# Colorado-Gifted Education Review (CGER) Handbook

## Self-Assessment and Review Team Process

Office of Gifted Education

1560 Broadway, Suite 1175

Denver CO 80202

303-866-6794

rolfe_t@cde.state.co.us

# Table of Contents

**Introduction** ..... 3

**Part I. Overview** ..... 4

**Responsibilities of Administrative Unit** ..... 8

**Keys to Successful Partnerships** ..... 10

**Part II. Process Tools & Tips**

- Developing the Review Schedule ..... 11
- Setting up Focus Groups ..... 12
  - Sample Invitation to Potential Focus Groups ..... 14
  - Focus Group & Individual or Group Interview Questions ..... 15
- Hosting the Gifted Education Team Review ..... 16

**Appendix**

- Administrative Checklist ..... 27
- Desk Audit Checklist ..... 39
- Advanced Learning Plan Review Checklist ..... 41
- State Performance Plan Indicators ..... 42
- CGER Report Template ..... 43
- Priority Timeline ..... 57
- Glossary ..... 58

# Introduction

The Colorado Department of Education (CDE) invites directors and coordinators of gifted student programs to collaborate in a monitoring process that continually improves gifted student learning and education. This process, called the Colorado - Gifted Education Review, or C-GER, is a shared responsibility of administrative units and CDE. In this joint effort, C-GER increases the capacity of educators and educational systems to identify and program for gifted learners. The results of C-GER allow each administrative unit to prioritize areas for improvement as demonstrated in program plans and goals. The strengths of programs uplifted through C-GER will be shared among regional network systems that foster collegial support and cultivate models for shared interests and growth in gifted student education.

In accordance with state statute, C-GER aligns with the Rules for the Implementation of Gifted Education under the Exceptional Children's Education Act, Rule Section 12.07. The intent of C-GER is to be a support system in fulfilling the monitoring requirements. To accomplish this goal, C-GER will combine the current annual CDE visit to administrative units with an extended visit every 4 years. The annual visit is a reflective dialogue about the results of the administrative unit's annual report and needs for individual or network group assistance. Extended visits are one to three days, depending upon the size of the AU and factors to be considered. The extended visit verifies the implementation of program plan elements, accreditation requirements and progress toward the AUs state performance plan program goals. Over the course of time, C-GER will continue to evolve as it responds to the results of the process and feedback from participants.

This C-GER handbook provides basic information to participants in the shared monitoring process which is tailored for the individual AU in collaboration with the C-GER review team.

As a team of educators,

***Celebrate the small steps of progress along the pathway to quality gifted student education!***

Jacquelin Medina
Director, Gifted Education
303.866.6652

medina_j@cde.state.co.u

# CGER: Overview

The Colorado Department of Education is committed to improving outcomes for identified gifted students through efforts that focus on providing technical assistance and data-based decision making. C-GER is a collaborative multi-component process. The purpose is to create a partnership in reviewing regulations, performance and program plans. Results will validate strengths and develop strategies for student outcomes and continuous improvement. The C-GER process relies on using meaningful data, such as parent/staff survey data, the performance of identified gifted students on state and local assessments, enrollment data and indicators outlined in the State Performance Plan.

**COMPONENTS:**

C-GER is an ongoing improvement process that occurs over time, including an onsite visit within a 4-year cycle. Components of C-GER include verification of documents described in the desk audit (page 32). The desk audit typically involves the comprehensive program plan and documentation submitted to CDE on an annual basis, like the proposed budget form, budget expenditures, the UIP program addendum (2014), and enrollment information.

**THE COLORADO GIFTED EDUCATION REVIEW PROCESS IS A FOUR-YEAR CYCLE THAT INCLUDES THE ANNUAL SUBMISSION OF THE UIP ADDENDUM AND A TEAM REVIEW ONCE WITHIN THE**

The gifted education regional consultant also meets with AU directors and coordinators on a regular basis to inform implementation needs and collaborative technical assistance. These conversations may include:

- Data driven questions
- Verification of movement toward improvement goals and/or student targets
- Discussion to determine if technical assistance is needed and how that might work best for the administrative unit

- Discussion of specific programming options or other services for gifted students; and family involvement considerations

**Administrative Unit Checklist:** The AU checklist is a key tool for self-evaluation and for indicating to the review team evidence that program plan elements are being implemented. The AU Checklist is typically completed by the director, coordinator, and/or team of personnel responsible for gifted education. When completing the AU checklist, a column is provided to indicate evidence that exists in support of program plan implementation. If evidence is not yet available, this opens opportunity for conversation and questions.

**THE TEAM REVIEW CONSISTS OF A DESK AUDIT AND AN ADMINISTRATIVE UNIT SITE VISIT.**

**Team Review:** On a rotating basis (every four years or as needed), a team of external experts in the field of gifted education will conduct a review with an Administrative Unit. This Review Team, identified by the Colorado Department of Education, will visit the site to document and validate the Administrative Unit's progress in meeting the elements of the State Performance Plan. They will review data on current status, review evidence in support of program elements and address questions requested by the Administrative Unit. In addition to validation, the team will provide recommendations for next steps. The Team Review Process is one that captures the administrative unit at a point in time; it is not an event, but supports continuous movement toward exemplary practices. If any areas are found to be out of compliance with Colorado Gifted Education Statutes, an action plan with timeline for implementation will be required. An action plan with timelines may also be required for areas that are "developing" and not yet "on target." Depending on the situation this might include an additional site visit the following school year to review progress on suggested actions. Additionally, Administrative Units that are distinguished in certain program elements might be asked to serve as models and resources in the State.

- **Composition.** The review team is comprised of:
    - Four to six (dependent on district size) gifted education personnel from other administrative units and the Department

- **Structure.** The team review occurs over a period of one month. The review includes the

following components:

- **Desk Audit.** Four weeks prior to the actual team review visit, the following data is submitted to the team lead by the administrative unit's Director of Gifted Education:
  - AU Checklist
  - 2013-16 AU Program Plan
  - Budget Form
  - Acceleration strategies and options
  - Differentiated programming options for all categories on definition.
  - Prior CGER report, CGER Timeline, and evidence of completion of priority improvements
  - Professional Development Documentation
  - Program evaluation documentation
  - Advanced Learning Plans
  - Disaggregated GT data
    - achievement and growth
    - sub groups (proportionality)
    - areas of giftedness (identification)
  - Dispute resolution policy

**GIFTED EDUCATION DIRECTORS AND CGER REVIEW TEAM MEMBERS USE THE DESK AUDIT CHECKLIST FOR COLLECTION, SUBMISSION, AND VERIFICATION OF GIFTED PROGRAM ELEMENTS.**

- **Administrative Unit Site Visit.** The team gathers at the Administrative Unit's site to meet with the Gifted Education Director and other personnel, as deemed necessary. During this time the director will provide a brief description of how the AU has addressed the designated priority improvements indicated on the last CGER report and any other areas on which the AU has focused since the last review. (Turn-around and priority improvement district AUs and multi-district AUs, with such districts under their umbrella, will also discuss with the CGER Team

and any other personnel present about how gifted students fit into improvement plans for the district. A summary of gifted student data, e.g. achievement, growth and demographics, will also be presented to the CGER team. The overview includes what the Administrative Unit learned from its self-evaluation and delineates specific areas or questions the Administrative Unit would like the review team to consider. The presentation provides Review Team members with a chance to gain perspective of the Administrative Unit and what it views as its strengths and weaknesses. Additional information is reviewed by the team through interviews, parent focus groups, and evidence provided by the Gifted Education Director to support work on current State Performance Plan Indicators.

