Davis Joint Unified School District

Special Report to the Board of Education on Review of the Alternative Instructional Model (AIM), 2015

September 17, 2015

(The Special Report to the Board of Education has been updated as of 09/16/2015. You can find the changes, which are tracked on pages 11-12 and Appendix K and L.)

Special Report to the Board of Education on the Review of the Alternative Instructional Model (AIM), 2015

The mission of Davis Joint Unified School District, a leading center of educational innovation, is to ignite a love of learning and equip each student with the knowledge, skills, character, and well-being to thrive and contribute to an evolving and increasingly-connected world, through a system characterized by:

- Optimal conditions and environments for all students to learn
- A team of talented, resourceful, and caring staff
- Transforming teaching, learning, and operations in our continuing pursuit of excellence
- Resourceful, transparent, and responsible fiscal planning, and
- A diverse and inclusive culture

Adopted by the Board of Education, March 6, 2014

Office of the Superintendent
Davis Joint Unified School District

This report was produced pursuant to the Board of Education motion on June 4, 2015, directing the Superintendent to:

> *Provide more equitable access to the AIM program, move to eliminate the use of private testing to qualify students, beginning with students who would first be admitted to the program in the 2016-17 school year.*

> *Further, direct the Superintendent to have staff review and recommend assessment protocols to be implemented in screening students beginning in the 2015-16 school year. The focus of assessment will be to identify students whose needs cannot be met in classrooms which fully implement best practices of differentiated instruction.*

> *Assessment will take into consideration multiple measures. Recommended changes will be approved by the Board, prior to implementation. Further, direct the Superintendent to develop a plan for the district which fully implements differentiated instructional practices in all classrooms.*

For the reader's convenience, this report contains information about and from outside organizations, including hyperlinks and URLs. Inclusion of such information does not constitute an endorsement by the Davis Joint Unified School District Superintendent Winfred Roberson and/or the school district.

Davis Joint Unified School District
Winfred B. Roberson, Jr.
Superintendent

Department of Instructional Services
Clark Bryant
Associate Superintendent
Stephanie Gregson
Director for Curriculum, Assessment and Learning

Department of Administrative Services
Matt Best
Associate Superintendent

September 2015

This report is available on the school district's website at: www.djusd.net/aim

Table of Contents

Preface

The history of the Alternative Instructional Model (AIM) program reflects the commitment and effort of the Board of Education and the administration of Davis Joint Unified School District (DJUSD) (hereafter the administration) to expand educational opportunities for children with identified abilities. Throughout this report students served by the AIM program refer to individuals who receive services in self-contained classrooms as pursuant to the AIM Master Plan. Gifted and Talented Education (GATE) is defined differently in academic research and throughout scholarly education articles. For the purpose of this report and for the current AIM program, DJUSD adheres to the definitions that appear in the approved version of the AIM Master Plan:

> *The stated purpose of the program is to provide a quality educational program for gifted and talented students in order to develop their knowledge, skills, abilities, and values. The district's GATE program serves three categories of gifted students:*
> *1) intellectually gifted—students with high potential in the areas of abstract thinking and reasoning ability as applied to school learning situations;*
> *2) high achieving—the student who scores two or more levels above grade level in two or more academic areas and/or maintains a 3.6 grade point average in college preparatory academic classes for a period of two consecutive years;*
> *3) high achieving in a specific academic area—the student who scores two or more levels above grade level or who maintains a 3.6 grade point average in a single academic area for a period of two or more years.*

The administration used these definitions as framework for addressing the directives in the June 4, 2015 Board motion and in preparing the report's recommendations. DJUSD remains committed to continuing to serve both intellectually gifted and high achieving students.

The Special Report to the Board of Education on the Review of the Alternative Instructional Model (AIM), 2015 contains seven major sections that address requirements set forth in the BOE directive. The sections are: (1) brief history of the AIM Program and Identification in Davis Joint Unified; (2) research sources for the report (3) identification process key considerations (4) recommendations specific to the identification process; (5) examination of differentiation; (6) leadership structure and elements; and (7) conclusion.

History of AIM/GATE Program and Identification in DJUSD

In the early 1990's students were nominated for GATE program testing by parents and/or classroom teachers. Students were administered the Cognitive Abilities Test (*CogAT*), which required a 97th percentile on the Total, Verbal, or Nonverbal to qualify. The CogAT is a group-administered assessment intended to estimate students' learned reasoning and problem solving abilities through a battery of verbal, quantitative, and nonverbal test items. This test was administered at the District Office after school hours.

In 1995, the district began using the Otis-Lennon School Ability Test (*OLSAT*) for identification in order to better align the test's norm with the district's demographics. The OLSAT is a group-administered assessment intended to estimate students' abstract thinking and reasoning ability. The qualifying score was set at the 97th percentile, and there was outreach in the community to encourage referrals from teachers and parents in an effort to identify a more ethnically and racially diverse population of students. Testing was administered after school hours.

In 1998, the district moved the testing site from the district office to school sites. For the next several years, tests were offered at each elementary site after school hours. The goal of this change was to increase referrals and participation. The reported effect was nominal.

In 2003, the BOE approved a pilot testing program. All students in the third grade at three schools were administered the *OLSAT* in their classrooms. Students from all the other sites were tested based on parent and/or teacher nomination at the site. Pilot testing during the school day resulted in higher levels of participation.

In 2004, the classroom testing pilot was approved for districtwide use. Also that year, in an effort to identify more students from underrepresented groups, the qualifying score was adjusted to the 92nd percentile on the Total score and the 90th percentile on either the Verbal or the Nonverbal scores. As a result, the GATE-identified student population became more diverse. However, it was reported that the demographics of the GATE program did not mirror that of the district.

