Timeline

September
Conducted review of final course content

October
Presentation and discussion

November
Vote to move forward with IB Global Politics as the American Government substitute exam

December
Resolution to the full board

Update:
Operating Standards for Identifying and Serving Gifted Students (3301-51-15)

Overview of Survey Results

Sue Zake
Director
Office for Exceptional Children
Review of Activities

- Draft Introduced (9/14/15)
- Background Documents (week of 10/12/15)
- Survey Opened (10/20/15)
- Survey Closed (11/7/15)
- Review of Survey Results (11/16/15)

Preliminary Results of the Survey

Respondents

Survey Items

General Survey Themes
## Unduplicated Survey Counts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>Number of Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3451</td>
<td>3689</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Duplicated Counts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parent</td>
<td>1,439</td>
<td>1,532</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>664</td>
<td>474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gifted Intervention</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gifted Coordinator</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>683</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Office</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendent</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Education Programs/Organizations Represented by Respondents

- Traditional: 89.89%
- Community School: 2.68%
- Educational Service Center: 3.87%
- Other: 3.56%

Typology of Settings Represented

- Suburban: 44%
- City: 23%
- Rural: 16%
- Small Town: 12%
- Multiple Settings: 5%
Identification

Survey Item:
The proposed rule clearly provides the guidance needed to support identification of gifted students.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opinion</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>7.08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>49.14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither Agree or Disagree</td>
<td>13.08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>20.34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>10.36%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Opportunities for Identification

Survey Item:
The proposed rule clearly defines opportunities for identification of students as gifted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opinion</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>7.57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>48.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither Agree or Disagree</td>
<td>13.84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>19.59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>10.25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Gifted Services

Survey Item:
The proposed rule provides flexibility in how districts may serve gifted students.

Strongly Agree: 9.01%
Agree: 51.06%
Neither Agree or Disagree: 24.12%
Disagree: 8.71%
Strongly Disagree: 7.10%

Gifted Services

Survey Item:
The proposed rule clearly describes standards for the quality and extent of gifted services.

Strongly Agree: 4.61%
Agree: 31.80%
Neither Agree or Disagree: 16.85%
Disagree: 19.21%
Strongly Disagree: 27.53%
General Comments on Teacher Qualifications

Parents

Teachers

Superintendents and Principals

Funding

Survey Item:
The proposed rule outlines the district obligation to report on funds that support gifted education annually.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree or Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9.85%</td>
<td>53.41%</td>
<td>24.75%</td>
<td>6.10%</td>
<td>5.89%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Survey Item:
*Gifted staff qualifications for educational service centers that receive gifted unit funding are clear.*

Funding Comments

*Widespread confusion about gifted funding:*
  - Some believe there is no funding
  - Some want gifted education fully funded
Accountability

Survey Item:
Requirements for submission of annual plans and reports set clear expectations for identification and services for gifted students in the proposed rule.

- Strongly Agree: 7.76%
- Agree: 49.90%
- Neither Agree or Disagree: 15.19%
- Disagree: 10.44%
- Strongly Disagree: 17.27%

Accountability

Survey Item:
Components of the gifted indicator and the use of the indicator in the annual district report card are essential to evaluation of gifted education services as outlined in the proposed rule.

- Strongly Agree: 8.35%
- Agree: 38.03%
- Neither Agree or Disagree: 19.04%
- Disagree: 14.35%
- Strongly Disagree: 20.24%
General Comments

There is a desire for greater transparency

The draft Operating Standards are too vague and don’t provide enough guidance

Timeline

September and October 2015
- Draft 1 presented to the Achievement and Graduation Requirements Committee
- Public comment and feedback

November/December 2015
- Preliminary results from public comment

December to February 2015
- Committee discussion
- Rule revisions

March 2016
- Possible Committee action
Next Steps

December
- Present a completed summary and analysis of the survey
- Presentations on gifted identification and services, including educator qualifications
- Determine next steps to inform further revision and development of the *Operating Standards for Identifying and Serving Gifted Students*

Update on Assessment

Jim Wright  
Director  
Office for Curriculum and Assessment
Committee Discussion