improve teaching and guide professional development in gifted education and sets goals for improvement along with an action plan.</p>	<p>The educator reflects on instructional practices and chooses professional development opportunities based on the need to improve teaching, and guide professional development in gifted education. Goals are set and an action plan is followed. Knowledge of best practices in gifted education is shared with other stakeholders.</p>