**SCHOOL SITE VISITS HELP REVIEW TEAM MEMBERS TO VERIFY PROGRAM ELEMENTS THROUGH AUTHENTIC DATA COLLECTION, AND INDIVIDUAL AND SMALL GROUP INTERVIEWS.**

- **School Visits.** The review team will visit a random sample of schools in the Administrative Unit as well as identified priority improvement and turnaround schools. (The review team might split into smaller sub-groups for larger Administrative Units.) The school visits provide an opportunity for the team to review and verify evidence that supports accomplishments of indicators in the State Performance Plan. During the school visits, the team may also conduct focus group sessions/interviews with school stakeholders.

- **Report Writing & Sharing.** The review team meets at a pre-arranged location outside of the school district to complete its verification work, review evidence collected during the visit, and craft a preliminary report of the team's findings. Review team deliberations allow the team an opportunity to reach consensus, draft a report, and write commendations and recommendations. An Executive Summary of the report is then shared with the Gifted Education Director and other administrative personnel. The focus of the summary is on two priority improvements areas that will have the most impact on gifted student learning and growth.

  - **Summary of the Review Team's Activities**. Over the course of the Gifted Education Team Review, the review team engages in evidence/artifact review, focus groups, school visits, and professional interviews. These activities help the review team gather and analyze evidence and

determine how well the administrative unit is addressing the needs of gifted and talented students. When making written recommendations for next steps, the team will focus on those activities that will most impact the growth of gifted students.

## CGER: Responsibilities of the AU

The Colorado Gifted Education Review includes consideration of annual submissions of documentation to the Colorado Department of Education along with a team review visit which will occur once over a 4 year cycle or earlier as requested. Both are an ongoing process of reflection engaging in continuous improvement, and demonstrating growth in program enhancements. The following chart outlines how the process unfolds and the responsibilities of the administrative unit.

| Timing | Administrative Unit Responsibilities |
|---|---|
| **Every year** | • Submit the UIP Program Addendum to CDE<br>• Submit budget expenditures and student enrollment information to CDE through ongoing regular district procedures<br>• Participate in resource and verification conversations with GERC |
| **Gifted Education Team Review (every 4 years or earlier as needed)** | **Prepare for the C-GER Team:**<br>• Collect data from a self-evaluation process that includes feedback from stakeholders and review of the gifted programming rubric and gifted student outcomes<br>• Conference with the review team chair and coordinate logistics for the review:<br>  • Arrange for focus group participants<br>  • Establish the review schedule<br>  • Identify schools to be visited during the School Visits<br>  • Coordinate logistics for the team during review<br>  • Address any questions and/or concerns related to visit preparation |

| | |
|---|---|
| **Gifted Education Team Review (continued)** | • Ensure the Administrative Unit is ready for the review<br>• Prepare presentation of self-assessment findings: priority improvement timeline and student achievement summary; questions and elements for confirmation by the review team<br>• Gather evidence/artifacts examples to document the district's fulfillment of the state performance plan indicators.<br>• Invite Superintendent(s) or other district personnel for review team summary meeting on final day<br><br>• Host C-GER review team and coordinate all logistics.<br><br>• Culminate the Review:<br>• Review team shares findings from the Colorado-Gifted Education Review with the Gifted Education Director and other personnel as deemed necessary<br>• Celebrate accomplishments and recognize personnel impacting the success of their gifted education program<br>• Prioritize recommendations from the review process that the Administrative Unit will incorporate into its gifted education program |
| **Review follow-up (every four years following Gifted Education Team Review)** | **Follow-up to the C-GER**<br><br>• Share findings of review with AU/district stakeholders:<br>• Parents<br>• Teachers/Counselors<br>• Administrators<br>• Students<br>• School Board<br>• Community<br>through a copy of the report, Website, meetings, etc.<br><br>• Prepare and begin implementation of an improvement action plan, if required, with assistance of district |

| | |
|---|---|
| | personnel<br><br>• Share progress on a regular basis with your stakeholders |

## CGER: Keys to Successful Partnerships

**The C-GER team will …**

**Be positive and forthright.** C-GER team members will maintain a positive attitude and presence at all times, and constantly engage in active listening. The team will maintain an objective and professional approach with all AU stakeholders.

**Be supportive.** Team members will ask questions and provide input to support the needs of the AU.

**AUs that have hosted a Gifted Education Peer Review offer the following advice to their colleagues.**

**Verify programming targets.** It is the job of the C-GER team to gather evidence from the AU that supports and verifies the state programming targets, and to provide commendations and/or recommendations for improvement.

**Be open and honest with the team**. The more authentic and accurate your responses are to the team, the better able the team is to assess the strengths and needs of the Administrative Unit.

**Stay on schedule**. Use the schedule to guide the visit.

**Communicate with all stakeholders about the visit.** The more people who know about the visit and the activities of the team, the better. Be as open and transparent about the process as possible.

**Share and encourage the team to review specific pieces of evidence/artifacts.** Include those that you feel are critical to the team's understanding of your work.

**Highlight the areas where you need the review team's assistance**. The earlier in the process that the team discovers the challenges the district is facing the more time the team has to consider and craft powerful recommendations to support the Administrative Unit in addressing those challenges.

**Remember, you get out of a process what you put into it**. The more committed the Administrative Unit is to the process and gaining valuable support and feedback from peers, the more likely it is to receive a meaningful Gifted Education Team Review.

# CGER: Developing a Review Schedule

The Administrative Unit's Gifted Education Director works with the review team chair to develop the site visit schedule. A typical review lasts two days. Decisions on review length will be made between the team chair and Gifted Education Director. The following is an overview of key components of a C-GER visit.

## Key Components of a Typical 2 day Peer Review Schedule

**Day 1 – Administrative Unit Priority Improvement Update and Artifact/Evidence Review**

- AU Coordinator/Director provides general orientation to Team and a brief description of how the AU has addressed the designated priority improvements indicated on the last CGER report and any other areas on which the AU has focused since the last review. (Turn-around and priority improvement district AUs and multi-district AUs with such districts under their umbrella, will also discuss with the Gifted Education Director and any other personnel present about how gifted students fit into improvement plans for the district.) Also include a brief summary of student data e.g. achievement, growth and demographics. This presentation will last approximately 45 minutes.
- Team interviews the Administrative Unit's Gifted Education Director/Coordinator and any others as needed.
- Some team members conduct evidence review while other members visit schools, interview focus groups of teachers, students and administrators
- Team meets to debrief findings and identify themes for the report

**Day 2 – Final Reviews, Report Writing and Sharing**

- Team reviews and verifies findings and completes a preliminary summary
- Team meets with AU Gifted Education Coordinator along with other AU administrator's (e.g. superintendent, RtI coach, curriculum specialist, etc.) as appropriate to highlight points from the Executive Summary.

