

APPENDIX SECTION A

DISTRICT TASK FORCE FOR TAG REVIEW

- Committee Process Documents
 - Task Outline
 - Hopes and Concerns
 - Know and Need to Know
 - Questions

- Task Force Recommendations - Draft
 - Identification
 - Models of Service
 - Assessment

**TASK FORCE ON TAG SERVICES
PORTLAND PUBLIC SCHOOLS
PROPOSED OUTLINE OF ACTIVITES
Fall 2002**

Agendas

Meeting One:

- Action Plan
- Consensus skills
- Know/Ned to Know Discussion Groups
- Best practices and Service Delivery

Meeting Two:

- Model of Services – Local and National
- Discussion Groups

Meeting Three:

- Best Practices in Identification
- Identification Practices – Local and National
- Discussion Groups

Meeting Four:

- Servicing the needs of Tag students in Portland
 - A discussion
- Developing Key Points – Including framework

Meeting Five:

- Reviewing and Revising the recommendations

CHARGE

- Review service options of TAG students
- Service delivery
- Program model
- Identification
- Bring and share ideas for constituent groups
- Develop key points for consideration and next steps
- Submit with final report from consultant

Key beliefs

- The fundamental purpose of a program review is to provide information that can be sue to improve and/or advance the program for TAG students
- A program review is a collaborative process among all stakeholders
- The use of multiple data sources is used to highlight the complexity and the salience of issues needing to be considered

**PORTLAND PUBLIC SCHOOLS
TAG REVIEW TASK FORCE
FALL 2002**

HOPES AND CONCERNS

The following hopes and concerns have been recorded as received from the members of the task force and will be used as an evaluation tool at the completion of the work.

HOPES
*Want to be a vital role in the task force!! Help with final document and get full understanding!!
*I hope we achieve our goals and do not waste our time.
*That we will celebrate our successes and move forward comfortably rather than in a reactive way.
*A clear 3-5 year action plan for PPS that meets the needs of TAG students.
*\$\$ support from district
*Staff development provided by district
*Some viable ideas can be shared
*For teachers at all levels of instruction to be supportive of the TAG program.
*My hope is to come up with a cohesive plan that improves instruction for students while not adversely impacting teacher workload.
*We can get more academically affective TAG delivery for elementary school and middle school, and better means for assessing progress.
*Set PPS on a course that helps teachers learn strategies to engage, challenge, and motivate students.
*This work will contribute to equitable delivery of services for all students.
*That change (positive of course) will actually happen for our TAG kids
Better service delivery for TAG students consistently through the district.
*To build district <u>consistency</u> regarding TAG i.e. curriculum, staff development, resources
*Fundamental changes re PPS TAG services/program
*Concrete commitment re: identification and providing service to all high-end (gifted) students. Their under education is our societies loss.

Hopes and Concerns continued

CONCERNS:
*That people may come with their own agenda and not be open to listening to each other.
*I am concerned that the “consensus” concept may block some important issues.
*Time restrictions/conflicts; have class on Wednesday
*Do you need us to be more consistent?
*Results will be “put on a shelf” and never utilized.
*This process will just go on a shelf with other reports and won’t effect change.
*Another meeting that means well but no punch, no power, and no money
*There were more men on this task force. Their voice is needed.
*Will TAG ever have \$ so we can truly make the changes necessary?
*That this experience will generate practical, useable information.
*Is this the sum total of research in the various program models, because it feels inadequate for the mostly administrative members of our group.
*My concern is that skipping a student ahead is not the best answer but one that parents value.
*That the program does not get financial support.
*Loudest voices heard!
*Administrative changes will sabotage plan.

**Portland Public Schools
Task Force on TAG Services
Fall 2002**

Know/Need to Know: Informed Decision Making

The following information was generated by task force members while working in small groups. The chart is an aggregate of the items listed by the members.

KNOW	NEED TO KNOW
1. Assessment	
a. State scores (meets, exceeds, RIT) provide insufficient information about high end learning; system doesn't show evidence of growth	a-1. (About) off level articulation 1.)experience 2.)data
	a-2. How do we evaluate with different tests – PALT and O.S. tests
b. Know there is not adequate testing for upper end – topping out	b. Effective way to measure high end kids
c. Focus is to bring kids up to benchmarks	
2. Delivery service	
a. Most schools use a full inclusion model of delivery	a. Is this best practice? Is it effective? 2.) district data
b. Difficult to build an adequate program in all schools	b. Continuity of curriculum in all content areas
c. Wide range of services	c. What can be done? Teacher training; teacher attitude; leadership (within buildings)
d. Wide range of understanding of TAG: identification, instruction, support	d. Social climate for TAG students
e. Know what best practices are	e. How to implement best practices? Research (current) that has been done re: models of TAG implementation
f. Hit and miss building to building	f-1. Success of service delivery models f-2. Success of the programs
3. Professional Development	
a. Pre-service teacher training absent/limited in gifted education and differentiated instruction	a. (What is) higher education articulation; programming? 1.) ODE 2.) TAG Office

