

School District of Elmbrook Gifted and Talented Program Evaluation Executive Summary

The Elmbrook School District is located in suburban Milwaukee and has a generally high-achieving student body – scoring above the Wisconsin averages in the math and reading sections of the Wisconsin Knowledge and Concepts Examination (55% proficient or advanced in reading, 75% proficient or advanced in math) and on the ACT. Scores on MAP math tests are significantly higher than state averages. With regard to gifted and talented education or explicit programming for advanced learners, many positive things are happening, but these are not being implemented in a systematic and continuous way. This report outlines the status of district policies and practices with regard to gifted and talented education with a focus on grades K-8. Although some reference is made to high school programming, the original charge of this evaluation was to emphasize grades K-8.

Overall the vast majority of time and effort with regard to gifted and talented education goes toward a cumbersome and in some cases illogical identification process. This process, if implemented as described in policy, would result in very few students being identified. Although roughly 8% of students district-wide are identified currently as gifted or are on a watch list, this is not a result of published identification policy as that policy is not implemented with high fidelity. The process as written in every area and at every grade level involves several high hurdles before a student can receive services. These include first being nominated, or somehow otherwise passing through a screening phase, followed by a multi-step confirmation assessment process composed of “and” combination rules. Depending on the content area, this confirmation assessment process involves from one specific to several ill-defined criteria that do not match well with programming to then be provided. For example, nonverbal tests of academic aptitude are one measure of creative talent. Students who are identified with this method are then provided no programming beyond extra-curricular activities. Such a process is not meeting an identified need and is likely taking significant staff time to implement. District staff and parents stated that the identification process is long and that the logistics and rationale for the process are not well communicated. Staff also indicated that the vast majority of the time they spend on gifted and talented education is devoted to identification, which likely negatively impacts the quality and quantity of services provided to students.

Any educational assessment is only worth administering if it results in an improved educational experience for students. This is true for gifted and talented identification as well as classroom assessment. In the current gifted and talented education policy at Elmbrook, the vast majority of identified students remain served solely through general classroom differentiation. This is less true at the high school level where a wider range of options is available. However, even then it's not clear what role identification plays (since there is some ability to self enroll) or how it serves to find all kids in need of a particular intervention. Given the wide range of readiness and ability present in the district, it's unclear how or if classroom differentiation can challenge advanced learners effectively. Whether or not a student is challenged in a classroom depends on his or her current level of readiness / mastery, the curriculum of the course or program and the ability of the teacher to differentiate. Based on the MAP achievement data included in this report, it's clear that some students are far above and far below grade-level standards. Challenging these students in the regular classroom would require a teacher to differentiate up or down

as many as four grade levels. If this isn't possible then regular classroom differentiation will not provide challenge for these advanced learners. Math seems to be the one exception. Math acceleration and grouping for instructional purposes appeared common in interviews, focus groups, and in classroom observations. With that said there are likely more students who could use additional challenge in math who do not qualify for math acceleration. Current policies accelerate only the most advanced students – those many grade above their chronological age peers. This will leave some students who still require more challenging math curriculum than they can receive in the general education classroom but who are also not ready for full-grade acceleration. Attention to this gap – perhaps starting in math and then expanding to other content areas – is needed.

The overall recommendation for the district is to take a step back and consider what it wants to accomplish with a gifted and talented program. This should begin with a district-level and school-level review of student achievement data (needs assessment) in order to determine the range of student skills and levels of readiness. Luckily, over the last year this process has already begun and procedures are being put in place to train teachers and administrators in proper data use and interpretation. This discussion and the procedures and policies that result should include considerations for what happens for students once they reach grade-level proficiency in a given area. This will help lead to a perception that “good teaching” includes considerations for how to support struggling learners as well as how to challenge advanced learners. A lesson is not ready to be implemented until the instructor has considered what students who have already mastered the content will do next in order to remain challenged. A second important step will be for the district to convene a larger discussion among all stakeholders regarding the purpose of a gifted and talented program. Although this might seem obvious to some, it will be important for everyone involved to be on the same page as the district moves forward. Again, the district appears to be moving in this direction already with the creation of a Steering Committee to convene a discussion around these very topics. Once the district has a solid understanding of the current levels of readiness of its students and where it wants to go with those students who are already grade-level proficient (or better), then more specific action with regard to identification and programming can begin. Much of that discussion could be informed by the recommendations included in this report.

With regard to programming, changes need to be made so that a) the regular education classroom is a place where the widest range of learners can be effectively challenged and b) students who can no longer benefit from the regular, grade-level classroom have other options available. The district should look at student data in each content area and in each grade level and consider how it might structure general education classrooms or curriculum in order to meet the first goal as well as put policy and procedures in place so that those students who require more challenge can have that challenge provided through the second goal. This two-step process aligns with Response to Intervention tiered levels of intervention and should be conducted in each major content area with consideration for DPI statutes and Administrative Rules. For example, perhaps the range of student readiness present in a given elementary classroom could be decreased (flexible cluster grouping) in order to help the teacher reach and challenge a larger percentage of students than would be possible if his or her classroom contain the full range of academic readiness present in a school.

The final recommendation deals with a larger philosophy for the district. Although this is up to the school board and school community as a whole, the district should consider taking an inclusive approach to gifted education. What this means is that Elmbrook should design programs and services for which there appears to be a need (via the data reviews and steering committee meetings discussed above) and then implement identification procedures to find every student who might be ready for or benefit from these programs. Such identification procedures would have the goal of finding all possible students who might benefit as opposed to more traditional models of gifted education that are more exclusionary in nature. This might involve less testing and assessment overall, lower criteria for identification or admission, and even establishing some programs as open to any student who wishes to challenge him or herself. The district has precedent for this in the honors and Advanced Placement sections of certain courses at the middle and high school levels. Current practice at the high school is closest to what gifted education in K-12 schools should be – most programs open to students who believe they are ready and identification systems that serve as a means of including all students who have a particular need. In general, the goal of gifted education (and the district's very motto) is for every student to be challenged and learn something new in school - every time, all the time. With this as a goal, the district can move forward to put policy and procedures into place to make this happen for advanced learners.

Background

In late summer of 2013, Ms. Tanya Fredrich, Director of Student Services, approached Dr. Scott Peters, assistant professor of measurement, assessment, and gifted and talented education at UW-Whitewater, regarding an evaluation of the gifted and talented program at the Elmbrook School District. At Ms. Fredrich's request, Dr. Peters prepared an evaluation proposal that was subsequently revised and approved (included in appendix). Overall the evaluation was to focus on grades K-8 and be based on Wisconsin state statutes and Department of Public Instruction administrative rules regarding gifted and talented education as well as the Pre-K – grade 12 Programming Standards from the National Association for Gifted Children.