In 2005, under the auspices of Javits grant the DJUSD GATE Identification Procedures Evaluation Report (available at http://www.djusd.net/aim) was completed and a more comprehensive process was designed to search and serve underrepresented groups by implementing a second round of testing for identification. The goal was to include students with risk factors as well as

those who had scored in the *standard error of measurement* (+/- 5%) on the *OLSAT*. The process for retesting included:

- Students without risk factors were administered the Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children *(WISC)* by the GATE Psychologist, an employee of the Davis Joint Unified School District. The WISC is an individually administered intelligence test.
- Students with risk factors were administered the Test of Nonverbal Intelligence *(TONI)* by the DJUSD GATE Coordinator.

The new qualification score for AIM identification became:

- 96th percentile Total *and either* Verbal *or* Nonverbal score of 96th percentile with no risk factors, or
- 95th percentile with one risk factor, or
- 94th percentile with two or more risk factors

A search and serve process was also triggered when: 1) there was a discrepancy in norm referenced tests on reading/language arts and math scores, 2) a review of work samples suggested giftedness, 3) parent or teacher recommendations included gifted characteristics on a nomination form, or 4) the student was in a subgroup that suggested s/he might have a lower than accurate OLSAT score because of cultural background.

In 2012, the Board of Education added a lottery process for the placement of AIM students for the 2012-2013 school year. In addition the name of the Gifted and Talented Education (GATE) program was changed to the Alternative Instructional Model (AIM) program.

In the summer of 2014, the Master Plan was updated to reflect the District's commitment to provide teacher support and training focused on differentiation so that all teachers were equipped to effectively meet the learning needs of all AIM-identified students. The district offered professional growth through the California Association for the Gifted summer and fall workshops. Differentiation training was also embedded into Common Core math training. Increasing the use of differentiation techniques was intended to improve student performance and outcomes in self-contained and non-self-contained classes for students who were identified as gifted and/or high achieving in math. In addition, the Master Plan was updated to include flexible and innovative differentiation related instructional practices to improve student performance and outcomes in self-contained and non-self-contained classes for students identified as AIM and/or high achieving in math.

The district is committed to the continuous improvement of all programs. The following sections of this report outline the recommendations and next steps for the AIM program.

Research Sources
Process, research and data collection

Since mid-June the administration has undertaken a thorough process of research and analysis culminating in The Special Report to the Board of Education on the Review of the Alternative Instructional Model (AIM), 2015. This section outlines the many steps taken and issues considered as part of the process.

Data was collected by reaching out across the state to GATE program leaders, prominent researchers and experts, as well as by consulting those within the DJUSD school community. These external and internal sources provided valuable information and context to the administration's research.

Investigation of GATE programs across California

The administration received data from fifteen (15) California school districts. Research was conducted online, by personal phone calls and/or email. Information about the districts reviewed is included in Appendix D. Administration sought data on program structure, assessments used for identification, and qualifying scores.

From the program research, evidence suggests that each district has a unique system for identifying students as well as individualized systems to serve those students. A summary of key findings from this research reveals:

- The OLSAT and CogAT are commonly used in the identification process and are sometimes used in conjunction with other assessments.
- Identification scores are used in some districts with qualification scores ranging from 90-99 percentile, while some districts use a portfolio approach to GATE identification with assessment scores, work samples of student achievement and teacher recommendations considered in combination.
- Some districts have self-contained service models while others use differentiation techniques in heterogeneous classrooms, including cluster grouping.
- Some programs have extracurricular programs for GATE-identified students that occur outside of the traditional school day.

Researchers and Expert Practitioners

In addition to a review of key academic articles pertaining to GATE services, identification systems, models, and best practices (Appendix E), the administration consulted researchers and expert practitioners in the field of GATE identification and assessment including Marcia Gentry, Professor, Ph.D., College of Education, Purdue University, Dr. Barbara Branch, Executive

Director of the California Association of the Gifted (CAG), Megan Welsh, Assistant Professor, Ph.D., UCD School of Education, as well as administrators from other school districts with experience in the field.

Experts were questioned on the following topics:
- assessment tools
- differentiation
- high achievement vs. intellectual giftedness
- identification processes
- professional development systems for GATE certifications GATE Program descriptions

The following key themes were heard:
- There are a wide variety of definitions of giftedness and varying program structures developed to serve student needs.
- A successful GATE program clearly defines the population who will be identified and served as gifted and then builds the program to meet the needs of those students.
- A strong corollary exists between intellectual giftedness and high achievement and, as such, there appear to be no clear or straightforward assessment tools to distinguish or make separate identifications.
- It is better to use multiple measures to identify students for GATE programs.
- The way multiple measures are implemented will have an impact on the appropriate identification of students.

Internal Consultation and Review of Community Feedback

Understanding the experiences, perspectives and feedback from district personnel as well as Davis community members, has been a priority for the administration during this process. A thorough review of all emails sent to the newly created AIMinput@djusd.net email address was conducted. Additionally, the administration carefully considered community input on the AIM program made through opinion pieces in local media, public comment to the Board of Education, and meetings and conversations with DJUSD administrators about the AIM program. Moreover, the administration held specific outreach meetings with principals with AIM strands at their sites and with GATE teachers. At these meetings participants were asked to share thoughts about the identification process, differentiation and any other feedback about the AIM Program.

Email Feedback

The district received 49 emails from 33 individuals (as of 08/18/2015) directed to the AIMinput@djusd.net email address. Emails are attached in Appendix F. The public was notified that emails sent to this address will be reviewed, considered and made available to the public.

Input from Teachers and Principals

Written input from AIM Teachers was collected and reviewed carefully. In addition, the administration held AIM discussions on August 18 and August 19 for both elementary and secondary AIM teachers, specifically to elicit feedback and suggestions. Similarly, the administration reviewed all written input from principals and held a meeting with principals on August 14 to receive input and suggestions. Meeting minutes are attached in Appendix G.

