### **Board Policy**

Code No. 604.3E1

### **Identification for Extended Learning**

### **Identification for Extended Learning Program**

#### **Identification of Underserved Populations:**

To ensure inclusion of all students in the ELP Identification Process, the following considerations will be given:

- Underserved populations will be represented in the screening pool.
- By rank ordering disaggregated data, students whose scores are significantly above those in their subgroup may be considered for inclusion in the screening pool data.
- Teacher recommendations will be sent to district ELL teachers to flag any potential candidates for the screening pool.
- These students may have scores that require them to have their own additional list because they may not appear on the traditional lists.

#### **Process for Determining Placement:**

- 1. Collect the following data:
  - a. Teacher Recommendations
  - b. Iowa Assessment Scores Disaggregated
  - c. Parent Referrals
  - d. Renzulli Scale filled out on Google Form for entire screening pool
- 2. Administer CogAT (elementary) or SAGES (middle school) to students:
  - a. Who have a teacher recommendation, or
  - b. Who are among the 20-25% of students who score at the highest level on the Iowa Assessment. (3rd Grade)
    - who fall in the 20-25% in subsequent years and have not been previously i. assessed by either the CogAT or SAGES
  - c. Who score significantly higher on the Iowa Assessment compared to other members of the subgroup.
- 3. Analyze and Organize the Data by
  - a. Using the Lohman & Renzulli Identification Method.
- 4. Repeat Steps 1-3 for disaggregated subgroups using each as its own comparison group.
- 5. ELP Team meets to review data and make final placement decisions.
- 6. Those screened but not placed will be flagged for additional differentiation in their individual building.

### **Identification Assessments and Timeline:**

Grade Spans:	Required Assessments/ Artifacts (Or Equivalent):	Additional Assessments/Artifacts:		
K-3	All or some of these options to determine placement for services:  • PETS Curriculum Checklist K-2  • Observation of behaviors and skills that demonstrate advanced attainment of developmental milestones  • Identification for Flexible Enrichment groups for talent development using common formative assessment results, teacher observation of classroom performance. Within these groups further data will be gathered using  • Observation of behaviors and skills that demonstrate advanced attainment of developmental milestones	Additional Items to Determine Placement:		
End of 3rd Grade Whole Grade Screening	To Establish the Screening Pool:  1. Teacher Recommendations collected in grade level PLCs (e.g., Sousa Scales)  2. Iowa Assessments (Broken down by subgroups: e.g., EL, IEP, At-Risk, Low SES, Minority)  a. Domain Specific Percentile Cutoff 95th percentile  3. If available PETS Curriculum Checklists from K-2  Determine Placement:  1. CogAT Level 9 for General Intellectual or Specific Academic Placement  2. Iowa Assessments  a. Domain Specific Standard Score to help with Specific Academic Placement  3. Teacher Rating Checklists Per Individual Students  4. PETS Curriculum Checklists from K-2  5. Prior identification for gifted services  Identifying students from underserved populations  (EL, 2e, low SES, minority)  CLED Assessment  HOPE Scale  Directions  Student data will be examined using like-subgroup comparisons	Additional Items to Determine Placement:  Student Work Samples  Re-talk with classroom teachers about specific gifted characteristics that student is showing. (Teacher Inventories)  SAGES  Iowa Acceleration Scale  Student Interview with Intake Interview Rubric  Rubric  Questions  Parent Recommendation: Things My Child Does		

# 4-5 Process for those not identified at end of 3rd grade

#### **To Establish the Screening Pool:**

- 1. Teacher Recommendations collected in grade level PLCs (e.g., Sousa Scales)
- 2. Iowa Assessments (Broken down by subgroups: e.g., EL, IEP, At-Risk, Low SES, Minority)
  - a. Domain Specific Percentile Cutoff 95th percentile
- 3. If available PETS Curriculum Checklists from K-2
- 4. Parent Requests
  - a. Evidence of prior gifted programming at previous school
  - b. Parent Inventory (Karen Rogers-PIP)

#### **Determine Placement:**

- 1. CogAT Level 10 for General Intellectual or Specific Academic Placement
- 2. Iowa Assessments
  - a. Domain Specific Standard Score to help with Specific Academic Placement
- 3. Teacher Rating Checklists Per Individual Students
- 4. PETS Curriculum Checklists from K-2
- 5. Prior identification for gifted services

