GIFTED ADVISORY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES
April 27, 2022
10:00 a.m. to 2:00 p.m.

WELCOME AND CALL TO ORDER
Office for Exceptional Children Associate Director Joseph Petrarca welcomed all and called the meeting to order. Gifted Advisory Council Chair-elect Jackie Rausch called the roll. Meeting norms and February meeting feedback were reviewed.

PUBLIC COMMENT AND VOTING ITEMS
No members of the public requested to make comments to the council. Due to there being no quorum, the approval of February 2022 minutes and Chair-elect vote were both postponed until the proposed September meeting. Members were asked to contact Beth Arledge if they are interested in being considered for the Chair-elect position.

PURPOSE AND EXPECTATIONS OF RULE FEEDBACK
- Engage stakeholders in discussions regarding Ohio Administrative Code (OAC) 3301-51-15 Operating Standards for Identifying and Serving Students Who are Gifted
- Obtain stakeholder feedback on current rule
- Obtain suggested revisions for consideration from stakeholders
- Department reviews all feedback prior to public comment

Ohio legislation requires these rules undergo a review by the Ohio Department of Education and stakeholders every five years. Department staff is in the process of conducting the review of these standards. Public comment is slated for Fall. Stakeholders will receive multiple electronic communications throughout the public comment period. A GovDelivery notification will be sent out as a reminder of the public comment period. An article on the rule revision will be included in the department's electronic newspaper, EdConnection. A story will run the day the comment period begins, and a reminder article will run in the 'Deadline and dates' section throughout the public comment period.

SECTION REVIEW AND DISCUSSION
Definitions and General
- Defines terms "gifted," "school district," and "specific academic ability field"
- Duplicated from or based on Ohio Revised Code (ORC) 3324.01
- Additionally defines "trained individual" and "visual or performing arts"
- Establishes that all minimum standards for elementary and secondary students shall also be followed for students who are gifted

 Discussion and feedback:
  - ➢ Is "show potential" clear enough?
    - o This is from Ohio Revised Code.
  - ➢ Why doesn't it say, "gifted and talented" rather than just "gifted"?
  - ➢ Is "environment" clear enough? Could we say, "environment and culture"?
  - ➢ Under "specific academic ability" consider adding "technology".
  - ➢ Somewhere in the document there should be a statement or definition of what service is.

➤ A definition for creativity would be helpful.
➤ Concerned about definition of specific academic areas because it does not include twice exceptionality.
➤ Verbally gifted have to prove they have a disability.

Identification: Definition
- Defines criteria for identification in four broad categories (Duplicate of ORC 3324.03)
    o Superior Cognitive Ability
    o Specific Academic Ability
    o Creative Thinking Ability
    o Visual or Performing Arts Ability
- Establishes "once identified, always identified"

Discussion and feedback:
➤ Clarification around where it says "the preceding 24 months" is needed.
➤ Standard error of measure should be used uniformly.
➤ Identifying children as creative with and intelligence test score is a huge problem.
➤ We should accept superior cognitive in any category that falls under the gifted range, not just one.
    o This is something we can discuss with the ODE legal office.
➤ "Exhibiting specific academic ability" – when many districts use tests that are given three times a year, they fall on our list of approved assessments. We have to use that as a gifted screener. This is a cumbersome task in dealing with vendors. Creates more work in the districts. Some flexibility on the 30-day piece would help.
➤ On tests such as CogAT some students are very high on one battery but can't be identified.
➤ Qualifications for definition for superior cognitive 95th percentile on overall composite achievement test, this is not clear.
➤ Composite score would be better stated "or sub scales".
➤ Say either "assessment" or "identification and assessment". Be consistent.
➤ Is there any talk of moving away from a national score to more local scores?

Identification: Testing/Assessment
- References ORC 3324.02 by requiring districts to only use instruments for identification from the List of Approved Assessments established by the Department of Education
- Requires districts to ensure assessment instruments are administered by trained individuals and valid for the specific purpose and populations being tested
- Includes test administration considerations for special populations, including the use of accommodations, testing in native language, and others

Discussion and feedback:
➤ Need to think about assessments in other languages.
➤ What clarification can be provided to districts for assessing students who have significant cognitive disabilities?
➤ Accommodations for English learners should be highlighted more and encouraged more.
➤ Screening assessment language is confusing because districts feel that everyone needs to take the test, so clarify screening for students with significant cognitive disabilities.
➤ Change "at the request of the parent" to "primary caregiver".
➤ Fix all typos.