This report is based on the review of published district policy and data, elementary and middle school site visits, meetings with school and district administrators, and focus groups with instructional resource teachers and general education staff. Drafts of the report were circulated among district administration and the instructional resource staff in mid-October and revisions were made before this final report was submitted in early November. Overall the entire process took significantly more time than was originally planned.

Although Wisconsin state statutes and administrative rules were used in this program evaluation, this report should not be seen as finding the district in or out of compliance with any or all of those statutes or rules.

Detailed Report

Each section is organized by overall findings (including reference to data, interviews, or observations) followed by recommendations and suggested resources.

Report Outline:

A. Wisconsin Statutes and Administrative Rules (see appendix)

1. Establish a Plan
2. Designate a Person to Coordinate Gifted and Talented Programs
3. Identify gifted and talented pupils:
 - a. Grades K-12
 - b. General Intellectual
 - c. Specific Academic Area
 - d. Creativity
 - e. Visual and Performing Arts
 - f. Leadership
 - g. Allow for multiple area identification
 - h. Pupil profiles based on multiple measures
 - i. Instruments used are appropriate
 - ii. Instruments used are responsive to student demographic factors
4. Students have access to appropriate programming without charge
 - a. Programming is systematic
 - b. Programming is continuous
5. Parental participation:
 - a. Identification process
 - b. Programming decisions

B. Best Practices not Addressed in State Statutes or Administrative Rules

1. Affective Concerns
2. Opportunities to Work Together
3. Program Effectiveness / Evaluation
4. Staffing
5. Staff Training

C. Summary of Recommendations

D. Appendices

A. Wisconsin Statutes and Administrative Rules:

Information regarding Wisconsin State Statutes and Administrative Rules is summarized in the appendix and can be found at: http://cal.dpi.wi.gov/cal_gift-law. They have been broken down and presented here in such a way as to facilitate reporting.

1. **Each school district shall establish a plan....to coordinate the gifted and talented program.** – note that as State Statute 121.02(1)(t) is directed at school boards, this “plan” is the responsibility of the school board itself.

Findings: There is no one coherent, stand-alone plan for gifted education policy and programming. Many individual policy statements (board approved) do exist, but these do not represent a plan that could be used as a guiding document to coordinate systematic and continuous services. For example, a new parent or administrator to the district would have no one place to go in order to determine policy or practice with regard to advanced learners. Most school district personnel interviewed (general education teachers and even building-level administrators) were not aware of existing policy or if any specific plan existed. Some parents referenced having seen the published policy documents (6142.1) while others said they were not aware of any such policy. In nearly all cases, parents and staff made it clear that the published policies were not universally followed across or even within particular schools. The existing “Gifted and Talented Identification and Procedures” (6142.1) document is the closest thing the district has to a formal plan, but this deals almost exclusively with student identification.

Recommendation: Once the district steering committee completes its work in May of 2014, the committee should propose its recommendations in the form of a district gifted and talented education plan. This plan should outline all aspects of identification and programming including definitions, levels of services, appeals procedures, communication procedures, and points of contact. A timetable should also be included for when the formalized gifted education plan will be evaluated and revised. An example plan (not necessarily a perfect one) is included in the appendices from the Baraboo School District. Much of the initial work toward the creation of a plan has already begun with professional development related to data use in the schools as well as this evaluation and the creation of the Steering Committee. It seems natural that all of this work (once completed) be distilled into a final gifted and talented education plan. The initial work of the Steering Committee might be to propose a timeline for the development and approval of a full district plan to the school board.

2. **Each school district shall....designate a person to coordinate the gifted and talented program.**

Findings: Ms. Tanya Fredrich is staffed with the oversight of gifted and talented policy and programming for the district and would be seen as the district coordinator of gifted services. However, she is not officially designated as the district gifted and talented coordinator and her official duties include far more than just this work. No position of gifted and talented coordinator exists at the district level. On the district website both she and the Assistant Superintendent are listed as contacts even though neither is listed as the district gifted and talented coordinator. Her job description (official title as Director of Special Education and Student Services) includes many roles and responsibilities. In

practice it appears she is more of an administrator than a district-level facilitator and program coordinator. This is not inherently bad but does limit the amount of direct coordination she will be able to conduct. Few teachers or staff spoke to the district gifted and talented coordinator position and there was no formal job description or list of roles and responsibilities in the policy documentation. The only relevant comments from parents or staff came in the form of some individuals expressing concern that they didn't know who to talk to in order to voice a concern or complaint. For example, if a principal refused a particular programming request, parents were not sure who to speak with at the district level. Building-level IRTs also voiced concerns that what they are able to accomplish is limited given that identified students often need content that reaches across grade levels and into different buildings. This is an inherent barrier for building-level staff that can be bridged by having a district level gifted and talented coordinator. General education teachers and building-level IRT staff also referenced a desire and need for professional development and training regarding best practices in classroom differentiation for gifted learners as well as communication and training related to district policy. Nearly every meeting included staff and parents who expressed a desire for greater communication and training regarding gifted and talented education. This is a perfect task for a district-level coordinator.

Recommendation: The School Board, with input from the Steering Committee, should draft a position description for the role of district-level gifted and talented program coordinator. This position should include oversight responsibilities for the building-level IRT staff, percent of time allocated (FTE), roles and responsibilities, etc. Although some districts have this as an administrative position with oversight duties, many others have this as an instructional / program coordinator position that does not involve staff supervision. Examples of such job descriptions from the Madison Metropolitan School District, the School District of Baraboo, the school District of South Milwaukee, and the School District of Fort Atkinson are included in the appendix. Even if this is not a full-time position, the district would benefit from someone devoting a majority of his or her effort toward the coordination and facilitation of programming who also has specific training in this regard.