KNOW	NEED TO KNOW
b. Know there is not enough support for teachers	b. How will district provide more support, staff development?
c. Difference in the amount of staff development; inconsistency	c. Consistency district wide? Are there options?
4. Identification	
a. Minority students are under-represented	a. Why? 1.) district data
b. Identification of non-English speaking students inconsistent	
c. Lack of instruments (tests, translators) not available for non-English identification	c. Data across the district – school to school; percent identified; what is distribution of resources (staff and community)
5. Curriculum and Instruction	
a. No separate TAG curriculum	
b. Middle school ability grouping in math (sometimes lumped for the rest of the day)	
c. Elementary – some ability grouping with math and reading	
d. Some schools ability grouping stays together for all – Middle school	
e. Outside resources (teacher or volunteer) for leveling – 1 day/week; math extensions	
f. Curriculum has multiple levels of entry and extensions – e.g. middle school; Investigations	
	g. Which teachers can extend – differentiated curriculum
h. Know process steps	h. What does the evidence of implementing a TAG plan look like? What are meaningful measurements of child's success? High end testing evidence?
6. Fiscal	
a. Wide range of TAG \$\$\$ usage	a. What can be done? Burning concern
7. Other	
a. Wide range of understanding of Task Force members	
	b. Are we going to continue as we are – or is change an option? Will this review (Task Force) impact state investigation?

**PORTLAND PUBLIC SCHOOLS
TAG REVIEW
QUESTIONS GENERATED BY THE TASK FORCE
FALL 2002**

Members of the Task Force raised the following questions during their meetings. The questions and data provided were used as the sub-groups developed the framework for next steps. The hope is that these will guide the next group as they do an in depth exploration of how to restructure or revise the current TAG services.

1. Is there a certification program for TAG teachers in the state of Oregon?
2. Where can one find professional development for staff to provide services to a wide range of students?
3. What are we providing (Professional Development) in Portland PS? Is it consistent, constant?
4. Are subjects different; for example extensions in content areas; how can staff better understand content area (e.g. math)?
5. Is there a full continuum of options? What is considered exemplary? How can we set up PPS to provide this type of delivery?
6. Need clarification of terminology for gifted – e.g. high, moderately gifted
7. How are social/emotional issues handled? Are there counselors for TAG – especially at the elementary level? Do they help TAG students learn how to get along with others?
8. Should we be monitoring the progress of TAG students in the Portland PS? How should this be done? What should be the focus?
9. How do we deal with the political issues, such as grouping
10. A great deal of emotion surrounds TAG and the issues that arise – e.g. grouping. Is this a lack of understanding and/or support on the part of the district, administration, board, teachers, and parents?
11. Co-teaching has been explored as a potential model – what would be the cost impact of this?

**Portland Public Schools
Review of TAG Services
Task Force Report**

The Task Force will be asked to form four groups and each group will tackle one of the proposed target areas. The essential question may be modified to meet the perspective of the team. The expectation is that the team will formulate next steps for the target area so that the district TAG Task Force that will continue the work in the spring 2003 will have direction and a framework with which to begin. The information for the next steps should be taken from articles, discussion sessions, presentations by staff and the facilitator, and district, state, and national documents.

Possible essential questions for task force action:

Target Area: Delivery Service

To what extent is the Portland Public Schools TAG delivery service meeting stated goals and standards (district, state and national)?

Next Steps:

Target Area: Student Services and Identification

To what extent are TAG identification procedures meeting the needs of students in Portland Public Schools?

Next Steps:

Target Area: Achievement

What evidence would document positive student performance trends for identified TAG students?

Next Steps:

Target Area: Model of Service

To what extent is the service delivery model integral to the district system/plan of instruction?

Next Steps:

**PORTLAND PUBLIC SCHOOLS
REVIEW OF TAG SERVICES
TASK FORCE RECOMMENDATIONS
IDENTIFICATION-DRAFT**

- **Essential Question: To what extent are the student identification procedures for the Talented and Gifted (TAG) program meeting the needs of the students in the Portland Public Schools?**

