

Gifted Advisory Council Meeting
Ohio Department of Education, Room 102
March 6, 2018
1:00 – 3:30 p.m.

WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

Kim Monachino welcomed council members and guests to the meeting, and had all council members and ODE staff introduce themselves.

NORMS

Kim reviewed the meeting norms with the group.

APPOINT A CHAIRPERSON FOR THE GIFTED ADVISORY COUNCIL

Kim discussed the need for a chairperson to work with ODE staff in planning and facilitating meetings. Kim nominated Dwayne Arnold as chair and he graciously accepted the appointment.

PURPOSE

Wendy Stoica reviewed the purpose of the Gifted Advisory Council.

Gifted Advisory Council:

The superintendent of public instruction shall establish a gifted advisory council. The council shall:

- (1) Represent a variety of stakeholders from diverse regions of the state, including parents, general and gifted educators, administrators and others as determined by the superintendent;*
- (2) Assist in the development and updating of a department-approved plan for gifted education in Ohio;*
- (3) Advise on policy recommendations;*
- (4) Serve as advisors in establishing criteria for review of proposals to implement innovative gifted services; and*
- (5) Establish criteria for identifying and recognizing schools, districts, and other educational providers*

Ohio Administrative Code 3301-51-15(I)

APPROVE DECEMBER 5, 2017 MEETING MINUTES AND REVIEW TODAY'S AGENDA

Wendy asked council members to review the December 5, 2017 meeting minutes and offer edits or comments. The minutes were approved with no edits. Wendy then reviewed the agenda for today.

REVISIONS TO GIFTED RULE

Maria Lohr provided an update on SB 216.

Proposed revisions to the gifted operating standards (OAC 3301-51-15) include:

- Decrease in professional development clock hours for educators designated as service providers:
 - General education teachers without qualifying AP/IB training: reduces from 60 clock hours over 2 years to 60 clock hours over 4 years (with a focus on the 8 gifted competencies)
 - General education teachers with 24 clock hours of qualifying AP/IB training over the previous 5 years: reduces from 60 clock hours over 2 years to 30 clock hours over 4 years (with a focus on 5 specified gifted competences)

- Specifies that services can be reported in year one as long as the designated service providers maintains the minimum clock hour PD requirement (for example: a total of 15 clock hours by the end of year one, a total of 30 clock hours by the end of year two, etc.)
- Adds flexibility for carry over of clock hours in excess of minimums
- Adds flexibility for qualifying professional development in gifted education from the previous 24 months to count toward the requirement for teachers designated as service providers on or after July 1, 2017

If the State Board of Education approves the revision, it will be presented to the General Assembly. We are hoping the changes will be in place for next school year.

UPDATE FROM GIFTED COST STUDY

Wendy reported that the Gifted Cost Study group is approximately two-thirds of the way through their work. The researchers have completed on-site visits across the state, and brought together three ESCs in order to have a comprehensive view. The report is due on May 1, 2018. A draft report will be shared at the end of March, and another draft will be presented in April. The final report will be made available publicly.

UPDATE FROM OHIO ASSOCIATION FOR GIFTED CHILDREN – TEACHER ACADEMY

Mike Demczyk shared that the February 26th Ohio Association for Gifted Children Teacher Academy was a great success, boasting a sold-out crowd. Many general education teachers were in attendance. Among the themes of the sessions were Creative Thinking, Project-Based Learning, Escape Rooms, Measuring Student Growth, and Cluster Grouping. ODE presented on Formative Instructional Practices, and Writing Effective WEP Goals.

DEBRIEF FROM DECEMBER 5, 2017

Wendy facilitated a debrief of the December 5, 2017 meeting.

- Themes from Innovative Services work sessions:
 - Definition should include a sustained and challenging experience that is not a service already described in the gifted operating standards.
 - Innovative Service should be a unique experience tailored to student needs and interests and may take many forms.
 - Criteria to evaluate proposals should include equal access for all eligible students, qualifications of the service provider(s), and plan to evaluate the effectiveness of the service.

DISCUSSION OF DRAFT DEFINITION

Council members reviewed the draft definition:

A service that is not already defined in the gifted operating standards and offers a sustained and challenging experience, based in evidence or research suggesting that the service is effective or is a promising practice, to meet the unique needs and interests of the district's students. Innovative services shall be for students who are gifted, or in the case of talent development, students who are likely to be identified gifted.