3. Identification:

a. Identification occurs in grades K-12

Findings: The formal identification process begins following an initial catalyst. This catalyst can come in the form of a student entering the district who was previously identified as gifted, a teacher nomination, a parent or guardian nomination, outside testing, or an internal data review based on ongoing district assessments (see p. 3 of 6142.1). Despite this range of options, district staff stated that roughly 90% (on average across all grade levels ranging from 85% to nearly 100%) of students are identified following an internal review of student data. These data reviews occur after a round of standardized achievement testing (such as MAP testing). Following is an analysis regarding each catalyst:

- *New student to the district previously identified as GT:* In this way students who enter the district are automatically considered (formally assessed for gifted confirmation) if they enter the district and were previously identified as gifted. This does not appear to be a common occurrence since most students who are new

to the district enter at the beginning of the year or at semester break allowing them to be included in the regular district assessment process. However, district staff at each level (elementary, middle, and high) indicated they do review data on each entering student as well as administer confirmation assessments as appropriate. At least one parent mentioned that her child had been identified as gifted in a previous district and that this information was not considered when she approached district staff regarding the identification of her child. Further, even though her child's performance met Elmbrook criteria, this child was still not identified for services. Other parents referenced confusion regarding the inclusion of previous identification status as a criterion for identification. Several parents mentioned moving to the district with children previously identified as gifted only to be met by many barriers to service – their students were re-assessed several times despite having been identified in a prior district.

Recommendations: This is a good policy to have in place as it prevents those students who enter the district after a universal screener was administered from being falsely designated as not in need of services. However, it's not clear in what way students designated as in need of services (identified as gifted) in other districts would automatically be in need of services at Elmbrook. It's possible that students who needed services in another district would have their needs met by existing, grade-level programming in Elmbrook. Although not terribly common, this is a good catalyst step to keep in place. If universal screening / data reviews are used to locate students on an ongoing basis, then a procedure needs to be in place for those students who are not included in those reviews. One of those groups of students is those who enter the district mid-year and thereby miss the assessment window. Students who enter mid-year should be screened to make sure they are not missed. At the same time, students who enter with relevant assessment information should have this information considered. If they were previously identified, then these data should be considered rather than have similar assessments re-administered. When in doubt the district should allow a student to enter a program unless there is real reason to administer follow-up assessments. If a student enters the district with a range of previous assessment data as well as a previous identification in another district, there seems little reason to administer additional assessments. The coordination and facilitation of this catalyst pathway is a perfect job for a district-level coordinator.

- *Teacher nominations*: The same form (6142.1 – p. 29 of GT Identification and Procedures document) is used for nominations from parents, teachers, guardians, or community members. It's worth noting that community member nominations are not listed as one of the initial screening catalyst options but are listed later on the nomination form itself. The teacher nomination form includes a reference to a "bright child / gifted learner form" that is not included in the Policy document referenced above. When found this form was clearly outdated (from 1989) and does not seem well-connected to any particular programming. It's also not clear what formal role this distinction / handout plays in the identification process. District staff stated that in years past a more laborious process was used to collect recommendations or nominations from teachers and that this form was implemented to make this process more efficient. However, this still doesn't

address several key questions. Are gifted students treated as different from bright students if they have a need for or might benefit from the same programming? It's not clear how this rationale matters in the larger process of educating all students. For example, one student may need a program because she is "gifted" while another because he is "bright" – it's not clear why this distinction matters if they both need or would benefit from the same program. District IRT staff mentioned that even though requests are sent out for nominations, some teachers will refer certain students to them for identification and some will not. There is wide variability. Some teachers mentioned having referred many students while others haven't recommended a student in decades. Several mentioned not knowing district criteria for giftedness or for what they would be nominating a student for. From conversations with district staff it does not appear that most general education teachers have any training or significant understanding of gifted education or what they should be looking for when nominating students. This likely prevents some nominations as well as decreases the validity of others. Those nominations that do occur may be inaccurate because teachers do not understand what they are nominating students for while still others are incorrect because nomination criteria are not well communicated. Some classroom teachers also mentioned a belief that they were expected to address the needs of advanced learners in their classrooms and that little else was available for such learners (math being the exception).

Recommendations: If teacher nominations continue to be a component of the district identification process then all teachers will need training in the general characteristics of gifted students. Further, they will need training in official district procedures regarding identification as well as programming. If teachers do not know what a gifted students "looks like" in terms of observable behaviors or for what that students will be provided once nominated, then they cannot provide valid nominations. In general, it is best to use teacher recommendations for inclusion only (not for exclusion) due to their tenuous validity with specific programming. Instead of asking teachers to nominate students who are "gifted" they should instead look at lists of students who missed internal data review criteria but whom they believe should be in the particular program. For example, if one student missed the MAP criteria for math by two percentile points, a teacher recommendation could be used to overrule that decision and place the student in the program. Currently, such a student would not be eligible for the program. Because the district has a fairly comprehensive system of universal screening at most grade levels (at least in traditional content areas), teacher nominations should be used in these areas as a form of inclusion – to locate those students who the tests missed. In areas for which there are not universal assessments, teacher nominations can take on a larger role. This is why an understanding of what a teacher (or parent) is nominating a student for is critical to a quality nomination.

- *Parent / guardian nomination*: It's not clear that parents are widely-aware of the importance of a nomination (from any source) in the identification process. Because being successfully nominated (as one option for a catalyst) is critical to the successful identification of a student, parental awareness (particularly by

parents who might not otherwise be aware) of this as an option is critical. The nomination form used for parents, teachers, guardians, and community members includes a Scales for Identifying Gifted Students (SIGS) be completed and that the student scores in the 98th percentile or greater in order to pass the nomination stage. It's not clear why this fixed percentage was chosen or how it relates to existing curriculum or programming. In some cases a parent will "nominate" his or her student by making an informal inquiry to an IRT and then that parent will be asked to complete a SIGS form. The rationale for this two-step process is unclear. It's also not clear for which areas a SIGS would be used since it does not directly correspond to the five areas required under state statute. Other criteria required under the "criteria review" include two or more classroom performance pieces or pieces of evidence, a rating scale at 85%, evidence from outside of the school setting, and a CogAT nonverbal SAS of 135+ (for creativity) – all on the nomination process form. Further direction regarding the criteria for evaluating the classroom evidence is not provided. No information is included regarding the "rating scale," what it is, who fills it out, etc. It seems redundant that a nomination is required, followed by a parent rating scale (SIGS), followed by or concurrent with some other nomination. The only place where ratings are mentioned in the procedures document is with regard to creativity, leadership, performing arts, or visual arts. However, no further reference to any rating scale is made nor is any such scale included. Elmbrook IRT staff mentioned that this component no longer applies. No information is included regarding "outside criteria", what these criteria should demonstrate, or how they are to be evaluated. Finally, the CogAT non-verbal subtest is used as a screener for the identification of the creatively gifted. It's unclear how, if at all, such a test correlates to creativity, creative talent, or the programming to be provided after a successful identification. Overall the nomination form / flow-chart (p. 29 of practice statement 6142.1) is very vague and confusing.