From all of the community input, the administration identified the following themes:
- Acceleration
- AIM advisory committee
- Assessment/ ID process
- Current placement process/ lottery
- Qualification score
- Differentiation
- Diversity/ Underrepresentation/Race/ Equity
- Instructional practices (Cluster Grouping, etc.)
- Parent/ Student input
- Private testing
- Program design that meets student potential
- Program messaging and Communications
- Research
- Serving AIM-identified, low-achieving students
- Social Effects of Self-Contained classrooms
- Teacher training/ GATE certification
- Time, transparency and piloting changes
- The AIM coordinator position
- The UCD Researchers research on the DJUSD AIM program

Section I: Identification Process
Key Considerations

To guide research, analysis and the formulation of recommendations for this report, the administration considered the following key topics: (Note- items are not listed in order of priority).

Impact of the elimination of private testing

The administration speculates that the elimination of private testing may have an effect on program size. Using a simplified model based on data and trends from the last three years, the administration projects that the approximate size of the AIM program would fall between 77 and 100 students with the elimination of private testing if the number of students tested remains constant (Appendix N). These numbers would suggest that the district would offer between three and four sections of self-contained AIM classrooms. These projections are strictly based on the elimination of private testing and does not account for potential changes in qualification scores or to the location of AIM strands.

Risk Factors

Research confirms that it is important to identify risk factors in the AIM Identification process to mitigate for inherent biases identified in the assessments of intellectual abilities. Steps must be taken to ensure the identification process also serves underrepresented populations.

After a review of the AIM Master Plan and relevant research, the administration believes that risk factors may impact a student's potential or performance on tests of school ability and/or achievement. The presence of these variables may be documented by a review of school records or a statement from the administrator, teacher, or parent. The administration's recommendations reflect the need to consider risk factors for AIM identification.

Review of Intellectual Abilities Tests

When considering which assessments to use in order to measure for intellectual abilities and GATE/AIM identification, the administration used the All Mental Measures Yearbook test reviews by the Burros Center for Testing (See Appendix H). Each review provides a summary of an assessment and typically two independent reviews by experts in the field.

These reviews, as well as input from experts and practitioners, were used to help guide the decision to use the CogAT, Form 6; Naglieri Nonverbal Ability Test; Otis Lennon School Ability Test (OLSAT), Eighth Edition; Slosson Intelligence Test; 3rd 2002 Edition; Test of Nonverbal Intelligence (TONI), Fourth Edition; Wechsler Intelligence Test for Children, Fourth Edition; and the Woodcock-Johnson III. In conducting the analysis of the various tests, consideration was

given to the purpose for the test, recommended use, individual versus group assessments, time of the assessments, age ranges and cost of administration (Appendix E).

Inclusion of a Teacher Rating Scale

Research in the field around multiple measures (Lohman 2005; Pfeiffer 2007; Worrell and Erwin 2011; Peters and Gentry 2012) supports the involvement of teachers as an essential part of the identification process.   Several different gifted rating scales have been developed to provide a systematic way to include teacher input such as the Gifted Rating Scales (GRF), the Scales for Rating the Behavioral Characteristics of Superior Students (SRBCSS), Scales for Identifying Gifted Students (SIGS) and the Having Opportunities Promotes Excellence Teacher Rating Scale (HOPE). When considering which of these tools DJUSD might employ, the number of items, subscales and a focus on underrepresented students were examined (Appendix I).

Discussion of "And", "Or," and "Mean"

When multiple measures are used for assessment, consideration must be given to how they are combined to determine qualification. McBee, Peters, Waterman (2014) describe the impact of different ways to use these scores, which shows that when students are expected to meet the qualification score on all assessments, the results tend to under-identify students. When students must meet only one criterion, the process tends to over identify students. However, when scores on each criterion are converted to a common scale (McBee, Peters, and Waterman 2014) students will be less homogeneous than those identified through an "And" standard, where students must qualify on all assessments. Additionally, using the common scale will create a group that is more homogeneous through a system where students qualify on one "Or" another assessment.

The administration's recommendation represents a strategy of multiple measures guided by this framework. More about multiple measures including a table with options considered is available in Appendix J.

Qualification Score for AIM Identification

A qualification score for identification is the minimum score required for AIM-identification. Qualification scores are a reflection of the program a district wants to run in order to serve the students they have identified. There is no consensus in the research or among experts about the qualification score. Local districts are directed by the state to develop their own program design and identification criteria. As mentioned earlier, research for this report suggests that the qualification score ranges from 90-99 percentile in GATE programs throughout California.

The current DJUSD qualification score for AIM-identification is the 96 percentile. Raising or lowering the qualification score will have a direct effect on the projected number of students who qualify.

Analysis from relevant research as well as conversations with GATE teachers, principals and community input has led the administration to select a qualification score that is meant to best serve the DJUSD student population.

Differentiation within neighborhood classrooms

As part of its examination and considerations, the administration spent considerable time focused on understanding best ways to implement differentiation strategies throughout DJUSD. The process focused on identifying a common definition and understanding of differentiation for DJUSD. After consulting with experts and reviewing relevant research, the administration has proposed a series of efforts aimed at improving differentiated instruction. A thorough discussion about this topic is available in Appendix M that supports the administration's recommendation on differentiation.

Section II: Recommendations

DJUSD Administration provides the following four (4) recommendations pertaining to the AIM identification process for consideration by the Board of Education and for inclusion in the AIM Master Plan.

1. Continued use of the OLSAT for Universal Testing

Based on literature reviews and as a means to connect the proposed identification process to the existing one, we recommend continuing with OLSAT as a universal third grade identification test at the beginning of the year. In addition to providing a basis for comparison between the new assessment system and the old one, it is a highly recognized test in the field. However, since the test has been shown to reflect a higher level of success for white and Asian students, it is essential for the district to include safeguards that identify underrepresented groups of students including English Learners, low income, Hispanic, and African American.

2. Pilot the HOPE Scale

Involving teachers in the process of identification of gifted and talented students allows those working directly with the students to contribute their experience and knowledge. The HOPE Scale assessment was designed to identify and serve high-potential students from low-income families. Classroom teachers complete the HOPE scale for each of their students by answering eleven questions using a six point frequency response scale. The future use of the HOPE in DJUSD may mitigate for the inherent biases associated with other assessments. It is the recommendation of the administration that third grade teachers would use this tool as an additional measure for the identification of AIM students.