# CGER: Setting up Focus Group/Interviews

**A focus group** could be defined as a group (7-10 people) of interacting individuals having some common interest or characteristics, brought together by a moderator, who uses the group and its interaction as a way to gain information about a specific or focused issue.

**Interviews** are usually more personal with questions being asked of a few participants (2-4) or an individual.

**ALLOW PLENTY OF TIME TO SCHEDULE FOCUS GROUPS AND INTERVIEWS**

**Purpose and coordination**. A critical component of the Gifted Education Review is to gather information from district and school stakeholders through the use of focus groups and/or personal interviews. Such discussions provide an opportunity for the team to verify information from a variety of stakeholders about the district's current gifted and talented education as seen through a specific lens. The Gifted Education Director, in conjunction with district and school leadership and with guidance and support from the review team chair, invites and schedules stakeholders for their participation in this information-gathering process.

**Selecting Participants.** Two weeks prior to the CGER site visit the review team chair will contact the Gifted Education Director about what type of focus groups and interviews the team will be conducting during the site visit. While it might be tempting to identify only those stakeholders who are active and strong supporters of the Administrative Unit/district, it does not maximize the insights and richness of the findings that can emerge from these discussions that ultimately benefit the AU's improvement efforts. The following guidelines are designed to help the Gifted Education Director in identifying random groups of stakeholders to be interviewed.

- Participants of a focus group represent only the intended stakeholders
- Focus groups should be random in selection and comprised of a cross section of districts/schools
- To maximize participation, focus groups can be conducted through distance learning systems that connect participants remotely.

**Inviting Participants**. The Gifted Education Director should begin inviting stakeholders to be interviewed as soon as he/she has finalized the visit schedule (approximately two weeks prior to the visit). Typically focus groups are comprised of 8-15 people. On page 14 is sample language that can be adapted and used as appropriate when inviting stakeholders to participate in the focus groups/interviews.

## Typical Stakeholder Groups:

- Gifted Education Director and other district administration as needed (district wide)
- Parent and community members (district wide) for focus group in evening
- Teachers (GT and Classroom)
- Students
- Building administrator(s)

### Guidelines for Identifying Stakeholders to Be Interviewed

Stakeholders should collectively:

- Reflect the Administrative Unit's broader community; *socio-economic levels, race and ethnicity, regions served by the district, etc.*
- Provide a range of viewpoints and perspectives; *strong, active supporters of the unit/district, critics of the unit/district, those who are less involved, etc.*
- Represent all schooling levels in the Administrative Unit; *pre-K to career/technical, if applicable*
- Represent all major categories of positions in the Administrative Unit; *leadership, administrative, teaching, guidance, and support functions*
- Include individuals who are knowledgeable of the Administrative Unit's efforts in Gifted Education
- Include individuals who can discuss the strengths and challenges the Administrative Unit wishes the team to understand

**Preparing Participants.** After stakeholders accept the invitation to participate in a focus group/interview, the Administrative Unit sends a brief note to confirm the date, time, and location of the meeting. The note should emphasize the importance of being on time. The note should repeat some of the information from the invitation letter that highlights the purpose and activities of the team. Focus groups typically last 30-45 minutes. Interviews range from 15-30 minutes.

## Sample Invitation to Potential Focus Group/Interview Participants

Dear *<insert name>,*

You are cordially invited to participate in *<insert name of Administrative Unit>*'s upcoming Gifted Education Peer Review by participating in a stakeholder focus group/interview.

*<insert name of Administrative Unit >*'s Gifted Education Peer Review will take place *<insert dates>.* The review is led by a team of professionals from around the state. During the review, the Review Team interviews a wide range of district and school level stakeholders, examines Evidence/ Artifacts, conducts school visits, and engages in professional deliberations to determine the Administrative Unit's compliance with state statues as well as offering collaborative support and commendations for what is working. The team shares its findings via a report. The Administrative Unit uses the findings from the team to further its continuous improvement efforts.

On *<insert day>*, the Gifted Education Peer Review Team will be conducting focus groups/interviews with stakeholder groups. We would like the team to interview you as part of the *<insert interview group>* at *<insert time>* in *<insert location>.* The focus group/interview will last approximately <insert allotted time for interview> minutes. We believe that you have experience, knowledge, and insights that would enhance the team's understanding of our Administrative Unit.

Please reply to this invitation by *<insert date>.* I hope you can participate in this exciting and valuable process.

Sincerely,
*<Gifted Education Director and/or Superintendent>*

# FOCUS GROUP AND INDIVIDUAL OR GROUP INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

| | PARENTS | STUDENTS | TEACHERS | ADMINISTRATORS |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **COMMUNICATION** | **Prompt:**<br>**How do you learn about gifted programming in the school(s)?**<br><br>**Probes:**<br>How were you informed about the gifted program offered by your district?<br><br>If you wanted more information about gifted education guidelines and procedures, where could you get answers to your questions?<br><br>How do you hear about your student's progress in gifted programming? | **Prompt:**<br>**How do you learn things about gifted programming?**<br><br>**Probes:**<br>How would you go about finding more information about gifted programming in your school?<br><br>How do you know about your progress in gifted programming? | **Prompt:**<br>**How do you communicate with parents and students concerning gifted education?**<br><br>**Probes:**<br>How do you receive information about gifted programming in your school and district?<br><br>How do you communicate a gifted student's progress with parents, students and administration? | **Prompt:**<br>**How do you communicate with parents, students and staff about gifted education?** |
| **PROGRAM PLAN ELEMENTS** | Communicate to **parents and educators** programming options and access | | | |
| **DEFINITION** | [Desk audit] | | | |
| | | | | |
| | **PARENTS** | **STUDENTS** | **TEACHERS** | **ADMINISTRATORS** |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **IDENTIFICATION** | **<u>Prompt</u>:**<br>**What is the process and criteria for gifted identification in your district?**<br><br>**<u>Probes</u>:**<br>What criteria were used to determine your child's gifted identification?<br><br>What input do you have into the referral and identification process in your district?<br><br>Did your child participate in any classes/activities before being identified to develop his or her area(s) of strength? | **<u>Prompt</u>:**<br>**How were you identified as gifted and talented?**<br><br>**<u>Probes</u>:**<br>How did you know you were being considered for gifted education?<br><br>In what areas are you identified as gifted?<br><br>How do your teachers help you strengthen your identified areas of strength?<br><br>Did you participate in any special classes/activities before you were identified as gifted? | **<u>Prompt</u>:**<br>**What is the process and criteria for gifted identification in your district?**<br><br>**<u>Probes</u>:**<br>What input do you have into the referral and identification process in your district?<br><br>What information do you gather for the gifted identification team?<br><br>How do you receive information about your students who have been identified as gifted?<br><br>What do you do for students in your classroom who you think might be gifted? | **<u>Prompt</u>:**<br>**What is the process and criteria for gifted identification in your district?**<br><br>**<u>Probes</u>:**<br>What input do you have into the referral and identification process in your district?<br><br>What happens to develop the strengths of students who might be gifted in your school? |
| **PROGRAM PLAN ELEMENTS** | Clearly written procedures include: screening tool, referrals, parent notifications, review team process, multiple avenues of communication for all categories of giftedness stated in the definition. | | | |
| **FOCUSED STATE PERFORMANCE** | Do demographics reflect | | | |