- *Outside testing*: Although referenced in the initial nomination (as one potential catalyst for further testing), outside testing is never referenced again and no policy for how these data will be included or on what basis decisions will be made is included in the procedures document (6142.1). There are similar issues here as with the "new student to the district" criteria. Being identified as gifted in one district does in no way mean that a student inherently needs curriculum or programming beyond what is provided as part of the regular education setting in Elmbrook (GT programming). A process should be developed to explain how these outside testing materials will be used in the identification decisions. Further, although additional outside information may be helpful in planning interventions, the district should not rely heavily on this option as it will favor individuals and families who can afford outside testing thereby resulting in underrepresentation of students from low-income families. Outside information can and should be considered if it is relevant to deciding if a student is in need of a particular program or service. There should be a formalized process for collecting these data from parents as well as how they will be used to make educational decisions. Perhaps this could be a component of initial student enrollment forms for kindergarten or students who open enroll.

- *Internal data review at time of District assessments:* This is by far the most important step in the identification process as it appears to be the closest thing to a universal screener that the district has in place – at least in the areas of specific academic and general intellectual areas. There are no clear criteria regarding what scores on what tests are required to result in a successful nomination (because all of the criteria discussed so far only serve to nominate a student for confirmation testing). Ideally this path should “catch” the most students since it is the only path through which all students are eligible / tested (a requirement of NAGC Program Standards– see appendix). This process needs to be broken down by area for which students will be identified. For example, what scores on which assessments will identify a student as in need of which particular program? Right now there exists a vague description of which assessments are used to identify a student as “generally intellectually gifted” or gifted in a “specific academic area” but the specificity of for what program a student is being identified is lacking. Criteria are included on the various student profile sheets (see pages 4-28 of the Policy document) but these seem to relate to the confirmation / data review phase that is completed once a student is successfully nominated. As stated earlier, data reviews are the primary way through which students are nominated (>90%). Therefore, criteria need to be established for what data and what scores will result in a successful nomination to result in further testing. In reality the data review nomination stage and the review of student’s data profile stage seem to be inherently intertwined – often conducted concurrently or in the same step. These should probably be a single step. As long as all (or nearly all) students are included in the pool of students tested with district assessments, then there seems to be no benefit to having two separate steps. In discussions with IRT staff it sounds like in practice these were treated as the same step even though on the flow chart they are presented as separate.

Recommendations: The district needs to develop a systematic and continuous plan for how to identify students in need of additional challenge within the five areas mandated under Wisconsin Administrative Rule. Currently, general intellectual and the specific academic area of math are the closest to being in compliance with regard to identification policy. However, it does not appear that stated policy, even in these best of areas, is implemented as stated. As currently practiced, in all areas those students who need more than the general education classroom can provide but who do not receive extremely high test scores (e.g., 98th percentile) are left without appropriately-challenging services. There is a likely a gap between those students who need more challenge and those who qualify as “gifted” according to district criteria – for example, those scoring at the 97th percentile when the cut score is the 98th. As suggested in the Executive Summary, the district needs to consider a full continuum, in line with RtI, for how and where every student will be challenged. Right now district identification criteria are likely to find the most extreme or highly-advanced students (which is important) but will leave a larger population of students (those who are advanced and could benefit from more challenge but who do not meet current identification criteria) not served. A process for finding both groups of students – those highly advanced and those who are in need of more challenge but are not quite as advanced – needs to cover grades K-12 and include all students.

b. & c. General Intellectual and Specific Academic Area.

Findings: At specified grade levels (e.g., K-2, 3-5, etc.) different flow charts exist outlining the multiple criteria that are used to create student profiles to identify students in general intellectual ability and math and reading (specific academic areas). In many cases the criteria for reading or math are similar to or the same as for general intellectual area. Grades K-12 are covered in these three areas by the various flow charts indicating policy exists for identifying students in grades K-12 in these areas. Other academic areas such as social studies, science, non-reading areas of language arts, etc. are not included. The area of general intellectual ability includes consideration of science or social studies achievement test scores in the identification processes, but these are never mentioned with regard to specific academic area. It's worth noting that page two of the Procedures document references that the district will develop criteria for identification in these areas (e.g., writing, music, science, social studies, etc.) in the 2008 – 2010 school years. As of right now it does not appear, based on approved policy, that proactive identification takes place in any academic areas beyond math and reading even though some students are officially identified in these areas. According to district data, in 2013 – 2014 four high school students were identified as gifted (or watch list) in science, one in social studies, and 23 in writing. It's not clear from policy documents how identification in these areas occurs. Staff were also unsure as to how this happened but suggested it probably occurred under older identification policies that are no longer in place. According to the current policy, it shouldn't be possible. The vast majority of identified students in Elmbrook are in the areas of general intellectual and/or math.

Recommendation: Criteria for identification in general intellectual and some specific academic areas are specified in policy. However, it's not clear how well they are followed. More importantly, there does not appear to be a strong connection between how students are identified and how they are programmed for in their area of talent. For example, a student might score in the 97th percentile in reading – several grade-levels above average (see Analysis of District MAP data) – and yet the programming he or she receives is differentiation in the regular classroom. This represents a mismatch between need and programming. As was stated earlier, identification criteria should be based on which students need and would benefit the programming to be provided. Some criteria reference the 93rd percentile while others a score representing the 98th percentile. It's not clear why students scoring at these levels would benefit from special services whereas students just missing those criteria would not. The district should expand identification to include a wider range of specific academic areas. These policies should be based on what skills a student would need to have in order to be successful in the program with which he or she would be provided. In the area of general intellectual, the district needs to implement some kind of universal screening. Right now the reliance on achievement testing as the sole universal assessment would not likely be in compliance with State Administrative Rules.

d., e., & f. Leadership, Creativity, and Visual and Performing Arts.

Findings: The areas of creativity, leadership, and visual and performing arts are in all grade levels much more sparsely addressed. A one-page flow chart exists (p. 28 in the Procedures document) covering the areas of Creativity, Leadership, Performing Arts (including music or drama) and Visual Arts. It appears that these are all considered together or at least through the same procedures. However, it's not clear what criteria

are part of the nomination process and which are part of the confirmation process. The document states that “For a student to go through the confirmation process he/she must have a nomination and at least two of the criteria listed”. Criteria are then listed for each area. However, if this is the nomination, then no criteria are presented for confirmation. Only one set of criteria are presented. It’s never made clear which “GT Confirmation Assessments” are to be given by the IRT, RTT, or other school staff in order to “confirm” eligibility. District IRT staff were unsure as to how currently-identified students in creativity, leadership, or music were ever identified and indicated this as an area of weakness. As of 2013 – 2014 some Elmbrook students are identified in the areas of art, drama, music, and/or creativity though it’s not clear how this identification occurred. No IRT or general education staff mentioned any explicit programming for students advanced in these areas. Although some identified students took advantage of an extensive list of extracurricular activities at the high school level (including youth options), very little was available at the elementary or middle school levels in these areas.