Current Model for Identification and Selection of TAG Students (2002-2003)			
Nomination	Identification	Criteria	Selection
*Occurs twice a year: October and February	*Requires two nomination forms: parent and teacher *Three categories: Intellectually gifted; Academically talented in reading and/or mathematics *May be identified as “potential”	*Data gathered includes: -one standardized test (academic or intellectual) at the 97 percentile; -two rated work samples at a 5 or 6; - completion of the Frazier Traits, Attributes and Behaviors Scale indicating TAG eligible	*Will be selected if: Standardized test score of 97 th percentile or above and at least one other criteria is a yes *Will not be selected if: Standardized score is below 95 th percentile; work samples are poor, and nomination and social/emotional variables are weak *may be identified as “Potential” is standardized score is 95 th percentile and at least one of the other three criteria is rated positive

- **Next Steps for developing an exemplary identification model, K-12, across the district**

Nominations		
A district should have a comprehensive and cohesive process for student nomination in order to determine eligibility for gifted education services. Specific areas for consideration include the following:		
Students	Staff	Parent and Community
*Students of minority are under-represented in the Portland Public Schools TAG program.	*Teachers lack knowledge of cultural differences in learning styles, listening behaviors, and response patterns. *An English speaking teacher may have difficulty determining the intellectual potential of English language Learners, which can lead to erroneous conclusions and too few nominations	*Communication with parents of under-represented populations needs to be addressed
*Tag students should be nominated for areas of strength and potential	*Teachers lack knowledge of TAG characteristics *Professional development should be provided at the beginning of the school year to increase teacher knowledge and skills concerning the nomination process.	*Parents initiate the majority of the nominations. Teachers and others need to proactively nominate students. *Civic and community organizations could be a helpful resource for parents to understand the nomination process and TAG program.

Instrumentation

The instruments used for student assessment to determine eligibility for gifted education services must measure diverse abilities, talents, strengths, and needs in order to provide students an opportunity to demonstrate any strengths.

Student Profiles	Instruments	Collaboration
*A student (assessment) profile of individual strengths and needs must be developed to plan appropriate intervention	*Criteria for identification does not stress talent aptitude and performance. Too strong a focus on academic and intellectual	*Collaborate with ESL, Special Education, and regular education staff
*Surface under-represented populations	*Consider cultural bias in current instruments and consider alternative testing	*Collaborate with ESL, Special Education, and regular education staff *Use ESL tests as part of identification process for alternative tests
*Consider identification and processes vs. assessment for instructional needs for students *Few students are nominated at the middle and high school years in Portland Public Schools.	*Need alternate measures *No way to identify by talents or creative ability	*Student identification procedures and instruments must be based on current theory and research *Research indicates identification of gifted students should be a flexible and continuous process, which allows for the recognition of gifts and talents that emerge at any stage of a student's education; if students are placed in an effective program that meets their educational and creative needs, more students will be eligible for TAG services as their talents emerge

Procedures		
Written procedures for student’s identification must include provisions for informed consent, student retention, student re-assessment, student exiting, and appeals procedures. Specific areas for consideration include the following:		
Forms	Procedures	Communication
*Should be reviewed for clarity and conciseness	*Outline all procedures with timelines and information sources	*Translated for speakers of other languages
*Accessible to all parents and students	*Distributed to all stakeholders annually	*Collaboration with other departments such as ELL and Special Education
*Include specific steps for appeals	*Clarify complaints vs. appeals for identification or exiting of a student	*Data should be collected and shared regarding decisions

- **Key Indicators for Identification Model**

Key indicators are based on the following minimum and exemplary examples developed by the National Standards for Gifted Education. They are included to help the district determine TAG identification procedures and how they best meet the needs of the students.

**PORTLAND PUBLIC SCHOOLS
REVIEW OF TAG SERVICES
TASK FORCE RECOMMENDATIONS
MODELS OF SERVICE-DRAFT**

- **Essential Question: Does the current model of service meet the needs of TAG students and satisfy the district’s mission?**

Current Model		
K - 5	Middle School	High School
*Within self contained classrooms	*Some tracking	*“Cafeteria plan”
	*Some acceleration	*Some classes at grades 10-12
		*Better options in math and science

- **Next Steps for developing an exemplary model of service, K-12, across the district**

CONTINUUM OF SERVICES: Provide diverse services for identified needs			
Level I	Level II	Level III	Level IV
*In class enrichment	*Clustering of students within classrooms	*Acceleration	*Dedicated School for identified students
	*Pullout classes and activities based on need and interest	*Cross-grade grouping	
	*Independent projects based on interest and resources	*Other options as identified as best practices	

- **Articulation of Services**

ARTICULATED SERVICES:		
Consistent and built on a strong academic and instructional foundation		
Services model	Instructional Methods	Communication
*Pullout within regular classroom	*Pre-assessment to eliminate any holes in basic skills	*Central Office to school to classroom to parent and students
*Articulated services, K-12; across grades and within content areas	*Acceleration to match rate and level of student learning	*School to school for transfer students
*Leadership commitment by all involved for accountability and compliance to State and District rules and policies		*District to district to facilitate placement