| INDICATORS | proportionality in subgroups and what does the equal and equitable access pre-identification and formal identification process look like? | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **PARENTS** | **STUDENTS** | **TEACHERS** | **ADMINISTRATORS** |
| **PROGRAMMING/** | **<u>Prompts</u>:**<br>**Tell us about your child's gifted programming.**<br>**Tell us about your involvement with your child's ALP.**<br><br>**<u>Probes</u>:**<br>-What steps does your child's school take to support the academic and social emotional needs of your child?<br>-What benefits does your child gain from gifted services? How do you know?<br>-Was the ALP process a collaborative effort between the teacher, you and your child, and other school personnel as needed?<br>-Has the ALP been reviewed annually? | **<u>Prompt</u>:**<br>**What happens in school for you and other gifted kids?**<br>**Tell us about your ALP.**<br><br>**<u>Probes</u>:**<br>-Did you have input into your ALP?<br>-Does your ALP address your strengths, interests, and other special needs as an identified student?<br>-Are you able to make changes to the ALP?<br>-How are your needs addressed in the classroom?<br>-Do you have access to advanced work?<br>-Are you able to articulate (express) your needs to classroom teachers? | **<u>Prompt</u>:**<br>**What do you provide for the gifted students you teach?**<br>**Tell us about your involvement with your gifted students' ALPs.**<br><br>**<u>Probes</u>:**<br>-What type of support/scaffolding does your district provide for teachers working with gifted students?<br>-Is differentiated instructional philosophy and support evident for gifted students by acceleration decisions, cluster grouping, evidence-based strategies, critical and creative thinking strategies, and higher order thinking?<br>-Is it evident in ALPs that programming matches the assessment data on strengths and interests of the gifted student?<br>-Is the ALP process a collaborative effort of the teacher, parent and student, and | **<u>Prompt</u>:**<br>**What does gifted student programming look like in your school/district?**<br>**Tell us about the ALP process in your school/district?**<br><br>**<u>Probes</u>:**<br>-What is happening to implement the READ Act for advanced readers?<br>-What type of support/scaffolding does your district provide for teachers working with gifted students?<br>-In regards to teacher effectiveness, what are you looking for in classrooms with gifted students?<br>-How are the social-emotional goals of gifted students addressed in your school? |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | other school personnel as needed?<br>-Is there evidence in ALPs of an affective goal for each identified student?<br>-Regarding teacher effectiveness, how do you view your role with gifted students in your classroom? | |
| **PROGRAM PLAN ELEMENTS** | Clearly communicated and articulated programming matched to strengths.<br><br>Where students are served and type of differentiation in place.<br><br>Affective and guidance support systems in place.<br><br>Advanced Placement, honors, pre-collegiate, challenging post-secondary options. ALPs match programming to student strengths, reviewed annually, collaborative process. | | | |
| **FOCUSED STATE PERFORMANCE INDICATORS** | Tier II and Tier III instructional strategies in place.<br><br>Acceleration plan and policy | | | |
| | **PARENTS** | **STUDENTS** | **TEACHERS** | **ADMINISTRATORS** |
| **EVALUATION AND** | **Prompt:** | **Prompt:** | **Prompt:** | **Prompt:** |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **ACCOUNTABILITY/** | **How have you been involved in the goal setting and monitoring of your student's Advanced Learning Plan (ALP)?**<br><br>**Probes:**<br>How do you know if your child is achieving and growing in his or her area(s) of strength?<br><br>**Prompt:**<br>**What do you know about gifted program evaluation in your district?**<br><br>**Probes:**<br>- Have you been asked to evaluate gifted programming services your child has received in the district?<br>---Did you receive any surveys to fill out?<br>-Are you aware of reports presented to school administration, the Board of Education and the community about gifted education? | **What role have you played in the development and implementation of your ALP?**<br><br>**Probes:**<br>How do you know if you are achieving and growing in your area(s) of strength?<br><br>**Prompt:**<br>**What do you know about gifted program evaluation in your district?**<br><br>**Probes:**<br>-Have you been asked to evaluate gifted programming services you have received?<br>---Did you receive any surveys to fill out? | **Tell us how you monitor achievement and affective goals for gifted students.**<br><br>**Probes:**<br>-How and when do you monitor growth on your ALPs? -What procedures are in place if a student isn't making achievement growth?<br><br>**Prompt:**<br>**What do you know about gifted program evaluation in your district?**<br><br>**Probes:**<br>- Have you been asked to evaluate gifted programming services your child has received in the district?<br>---Did you receive any surveys to fill out?<br>-Are you aware of reports presented to school administration, the Board of Education and the community about gifted education? | **What do you know about the ALP process in your district?**<br><br>**Probes:**<br>-What is the database you use for keeping student information about ALL gifted student identification categories? Who is responsible for keeping it updated and when is it updated?<br>-How do you know if GT students are moving toward identified growth targets?<br><br>**Prompt:**<br>**What is the process that your district uses to self-evaluate your GT Program (i.e., surveys, outside consultants)?**<br><br>**Probes:**<br>-What do you know about an evaluation of the district's gifted education program?<br>-Are you aware of reports that are presented to school administration, the School Board and community about the gifted program? |
| **PROGRAM PLAN ELEMENTS** | Methods for monitoring consistent with | | | |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | accreditation requirements for achievement. Affective growth monitored.<br><br>AU self-evaluation in place. | | | |
| **FOCUSED STATE PERFORMANCE INDICATORS** | Local data base of gifted student information for all categories of giftedness.<br><br>Gifted students moving toward identified growth targets. | | | |
| | **PARENTS** | **STUDENTS** | **TEACHERS** | **ADMINISTRATORS** |
| **PERSONNEL** | | | **<u>Prompt</u>:**<br>**Tell us about your training in gifted education.**<br><br>**<u>Probes</u>:**<br>-What gifted professional development opportunities are offered in your district? Have you accessed those? Which one/s?<br>-Do incentives exist | **<u>Prompts</u>:**<br>**Tell us about your training in gifted education.**<br><br>**<u>Probes</u>:**<br>-Are there ongoing and appropriate PD opportunities available to staff?<br>-Who manages the Gifted program at your school (in your district)? What are his/her qualifications, |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | for staff to increase their expertise in gifted programming? If so, what are the incentive/s?<br>-Do you feel as if you and/or your colleagues have the skills to adequately address the curricular and/or social-emotional needs of your gifted students?<br>-What administrative support exists for students or staff in your building (district)? | responsibilities, and focuses?<br>-In what ways does the AU gifted and talented leadership communicate to staff regarding professional development opportunities?<br>-Do incentives exist for staff to increase their expertise in gifted programming? If so, what are the incentive/s?<br>-What administrative support exists for students or staff in your building (district)? |
| **PROGRAM PLAN ELEMENTS** | Designated personnel for program plan management and professional development.<br><br>Trained and qualified teachers work with students.<br><br>Communication about PD | | | |
| **FOCUSED STATE PERFORMANCE INDICATORS** | Qualified program manager facilitates implementation of READ Act for advanced readers. | | | |
| | **PARENTS** | **STUDENTS** | **TEACHERS** | **ADMINISTRATORS** |
| **BUDGET** | **<u>Prompt</u>:**<br>**In what ways are you involved in the Gifted budget process?**<br><br>*Listen for: | | **<u>Prompt</u>:**<br>**In what way have you been involved with special projects or been provided extra materials or opportunities in your** | **<u>Prompt</u>:**<br>**In what ways are you involved with the setting of GT priorities for the budget?** |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | knowledge or evidence of collaboration efforts | | **gifted program?**<br><br>*Listen for: extracurriculars and equip/materials that might necessitate funding | *Listen for: knowledge or evidence of collaboration efforts |
| **PROGRAM PLAN ELEMENTS** | Budget collaborative process<br><br>Money spent on approved expenditures<br><br>AU commits some funds. | | | |
| **FOCUSED STATE PERFORMANCE INDICATORS** | Collaborative process | | | |
| **REPORTING** | [Desk audit] | | | |
| | **PARENTS** | **STUDENTS** | **TEACHERS** | **ADMINISTRATORS** |
| | | | | |
| **MONITORING/** | **<u>Prompt</u>:**<br>**Tell us how you were involved in the improvement process after your last C-GER?** | | **<u>Prompt</u>:**<br>**Tells us how you were involved in the improvement process after your last C-GER?** | **<u>Prompt</u>:**<br>**Tell us how you were involved in the improvement process after your last C-GER.** |
| **FOCUSED STATE PERFORMANCE INDICATORS** | C-GER improvement process collaborative | | | |
| **RECORD KEEPING** | [Desk audit] | | | |
| **DISPUTE RESOLUTION** | [Desk audit] | | | |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **EARLY ACCESS** | [Desk audit] | | | |

