



July 13, 2014

To: Debe Terhar, President, State Board of Education
Tom Gunlock, Vice President, State Board of Education

From: Ann Sheldon, Executive Director, Ohio Association for Gifted Children

Re: Proposed Gifted Indicator on School District Report Cards

I am writing in response to the July 11, 2014 memo sent to you from Tom Ash, Jay Smith, and Barbara Shaner. They wrote regarding three concerns regarding the proposed gifted indicator. I was surprised at the content and the timing of the memo and frankly a little disappointed. The framework for the gifted indicator was approved *unanimously* more than two months ago by the Gifted Performance Indicator Work Group. Mr. Ash was a member of the Work Group along with Michael Tefs. They represented the education management groups. Both gentlemen voted for the indicator and never once mentioned any of the issues that were outlined in the memo. In fact, much of the basic framework has been in place for months including the input element, which is required in Section 3302.02 of Ohio Revised Code. The concerns of Mr. Ash, Mr. Smith, and Ms. Shaner appear to be based on a misinterpretation of the resolution. This was apparent from my conversation with Mr. Ash on late Friday afternoon after I learned of the memo. While I believe I have corrected this misinterpretation, it is important for board members to understand that there have been months of discussion and analysis in the development of the gifted performance indicator. No decision was made without considerable thought as to the desired outcome at both the district and building level.

With regard to the specific concerns outlined in the memo, my response is as follows:

1. *Inputs should not be included as part of the indicator.* Response: Section 3302.02 of Ohio Revised Code requires that the level of services to identified students be part of the indicator, so there is no choice in the matter. Services cannot be reported without the level of identification as service levels are meaningless without knowing how many students are identified. Percentage served statistics would be highly vulnerable to manipulation without also knowing the percentage of students identified. (It is easy to serve 100% of the gifted population if few students are identified.) Department staff, the Gifted Performance Indicator Work Group, and members of the Accountability Committee have always supported these very basic input measures. In fact, these input measures were part of the original gifted performance indicator that this board voted for unanimously in December of 2011. Based on data from the department staff on identification and services across different demographics, grade bands, and gifted areas, it became very clear to the Gifted Performance Indicator Work Group that we needed to look beyond the overall number or percentage of gifted students identified and served. Too few minority students and students in poverty are being identified and served. Too few students in the early grades are being identified. Too few students in the arts are even being screened. (See attached). There was also an awareness that it is somewhat unfair to urban districts to look merely at OAA and OGT test scores that we know are highly correlated to wealth. In my opinion, some of the best work of the Gifted Performance Indicator Work Group was to fashion an input point system that will tell a full story of what is happening across grade levels, gifted types, and student demographics. This information along with the other two elements of the indicator will help administrators and the public pinpoint areas of both strength and weakness in the district with regard to gifted children. This is the whole point of the gifted performance indicator.

2. *The proposed input portion of the gifted indicator calculation does not allow for any type of alternative student acceleration to qualify for the districts' service of students identified as gifted.* Response: This is simply an incorrect statement. Acceleration in multiple forms including but not limited to AP and PSEO/dual enrollment courses as well as whole grade and subject acceleration is allowed to be reported as service based on Chapter 3324 of ORC as well as the operating standards. Nothing in the proposed gifted performance indicator would change that. The Gifted Performance Indicator Work Group considered putting an added incentive for acceleration in the input element of the indicator (as requested by the two gifted advocates involved), but ultimately the majority of the work group including Mr. Ash and Dr. Tefs decided it was better to revisit this issue in 2016.
3. *Including the percentage of students identified as part of the input section could cause districts to over-identify gifted students.* Response: The response to the first concern applies here as well. It should be noted that in Ohio, it is almost impossible to over-identify gifted students as no subjective measures are allowed in the identification process. But we do know that there is a problem with under-identification in many districts. The input point system was purposely designed to discourage manipulation of identification figures. As Mr. Ash should recall, more points were allocated to services than to identification, specifically to address this concern. In addition, the highest number of points allocated to identification in any area is capped at 15% which is slightly below the state average. A district has absolutely no incentive to identify any more than 15% of its student population. In fact, there is a huge disincentive to identify any more than this percentage as districts are allocated more points for serving students. A larger percentage of students identified would require districts to also serve a larger number of students to receive more points.

The rest of the memo discusses state law requirements for services and spending gifted funds. While OAGC disagrees with the education management associations' interpretation of the law, the discussion is really not germane to the gifted performance indicator resolution. There is nothing in the indicator framework that dictates or encourages any form of service over another, and funding is not a part of the indicator. Districts have wide flexibility to provide services as they see fit based on current law.

