**Gifted Advisory Council Meeting Notes**

**December 8, 2021**

**10:00 a.m. to 2:00 p.m.**

**Welcome and Call to Order**

OEC Associate Director Joseph Petrarca welcomed all and called the meeting to order. Council members and ODE staff introduced themselves.

**Gifted Updates**

Gifted Rules

OAC 3301-51-15 is up for review. Staff are working now on a final draft for review.

The timeline for this process:

* December 2021-March 2022: First draft
* December 2021-April 2022: Stakeholder review
* May 2022-July 2022: Public comment
* July-September 2022: Final draft
* October-December 2022: SBOE
* December 2022-April 2023: Agency review and filing

New Use of Funds Guidance

The Gifted Use of Funds Guidance document is going through agency review and should be available soon. We know districts are anxious to have this resource released.

Gifted Indicator Review and Feedback

House Bill 82 was passed this summer and went into effect September 30, 2021. This bill includes significant changes for the school report card, including moving the Gifted Indicator to Gap Closing. Gap Closing indicates if certain measures are “met” or “not met” for various subgroups. This includes the Gifted Performance Indicator, which includes the performance of gifted students on state assessments, the identification of gifted students, and the level of services provided to gifted students. The due date for this work is March 31, 2022. We formed a workgroup around this, which has met once and will meet again today after this meeting. Recommendations from the workgroup will be forwarded to the State Board of Education Committee in January, then it will move to full Board in February, with adoption due by the end of March.

Questions and Feedback

* How often will this new workgroup meet?

We are working out the schedule, but we intend to meet weekly.

* How will we provide input?

Email Maria Lohr at Maria.Lohr@education.ohio.gov or gifted@education.ohio.gov.

* As you’re considering reform, please consider changing the vernacular from “gifted students” to “gifted and talented students”.
* Has there been conversation around what would be an appropriate, encouraging number of districts that attain the indicator?

This is much of what we will get into during this afternoon’s meeting. We will review data and look at individual components such as performance index data. We will also look at levels of identification and service.

* Consider using the full-scale IQ and not simply the tests that are utilized now. Many states are more flexible than Ohio in their identification process.
* Happy to hear that equity index will be an option to consider. This is important to determine appropriateness and gives a better baseline.
* We also need to look at how these students are being served; how do we support schools in having all the resources needed to provide adequate and appropriate services?

This can be changed through the rules process.

* English learners and twice-exceptional students are consistently referred for gifted identification testing. We want to encourage more of that across the state. Students who are particularly high in verbal areas we do not have another assessment that would recognize their strengths.
* Talk about assessment not identifying; don’t just use one piece of data.
* Districts have many compliance pieces, but sometimes not enough accountability for what is happening in the classroom. We need to better hold districts accountable for service.
* There are gaps in EMIS data collections. Sometimes we don’t collect data around types of instruction, specific and descriptions of programs, or other factors.
* Could members of the workgroup share a summary of the work-to-date?
* Reviewed the bill, reviewed information OAGC put together for us
* Plan to review the under-representation of minority and economically disadvantaged students
* Data staff will be running simulations to assist with this work
* We may create smaller subgroups to discuss very specific items
* Goal to have something ready by the end of January
* Will work in coordination with the performance and impact subcommittee of the State Board of Education

**Workgroup Debrief**

Equitable Identification Practices

Goal of the logic model:

* Ohio will have a change in practice regarding gifted identification that is reflective of the idea that students who are gifted are present in all student groups regardless of ethnic or cultural backgrounds, gender, economic status, disability or English language proficiency, that results in the population of students who are gifted being more reflective of Ohio’s total student population.

Current status and next steps:

* The Equitable Identification Practices Workgroup has formed subcommittees focused on the following areas: stakeholder engagement, resources, research, and data analysis. Workgroup subcommittees will meet to accomplish specific activities outlined in the group’s logic model.

Feedback: None

Highly Effective Student Supports and Services

Goal of the logic model:

* To create a best practices document or manual of effective supports and services. We plan to include exemplars, guidance on SEL strategies, and “what-not-to-dos”.

Current status and next steps:

* We had presentations on acceleration and cluster-grouping, and write-ups are coming. We will be creating a standard template for presentations. There are more presentations to come.

Feedback:

Q: How are you defining services?

A: We are looking at service options under EMIS codes. We started with acceleration and cluster grouping.

Q: Is the group considering the alignment between identification and service?

A: We are looking at options for districts to match up levels of identification with the services. We are also looking to see if services meet student needs.

Job-Embedded Professional Development

Goal of the logic model:

* To increase the number of educators with the required training to support the academic and social and emotional needs of students who are gifted
* Increased accessibility to professional development for educators and administrators and providing examples of alignment to other professional development and processes in districts.

Current status and next steps:

* The Job-Embedded Professional Development Workgroup is reviewing current research to see what are best practices that should be used in providing and developing professional development.
* Create a survey to determine the current state of professional development regarding gifted education

Feedback:

Q: What does “increasing the number of teachers who have the training required” mean?

A: We are referencing what exists currently and how to have it all in one place, also increasing the availability of the professional development needed, and ensuring it is more accessible.

**Updates, Next Steps**

New business

Some districts may be eliminating gifted programs under the guise of equity. Joseph Petrarca asked if this group should create a position statement. Ann Sheldon suggested that we have something started to discuss by the next meeting. Beth Arledge will create a document in the SharePoint site for team members to share their thinking, and we can revise it at the February meeting.

**Next meeting**

February 23, 2022

**Adjourn**

Ann Sheldon motioned to adjourn. Diane Oplinger seconded the motion. The meeting was adjourned.