Reactions to draft definition:

Strengths

- Sustained and challenging
- Addressing unique needs
- Not already in operating standards

Needs for improvement

- Last phrase should end at “students who are gifted.”
- Promising practice ... need to show additional steps
- Talent development needs revisited

Why would districts apply for an innovative service?

- Accountability – report card
- To show they do more than the minimum
- K 1, 2 – to help provide staffing and service & meet needs
- It demonstrates a willingness to be flexible
- Allows a format to follow
- Passion of the teacher

Staff will work on a revision for the council to review.

DISCUSSION OF REVISED INNOVATIVE SERVICE APPLICATION

Reactions/key ideas about application

- Talent development items should be vetted out
- Last part of page 2 – the wording is awkward around criteria/district students
- Could it be a focus for districts to work on talent development of students already identified in one area?
- Could we have two applications - one for gifted only and the other for students who are not identified gifted?
- Need them to submit what is the district priority
- It needs to be made clear that WEPs would need to be written for students served
- Maybe in the cover letter, get very clear about the intended outcome – creating positive measurable impacts
- Add an option that is GT only or open to larger scope and who is that
- How are GT needs met if open?
- Part 1
 - 5th Priority area: district must specify what serve is
- Part 2
 - Concern with “talent development”
- Part 3
 - #2 – Add gifted students
 - #5 – Add gifted students
 - Items 2 and 5 – clarify
- Part 4
 - District assurances ... educator responsible for assuring ... is the gifted person facilitating or delivering the service?

Questions and Answers

Q: Pertaining to quantifying measures – the social emotional piece is not a typical type of service. Are we saying if you fill out this application you can provide a class on social/emotional? Is this something that is addressed in an innovative gifted service?

A: They would provide that answer in part 3.

Q: We wouldn't be limited in how we can use gifted dollars?

A: No, you wouldn't.

DISCUSSION OF DRAFT RUBRIC

Reactions/Feedback on draft rubric

- Align the numbering/headers/labels and ordering between the application and the rubric
- Make it either “met” or “does not meet”
- 1c – Eliminate score of 1 – either have it or don’t
- 2 – Add “for gifted students” to rubric
- 2 – What/how is a promising practice defined
- 2 – Peer reviewed study – something that shows merit to research
- 2 – Study/data relevant to district (context demographics)
- 2 – What makes a promising practice “effective”
- 2 – Add district “proof” of it being effective for them
 - i.e. Peer reviewed, aligns to mission, fits population, etc.
 - Qualitative reasons why/how it is effective
- 3 – Give examples of types of data (such as ...) that is relevant to the criteria and/or student population
 - i.e. If it is a social emotional learning service – I may not need specific academic data
- 4 – Is it “equal access”? Maybe this should be part of the title.

Q: If they don’t meet the rubric, is it a done deal or can they fix?

A: Those questions are currently being discussed.

TENTATIVE TIMELINE

- March – Email reminder that applications will be available soon, description of who is eligible to apply
- Mid-April – Application opens
- End of May – Applications due
- Mid-June – Districts notified regarding decisions

We would like to send out an email to districts in March to tell them that applications will be available soon. We would ask that you give a heads-up to your groups, as well. We anticipate that an application will be final and posted in mid-April. In June, we will review and provide feedback, and then award to districts.

Council members expressed that the process feels rushed, and asked if it could be pushed back a bit. Kim agreed, saying that we don’t want to rush this, and when it is rolled out it should be correct. Kim said it is clear that we need some time to think more about this. ODE staff will respect the consideration of the group and get this back out to council members in writing.

Beth will send a reminder about homework. When feedback is received, Beth will place it in the collaboration center.

NEXT STEPS

- Week of March 12, 2018 – ODE will share the application for feedback. Feedback will be due by March 16, 2018.
- Home Fun – Council members send criteria for identifying and recognizing schools, districts, and other educational providers by April 27, 2018.
- May 8, 2018 – Develop criteria for identifying and recognizing schools, districts and other educational providers

- Establish meetings for the 2018-19 school year
- Proposed meeting dates for 2018-19 school year:
 - September 18, 2018
 - November 28, 2018
 - February 6, 2019
 - April 24, 2019

The meeting adjourned at 3:42 p.m.