Recommendation: Right now what is said to happen in policy and what actually happens in practice for gifted and talented students in the leadership, creativity, and visual-performing arts areas is very limited. The focus in the past has been on intellectual and academic areas. This represents an area in which the district can start from scratch and develop both programming and identification procedures based on district goals and priorities. Although no district does this perfectly, the district might consider reviewing the Wisconsin Association for Talented and Gifted’s Creativity guide for suggestions as well as talk with the Greater Dane County Talented and Gifted Network for suggestions regarding identification and programming in the leadership, creativity, and visual-performing arts. Staff from the Beloit School District have also been working hard on identification and programming for talented learners in the areas of creativity and leadership. Elmbrook is already in the process of exploring how expansion into these areas might help retain district residents in the district as well as help further engage existing students.

g. Identification can occur in one or multiple areas.

Findings: It’s clear from the district datasets that students can be flagged as gifted or as on the watch list in one or multiple areas. In nearly every instance of a student being identified it is in the areas of general intellectual and math with some occurrence of reading. Many of the students who are identified are flagged as gifted or watch listed in multiple areas. It does not appear that this part of State Administrative Rule is an issue for the district.

Recommendations: It appears that the current policy and practice with regard to allowing students to be identified in one or multiple areas is as it should be. The larger issue is that identification or assessment for all areas is not universal or, in some cases, proactively conducted at all (e.g., creativity). This means that even though it is hypothetically possible for a student to be identified as gifted in math and creativity (for example), it is nearly impossible to be gifted in creativity based on published policy. Even for those few students who are identified in one of these overlooked areas, there is no systematic programming. All of this points to the fact that while the policy may allow for identification in multiple areas, identification is for naught without programming or an appropriately-challenging intervention.

h. Pupil Profiles are Created Based on Multiple Measures.

Findings: District policy includes forms into which multiple data sources are to be entered in order to create student profiles (see pages 3-27 in Procedures document). However, nearly all use of multiple measures weighs heavily on “and” combination rules where a student must meet several criteria. For example, in grades 6-8 general intellectual a student must meet three of five criteria – all at fairly high scoring levels. This will have the effect of making the identification system more exclusive as opposed to inclusive. This is neither generally good nor bad, but it is a system created to identify fewer people incorrectly at the expense of missing many who should be identified. There are examples of “or” pathways which will tend to identify more students (giving the three of five option will locate more students than if all students had to meet only three options). However, these are always paired with “and” systems likely negating any inclusive benefits. For the purpose of the state rule the current policy as presented in the profile documents does seem to include multiple measures. When asked, some district staff mentioned that the profiles are completed for each student while in some cases the profiles have only limited data (such as a single test score). State administrative rule makes clear that identification decisions must be based on multiple measures and result in a student profile. Any and all identified students should have a range of data available on them for teachers as well as support staff so that appropriate programming can be provided.

- Identification measures are appropriate for their purpose: In areas of general intellect, math and reading, measures used include academic achievement tests as well as occasional use of academic aptitude tests. Although it is unclear for what specific programs these measures are being used to identify students for, they likely provide useful diagnostic information. That said, it’s not clear that how they are used is appropriate. For example, why are certain cut-off criteria (e.g., 93rd percentile or a SAS of 130+) used? Why is this particular score or criteria appropriate? This is never made clear and district staff were unsure as to the history of these criteria. Particular assessments are referenced appropriately (such as CogAT for general intellectual) for their stated purpose, but why certain cut-offs or scores are required is not made clear. Tests such as the CogAT are also not given as a universal screener likely negating any potential benefits. District staff noted that the CogAT was given as a universal screener at grades two and five until a few years ago and then it was discontinued. In the areas of general intellectual, math, and reading Elmbrook appears to be in compliance with regard to using appropriate identification tools (see the next section for a caveat). Although rating scales are referenced with regard to leadership, creativity, and visual-performing arts, these scales are not included in policy documents. District staff referenced occasional use of a part of the SIGS (home or teacher rating scale) for identification purposes but this process is not outlined. As with general intellect or specific academic area, criteria are not specified for how such rating scales are used – just that they are used. It’s important to remember that instruments are only valid or appropriate for certain purposes. There are also no criteria on how the additional artifacts (such as outside work samples) will be evaluated making a judgment of their appropriateness difficult. Most data regarding the proper use of assessment come from IRT staff conversations. They

are charged with often deciding what to do (with regard to confirmation assessment administration) once a nomination is received. If identification policies and procedures are to be valid for locating students who are in need of particular programming, greater details and specificity are needed.

Recommendations: Each area in which a student can be identified (five areas under state statute) should be aligned with particular assessment tools that should in turn have established cut scores or criteria (details on how they are used). These cut scores should be based on the requisite skills that are important or necessary for a student to perform well in the program for which he or she is being identified. For example, a score of 145 on the CogAT nonverbal subscale should only be used to identify students for “creativity” if that score indicates students have important skills necessary for success in a program. Likewise, a cut-score for entrance into an advanced math program (such as AP Calc AB) should be based on the score that corresponds to likely mastery of prerequisite skills. See the section on “Analysis of District MAP data” for what such a process might look like. The district may want to revisit the use of an academic aptitude test as a universal screener. Other districts have had difficulty coming into compliance with the next requirement without some instrument that is not as loosely tied to classroom achievement since the statute specifies “potential” abilities.

- The identification process and tools shall be responsive to factors such as, but not limited to, pupils' economic conditions, race, gender, culture, native language, developmental differences, and identified disabilities as described under subch. V of ch. 115, Stats.