# CGER: Hosting the Gifted Education Review

The following guidelines are available to assist the Administrative Unit so it feels it is well-prepared for the Gifted Education Team Review. The following suggestions provide a detailed overview of each component of the visit and how to prepare for it along with tips to help the Administrative Unit host a successful Review.

The visit schedule serves as the primary guide for the one- or two-day Review. The Administrative Unit's Gifted Education Director manages the schedule and ensures that all activities of the Review occur as planned. The Administrative Unit's Gifted Education Director should maintain the schedule and extra copies at all times during the visit. He/she should be available for questions and to help the team access needed information throughout the visit. It is a good idea for the Administrative Unit's Gifted Education Director to provide the review team members with his/her contact information (including cell phone) and the names and contact information of other Administrative Unit staff should questions or emergencies arise. Once the review team has arrived, the Administrative Unit's Gifted Education Director connects with the review team for any last minute issues or changes and then ensures that all details unfold as planned.

## Attending to the Details

- Director and C-GER team leader confirm logistics prior to the visit

**Day One**

- Ensure easy access to evidence/artifacts the team will need.
- Present a brief description of how the AU has addressed the designated priority improvements indicated on the last CGER report and any other areas on which the AU has focused since the last review. Provide a summary of gifted student data, e.g. demographics, achievement and growth.
- Confirm lunch arrangements for the team, e.g. list and directions for local restaurants.
- Check that all review team members have directions for schools and contact information.
- Support the schools as they host the school visits.
- Manage the schedule for focus groups and additional follow-up as directed by the team.

**Day Two**

- Host the meeting between the review team, yourself, and any other district staff where the Executive Summary will be shared.
- Make sure the room has an LCD projector with a computer hook up so the review team chair can project the Executive Summary to the audience.

**Conclusion**

CDE looks forward to supporting administrative units throughout the Colorado-Gifted Education Review Process. We hope this handbook has been helpful, and we welcome any feedback to improve its usefulness and procedures. Please feel free to share your comments with us at medina_j@cde.state.co.us