# Identifying students from underserved populations (EL, 2e, low SES, minority)

- CLED Assessment
- HOPE Scale
  - Directions
- Student data will be examined using likesubgroup comparisons

# Additional Items to Determine Placement:

- Student Work Samples
- Re-talk with classroom teachers about specific gifted characteristics that student is showing. (Teacher Inventories)
- SAGES
- Iowa Acceleration Scale
- Student Interview with Intake Interview Rubric
  - o <u>Rubric</u>
  - o Questions
- Parent
   Recommendation:
   <u>Things My Child</u>
   Does
- Parent Inventory (Karen Rogers-PIP)

### 6-8 To Establish the Screening Pool:

- 1. Teacher Recommendations collected in grade level PLCs (e.g., Sousa Scales)
- 2. Iowa Assessments (Broken down by subgroups: e.g., EL, IEP, At-Risk, Low SES, Minority)
  - a. Domain Specific Percentile Cutoff 95th percentile
- 3. Parent Requests
  - a. Evidence of prior gifted programming at previous school
  - b. Parent Inventory (Karen Rogers-PIP)

#### **Determine Placement:**

- 1. Iowa Assessments
  - a. Domain Specific Standard Score to help with Specific Academic Placement
- 2. SAGES Assessment
- 3. Teacher Rating Checklists (Purdue Rating Scales)

### Additional Items to Determine Placement:

- Purdue Rating Scales for Secondary Students (Possibly use for borderline students or move ins)
  - o Math
  - Science
  - o English
  - Foreign Language
  - Social Studies
- Student Interview with Intake Interview Rubric
  - o Rubric

per Individual Students

4. Prior identification for gifted services

# Identifying students from underserved populations (EL, 2e, low SES, minority)

- CLED Assessment
- HOPE Scale
  - o Directions
- Student data will be examined using likesubgroup comparisons

- o Questions
- Parent Inventory (Karen Rogers-PIP)
- Student Work Samples
- MAP Scores
- Iowa Acceleration Scale
- Trial Placement in Gifted Services/Curriculum with review of performance and products produced
  - Appropriately challenged, frustration, quality products, exhibiting high level thinking, advanced thinking skills
- Kids who take ACT
   Early in Middle
   School or in High
   School (Voluntarily
   Submitted by parents)
  - Use <u>College</u>

     and <u>Career</u>
     <u>Readiness</u>

     Standards (Use Score Rangesto determine placement)

## 9-12 All or Some of these options to determine placement for Services:

- Self-Nomination Form
- Teacher Recommendation Form
- Kids who take ACT Early in Middle School or in High School
  - Use <u>College and Career Readiness</u>
     Standards (Use Score Ranges- to determine placement)
- Prior identification for gifted services

# Additional Items to Determine Placement:

- End of year test for next grade level course
- IA Algebra Readiness Assessment
- Student performance in competitions and contests
- ACT Subtest scores
  may be considered if
  available
  <a href="http://www.act.org/co">http://www.act.org/co</a>
  <a href="mailto:ntent/act/en/college-and-career-readiness/standards.html">http://www.act.org/co</a>
  <a href="mailto:ntent/act/en/college-and-career-readiness/standards.html">ntent/act/en/college-and-career-readiness/standards.html</a>

#### **Parent Request Procedures:**

- Parent Requests K-3
- Parent Requests 4-8
- Parent Requests 9-12

### **Program Evaluation**

#### Program Goals:

- 1. Educators, recognizing the learning and developmental differences of students with gifts and talents, promote ongoing self understanding, awareness of their needs, and cognitive and affective growth of these students in school, home, and community settings.
- 2. Assessments provide information about identification, learning progress and outcomes, and evaluation of programming for students with gifts and talents in all domains.
- 3. Educators apply the theory and research-based models of curriculum and instruction related to students with gifts and talents and respond to their needs by planning, selecting, adapting, and creating culturally relevant curriculum and by using a repertoire of evidence-based instructional strategies.
- 4. Learning environments foster personal and social responsibility, multicultural competence, and interpersonal and technical communication skills for leadership in the 21st century.
- 5. Educators are aware of empirical evidence regarding (a) the cognitive, creative and affective development of learners with gifts and talents and (b) programming that meet their concomitant needs. Educators use this expertise systematically and collaboratively to develop, implement and effectively manage comprehensive services for students with a variety of gifts and talents.