While it is our goal to include the HOPE Scale as an integral part of this process, we recommend that we use it as a pilot and not use it as a qualification factor in 2015-16 (for AIM qualification in 2016-17), track how it aligns with our process, and report back to the Board in late spring 2016 about the anticipated effectiveness of using this measure.

3. Qualification Score Raised to 98th percentile

Analysis from relevant research as well as conversations with GATE teachers, principals and community input has led the administration to select a qualification score that is meant to best serve the DJUSD student population.

The administration considered the effect that a higher qualification score will have on the AIM program size. The same methods were used to speculate the size of the AIM program after the

elimination of private testing (Appendix O). Again these models are not inclusive of all variables. However, they are meant to provide some rough context for potential enrollment variations.

The projections suggest that if the qualification score were raised to the 98th percentile and after private testing has been eliminated, the range of self-contained requests will be between 63 and 73 students. These numbers suggest that the district would offer between two and three sections of self-contained classrooms. This analysis does not account for changes in requests for self-contained requests based on potential changes in self-contained strand placement.

4. Four Categories of Risk Factors

As referenced in key considerations, the use of risk factors to screen for additional testing is critical to mitigate for the inherent biases that exist in each assessment. DJUSD Administration recommends that risk factors shall be used to determine additional assessments which will be administered to determine eligibility**.** The administration recommends that consideration must be given to students who exhibit the following factors:

1. Economic: parent unemployed; low/single parent income; participation in free-reduced lunch programs
2. Health/Disability: ~~designated instructional services via Resource Specialist Program (RSP) such as~~documented learning disabilities (IEP~~,~~) or learning difficulty (504) significant physical or mental health problems (health plans), etc.
3. Language/Culture: primary language of parent and/or student is other than English; lack of proficiency or verbal fluency in English; limited home/school communication; part of underrepresented population.
4. Discrepant Indicators: a wide range of scores on indicators of school success (teacher reports, grades, test results, standardized tests, etc.)

The AIM Assessment Team (See Section IV) will determine which test will best meet the needs of particular students based on evident risk factors. (See Recommended Assessment Process Outline, Appendix K)

Recommended Process for AIM- Identification

A summary of the recommended identification process follows. For more details including timing, risk factor considerations and more, see Appendix K.

<u>STAGE 1</u>:

In the first stage of identification, the administration strives to build a system that equalizes the weight of multiple tools to minimize over identification and under identification. All 3rd graders would take the OLSAT and students scoring 98th percentile or above will qualify for AIM.

Third grade teachers would complete the HOPE scale for each of their students. For the 2015-2016 school year, the HOPE scale results are intended for research purposes only, not for AIM-identification.

<u>STAGE 2</u>:

In the second stage of the process, the AIM Assessment Team (see Section IV) will review risk factors and determine what test would be appropriate for students who did not qualify on the OLSAT. Students without risk factors, but who scored in the standard error of measure on the OLSAT will be rescreened using either the CogAT or the Slosson. For students with risk factors related to language or culture, the TONI may be administered. For students with economic risk factors, the Naglieri may be administered. The AIM Assessment Team may choose to administer the WISC in special circumstances (Appendix H).

If the HOPE pilot is successful, it will be used with the alternative assessments listed above to determine AIM-identification.

Section III: Differentiation

DJUSD intends to implement a targeted strategy to ensure that all students receive differentiated instruction. This shall be achieved through a two-step process of formulating a professional growth plan and implementing particular strategies for advanced learners. More details and discussion are available in Appendix M.

Differentiation: Professional Growth Plan

The professional growth plan focused on differentiation will be comprehensive and comprised of several layers to ensure sustainability and effectiveness. This plan is intended to serve all teachers.

Themes

For the 2015-2016 school year, a focus for differentiation professional growth will be on fourth grade teachers across the district. Fourth grade teams will be provided 2-3 release days throughout the school year to focus on the following topics:

- Principles of Differentiated Instruction
    - Key Elements
    - Differentiation Research
    - Differentiation for the Advanced Learner
- Strategies for a Differentiated Classroom

DJUSD will also offer these same professional growth sessions during the summer of 2016 for all teachers in DJUSD.

Building Capacity

DJUSD will build capacity by identifying lead teachers who have exemplary models of a differentiated classroom to provide ongoing professional growth at sites. In addition, we will look for experts outside of DJUSD in the area of differentiation to provide support for the professional growth sessions.

Additionally, to ensure sustainability and ongoing support the district will hire a .4FTE AIM Differentiation Specialist to provide focused support for fourth grade teachers across the district during the 2015-2016 school year. Instructional coaches will also focus their support efforts with differentiation best practices within our newly adopted math program during all professional growth sessions. The professional growth sessions will help all teachers understand the differentiation components embedded in the new Envisions math program. Moreover, DJUSD will begin to offer its own GATE certification program. Details of this program are discussed below in Section IV.

Other layers of differentiation professional growth may include:
- Book Clubs
  - *Mindset* by Carol Dweck
  - Leading a Differentiated Classroom by Carol Ann Tomlinson
- District Wednesday focus for all teachers in April & May 2016
  - Understanding of deep rigor and relevant instruction for all students
  - 4 C's - Collaboration, Communication, Creativity & Innovation, Critical Thinking & Problem Solving
- LearnZillion - to increase collaboration across district to enhance differentiation practices
- Resources/Materials/Support - collaboration grants for teachers to provide compensated time to plan for implementation of differentiation strategies and practices

Differentiation Strategies: Advanced Learners

Differentiation for the advanced learner incorporates information regarding differentiated classroom practices, but may have more emphasis on providing differentiated instructional methods that integrate a democratic learning environment with substantive information across the curriculum in advanced content, process and product. Typically, advanced learners demonstrate interest-based intrinsic motivation with a capacity for understanding abstract concepts and the ability to transfer knowledge from one learning situation to another.

What does this mean for the classroom teacher with advanced learners?