ODE staff, the Accountability Committee, and the Gifted Performance Indicator Work Group have spent months to develop the first gifted performance indicator in the country. It is unlike any other indicator on the report card. It is designed to encourage districts to increase the level of attention to an often-neglected student subgroup. I will be the first to acknowledge that the indicator is imperfect and incomplete. But until Ohio has new assessments and can measure performance and value-added at all grade levels, the proposed indicator is as good a measure as we can develop today. This is why the Work Group felt strongly that the indicator be reviewed in two years. The indicator will likely be report-only until 2015/2016. This will give us all ample time to assess the impact on district behavior toward gifted students. The indicator can then be revised.

While I am disappointed in the eleventh hour objections to the gifted performance indicator by BASA, OSBA, and OASBO, I am more concerned about the misinterpretation of the resolution itself. In re-reading the resolution, to me it is clear what the gifted performance indicator is designed to do. But it may be worthwhile for ODE staff to develop an FAQ so that others do not make the similar errors in interpreting the resolution.

I would like to thank ODE staff for their efforts in working with the gifted community as well as other stakeholders on the gifted indicator. It has been a long and difficult process, but I believe one that ultimately will be of huge benefit to gifted children in Ohio.

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me at anngift@aol.com or 614-325-1185.

C. Dr. Richard Ross, State Superintendent
State Board of Education

Status of Ohio's Economically Disadvantaged and Minority Gifted Students in Identification and Service

Economically Disadvantaged Students

45.5% of Ohio's student population is economically disadvantaged.

16.3% of Ohio's student population is identified as gifted.

7.5% of Ohio's economically disadvantaged population is identified as gifted as compared to **28.1%** of non-economically disadvantaged students.

18.2% of Ohio's gifted population is identified as economically disadvantaged vs. **81.8%** of Ohio's non-economically disadvantaged students.

2.9% of Ohio's economically disadvantaged student population is provided gifted services vs. **16.8%** of Ohio's non-economically disadvantaged student population.

19.5% of Ohio's gifted population provided services is economically disadvantaged vs. **80.5%** of Ohio's non-economically disadvantaged student population.

Minority Students

24.2% of Ohio's student population is identified as racial/ethnic minority.

16.3% of Ohio's students are identified as gifted.

9.2% of Ohio's racial/ethnic minority population is identified as gifted compared to **18.6%** of Ohio's non-Hispanic white population.

13.7% of Ohio's gifted population is identified as racial/ethnic minority as compared to **86.5%** of Ohio's non-Hispanic white population.

2.3% of Ohio's racial/ethnic minority population is provided gifted services vs. **20.3%** of Ohio's non-Hispanic white population.

16.1% of Ohio's gifted population provided services is racial/ethnic minority vs. **83.9%** who are non-Hispanic white.