Identification: District Identification Plan
- Duplicates language from ORC 3324.04 regarding the District Identification Plan requirements
- Requires initial assessment within 90 days of referral
- Districts cannot exclude students from service options due to reassessment or outside scores
- Establishes whole-grade screenings in the K-2 grade band and in the 3-6 grade band for specified areas of identification (superior cognitive, reading, math, and creative thinking)

Discussion and feedback:
- ➢ Whole-grade screening should be for all areas, not just those listed.
- ➢ Clarification needed on types of days.
- ➢ Does the state have guidance on profoundly gifted? It may be worth addressing.
- ➢ For identification plan, add language about when it should be updated and when it should be board approved.
- ➢ Need to add language about students with disabilities and gifted identification.

Identification: District Policy
- Duplicates language from ORC 3324.06 regarding the adoption and distribution of a district gifted policy statement, including required components
- Requires districts to include in policy statements a detailed list of services likely to be provided and a detailed list of all gifted services currently available within the district, including the criteria for receiving those services.

Discussion and feedback:
- ➢ Should not tell caregivers which test will be used. Some may try to obtain and prep their student.
- ➢ "Distribute" seems like someone is expected to print and send out. Be more explicit.
- ➢ Is there a way to clarify that district policy and the plan are different things?
- ➢ Rather than saying "resolving disagreements" could it say, "due process"?
- ➢ Need guidance around how teachers are informed – not just caregivers.
- ➢ Advanced placement should be capitalized.
- ➢ Include principals.

Provision of Services
- Describes parameters for gifted services, including: class sizes, caseload ratios, and instructional time for gifted service settings
- Requires services to occur during the typical instructional day with flexibilities for certain educational options
- Requires districts to only report services to the Department or parents when provided in accordance with the gifted operating standards
- Describes allowed settings for gifted services. Many settings are listed under ORC 3324.07, district plan for service of gifted students
- Describes placement procedures for gifted services, including use of written criteria for determining eligibility
- Establishes subject criteria cannot be used to exclude students from service and that written criteria cannot be unduly restrictive

Discussion and feedback:
- ➢ Talent development will not qualify as service. Need to be clear on what is and is not service.
- ➢ There should be some way to track and report talent development even though it does not qualify as service.
- ➢ Last time we went through this process we lost minimum minutes of instruction and ratios. We need to incorporate these things back into the rule.
- ➢ Reporting with early entrance – maybe for guidance documents.
- ➢ Need clarification around who the service provider actually is, also cluster grouping – need clarity on what it is and how to implement.
- ➢ Should the word equal be changed to equitable?
- ➢ There may be cases where there are not enough students to have a self-contained class, so it may not be reported that the GIS was providing the service. We need a way to make that clearer.
- ➢ In the reporting guidance there is no place – no program code – to report self-contained. This is a huge part of gifted services that not many districts provide.
- ➢ Should also mention academies, not just self-contained classrooms.
- ➢ Continuum of services – all grade levels or multiple based on student need?
- ➢ Maybe say continuum and menu or something similar to reflect the variety of services.
- ➢ Capitalize proper nouns here and watch other typos.
- ➢ There is not a way to capture that the GIS would be working with talent development.

Provision of Services: Personnel
- • Describes qualifications for gifted intervention specialists, gifted coordinators, and general education teachers who are designated as providers of gifted services
- • Establishes required specialized training in gifted education for general education teachers who are designated providers of gifted service, including reduced requirements
- • Includes description of professional development competencies, specified clock hours, and qualifications of providers of gifted education professional development

Discussion and feedback:
- ➢ Need some clarification around hours earned in excess of the minimum.
- ➢ Language about qualifying professional development – there is currently a date specified and says 24 months prior to that. This should be removed.
- ➢ Consider addressing the parameters around specified number of hours per competency.
- ➢ Be sure to clarify who is a qualified provider when talking about college or university personnel.
- ➢ Support for general education teacher is needed.
- ➢ Beyond 60 hours in year five – ongoing hours – more clear definition as to what constitutes ongoing hours and what is sufficient.
- ➢ Focusing on minoritized, culturally and in other ways diverse, highly gifted, etc., should be called out when speaking of professional development for all who are providing gifted services.
- ➢ Strengthen this portion of the rule to be sure children receive appropriate services through cluster grouping general education service model.
- ➢ Consider the load of varied service models, providing pull out push in services, etc. to help not overload teachers.