6. All educators (administrators, teachers, counselors, and other instructional support staff) build their knowledge and skills using the NAGC/CEC Teacher Standards for Gifted and Talented Education and the National Staff Development Standards. They formally assess professional development needs related to the standards, develop and monitor plans, systematically engage in training to meet the identified needs, and demonstrate mastery of standard. They access resources to provide for release time, funding for continuing education, and substitute support.

#### **Evaluation Tool:**

Questions	Data Sources to Consider	Instrumentation	Process for Data Collection	Involved Persons	Timeline	Strategies
Focus/Leading Question: What are the program strengths and weaknesses in relation to a) best practices in gifted education and/or b) fulfillment of program goals listed above?	NAGC Programming Goals Self-Study Checklist Excel form  Google Survey for parents of students who are receiving ELP services specific to the cycle year  Google Survey for classroom teachers for the district specific to the cycle year  Google Survey for students who are receiving gifted services specific to the cycle year  Administrator focus group at annual retreat	NAGC Program Standards Survey responses Focus group protocol District's demographics	Collect and analyze NAGC program goal data from involved persons.	ELP Staff Classroom Teachers Parents Students Building Administrators	5 Year Cycle: Year 1: Goals 1 & 4 Year 2: Goal 2 Year 3: Goal 3 Year 4: Goal 5 Year 5: Goal 6	Revisit ELP mission and program goals.  Collaboratively analyze data to assess program goal alignment with national program standards to build a profile of strengths and weaknesses and drive short-term goal-setting.  Develop action plan for goal attainment.  Reassess short-term goal attainment annually.
Question 1. To what extent is the gifted program meeting the needs of identified students as perceived by stakeholders?	Interviews Surveys Focus Group Program Documents Classroom Observation Data Student pre-post assessments and/or student products	Survey tailored to stakeholder group  Focus group protocol  Teacher Classroom Observation Instrument  District's demographics	Distribute surveys to target groups (see timeline) Conduct Focus Group	ELP Students ELP Staff ELP Parents Classroom Teachers Building Principals	Students and Parents at building transition years (Ex. 5th, 8th, & 12th)  Classroom Teachers and Building Principals every 5 year cycle (Revisit if this is often enough)	Collaboratively analyze data to assess the perceived impact or effect of ELP Programming Utilize data in conclusion question

Question 2. What evidence exists to document positive student performance trends for students participating in the gifted program?  Are individual students making growth as a result of their programming (One year's growth for each year spent in school)?  What is the program retention rate?	Possible data sources include:  Iowa Assessments (3-11)  MAP (6-11)  PETS Checklists (K-3)  Attendance of using PRIDE time for interest based topics (high school)  ICAP (electronic 4 year portfolio plan)  AP student outcome data (high school)  ACT Data (high school)  End-of-Course exam scores (high school)  Pre/post curriculum rubric	Possible instrumentation include:  AP Test  Iowa Assessments  End-of-Course Exam  I.S. and Mentorships Rubric  Teachers' differentiation checklists  Grade in concurrent enrollment/ dual enrollment class.  Rubric to grade	Collect data annually to show trends	ELP Staff Administrators Counselors Classroom Teachers	Collect data from all schools annually.	Collect and assess data annually.  Utilize data in conclusion question
	% of ELP Students that matriculate into AP coursework  Concurrent credit/dual enrollment credit  Student portfolios/artifacts  Independent studies and mentorship rubric ratings (secondary).  Regular teachers' differentiation checklists					

# Bettendorf Community School District BOARD POLICY - 604.3E1 • INSTRUCTION AT A POST-SECONDARY EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTION REGULATION

Conclusion: What are the recommendations for program improvement or revision?	Examine data from the question under consideration	See listed instrumentation for question under consideration	Compile needed data for analysis	ELP Staff  Building and Central Office Administrators	Annual review of select components	Develop short- term goals to address weaknesses and capitalize strengths.
Example: on AP/IB Benchmarks,						Develop action plan including recommendations
these short-term goals have been set:  1. 100% of all identified GT students will take at least 1 AP or IB exam 2. 50% of GT students in AP will score a 3 or higher.						Share results and recommendations with appropriate stakeholder groups.
3. The number of low-income students in taking AP/IIB or participating in gifted programs will increase by 10% annually.						

Cross Reference: 604.3 Talented and Gifted Program
604.3R1 Extended Learning Program Administrative Regulation

Approved: December 18, 2017