The DJUSD classroom environment will need to be able to provide opportunities:
- to manipulate ideas and draw conclusions about seemingly unconnected concepts
- for student questions to be valued
- for questioning to be guided by students to find the answers
- for in-depth exploration

Other methods to differentiate for advanced learners include:
- acceleration of content
- variety of curriculum content
- flexible pacing
- more advanced and complex abstractions and materials
- curricula focused to include elaborate, complex, and in-depth study of major ideas, problems, and themes that integrate knowledge across and within thought

As with any student, the teacher-student relationship is vital to creating a safe, respected learning environment where all can thrive. Students' motivation is increased when greater

emphasis is placed on student interest and when the students are met where they are both academically and socially. More background and details about tools and strategies to be used in the classroom can be found in Appendix M.

Sections IV: Leadership Structure and Elements

The administration recommends the implementation a new leadership model to appropriately address the needs of the AIM program in the district. The key goal of the new structures and elements are to:

1. Optimize program oversight
2. Increase transparency of the Identification process
3. Ensure adequate program support
4. Equalize credentialing of AIM Teachers
5. Establish a collaborative leadership team

Leadership

The process of research and analysis for this report provided an opportunity to look carefully at the evolving needs of the identification process and oversight of the AIM program. At present, the AIM Coordinator position is vacant. As the Board of Education considers approving an updated plan for the AIM identification process, the Superintendent will establish an appropriate leadership structure to support the recommendations in this report. The new leadership structure will look as follows:

1. Under the direction of the Associate Superintendent of Instructional Services, AIM program leadership will be led by the Director of Curriculum, Assessment and Learning, who will attain GATE certification. The Director will be responsible for:

    a. Parent communication/connection

    b. Elementary /junior high school placements

    c. AIM staff management/supervision

    d. AIM Advisory Committee

2. DJUSD will hire a .4 FTE AIM Differentiation Specialist (See Appendix L for job description) and eliminate the position of .4FTE AIM Coordinator. This job description will be brought to the Board of Education on October 1, 2015 for consideration and approval.

3. The support staff includes the, already implemented, addition of new (.25 FTE) secretary. Administration recommends the conversion of this position from a school year schedule (10.5 month) to an 11-month schedule in order to effectively communicate and support the placement process in late June and early August.

4. For transparency, the administration will create an AIM Assessment Team, comprised of the AIM Differentiation Specialist, an AIM teacher, a site principal, a psychologist, Director of Curriculum, Assessment and Learning, and Associate Superintendent of

Instructional Services. The AIM Assessment Team will review relevant student data to determine additional assessment(s) in alignment with the DJUSD AIM identification process, in order to ensure that each student receives the most appropriate assessment.

5. Professional development for AIM/GATE teachers will be served through the district's professional development system, which will launch a GATE certification program in the 2015-16 school year (Appendix P).

6. Consultation will continue with experts in gifted education including the California Association of the Gifted (CAG), as necessary.

GATE Certification and Training

Currently we have 25 AIM teachers teaching 4th-9th grade with 5 AIM teachers possessing a GATE Certificate either through a University GATE Certificate program or another agency's GATE Certificate program.

Starting in the 2016-2017 school year, all AIM teachers, will be required to attain GATE Certification. GATE Certification can be earned in the following ways:

- Completion of a GATE Certificate program through previous employment with another school district.
- Completion of a GATE Certificate program through a recognized institution such as California Association of the Gifted or University of Connecticut Certificate Program
- Participate in the DJUSD AIM Certificate program by attending the following courses presented by experts in the areas of:
  - Identification & Programming for the Gifted
  - Characteristics of GATE identified students
  - Social/Emotional Needs of the Gifted
  - Differentiated Instruction for the Advanced Learner
  - Learning Styles
  - Common Core State Standards in ELA & Math
  - Depth of Knowledge
- Complete an accredited University GATE Certificate program

Superintendent's AIM Advisory Committee

The Superintendent's AIM Advisory Committee will continue to meet monthly at the regularly scheduled time, published on the district's AIM website. The next meeting is scheduled for Monday September 28, 2015, at 4:00 PM. in the East Conference Room, with a planning meeting on Monday, September 21, 2015, at 12:00 PM. The planning meeting may be attended in-person or digitally. The Associate Superintendent of Administrative Services, will facilitate the meetings and the Director of Curriculum, Assessment and Learning will lead the AIM Advisory Committee with consultation from the Associate Superintendent of Instructional Services and CAG representatives until the new leadership structure is in place.

Section V: Conclusion

Through a thorough review of relevant research and input from district AIM staff, other school districts, community members, GATE experts and researchers, as well as through careful consideration of key factors, the DJUSD Administration has created a comprehensive set of recommendations to meet the directives established by the Board of Education on June 4, 2015. The administration recommends the continued use of the OLSAT, the piloting of the HOPE scale, raising the qualification score for AIM identification to 98th percentile and the use of four risk factors to determine additional assessments in order to mitigate for any test bias. The administration will also work to implement a professional growth plan focused on differentiation in all classrooms across the district. If the recommended updates to the AIM program are accepted and approved by the Board of Education, the administration will also implement a new leadership model to appropriately address the needs of the program.

Appendix A

GATE/AIM Definitions

Definitions of Gifted and Talented Education (GATE) in Education and Research

Through our inquiry we found numerous definitions of gifted and talented education (GATE) programs and students from across the nation. The fact that there are many definitions employed in a wide variety of programs demonstrates that each local agency must define GATE and develop a program to meet the needs of GATE students.

Some examples of definitions related to GATE programs and students from across the country are included below.

The federal government, for the Jacob K. Javits grant, defines gifted students as those who give evidence of high achievement capability in areas such as intellectual, creative, artistic, or leadership capacity, or in specific academic fields, and who need services or activities not ordinarily provided by the school in order to fully develop those capabilities.

Lewis Terman an American psychologist, noted as a pioneer in educational psychology in the early 20th century at the Stanford Graduate School of Education and is best known for his revision of the Stanford-Binet IQ test and for initiating the longitudinal study of children with high IQs called the Genetic Studies of Genius. He classified students who earned IQ scores greater than 135 as moderately gifted, those with scores greater than 150 as exceptionally gifted, and those with scores greater than 180 as profoundly gifted.