# CGER: Appendix

## Administrative Unit Checklist Gifted Education

| | Communication Outreach | Y | N | Evidence |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 12.02 (1) (a) | Does the AU communicate to educators about available gifted programming options within the AU and how those options may be accessed? | ☐ | ☐ | |
| 12.02 (1) (a) | Does the AU communicate to parents about available gifted programming options within the AU and how those options may be accessed? | ☐ | ☐ | |
| | **Definition** | | | |
| 12.02 (1) (b) | Is the definition adopted by the Administrative Unit the same or substantially similar to the definition of "gifted and talented student" specified in the Rules. | ☐ | ☐ | |
| 12.02 (1) (b) | Is the definition used as a basis for planning elements of the Program Plan and programming support for gifted students of various exceptionalities? | ☐ | ☐ | |
| | **Identification** | | | |
| 12.02 (1) (c) | Does the identification process allow for a variety of strengths and interests to be recognized? | ☐ | ☐ | |
| 12.02 (1) (c) (i) | Does the identification procedure ensure equal and equitable access to identification for all students (e.g., minority students, economically diverse students, culturally diverse students, students with limited English proficiency and children with disabilities) through the use of assessment tools that are unbiased toward the group completing the assessments? | ☐ | ☐ | |
| 12.02 (1) (c) (i) | Are the demographics of the gifted population reflective of the district's overall demographics? | ☐ | ☐ | |
| 12.02 (1) (c) (ii) | Does the administrative unit collect referrals from a variety of sources? | ☐ | ☐ | |
| 12.02 (1) (c) (ii) | Is a screening tool administered to every student at one or more grade levels? | ☐ | ☐ | |
| 12.02( | Are multiple sources of quantitative and qualitative | ☐ | ☐ | |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1) (c) (iii) | data in a body of evidence used to make identification decisions for all areas of giftedness? | | | |
| 12.02(12) & 12.02 (1) (c) (iv) | To determine an area of giftedness do criteria require that the body of evidence demonstrates advanced level on a performance assessment or ninety-fifth percentile and above on a standardized achievement test in the area of exceptionality? | ☐ | ☐ | |
| 12.02 (1) (c) (v) | Are well-articulated review team procedures implemented? | ☐ | ☐ | |
| 12.02 (1) (c) (vi) | Are the procedures for identification assessment clearly written and available to all schools? | ☐ | ☐ | |
| 12.02(1) (c) (vi) | Does the administrative unit have a consistent method by which parents are made aware of the assessment process for their student, gifted determination, and development and review of the advanced learning plan? | ☐ | ☐ | |
| 12.08 (1) (d) | If the administrative unit permits early entrance of age 4 gifted students into kindergarten, its program plan shall describe the elements of an early access process and how those elements, criteria and components will be implemented. | ☐ | ☐ | |
| | **Programming** | **Y** | **N** | **Evidence** |
| 12.02 (1) (d) | Is it well articulated that programming shall match the strengths, interests, and special needs of the gifted student? | ☐ | ☐ | |
| 12.02 (1) (d) (i) | Is it evident in advanced learning plans that programming matches the assessment data on strengths and interests of the gifted student? | ☐ | ☐ | |
| 12.02 (1) (d) (ii) | Does the administrative unit clearly describe where gifted students are served (e.g., general classroom, classroom cluster groups, vertical cluster groupings, pull-out groupings, or school for gifted)? | ☐ | ☐ | |
| 12.02 (1) (d) (iii) | Is differentiated instructional philosophy and support evident for gifted students as exemplified in any of the following: | ☐ | ☐ | |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | • Does the administrative unit have a well-articulated process to consider and determine acceleration decisions?<br>• Is cluster grouping, a research-based strategy, supported and implemented in the administrative unit?<br>• Are critical and creative thinking strategies incorporated into differentiated content and assessment for gifted students? | | | |
| 12.02 (1) (d) (iv) | Are affective and guidance support systems available to gifted students in needs of such services? | ☐ | ☐ | |
| 12.02 (1) (d) (v) | Does the administrative unit provide diverse content options (e.g., mentorships, honors program, advanced math) and/or support strategies for each area of giftedness at the different levels of school? | ☐ | ☐ | |
| 12.02 (1) (d) (vi) | Does the administrative unit implement a well-communicated method to articulate the needs, interests, and achievement of every gifted student, preschool (if applicable) through grade 12 as exemplified in any of the following:<br>• Is there an administrative unit timeline for the transition of gifted student data to the next level of school in a timely manner for planning and appropriate course selection?<br>• Is gifted student data systemically available for articulation and transition? | ☐ | ☐ | |
| 12.02 (1) (d) (vii) | Does the administrative unit have a method to facilitate early college planning for gifted students? | ☐ | ☐ | |
| 12.02 (1) (d) (vii) | Does the administrative unit have pathways for advanced placement courses for gifted students? | ☐ | ☐ | |
| 12.02 (1) (d) (vii) | Are pre-collegiate, pre-advanced placement, vertical teaming, or study skill programs available to gifted students who may need additional support and instruction before taking advanced placement courses? | ☐ | ☐ | |
| 12.02 (1) (d) | Is there evidence of ALPs for gifted student that facilitate planning, record keeping and future | ☐ | ☐ | |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| (viii) | instructional decisions? | | | |
| 12.02 (1) (d) (viii) | Is the ALP process a collaborative effort of the teacher, parent and student, and other school personnel as needed? | ☐ | ☐ | |
| 12.02 (1) (d) (viii) | Are ALPs reviewed annually (e.g., during a regular teacher-parent conference; phone conference; individual parent-teacher meeting)? | ☐ | ☐ | |
| 12.02 (1) (d) (vii) | Are challenging post secondary options available to gifted students in their area of strength? | ☐ | ☐ | |
| | **Evaluation and Accountability** | **Y** | **N** | **Evidence** |
| 12.02 (1) (e)(i) | Do methods by which student achievement is monitored and measured for continual learning progress align with the state accreditation process (e.g., district assessments, progress monitoring data, ALP goals, classroom performance, and state assessment data)?<br>• Do gifted students have a plan of action (ALP) for coursework, mentors, internships, assessments or other options facilitating the growth of their exceptionality, and future college planning?<br>• Are gifted student data results used to determine goals for the administrative unit and the instructional focus for the individual ALP?<br>• Does the administrative unit have a goal or goals for improving gifted student achievement? | ☐ | ☐ | |
| 12.02 (1) (e) (ii) | Is the affective growth of gifted students monitored on the ALP and social-emotional needs addressed as needed (e.g., goal or check-off ALP system)? | ☐ | ☐ | |
| 12.02 (1) (e) (iii) | Is gifted student achievement and reporting consistent with accreditation requirements as exemplified by the following:<br>• Are the accreditation requirements for categorical groups (e.g., exceptional ability, students with disabilities, English language learners) equally applied to gifted students or students with exceptional ability? | ☐ | ☐ | |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | • Is TCAP data disaggregated for gifted students?<br>• Are there ways to address disparities in gifted student data if evident?<br>• Is the learning of gifted students monitored for growth? | | | |
| 12.02 (1) (e) (iv) | Does the administrative unit's self-evaluation provide feedback on: policy, goals, identification process, assessment, programming components, personnel, budget, reporting practices, and the impact of gifted programming on student achievement and progress? | ☐ | ☐ | |
| 12.02 (1) (e) (iv) | Does the administrative unit's program evaluation involve periodic feedback from major stakeholders: parents, students, educators and administrators? | ☐ | ☐ | |
| 12.02 (1) (e) (v) | Is data on gifted student achievement available to all stakeholders on an annual basis? | ☐ | ☐ | |
| | **Personnel** | **Y** | **N** | **Evidence** |
| 12.02 (1) (f) (i) | Beginning in 2010-2011 school year, does the administrative unit employ personnel responsible for the management of the program plan? | ☐ | ☐ | |
| 12.02 (1) (f) (i) | Beginning in 2010-2011 school year, does the administrative unit employ personnel responsible for gifted education professional development activities? | ☐ | ☐ | |
| 12.02 (1) (f) (i) | Are personnel who work in specific programs or classrooms consisting of mainly gifted students encouraged to become qualified personnel in gifted education? | ☐ | ☐ | |
| 12.02 (1) (f) (i) | Does the administrative unit have designated personnel knowledgeable in the characteristics, differentiated instructional methods and competencies in the special education of gifted students who provide instruction, counseling, coordination and other programming for gifted students? | ☐ | ☐ | |
| 12.02 (1) (f) (i) (b) (I) | Does the administrative unit provide professional development to improve and enhance the skills, knowledge and expertise of teachers and other personnel who provide instruction and other | ☐ | ☐ | |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | supportive services to gifted students, (e.g., training in differentiated curriculum, instruction, and assessment for gifted learners)? | | | |
| 12.02 (1) (f) (i) (B) (II) | Does the Administrative Unit have a plan to increase the number of qualified personnel providing instruction to gifted students? | ☐ | ☐ | |
| 12.02 (1) (f) (ii) | Does the administrative unit make attempts to collaborate with universities and/or colleges for the development of qualified personnel? | ☐ | ☐ | |
| 12.02 (1) (f) (iii) | Are provisions in place to ensure that gifted students are taught by highly qualified teachers in core academic areas? | ☐ | ☐ | |
| 12.02 (1) (f) (iv) | Are provisions in place to ensure that paraprofessionals are not the sole instructional provider for gifted students? | ☐ | ☐ | |