Gifted Identified and Served Percentages, School Year 2012-2013

	K-12	K	1st	2nd	3rd	4th	5th	6th	7th	8th	9th	10th	11th	12th
Identified as % of Enrolled														
Gifted - Identified	15.2	0.7	2.0	9.5	13.6	16.3	17.5	18.4	19.2	19.6	17.8	19.8	20.1	21.0
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Gifted Superior Cog	5.6%	0.2%	0.6%	2.3%	4.1%	5.2%	6.1%	6.7%	7.4%	7.7%	6.9%	7.9%	8.0%	8.4%
		0.5%	1.1%	3.9%									10.0%	10.6%
Gifted Reading	7.2%	0.4%	0.9%	4.2%	5.7%	7.2%	7.8%	8.4%	9.3%	9.6%	8.6%	9.9%	%	%
		0.4%	0.9%	4.2%						10.0%		10.2%		10.7%
Gifted Math	7.7%	0.0%	0.2%	2.2%	6.2%	8.2%	9.2%	9.4%	9.9%	%	9.0%	%	9.9%	%
Gifted Other		0.0%	0.2%	2.2%										
Types	3.1%	%	%	%	2.9%	3.3%	3.6%	3.7%	3.8%	4.0%	3.8%	4.1%	4.3%	4.3%
Served as % of Enrolled														
Gifted - Served	3.2%	0.1	0.2	0.8	3.6%	5.5%	6.5%	6.2%	5.2%	5.1%	1.7%	1.9%	2.0%	2.1%
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Gifted Superior Cog	1.5%	0.1%	0.1%	0.4%	1.6%	2.5%	3.1%	2.9%	2.6%	2.5%	0.9%	0.9%	0.9%	0.9%
		0.0%	0.1%	0.4%										
Gifted Reading	1.4%	0.0%	0.1%	0.2%	1.5%	2.2%	2.7%	2.8%	2.6%	2.6%	0.9%	0.8%	1.0%	0.9%
		0.0%	0.1%	0.2%										
Gifted Math	1.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.6%	2.6%	3.3%	3.1%	2.2%	2.1%	0.7%	0.7%	0.8%	1.0%
Gifted Other		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%										
Types	0.2%	%	%	%	0.2%	0.2%	0.3%	0.3%	0.3%	0.3%	0.2%	0.3%	0.3%	0.3%
Served as % of Enrolled														
Gifted - Served	20.9	9.5	9.9	8.7	26.4	33.6	36.8	34.0	27.3	26.0			10.0	
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	9.6%	9.4%	%	9.8%
Gifted Superior Cog	9.8%	8.1%	4.8%	4.1%	11.5%	15.0%	17.6%	15.8%	13.4%	12.6%	%	5.2%	4.3%	4.7%
		6.0%	3.9%	3.7%	11.0%	13.6%	15.4%	15.4%	13.7%	13.3%				
Gifted Reading	9.5%	5.9%	3.6%	2.5%	11.5%	15.8%	19.0%	16.6%	11.5%	10.7%	4.9%	4.1%	5.1%	4.4%
		5.9%	3.6%	2.5%	11.5%	15.8%	19.0%	16.6%	11.5%	10.7%				
Gifted Math	9.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.4%	%	%	%	%	%	%	4.0%	3.6%	3.9%	4.8%
Gifted Other		0.0%	0.0%	0.4%										
Types	1.4%	%	%	%	1.2%	1.3%	1.5%	1.6%	1.5%	1.7%	1.1%	1.7%	1.7%	1.4%

Note: In this analysis, Gifted types are not mutually exclusive

Gifted Identification and Service for Visual and Performing Arts, School Year 2012-13

	Enrollment	Identified		Served		
			% of Enrollment		% of Enrollment	% of Identified
Kindergarten	114,598	4	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00%
1st Grade	130,798	24	0.02%	0	0.00%	0.00%
2nd Grade	128,087	53	0.04%	1	0.00%	1.89%
3rd Grade	128,461	186	0.14%	3	0.00%	1.61%
4th Grade	128,695	308	0.24%	17	0.01%	5.52%
5th Grade	129,786	498	0.38%	36	0.03%	7.23%
6th Grade	132,772	665	0.50%	21	0.02%	3.16%
7th Grade	134,237	1,058	0.79%	40	0.03%	3.78%
8th Grade	133,111	1,363	1.02%	81	0.06%	5.94%
9th Grade	145,437	1,619	1.11%	80	0.06%	4.94%
10th Grade	132,756	1,845	1.39%	57	0.04%	3.09%
11th Grade	129,098	2,027	1.57%	71	0.05%	3.50%
12th Grade	125,103	2,281	1.82%	51	0.04%	2.24%
K-12th Grade	1,692,939	11,931	0.70%	458	0.03%	3.84%

Gifted Identification and Service for Creative Thinking, School Year 2012-13

	Enrollment	Identified		Served		
			% of Enrollment		% of Enrollment	% of Identified
Kindergarten	114,598	53	0.05%	44	0.04%	83.02%
1st Grade	130,798	87	0.07%	7	0.01%	8.05%
2nd Grade	128,087	567	0.44%	59	0.05%	10.41%
3rd Grade	128,461	991	0.77%	195	0.15%	19.68%
4th Grade	128,695	1,318	1.02%	254	0.20%	19.27%
5th Grade	129,786	1,712	1.32%	392	0.30%	22.90%
6th Grade	132,772	1,904	1.43%	331	0.25%	17.38%
7th Grade	134,237	2,159	1.61%	329	0.25%	15.24%
8th Grade	133,111	2,326	1.75%	300	0.23%	12.90%
9th Grade	145,437	2,508	1.72%	230	0.16%	9.17%
10th Grade	132,756	2,802	2.11%	57	0.04%	2.03%
11th Grade	129,098	3,009	2.33%	335	0.26%	11.13%
12th Grade	125,103	3,477	2.78%	423	0.34%	12.17%
K-12th Grade	1,692,939	22,913	1.35%	2,956	0.17%	12.90%