Findings: In general this requirement seeks to assure that assessment and identification procedures are not biased toward any particular group and that all students have an equal opportunity to be identified. Currently, there is very little evidence that any existing identification policies were designed specifically to be responsive to student diversity. Right now, what identification policies exist are heavily influenced by standardized achievement tests or teacher nominations – both of which have been questioned in the gifted and talented research literature in terms of bias and underrepresentation. This practice has likely had the effect of exacerbating the underrepresentation of racial and ethnic minorities, students from low-income families, and students with disabilities in gifted and talented programs. The inclusion of the CogAT is the one obvious exception. In general, aptitude tests are less influenced by cultural and environmental factors than are academic achievement tests. However, because the CogAT is not used at any grade level or in any content area as a universal screener, these benefits are unlikely to be realized. Instead, only those students who receive some other kind of nomination are then tested with the CogAT. This causes some students to be missed even though they might score highly on the CogAT and benefit from a program – they might receive a high enough CogAT score but are never tested because their nominations are not high enough (or they are never nominated). As part of a special education evaluation and report, proportionality was analyzed regarding gifted and talented identification. At the elementary school level, only 2% of students from low-income families are identified as gifted. At the high school level, only just over 2% of identified gifted students have an identified

disability. Only 1.2% of identified students are African American, 2% are Hispanic, and less than 1% are limited English proficient. Overall 2.3% of students identified as gifted and talented were from low-income families. This final disparity crosses over to general academic performance as well. In the 2012 – 2013 school year, students from low-income families scored at WKCE “advanced” levels in math and reading at far lower rates than their higher-income peers (12.7% vs. 2.9% in reading and 32.9% vs. 10.8% in math). These are larger than average excellence gaps than compared to the State of Wisconsin as a whole. Overall it does not appear that existing identification procedures are responsive to student diversity.

Recommendations: As part of its work in developing a gifted and talented education plan, the district should include a section on what will be done to proactively locate students from traditionally underrepresented populations. This can include the subgroups included in State Administrative Rule (see above) but can also go even farther to locate students who might be underachieving and therefore not stand out on standardized achievement tests. Much of this will be addressed through the creation of a proactive identification policy that seeks to find all students who might benefit from a particular program. Right now the district is experiencing the same underrepresentation of students from certain subgroups in the ranks of identified gifted and high-achieving students that is common across the country. The appendix includes an Office for Civil Rights Checklist for Assessment of Gifted Programs that could be used as a basis for evaluating the degree of responsiveness to student diversity of a program’s identification policy.

4. The school district board shall provide access, without charge for tuition, to appropriate programming for pupils identified as gifted or talented

Findings: Programming in the district is much more variable and idiosyncratic than identification. The 30+ page policy document contains almost no reference to programming – it deals almost exclusively with identification. The only programs for which there appear to be explicit, board-approved policy are acceleration and youth options. Some references are made to enrichment as well. Within these areas reference is made to programming being provided without charge to the student or parents. In each case of the programs for which policy exists (e.g., early entrance, acceleration, youth options, grade-skipping, etc) the process for decision making is lengthy and extremely subjective. Often teams are convened to determine if evidence exists to warrant the decision regarding programming. Criteria are not provided and this leaves great leeway to building principals who may be personally against certain programming. By far the most common form of programming for identified students is differentiation within the regular classroom setting. This is not unusual. However, given the range of student readiness at a given grade level (see separate Analysis of District MAP Data) it’s unclear how a classroom teacher could effectively challenge students who are, in some cases, several grade levels advanced in their demonstrated proficiency. In the areas of leadership, creativity, and visual and performing arts, district policy makes no reference to programming. When asked, district IRT staff references electives and specials related to music and art as the only programming options. At the high school level a slightly better situation exists. Extra-curriculars or art, music, student council, etc. were referenced as

the programming options in these areas. Youth options is also available to students. However, these do not count toward compliance since they are not often included as part of the regular school day. Further, they are not identified for or provided based on an identified need. Self-selection can work as a form of identification as long as other methods are also used as a way of locating students who don't know to self identify.

Recommendations: The district should approach all curricular planning – from the classroom-lesson level to the district-level course offerings – from the perspective of what will happen once students demonstrate grade-level proficiency of course content. If a student enters a class having already mastered grade-level math content, what happens next? If a student satisfies the goals of a lesson, what happens next? If a student completes all of the math offerings the district has by grade ten, what happens next? This mostly applies to the areas of general intellect and specific academic area but is a good basis for all curricular planning. With regard to the non-academic areas (creativity, leadership, visual-performing arts) the district needs to implement systematic and continuous program offerings. This means offering opportunities for students with leadership, visual-performing art, and creativity talents at all grade levels that build on each other and result in student learning and growth. More flexibility exists in these areas in terms of programming but some programming is still required. Of what small amount of programming exists with regard to gifted and talented education in the district, the vast majority is in the areas of general intellect and specific academic area. Some IRT staff weren't even sure how those students who are identified in creativity had been originally identified. In general, staff seemed well aware that more needs to be done in these areas starting from scratch.

5. The school district board shall provide an opportunity for parental participation in the identification and resultant programming

Findings: Parents become involved in the education of a potentially gifted or talented student in one of two ways. Some become involved by first nominating their children for gifted identification. This is a small number (likely less than 10 – 15% of all identified students at all grade levels). The other way parents become involved is when their children are automatically flagged for additional assessment via an IRT's review of district data. Once this happens parents are notified in order to obtain permission for further testing. Parents then remain involved (or are contacted) with test results and a final decision with regard to identification status and program placement. It's worth noting that parents referenced this communication as a serious problem area. Many parents expressed frustration about a lack of knowledge regarding program offerings, policies, or even who to contact with regard to questions. Occasionally parents are also involved via phone or face-to-face meetings. At the high school there is a monthly newsletter that is sent out to all parents that often includes notices about GT. However, at the district level there is no systematic outreach to parents to make them aware of the nomination option or the policies or programming related to gifted and talented education in the district. Again, some good things are happening in this area but these are not due to a systematic, proactive plan for communication. Most parents learn about identification or programming options from other parents or through the parent advisory group. Those parents who do become involved in one way or another do appear to have an opportunity to be included in identification and programming decisions. Despite this fact, some still

voiced concerns that their ideas or suggestions were not taken seriously or that they did not receive satisfaction regarding a request. This is not a problem that is unique to Elmbrook but involves striking a difficult balance regarding engagement and communication with parents.

Recommendations: The district has already implemented a parent advisory group. This is a good first step toward greater parent engagement and communication. The district should also consider outreach and communication regarding available opportunities. All parents need to be made aware of district offerings for advanced learners. Informational meetings should be held yearly at all school buildings and items should be added to general school-parent newsletters to make sure parents are aware of what to do if they feel their students are not being challenged or might benefit from a district program offering. An appeals process should also be established for what happens if a parent disagrees with identification or programming decisions. This should include contact points as well as a flow chart of decision makers. In general, the district should take the perspective of actively trying to make sure parents are well informed of their options as well as opportunities for involvement. At this point the concern is not with parental involvement once students are nominated or identified. The problem is communication with and outreach to parents of potentially gifted students.