| 12.02 (1) (f) (v) | Are district personnel aware of the means by which the administrative unit supports the acquisition and/or improvement of the knowledge and competencies of personnel relating to the instruction, programming, and counseling for gifted students (e.g., inservice, coaching, induction programs)? | ☐ | ☐ | |
| | **Budget** | **Y** | **N** | **Evidence** |
| 12.02 (1) (g) | Does the administrative unit implement a collaborative process with stakeholders (e.g., schools, districts, parents, or steering committee) for determining the gifted education budget? | ☐ | ☐ | |
| 12.02 (1) (g) | Does the budget reflect the cost of implementing the programming, goals and objectives stated in the Program plan? | ☐ | ☐ | |
| 12.02 (1) (g) | Does the budget detail the funding committed by the administrative unit and funding requested from the Department of Education? | ☐ | ☐ | |
| 12.02 (1) (g) | Is the funding committed by the administrative unit equal to or greater than the amount requested from the Department of Education? | ☐ | ☐ | |
| 12.02 (1) | Is state funding for gifted education used only for one | ☐ | ☐ | |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| (g)(i)(ii)<br>(iii)<br>(iv) (v) | or more of the following purposes?<br>1) salaries for appropriately endorsed or licensed personnel serving primarily gifted students (e.g., director, coordinator, gifted resource teachers, counselors of the gifted); 2) professional development and training related to gifted education; 3) activities associated with gifted programming options specific to gifted students and their ALPs; 4) supplies and materials used in instructional programming for gifted education; and 5) technology and equipment necessary for the education of gifted students (up to 25% of state funds) | | | |
| | **Reporting** | **Y** | **N** | **Evidence** |
| 12.03 | Does the administrative unit have a current report on file at the Department of Education (due September 30 annually)? | ☐ | ☐ | |
| 12.3<br>(2) (a) | Does the administrative report provide evidence of programming through the grades, preschool (if applicable) through grade 12? | ☐ | ☐ | |
| 12.03<br>(2) (b)<br>(c)<br>(d) | Are formally identified students reported to CDE according to: gifted in math, gifted in language arts, gifted in both (math and language arts), and other (aggregate of student gifted in creativity, leadership, visual arts, music, and performing arts) as well as by grade, gender, ethnicity, twice exceptionality, if appropriate, and by early entrance preschoolers, if applicable? | ☐ | ☐ | |
| 12.03<br>(3) | Does the administrative unit report the number of non-identified students served through gifted student programming? | ☐ | ☐ | |
| 12.03<br>(4) | Does the AU report the percentage of gifted students who have been identified? | ☐ | ☐ | |
| 12.03<br>(5) | Is the number of qualified personnel working in the administrative unit reported on the end-of-year report? | ☐ | ☐ | |
| 12.03 | Are programming strategies common to each level of | ☐ | ☐ | |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| (6) | schooling reported on the end-of-year report? | | | |
| 12.03 (6) (b) | Does the administrative unit delineate methods for articulation/transition through the grades? | ☐ | ☐ | |
| 12.03 (6) (c) | Does the administrative unite delineate methods and tools used to monitor gifted students achievement and commensurate growth? | ☐ | ☐ | |
| 12.03 (7) | Do the administrative unit and their member districts, if any, comply with the requirements of accreditation with regard to student achievement, instructional goals, identification of disparities in the data, growth and reporting? | ☐ | ☐ | |
| | **Audit** | **Y** | **N** | **Evidence** |
| 12.04 | Is the administrative unit aware and ready to participate in monitoring activities associated with the Colorado Gifted Education Review (C-GER)? | ☐ | ☐ | |
| | **Record Keeping** | | | |
| 12.05 (1) | Are the financial records of the administrative unit kept in accordance with accepted principles of governmental accounting? | ☐ | ☐ | |
| 12.05 (2) | Does the administrative unit maintain an inventory of all equipment purchased with state funds throughout the useful life of the equipment? | ☐ | ☐ | |
| 12.05 (3) | Does the administrative unit's ALP provide a record of ongoing programming options and strategies utilized with individual students and results? | ☐ | ☐ | |
| 12.05 (3) | Is the ALP part of the student's ongoing records? | ☐ | ☐ | |
| 12.05 (3) | Is the ALP utilized in educational planning and decision-making concerning subsequent programming for that student? | ☐ | ☐ | |
| 12.05 (3) | Is the ALP utilized in the articulation process? | ☐ | ☐ | |
| 12.05 (3) | Do gifted student records include the body of evidence that identified the area of exceptionality, interests and | ☐ | ☐ | |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | needs? | | | |
| 12.05 (4) | Are gifted student educational records and ALPs held to be confidential and protected in accordance with applicable federal and state laws and regulations, and maintained, retained and destroyed consistent with the ongoing system of student record keeping established in the administrative unit, including its member districts? | ☐ | ☐ | |
| | **Dispute Resolution** | | | |
| 12.06 | Does the administrative unit have a written, well-articulated dispute resolution process? | ☐ | ☐ | |
| 12.06 | Does the dispute resolution afford the aggrieved individual notice of the decision giving rise to the dispute and an opportunity to be heard before the decision is implemented? | ☐ | ☐ | |
| | **Early Access** | **Y** | **N** | **Evidence** |
| 12.08 (2) (a) (i) | Are criteria and process explained and accessible to parents, educators and public? | ☐ | ☐ | |
| 12.08 (2) (a) (ii) | Is professional development provided to preschool, general and gifted education personnel, including preschool, kindergarten and first grade teachers and principals? | ☐ | ☐ | |
| 12.08 (2) (a) (iii) | Is there evidence of collaborative efforts among parents, preschool, general and gifted educators? | ☐ | ☐ | |
| 12.08 (2)(a) (iv) | Is an advanced learning plan developed as a collaborative process including the parent/s and classroom teacher? | ☐ | ☐ | |
| 12.08 (2)(b) | If there is a fee, is there evidence that it is reasonable (no fee for free and reduced eligible students), and is early access assessment integrated into ongoing assessment practices as much as possible? | ☐ | ☐ | |
| 12.08 (2)(d) | Do criteria include referral by parent or educator; a student profile of strengths, performance, readiness, needs and interest; and are all criteria in the body of evidence considered? | ☐ | ☐ | |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 12.08 (2) (d)(i) | Is aptitude measured at the 97 or 98 percentile ranking and tools listed? | ☐ | ☐ | |
| 12.08 (2) (d)(ii) | Is achievement measured at the 97 or 98 percentile ranking and tools listed? | ☐ | ☐ | |
| 12.08 (2)(d) (iii) | Does performance data include work sample/s and input by parent and teacher/adult? | ☐ | ☐ | |
| 12.08 (2) (d) (iv) | Is data for readiness, social behavior and motivation collected through identified tools? | ☐ | ☐ | |
| 12.08 (2)(d) (v)(A) (I) | Is there a determination letter that provides evidence of signatures by the parent, gifted education staff, early childhood staff, receiving teacher and administrator, and recognition and support of child's placement? | ☐ | ☐ | **Evidence** |
| 12.08 (2)(d) (v)(A) (II) | Does the ALP include a transition goal for the first year of early access? | ☐ | ☐ | |
| 12.08 (2)(e) (v)(A) (III, IV) | Is there evidence of communication with the student about school success, and parent-teacher communication? | ☐ | ☐ | |
| 12.08 (2)(d) (v)(B) | Is there clear articulation about how parents, teachers, school administrator and the learning environment will contribute to a positive support system? | ☐ | ☐ | |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 12.08 (2)(e) (i)(A) | Is the timeline for application period clear—due by April 1, unless AU permits applications after April 1? If so, are the conditions easily understood? | ☐ | ☐ | |
| 12.08 (2)(e) (i)(B) | Are determinations made within 60 calendar days of receiving referral portfolios? | ☐ | ☐ | |
| 12.08 (2)(e) (i)(D) | Is it clear that the child will be age 4 for kindergarten, and age 5 for first grade by the start date of school? | ☐ | ☐ | |
| 12.08 (2)(e) (ii) | Are there trained personnel identified to collect portfolios; collect data and provide testing, sit on a determination team consisting of a gifted education resource person, a teacher in early childhood and others identified by the AU; be a support team during transition to include the receiving teacher and administrator, parents, gifted education personnel and other person if identified by the AU? | ☐ | ☐ | |
| 12.08 (2)(e) (iii) (A) | Are requirements for the application portfolio clearly stated and parents responsible for the referral portfolio? | ☐ | ☐ | |
| 12.08 (2)(e) (iii) (A) (II) | Is a screening tool identified for parent and teacher input? | ☐ | ☐ | |
| 12.08 (2)(e) (iii) (A) (III) and (C) | Is performance data included in the portfolio, and a body of evidence used with quantitative and qualitative data? | ☐ | ☐ | **Evidence** |
| 12.08 | Are determinations a collaborative consensus process, or if no team exists, does the gifted director/a trained | ☐ | ☐ | |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| (2)(e)<br><br>(iii) (A)<br>(II) (D)<br>(I) | principal make the determination? | | | |
| 12.08<br>(2)(e)<br><br>(iii) (A)<br>(II) (D)<br>(II) | Do early access students have an ALP that includes academic and transition goals no later than the end of the first month of school? | ☐ | ☐ | |
| 12.08<br>(2)(e)<br><br>(iii) (A)<br>(II)<br><br>(D)<br>(III) | If the child is gifted, but not deemed appropriate for early access, is the child's assessment portfolio sent to the child's school for serving the area of exceptionality? | ☐ | ☐ | |
| 12.08<br>(2)(e)<br><br>(iv) | Is ongoing progress monitoring evident—at least every 5 weeks during the first year of early access—using the ALP and student performance reports shared with the parents and child? | ☐ | ☐ | |
| 12.08<br>(2)(e)<br><br>(v) | Is there a dispute resolution process accessible to parents? | ☐ | ☐ | |