- ➢ Need to further clarify how professional development is implemented and tracked for general education teachers and the hours within those four categories – when does the clock start, etc.
- ➢ Are twice-exceptional students included in those with special needs?
- ➢ Need clarification or rewording under competencies to ensure we're clearly defining who are the groups we are talking about and the nature and needs of kids who are gifted.
- ➢ The word nature presumes we are talking about giftedness being genetic. This is outdated language. A better term would be "development and needs".
- ➢ Coordinator qualifications – talking about teaching experience – doesn't specify gifted teaching experience.
- ➢ Should clarify number of districts a coordinator is coordinating for, also number of students.
- ➢ Early entrance and acceleration need to be included here.
- ➢ Can we address obtaining supplemental gifted endorsement and the various paths for that?
- ➢ Make sure there are some parameters around obtaining gifted endorsement so those pursuing this are fully trained and capable of doing the job.
- ➢ Caution about unfunded mandates – such as requiring districts to have a gifted coordinator. Give consideration to the new funding formula that was recently released.
- ➢ Is there a possibility to incentivize recruitment and retention of gifted coordinators?

Written Education Plan (WEP)
- Describes required components of a Written Education Plan (WEP)
- Requires development in collaboration with an educator who holds licensure or endorsement in gifted education
- Requires districts to make a reasonable attempt to obtain a parent signature on a WEP; but does not require parent signature for service placement
- Includes "No Service Letter" provision for identified students who do not receive any gifted education service

Discussion and feedback:
- ➢ Possibly add another layer of reporting for WEPs
- ➢ If the WEP had teeth it would rectify some of the issues we have already identified today – maybe it should be moved up further in the document with specific parameters
- ➢ WEPs can be cut and paste – how to make it worthwhile?
- ➢ Could WEPs be embedded in student success plans?
- ➢ Could the time spent doing WEPs be better spent in teaching and planning?
- ➢ Marginalized caregivers are lost about how to communicate and work with schools; be cognizant to have these documents in the caregivers' languages to the extent possible.

Funding
- Includes language about required reporting of district expenditures from ORC 3324.09
- Includes language regarding appropriately licensed and qualified gifted staff for educational service center funding

Discussion and feedback:
- ➢ Need to include updated language to be inline with the language in ORC

Accountability
- Describes audit participation based on risk assessment criteria. This is related to language in ORC 3324.05 about audit of numbers of students who are screened, assessed, and identified for gifted

Discussion and feedback:
- ➢ Need to include updated language to be in line with the language in ORC
- ➢ Clarification around reporting for screened and assessed
- ➢ Clarification needed around area of identification and services

Innovative Gifted Service Proposals
- Requires the Department to establish a process and criteria for submission and review of innovative gifted service proposals.

Discussion and feedback:
- ➢ This section could be eliminated
- ➢ Include language about talent development and guiding how it could work and having a way to report it

Gifted Advisory Council
- Establishes a state gifted advisory council representing a variety of stakeholders and details the council's responsibilities.

Discussion and feedback:
- ➢ If the section on innovation services is deleted, that language would need to be deleted here.
- ➢ There is language in the report card reform bill about the GAC being part of the review of the Gifted Indicator every three years, so that should be included here
- ➢ Some wording should be included around racial and ethnic diversity representation

Possible OAGC Presentation
Maria would like to have a presentation at OAGC with Gifted Advisory Council members. It would be nice to have one person from each subcommittee participate. An email will be coming out around this. Email Maria and or Beth if you are interested.

Proposed FY23 Meeting Dates
- September 28, 2022
- December 7, 2022
- February 22, 2023
- April 26, 2023

Position Statement – Districts Eliminating Gifted Programs
We are considering drafting a position statement in reaction to the trend of districts discontinuing gifted programs due to equity concerns. We will send an email about this. If you are interested in helping draft a position statement, please let us know. This work would take place over the summer. We may also consider drafting a document and asking for your input electronically.

The meeting was adjourned.