The Cattel-Horn-Carroll (CHC) theory is a psychological theory of human cognitive abilities that takes its name from Raymond Cattell, John L. Horn and John Bissell Carroll. The theory states that specific abilities are also assessed, including crystallized intelligence, fluid intelligence, short-term memory, long-term memory, processing speed, visual processing, auditory processing, and quantitative knowledge. Cognitive ability can be classified into three different strata: stratum I, "narrow" abilities; stratum II, "broad abilities".

Howard Gardner is a developmental psychologist who contended that there were seven (now eight; see Gardner, 1999) unique areas of human ability: linguistic, logical-mathematical, spatial, musical, bodily-kinesthetic, interpersonal, intrapersonal, and naturalistic intelligence.

Joseph Renzulli is an educational psychologist who developed the three-ring model of giftedness, which promoted a broadened conception of giftedness. In his three-ring conception, he posited that giftedness is the result of an interaction among above-average ability, creativity, and task commitment.

Robert Sternberg is a psychologist and psychomatrician who developed the triarchic model of giftedness, which includes intellectual, creative and practical intelligence.

Francois Gagné created a differentiated model of giftedness and talent, aptitude is natural ability in a given domain whereas achievement is systematically developed skill.

To date, none of these definitions or models of giftedness have emerged as dominant, based on empirical evidence. Moreover, with the exception of Cattell-Horn-Carroll theory, they have had little impact on the process of identifying gifted students in schools, as standardized measures of cognitive ability or academic achievement are the primary criteria for gifted identification (Pereleth, Schatz, & Mönks, 2000).

Current DJUSD Definition

The Davis Joint Unified School District is currently using the existing definition in the latest approved version of the AIM Master Plan. The stated purpose of the program is to provide a quality educational program for gifted and talented students in order to develop their knowledge, skills, abilities, and values. The district's GATE program serves three categories of gifted students: 1) intellectually gifted—students with high potential in the areas of abstract thinking and reasoning ability as applied to school learning situations; 2) high achieving—the student who scores two or more levels above grade level in two or more academic areas and/or maintains a 3.6 grade point average in college preparatory academic classes for a period of two consecutive years; 3) high achieving in a specific academic area—the student who scores two or more levels above grade level or who maintains a 3.6 grade point average in a single academic area for a period of two or more years.

Staff used this definition as the framework for addressing the directives in the June 4, 2015 Board motion as this is the currently approved Master Plan definition and it provides a framework for our following recommendations. We are continuing to serve both intellectually gifted and high achieving students.

APPENDIX B:

AIM Program Demographics Data

REPORT: 3rd Grade 2012-2013 Demographic Detail as of April 2013

Total	All	OLSAT-8	TONI-3	Other Tests
Black or African American	8	1	7	-
American Indian/Alaska Native/Filipino/ Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	7	1	5	1
Asian	48	22	12	13
Hispanic or Latino	31	4	27	-
White	96	18	45	33
Race Unknown	-	-	-	-
Total Identified 3rd Graders	190	46	96	47

REPORT: 3rd Grade 2013-2014 Demographic Detail as of April 2014

Total	All	OLSAT-8	TONI-3	Other Tests
Black or African American	8	-	8	-
American Indian/Alaska Native/Filipino/ Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	10	-	10	-
Asian	35	23	11	1
Hispanic or Latino	31	3	28	-
White	71	40	26	5
Race Unknown	-	-	-	-
Total Identified 3rd Graders	**155**	**66**	**83**	**6**

REPORT: 3rd Grade 2014-2015 Demographic Detail as of April 2015

Total	All	OLSAT-8	TONI-3	Other Tests
Black or African American	7	-	6	1
American Indian/Alaska Native/Filipino/ Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	5	1	2	2
Asian	48	23	4	21
Hispanic or Latino	20	-	18	2
White	63	18	14	31
Race Unknown	3	-	3	-
Total Identified 3rd Graders	**146**	**42**	**47**	**57**

APPENDIX C:

Number of DJUSD Students Qualifying for AIM by Percentile and Test

DJUSD Qualified Students by Percentile and Test

	2014-15		
Grade Level	3rd	4th	5th
Total Enrolled in DJUSD	633	619	615
Seats	116	116	120
Total Qualified All Forms	147	212	205
Requested Placement	107	138	141
Percent Qualified	23%	34%	33%
Number Qualified Through Private Testing	42	45	45
Number Qualifying at 99%tile (All Forms)	85	107	110
Number Qualified Through TONI, OLSAT, Slosson at 99%tile	70	92	93
Percent Qualified at 99%tile (without private testing)	11%	15%	15%
Number Qualified at 98%tile (All Forms)	25	41	33
Number Qualified Through TONI, OLSAT, or Slosson at 98%tile	16	24	24
Percent Qualified at 98%tile and above (w/o Private Testing)	14%	19%	19%
Number Qualified at 97%tile	10	17	17
Number Qualified at 96%tile	23	32	30
Number Qualified at 95%tile	1	12	13
Number Qualified at 94%tile	3	2	2
Number Qualified at 93%tile		1	

APPENDIX D:

School Districts Researched

Other Districts

District	District Enrollment	District Grade Span	Identification Tools	Program Model	Program Enrollment	Qualifying Score
Eureka Union School District	3,293	K-8	OLSAT referral process from teachers and staff members. 90 students assessed last year have 3 k-3 Continue to assess through seventh grade K-3 4-6 7-8	GATE cluster classes in fourth - eighth grade GATE Trained teachers. Develop individualized education plans (as a grade level need) GATE extension opportunities. May be in accelerated Math Class. Fully Included in classroom, no self-contained.	4.50%	98%
Irvine Unified School District	31,392	K-12	We use IUSD's Multiple Criteria Measure and/or OLSAT. OLSAT is only available as a fee-based option; the Multiple Criteria Measure is free and used as a blanket screener for all students in grades 3rd through 6th.	IUSD has both self-contained (APAAS – Alternative Program for Academically Advanced Students) and GATE-cluster for grades 4-6th. Middle schools provide options in either self-contained or GATE-cluster classes.	Approximately 4,500 students; Approximately 35% of our 4th through 8th grade students	Multiple Criteria Measure is the top 12% of each grade level; OLSAT = 95%;
LaFayette School District	3525	K-8	OLSAT	Students are assessed in third grade. If they qualify, they can attend self-contained classes in fourth and fifth grade on one of the elementary schools. Other students stay at their neighborhood school and receive differentiated instruction.	6% percent of tested class.	Changes from year to year. It depends on the number of students who are tested.
Mill Valley School District	3242	K-8	In Mill Valley, does not identify students as GATE and/or place students into a GATE program.	Mill Valley meet the needs of our gifted learners through differentiated instruction and offering a broad course of study that allows students to have deep experience with rigorous academics, arts, technology integration, and other enrichment during the school day.		

Napa Valley School District	18,610	K-12	All NVUSD 3rd grade students may participate in the universal testing in the fall of each school year. ALPS uses the Cognitive Abilities Test CogAT which is administered during the fall trimester.	Differentiated, rigorous and accelerated experiences during the school day, which can include the ALPS Project Zone, online math programs, or other off-line options. No self-contained classes	Approximately 10%	One or more at 90% or above
Palo Alto School District	12,527	K-12	Identification process suspended	Differentiation in neighborhood classrooms		
Rocklin Unified School District	12,738	K-12	Raven Progressive Matrices Plus, the Naglieri Nonverbal Ability Test, or the Weschler Intelligence Scale for Children (WISC)	Cluster Grouping and Self-Contained	about 1000; about 10%	98%
Roseville City School District	9820	K-8	OLSAT	Cluster Grouping and Self-Contained Elementary GATE clusters-Grades 3-5.	279 approximately 2%	94%
Sacramento City Unified	46,868	K-12	All 3rd grade students are screened using academic achievement data or nominated by teachers, principals or parents/guardians through a portfolio process. When a student passes the initial academic screening or is nominated through the portfolio process they are given the CogAT and teachers complete the Student Profile of Gifted Characteristics. GATE Committee	GATE Centers serve students coming from surrounding schools which do not offer GATE classes. GATE classes at Centers are composed of predominately GATE identified students and are taught by teachers trained in differentiation for high-ability learners. Site GATE Programs serve GATE students from their own school site in a cluster model classroom. Gifted students are clustered in a mixed-ability classroom which is taught by a teacher trained in differentiation for high-ability learners		

			meets to evaluate each referral and make recommendations for student identification.			
San Juan Unified School District	49,114	K-12	In the past, San Juan used the Naglieri as a universal screener for all 1st graders in January. Students needed to score at or above the 97th %tile to be GATE identified.	San Juan provides two elementary programs to serve our GATE/accelerated students. One is through differentiation in the general education classrooms. The other is through the GATE/Accelerated self-contained Rapid Learner Program which consists of one classroom of second-fifth graders at each of three elementary schools.	2.50%	97%
Santa Barbara Unified School District	15,593	K-12	95% on district approved intellectual abilities test.	GATE Magnet program at Washington School third - sixth grade		95% 93% for EL
San Mateo/Foster City	11,858	K-8	CogAT	Special Day Class (99) and cluster grouping (98 and 99)		99% on both verbal and quantitative sections
Washington Unified School District	7978	K-12	two years of CST and OLSAT	cluster grouping self-contained at Westmore Oak School 4th - 8th		98% or 91% (for EL Students)
Yuba City Unified School District	13,366	K-12	Reviewing for new assessment. Currently use Naglieri in conjunction with CST scores. 135 or higher automatically qualified; gifted profile with teacher recommendation (90%). Looking for alternative assessments. All students in third grade take the assessment.	Clustered with certified teacher. Provide some afterschool programs.		profile of gifted students 90%

APPENDIX E:

Academic Articles Referenced for the Report

Academic Articles

Callahan, C.M. (2005). Identifying gifted students from underrepresented populations. *Theory Into Practice*, 44:2, 98-104.

Carlson, J.F., Geisinger, K.F. & Jonson, J. L. (Eds.). (2014) *Mental Measures Yearbook*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

Carlson, J.F., Geisinger, K.F. & Jonson, J. L. (Eds.). (2010) *Mental Measures Yearbook*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

Cox, S.G. (2008). Differentiated instruction in the elementary classroom. *The Education Digest*, 5, 52-54.

DeJesus, O.N., (2012). Differentiated instruction:can differentiated instruction provide success for all learners? *National Teacher Education Journal*, 5(3), 5-11.

Dixon, F.A., Yssel, N., McConnell, J.M. & Hardin, T. (2014). Differentiated instruction, professional development, and teacher efficacy. *Journal for the Education of the Gifted*, 37(2), 111-127.

Jarosewich, T., Pfeiffer, S.I., & Morris, J. (2002). Identifying gifted students using teacher rating scales: a review of existing instruments. *Journal of Psychoeducational Assessment*, 20, p. 322-336.

Lohman, D.F. (2005). The role of nonverbal ability tests in identifying academically gifted students: an aptitude perspective. *Gifted Child Quarterly,* 49:2 111-138

Manning, S., Stanford, B. & Reeves, S. (2010). Valuing the advanced learner: differentiating up, *The Clearing House*, 83, 145-149.

McBee, M.T., Peters, S. & Waterman, C. (2014). Combining scores in multiple-criteria assessment systems: impact of the combination rule. *Gifted Child Quarterly*, 58:1, 69-89.

Peters, S. & Gentry, M. (2012). Group-specific norms and teacher rating scales: implications for underrepresentation. *Journal of Advanced Academics*, 23:2, 125-144.

Peters, S. & Gentry, M. (2012). Multiple group construct validity evidence of the hope   scale: instrumentation to identify low income elementary students for gifted programs. *Gifted Child Quarterly,* 54:1 298 – 313.