B. Best Practices not Addressed in State Statutes or Administrative Rules

1. Affective Concerns

Findings: Elmbrook is, on average, a high-achieving district. A perfect example of this is the fact that some sophomores take Calculus 3 (after exhausting all other math options). This high level of achievement creates a perfect environment for stress as well as other mental and psychological health concerns. Parents made comments that college-readiness was not enough for them – they wanted the district to aim for “Harvard-readiness” in terms of planning. Other parents voiced concerns over their students being too involved or taking too many advanced courses, but in general this was not a common topic voiced at parent or staff focus groups. An environment exists that could breed high levels of student stress. District staff noted that they often work with students to craft a schedule that is appropriate but not overly stressful. Staff also noted that decisions such as acceleration included discussions with parents and the student him or herself in order to assure programming does not become a burden.

Recommendation: Three steps are recommended with regard to affective concerns. First, all school counselors should be made aware or receive training regarding the burdens of high achievement or high potential. In other words, school counselors and school psychologists need training in how to identify and provide support for the mental and psychological challenges that accompany high ability. Although most of these concerns are no more prevalent in gifted students than in any others, there is some research to suggest gifted students experience these stressors more intensely than do their non-gifted peers. Second, the district might consider proactively implementing programs designed to support the psychological health of high-achieving or gifted students. An example of this is lunch-hour discussion groups such as Jean Peterson’s *Talk with Gifted Teens* materials (see appendix). There is also an article by Dr. Peterson regarding affective curriculum that might be worth discussing

at the administrative level when deciding what else needs to be implemented. Finally, a third recommendation involves including an opt-out provision in all programming and identification decisions. Gifted students are often pushed to do many things often without knowing when to say no. Any identification or programming decisions should include an opportunity for the student to include his or her thoughts and interests. Students should not be placed in programs against their will both for affective / psychological reasons, but also because this is likely to cause more harm than good in terms of academic performance. High-ability students need to be monitored as they take on more and more challenging activities and courses to make sure their affective needs are considered as well.

2. Opportunities to Work Together

Findings and Recommendations: Both for psychological / affective and cognitive reasons, advanced learners need opportunities to interact both socially and in academic settings. When not provided with appropriate programming and grouped in general education classes heterogeneously, these students are left with few intellectual peers. This can lead to feelings of social isolation as well as academic underachievement. Because of this, opportunities need to be created so that identified students can interact. This can take place in the elementary grades through Total School Cluster Grouping and honors courses at the high school level as well as through small-group counseling sessions (optional for students). Regardless of how it is accomplished, students need time to interact with age-level and intellectual-level peers.

3. Program Effectiveness / Evaluation

Findings: The effectiveness or outcomes of existing district programming are hard to evaluate as there does not appear to be an overarching philosophy or goal for gifted education programs in the district.

Recommendations: The effectiveness of gifted and talented identification policies and program offerings should be included in internal assessment and evaluation efforts. For example, any time the district looks to evaluate academic growth, performance of identified students should be disaggregated in order to assure that programs are resulting in student learning. Programs that are not directed at content mastery (such as programs focused on leadership) should be created with goals and outcomes in mind so that they can be evaluated and revised on an ongoing basis. Ideally, such internal evaluation efforts can play into teacher practice components of educator effectiveness. For example, a teacher working with advanced students (who might not show large academic growth because of low test ceilings) could include gifted and talented-specific student learning outcomes (SLOs) as part of his or her educator effectiveness portfolio. This way teachers receive “credit” for this work while at this same time satisfying evaluation criteria. All programming should be tied back to identified student needs but also to district goals and priorities at the school level and teacher SLOs at the classroom level.

4. Staffing

Findings: The district employs Instructional Resource Staff who, among many other duties, are charged with meeting the needs of advanced learners. However, current IRTs

voiced concerns that they continue to have duties added to their caseload that in turn makes it hard to find time to implement the extensive district identification policy as well as provide training and support to classroom teachers. Some IRTs also teach courses (2-3 courses per year for middle school IRTs) making it even harder for them to have a measurable impact on the education of advanced learners let alone all of the other subgroups with whom they are charged. Some IRTs referenced that years ago they were expected to spend far more time with advanced learners but that now their jobs had shifted more heavily toward facilitating testing and supporting other subgroups of students.

Recommendations: Given the range of learning needs, particularly in math, plus the lack of programming in the creativity, leadership, and visual-performing arts areas, the district should consider hiring additional staff to support gifted and talented education identification and programming. Although no district can simply hire staff to address all of the needs of advanced learners – general classroom teachers are an essential part of the program delivery model – staff with expertise in curricular differentiation, data analysis and interpretation, and program models such as acceleration policy development could help the district better meet the needs of advanced learners. In addition, a half or even full-time gifted and talented coordinator could help the district manage the large range of cross-grade level programming that would help keep students challenged. Given the number of buildings and the range of student readiness, a staff person with dedicated percentage of effort devoted to gifted education would likely make programming across grade levels and sites much easier. A district the size of Elmbrook with no staff dedicated to gifted and talented education exclusively will have difficulty coming into compliance with state statutes and best practices.

5. Staff Training

Findings and Recommendations: Currently, no district staff possess degrees or licenses in gifted and talented education. This in no way means teachers or IRTs do not have particular skills or are doing anything less than an excellent job. However, some degree of formalized training would likely help the district as it moves forward with the development of a comprehensive plan and the implementation of that plan. In the future IRT or gifted and talented coordinator positions could be advertised with licensure or degrees listed as a preferred qualification. The district could also incentivize training in meeting the needs of advanced learners through credit reimbursement or even contract to hold courses or trainings on site. Classroom teachers voiced a desire to receive more training in how to better challenge and meet the needs of their gifted learners. For this reason professional development related to the characteristics and best educational practices related to gifted learners should be incorporated into the district's overall in-service professional development plan for all teachers. As mentioned earlier, specific training might also be offered for school counselors and other support staff.

Administrators should also be trained as to requirements related to gifted and talented education under state statutes and administrative rules. A component of the Steering Committee's work should be to discuss how the district will go about assuring general classroom teachers have sufficient expertise to differentiate for a wide range of learners as well as how the district will move forward with training for new hires and existing staff regarding policy and best practice. The National Association for Gifted Children

has crafted teacher preparation standards for gifted and talented specialists as well as three general standards regarding what all teachers should know and be able to do with regard to advanced learners. Both are included in the appendix.