- **Key Issues for the Models of Service**

KEY ISSUES:		
Main fidelity to the model of service		
Cost Effectiveness	Best Practices	Staff
*Realistic and well managed budget that can match the model as defined	*Match with National Association of Gifted Standards for Gifted Programs	*A model that leadership can support, promote and fit into the school culture
*Compare to other models for appropriate cost expectations and spending	*Compliance with Oregon Rules for Service	*Inclusion of professional development for all staff to best deliver the model of service
*Allocate appropriate resources to run the selected model of service: -who controls the dollars -how dollars are distributed -longitudinal impact of implementation	*Research based model that fits the profile of Portland PS; uses the highest standards possible; and matches the needs of the student population	*Selection of knowledgeable and interested staff to teach the components of the model of service

*Fiscally responsible and accountable management	*Includes practices for assessment of student achievement over time that are realistic and informative; measure student progress at appropriate levels	*Creation of content expertise to model and mentor other staff
*A fit with board policies and procedures	*Identifies and supports the social and emotional needs of Gifted students	*On-going evaluation for indicators of success – sustained fidelity to the model; family and student satisfaction; teacher and administrator growth and support
	*Includes opportunity for leadership development for students	

**PORTLAND PUBLIC SCHOOLS
REVIEW OF TAG SERVICES
TASK FORCE RECOMMENDATIONS
ACHIEVEMENT- DRAFT**

- **Essential Question: What evidence would document positive student performance trends for identified TAG students?**

Current Procedures		
State Data	District Data	School Data
*Oregon Test of Achievement Standards <i>(grades 3,5,8,10)</i>	*Portland Assessment Levels Test	*Classroom pre-assessments
	*School achievement reports from the district	*Samples of work
		*Chapter and units tests
		*Teacher observations and conferences
		*Parent/Teacher conferences and report cards
		Report cards

- **Next Steps and key issues for monitoring achievement, K-12, for TAG students**

KEY ISSUES:		
Main fidelity to achievement data and student success		
Cost Effectiveness	Best Practices	Student Achievement
*Select instruments and practices that are within the fiscal means of the district	*Use instruments that have been proven to be effective at the state and district level	*Use instruments that clearly and fairly report achievement levels for students at all levels of ability
*Build on current instruments that are in use	*Select instruments that are culturally fair and free of bias	*Dis-aggregate data to show actual achievement and growth for designated groups
*Consider cost when altering the use of a test instrument	*Consider research on out of level testing for gifted students and when this is most appropriate	*Use current data to provide student achievement growth data; out of level from other instruments already in use such as Johns Hopkins testing for TAG students

- **Articulation of services regarding student achievement**

ARTICULATED SERVICES:		
Correlated to a strong academic and instructional foundation		
Services model	Instructional Methods	Data Sources
*Full time Academic and Intellectual model of service	*Monitor rate and level of learning for TAG students by year; year to year	*Classroom portfolio of achievement *Pre and post assessment for reading and mathematics for school year; year to year
*Pullout models of service	*Monitor rate and level of learning for students within grouping system (cluster, flexible, achievement etc)	*Pre and post test classroom data *Juried sample of work from special class
*Potential Candidates	*Grouping for area of strength within the classroom	*Teacher collection of student work over time *Pre and post assessment in areas of strength

- **Key issues for the area of achievement**

CONTINUUM OF DEVELOPMENT:			
Readiness	Cognitive Growth	Standards	Outcomes
*Social/emotional maturity level of students	*How is this related to social and emotional levels *How is social and emotional level measured	*Are students socially and emotionally ready to be tested out of level	*Should social and emotional growth be a factor for academic placement of students and assessment of learning?
*Readiness level for learning	*What can be expected based on assessment of intellectual and academic levels?	*What cognitive growth is demonstrated by standardized tested required at the state and district levels?	*What if no growth is evident? *What if there is minimal level of growth? *What would be considered minimum growth for a TAG student in an academic year?
*Interest level for learning		*Are the standards correlated to the learning plans for TAG students? *Should there be performance indicators for TAG students?	Is there a correlation to interest and application?
*Should the district provide a continuum of services to meet needs of TAG identified students	*Should service models be tailored and students selected for areas of strength or potential?	*What will determine the standards for growth within the different models of service?	*What determines benefit to child as result of TAG service?

*Fiscally responsible and accountable management	*Includes practices for assessment of student achievement over time that are realistic and informative; measure student progress at appropriate levels	*Creation of content expertise to model and mentor other staff
*A fit with board policies and procedures	*Identifies and supports the social and emotional needs of Gifted students	*On-going evaluation for indicators of success – sustained fidelity to the model; family and student satisfaction; teacher and administrator growth and support
	*Includes opportunity for leadership development for students	