## Focused Team Desk Audit Checklist

| Evidence | Program Plan Elements | Priority Indicators |
|---|---|---|
| ☐AU Checklist<br>Determine if evidence statements provide sufficient information and/or data from the AU<br><br>☐2012-2016 AU Program Plan<br><br>☐Early Access Plan, if on CDE's list of approved AU permitting early access under the ECEA statute<br>What is evidence that the early access plan is being implemented?<br><br>☐Other artifacts the AU wants to share as evidence of any program elements | • All | All |
| ☐New Budget Form, that includes a description of how funds will be used; budget indicated for proposed expenditures of state distribution and district contribution.<br><br>☐What is evidence that budgeting for gifted education involves collaborative efforts? | • Budget, Record Keeping, Reporting | |
| ☐Acceleration – How is acceleration implemented to appropriately address educational needs of gifted students – differentiated instruction and methods for acceleration? Is the AU utilizing Iowa Acceleration Scale for whole grade level acceleration? Is the determination for whole grade acceleration recorded on the student's ALP?<br><br>☐Differentiated programming options at the Tier II and Tier III levels that are systemic (across all schools and levels (elementary and secondary) for all categories on definition. *Handbooks, related PD, curriculum, policies (e.g. independent study, concurrent enrollment, mentoring/internships), Web site* | • Programming<br><br>• Communication Programming. Definition | Yes<br><br>Yes |
| ☐Prior CGER report<br><br>☐CGER Timeline<br><br>☐Evidence of completion of priority improvements; request evidence if needed | • Monitoring | |
| ☐Professional Development Documentation<br>In what ways is the AU increasing capacity of educators to understand and provide appropriate | • Personnel | |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| instruction for gifted students on an annual basis?<br>Explore PD in literacy if a need identified by AU student data.<br>In what ways, is the AU promoting educators to become qualified personnel in gifted education? | | |
| ☐Program evaluation documentation<br><br>☐Advanced Learning Plans (achievement and affective, related to strength) *Forms, data base, process, communication (Website, handbook, letters)*<br><br>☐Disaggregated GT achievement and growth data by sub groups, grade levels, identified strength areas, schools (correlate to GT achievement targets and UIP)<br><br>☐Ask: In what ways are gifted education personnel involved in transitional year activities for implementation of the UIP addendum for gifted education? In 13-14, few AUs will have completed a program addendum for gifted education. | • Evaluation Accountability<br><br>• Evaluation Accountability Record Keeping<br><br>• Accountability | Yes<br><br>Yes |
| ☐Identification Procedures for equal and equitable access in ALL areas of giftedness in definition. *(screening tool, referral procedure, assessment procedure, parent notifications, review team process for determination, criteria for exceptionality, multiple sources of data, multiple ways to communicate)*<br><br>☐Disaggregated GT data by sub groups (proportionality)<br><br>☐Gifted student enrollment maintained in a database indicating each student's area(s) of giftedness: cognition, academics, creativity, leadership, visual arts, performing arts (theater/dance) and/or music. | • Identification & Definition | Yes<br><br>Yes |
| ☐Dispute resolution policy with links to access information | • Dispute resolution & Communication | |

Time Line Guidance –

- Provide announcement of C-GER letter to administrative unit superintendent(s)/executive director late spring/summer prior to C –GER
- Lead C-GER person contacts AU gifted education director regarding C-GER dates, process and requested forms and information ASAP after announcement of annual schedule
- 8 weeks prior to C-GER – CDE provides AU folder to lead C-GER team person
- 5-8 weeks prior to C-GER – conduct the desk audit; request additional information from the AU gifted education director/coordinator
  Note: In 13-14 modifications to the guidance time line may be necessary due to development phase of new desk audit and onsite changes.

## Advanced Learning Plan Review

## Checklist

| | |
|---|---|
| ☐ | Does the administrative unit have a consistent ALP form that is used in its schools and/or districts/ |
| ☐ | Does the ALP form record strengths, interests and needs of the gifted student? |
| ☐ | Do programming options and goals match the strengths, interests and needs of the gifted student? |
| ☐ | Are ongoing programming results described? |
| ☐ | Are student achievement results recorded? |
| ☐ | Are individual programming options delineated? |
| ☐ | Are specific strategies used with the individual student recorded? |
| ☐ | Does the ALP describe programming options for each of the student's area of exceptionality? |
| ☐ | Does the ALP address where the student is served? |
| ☐ | Does the ALP address differentiated instruction and methods? |
| ☐ | Does the ALP address affective and guidance (college planning) support systems? |
| ☐ | Are methods for articulation reflected in the ALP? |
| ☐ | Is the ALP maintained in the student's permanent record consistent with the ongoing system of student record keeping established in the administrative unit? |
| ☐ | Is the ALP used for individual educational planning and decision making based upon the student's strengths and interests identified through the body of evidence collected during assessment? |
| ☐ | Does the ALP contain evidence of annual reviews? |
| ☐ | Does the ALP have a signature section to ensure the participation of teachers, parents, the student and other school personnel as appropriate? |

## 2012-2016 State Performance Plan Indicators

| Description of State Performance Indicator | | Description of State Performance Indicator | |
|---|---|---|---|
| AU will increase the identification of gifted students from traditionally under-represented populations as evidenced in proportionality of local data by 2016. | | AU will implement ALPs in high schools either as a blended plan with the ICAP or as a separate individual ALP by fall 2014. | |
| AU will implement procedures to identify exceptional potential/gifted students in all categories of giftedness. | | AU will have a policy or guidelines for acceleration. Districts reviewed acceleration plans for students in general and have a local acceleration plan for gifted students. | |
| AU will be successful in identifying and moving toward gifted student achievement/growth targets by 2016. | | AU will accomplish priorities set through the Colorado Gifted Education Review (C-GER). | |