Summary of Recommendations

Identification:

Overall the identification system and procedures appear overly complicated, at times unclear, and in general focused on keeping kids out. It's worth noting that multi-hurdle or "gate keeping" identification policies have been common in the field for many years and in most districts still are. As currently designed district identification systems will miss many of the students who they should identify (false negatives) at the expense of not accidentally identifying some students who do not need services (false positives). Such exclusionary policies are not necessarily bad. Some programs should err on the side of missing a few students for the sake of making sure programs remain rigorous and students do not face failure unnecessarily. For example, accidentally grade accelerating a student who is not ready could be potentially harmful to that student's learning or motivation. For this reason an identification system might want to err on the side of being overly cautious. However, it is not clear this is the case with Elmbrook. It's not clear that most "programs" or any offerings under the umbrella of "gifted" are sufficiently dangerous or would result in significant harm to students if they were more accessible as opposed to less (acceleration perhaps being the exception). Right now identification policies (when they exist for areas such as general intellectual, math, and reading) emphasize keeping students out as opposed to locating students who need more challenge in these areas. This is the difference between an exclusionary vs. inclusionary identification policy. Right now identification policies serve as multiple hurdles through which students must pass as opposed to multiple ways through which the district can find students in need. What identification "looks like" should be based on what programs will be provided to those students who are successfully identified. For example, if the district is looking for students who might benefit from full-grade acceleration, then more restrictive identification systems such as those described in the Iowa Acceleration Scale, should be implemented. Alternatively, if all that will result from a successful "identification" is a flagging of a student in the school data system, then the district need not bother with identification at all. Of course, this will be out of compliance with state statute and is certainly not best practice, but since in this scenario no programming is being provided, the district would already be out of compliance.

The district needs to start with observed student need, create programs or opportunities to meet that need, and then use assessment or other identification policies to locate students who are most in need of or would benefit from the programming put in place. Right now there is no clear connection between identification procedures or assessments and the programs or interventions to be provided to those students who are successfully identified. The district should first review need (see Analysis of District MAP Data for an example), then create programming that would meet that need before crafting identification policies. As it currently stands it's not clear that the process of identification is resulting in better or more challenging educational opportunities for students. Some students are receiving more challenging educational opportunities than are common at grade level (such as in math) but it's not at all clear that the identification systems are helping to locate students in need of these programs. Instead, they serve as barriers to access that if some are able to surmount, they can receive the service.

Programming:

At the K-8 levels programming is only really provided in the areas of reading and math with some reading and math-related content provided to those identified in the general intellectual area. All other programming takes place in the form of specials, as part of the regular curriculum, or after school as extra-curricular offerings. At the middle and high school levels more programming options are available through honors and AP classes in academic areas (still mostly reading and math), but at the elementary level even the district website says that most programming comes in the form of general education classroom differentiation. While a range of students can be challenged in the general classroom, this method of service will leave many student unchallenged, even in the traditional academic content areas. Even at the second-grade level, student readiness varies widely with some classrooms having several grade-levels of math or reading readiness represented. This level of variability is very hard if not impossible for one teacher to address in such a way that all students remain challenged and show growth.

The most effective and efficient way to facilitate a wider range of student being challenged at the elementary level is a total school cluster grouping model. In this fashion no single grade-level classroom has the full range of student readiness in a given content area. Instead, any given classroom only has about three-fifths (or three of five achievement levels) represented. This allows for the teacher to only have to teach a smaller range of student need. This in turn makes it more likely that a larger number of students can be challenged in the general-education classroom. At the middle and high school-levels this is less of an issue as students can elect to take honors courses (in some content areas) – though many of the five areas under state statute are still not addressed. A good first step would be to implement cluster grouping, perhaps in one school as a pilot, followed by extensive training of staff in how to target instruction to their assigned groups. Much of this training is freely available online (see appendix). This is a key component of the model. If curriculum is not differentiated, then clustering will not result in learning gains. Teachers need to know which student achievement levels they are working with and how to differentiate curriculum to meet those particular needs.

Parental Involvement:

Parental perception of involvement is very mixed. Some parents reported being proactively contacted by IRT staff to discuss identification and programming while others stated that they have yet to meet their school's IRT even after several years. A consistent theme emerged that parents felt they had to force their own involvement in order for anything to happen. In some cases this action was welcome by district staff while in others it was shunned. The district needs to proactively involve parents in gifted and talented decision making as well as communicate the availability of district services for advanced learners. At this time it's clear that the district does not have enough staff to handle such a large student population with regard to teacher training, identification, and communicating with parents on an individual basis. Instead, newsletters, email lists, group-information sessions, and the parent advisory group should be used to keep parents informed and educated.

Professional Development:

General education teachers referenced a severe lack of knowledge regarding existing district policy regarding gifted and talented identification and programming. Most knew if they had an identified student in their classes but few knew why they were identified or how the students were being served. Professional development is needed at almost every level: administrators, classroom teachers, IRTs, and even parents. Everyone involved in the Elmbrook community needs to be on the same page regarding what is offered, what happens, and what opportunities are available. In addition to awareness, the district could benefit from having someone on staff with explicit training in gifted education. Some staff have attended workshops or taken individual courses, but a staff member with deep understanding of best practices with regard to identification and programming would make the design and implementation of a program easier and faster.

D. Appendices

Example Baraboo Gifted and Talented Education Plan
 MMSD, Baraboo, Eau Claire, South Milwaukee, Janesville, and Fort Atkinson Position
 Descriptions
 NWEA MAP Alignment Report
 Office for Civil Rights Checklist for Assessment of Gifted Programs
 Wisconsin State Statutes and Administrative Rules Regarding Gifted and Talented
 Education
 Analysis of District MAP Data.
 Approved evaluation proposal – July 9, 2013

Cited Resources:

Peterson, J. S. (2008). *The essential guide to talking with gifted teens: Ready-to-use group discussions about identity, stress, relationships, and more*. Minneapolis: Free Spirit.

Peterson, J. S. (2003). An argument for proactive attention to affective concerns of gifted adolescents. *Journal for Secondary Gifted Education*, 14, 62-71.

Cluster grouping resource website: <http://www.purduegeri.org/#!/resources>

Wisconsin Association for Talented and Gifted Creativity Guide:
<http://www.watg.org/creativity-guide.html>

NAGC Pre-K – 12 Programming Standards:
http://www.nagc.org/uploadedFiles/Information_and_Resources/Gifted_Program_Standards/K-12%20programming%20standards.pdf

NAGC – CEC Teacher Preparation Standards in Gifted and Talented Education:
<http://www.nagc.org/index.aspx?id=1862>

NAGC Knowledge and Skill Standards in Gifted and Talented Education for All Teachers:
<http://www.nagc.org/index.aspx?id=5400>