



*The* OHIO 8

**MEMORANDUM**

**TO: State Board of Education**  
**FROM: The Ohio 8 Coalition**  
**DATE: January 9, 2014**  
**RE: Gifted Standards Feedback**

This document contains the Ohio 8 Coalition's initial feedback regarding the State Board's work on gifted standards. Using the concepts shared with us by Vice President Tom Gunlock, we have integrated our feedback (highlighted in yellow) throughout this document. We look forward to continuing to work with the State Board to define standards and measures around gifted education.

Gifted Dashboard – The Ohio 8 is concerned that this dashboard will force school districts into further competition by defining them as good or bad instead of resulting in identification of areas of strength, continuous improvement, and areas needing increased attention. What is the justification for dichotomizing districts into binary labels of “good” or “bad” when “giftedness in the schools is something we confer, not something we discover.” (Borland, 2005, pp. 7-8) and experts suggest re-conceptualizing giftedness and gifted education within a talent development model (Keating, 2009; Subotnik, 2003, 2009)?

1. A performance benchmark at the state level for each district type will be established for each measure.
  - a. The Ohio 8 would like clarification regarding how district type is determined
2. District data will be published for each measure along side the state and typical district data
3. The dashboard measures will be incorporated into the calculation for the gifted performance indicator with districts reported as meeting the indicator if they meet 80% of the typical (similar) district benchmarks for each of the eighteen measures below. (Several measures have multiple parts. There will be benchmarks for each portion for example for the first identification measure benchmarks would have to be met for screened, assessed and identified to meet the overall measure)
  - a. While we are supportive of multiple measures there is a lack of clarity around the execution of scoring, weighting, and ranking



- b. The Ohio 8 suggests that Gifted Operating Standards must first be developed and implemented before gifted report card measures can be appropriately defined.
4. The dashboard measures will be used to formulate rankings. (Unless we can make them go away.)

#### Identification

- Number and percentage of students screened, assessed and identified in superior cognitive and specific academic categories for grades K-3, 4-8, 9-12
- Percentage of minority, economically disadvantaged, ELL and SWD students screened, assessed and identified in superior cognitive and specific academic categories for grades K-3, 4-8, 9-12
- It is unclear if schools/districts will be penalized and/or rewarded if screening and assessment takes place but have small identification numbers.
- Narrow social construct of the term "gifted"- Today, few experts embrace the view of giftedness as high IQ. This fiction is one of the reasons for the historically underrepresentation of students of color and linguistically diverse students in gifted programs. Underrepresentation is particularly problematic in large diverse urban districts. How will this be addressed when reporting the identification measures? What happened to creative thinking (a different state category of giftedness)?

#### Service-

- Number and percentage of identified students served in superior cognitive and specific academic categories for grades K-3, 4-8, 9-12
- Percentage of minority, economically disadvantaged, ELL and SWD students screened served in superior cognitive and specific academic categories for grades K-3, 4-8, 9-12
- Percentage of students academically accelerated, including early entrance, by grade level bands K-3, 4-8, 9-12

#### Progress

- Value-added progress grades 4-8, mathematics and reading for students identified in superior cognitive, mathematics and reading categories
- Value-added progress high school level courses when available for identified gifted students (superior cognitive, ELA, mathematics, science and social studies)
- When available- progress based on above-level or adaptive assessments by grade level bands K-3, 4-8, 9-12
- The Ohio 8 seeks details on how the progress measure is currently calculated
- Will there be a minimum number of students needed in order to calculate a grade (similar to SAS there must be at least 6 students).
- Gifted students tend to score substantially above the mean. How will regression to the mean (the tendency for those with extreme initial scores to score closer to the average score on subsequent assessments) be addressed?



- Ceiling effects (problems that arise when a student's abilities are beyond the skills captured by the test and the student receives the highest test score, but this score does not reflect his/her true ability level)

#### Achievement

- Results of above grade level testing by grade level bands
- Percentage of superior cognitive and/or specific academic identified students scoring at 90<sup>th</sup> NCE on OAA and OGT by grade level
- When available- number and percentage of superior cognitive and/or specific academic scoring at highest scoring level (score of 5) on new assessments
- Percentage of middle school students earning high school credit
- Number and percentage of identified gifted students earning one high school credit or more through credit-flexible or credit by examination
- Because IQ scores can change and in some cases dramatically (Lohman & Korb, 2006; Nesbitt, 2009), experts refute the assumption of "Once gifted, always gifted" as scientific evidence indicates that giftedness is not fixed (Bronfenbrenner & Ceci, 1994; Ceci & Williams, 1997; Neisser, 1996). Giftedness is a useful descriptor of a group of students who display exceptional ability or uncommon promise in the classroom at **one point in time** (Keating, 2009). However, since superior cognitive ability isn't fixed, caution should be taken when making assumptions about gifted students' academic performance over time. How will the fact that giftedness is not an immutable attribute of a student be addressed when assessing academic achievement?
- Superior cognitive ability is only one predictor of academic success. Other nonintellectual abilities (ex. motivation) contribute to the successful academic trajectory of students. Hence, should high ability or the lack thereof be the only factor considered when determining students' achievement?
- The achievement measures fail to consider the fact that all gifted students can't "do everything" as some gifted students have severe deficiencies in certain academic areas.

#### Prepared for Success

- Number and percentage of superior cognitive and/or specific academic identified gifted students meeting remediation-free status
- Number and percentage of superior cognitive and/or specific academic identified gifted students enrolled and scoring 3 or better AP, 4 or better IB by course
- ACT/SAT mean composite for superior cognitive and/or specific academic identified students
- Percentage of superior cognitive and/or specified academic identified students earning an Honors Diploma

#### Audit Results if available