Peters, S. & Gentry, M. (2012). Additional validity evidence and across-group equivalency of the hope teacher rating scale. *Gifted Child Quarterly*, 57:2 85-100.

Pfeiffer, S. I. (2007). The gifted rating scales-school form: an analysis of the standardization sample based on age, gender, race, and diagnostic efficiency. *Gifted Child Quarterly,* 51:1, 39-50.

Rogers, K.B. (2007). Lessons learned about education the gifted and talented: a synthesis of the research on educational practice. *Gifted Child Quarterly,* 51:1 382-396

Subotnik, R.F., Olszewski-Kubilius, P. & Worrell, F.C. (2011). Rethinking giftedness and gifted education: a proposed direction forward based on psychological science. *Psychological Science in the Public Interest,* 12:1, 3 – 54.

Tomlinson, C. (2005). Quality curriculum and instruction for highly able students. Theory into Practice, 44(2), 160-166.

Tomlinson, C., Brighton, C., Hertberg, H., Callahan, C., Moon, T., Brimijoin, K., Conover, L., & Reynolds, T. (2004). Differentiating instruction in response to student readiness, interest, and learning profile in academically diverse classrooms: A review of literature. Journal for the Education of the Gifted, 27(2/3), 119-145.

Tomlinson, C. & Imbeau, M.B. (2010). *Leading a differentiated classroom.* Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Tomlinson, C. & Kalbfleisch, L. (1998). Teach me, teach my brain: A call for differentiated classrooms. Educational Leadership, 52-55.

University of Iowa. (2006). *Practical advice on using the cognitive abilities Test as part of an identification system.*

Worrell, F. C. & Erwin, J.O. (2011). Best practices in identifying student for gifted and talented education programs. *Journal of Applied School Psychology,* 27:4, 319-340.

Appendix F

Email Feedback Received by the District

All emails to AIMinput@djusd.net will no longer be included in the Special Report to the Board of Education on the Alternative Instructional Model (AIM), 2015. Concerns were expressed from persons submitting emails to this address that they were unaware of the Superintendent's message to all parents and on the website that all emails to this address would be made public. Out of courtesy, the administration has decided to remove the content of the emails from the report. A summary of email and other feedback is included in the report.

Appendix G:

AIM Teacher and Principal Meeting Minutes

DJUSD

DAVIS JOINT UNIFIED
SCHOOL DISTRICT

Winfred B. Roberson, Jr.
Superintendent

526 B Street ◆ Davis, CA 95616 ◆ (530) 757-5300 ◆ FAX: (530) 757-5323 ◆ www.djusd.net

Memo

Input Meeting with AIM Elementary Teachers

August 19, 2015

Present: Winfred Roberson, Clark Bryant, Matt Best, Stephanie Gregson, Luisa Guenther, Tracy Skinner, Karen Luke, Marla Cook, Elise Brewin, Sarah Foley.

Discussion: The A.I.M. program and gifted and high-achieving children were discussed. Three main points were raised regarding the A.I.M. program:

1. Definitions of what is considered "gifted" and how the District can best meet the standards set out in the School Board's A.I.M. Motion in June, 2015.

2. Assessment protocols for best identifying gifted students and how to achieve what Superintendent Roberson referred to as the right cocktail of assessment tools (i.e. determining which assessment tool or tools will most accurately identify the diverse range of children who fall within the District's decision on what constitutes "gifted" for our A.I.M. program.)

3. The distinctions between gifted children and high achieving students and the ramifications this distinction has on teaching within A.I.M. classrooms. Also discussed was differentiation as a teaching goal and the ultimate goal of teaching to the different needs of every child in the classroom, as well as the difficulty of differentiating if the range of children within a classroom is too high. Concerns about AIM identified students who may not be achieving in the self-contained classrooms.

Associate Superintendent Clark Bryant explained the current A.I.M. program administration at the district level, and identified the names of responsible individuals as follows:

Clark Bryant: Elementary Placement

Matt Best: Secondary Placement

Stephanie Gregson: Staff Development and Articulation

Secretary Susan Palsa: Elementary Placement

Secretary Katie Luna: Secondary Placement

DJUSD

DAVIS JOINT UNIFIED
SCHOOL DISTRICT

Winfred B. Roberson, Jr.
Superintendent

526 B Street ◆ Davis, CA 95616 ◆ (530) 757-5300 ◆ FAX: (530) 757-5323 ◆ www.djusd.net

Memo

Minutes of Input Meeting with Secondary AIM Teachers
August 18, 2015

The following individuals were present at the meeting: Winfred Roberson, Clark Bryant, Matt Best, and Stephanie Gregson. The following teachers were present: Ken McKim (Science, Harper), Rebecca Honig (English, Harper), Jeff Bryant (English, Holmes), Michael Tobey (Social Studies, Harper), Beth Merrill (English, Harper), Kathy Koblik (English, Emerson), Helen Spangler (English, Emerson), and Marie Rundle (site?).

The following topics were discussed:

1. First Part: Discussion of Topics for Articulation Meetings. Stephanie Gregson led the first half hour of the meeting, and asked for teacher feedback on how the district could best support the teachers and how the teachers would like to use the articulation meeting time in the future.

   Various Ideas for Future Articulation Meeting Discussion Proposed by Teachers: Close reading training and strategies, formal critical thinking, deeper work with materials, use of current events in conjunction with the reading of texts/literature, standardization of AIM across campuses, creating a safe environment for teachers to collaborate. Stephanie indicated that a Google drive folder would be created on brain research,

and that in future this would be a resource for teachers to find applicable research on teaching gifted students.

Topic for Next Articulation Meeting, October 28, 2015: Close reading of informational texts.

2. Second Part: Connection with Teachers to Expand District's Knowledge of Working with Gifted Students: Superintendent Roberson led the second part of the meeting. Matt Best read the Board Motion from June, 2015 regarding AIM. Winfred explained that in connecting with teachers, the district expands its knowledge of working with gifted students to bring back to the Board.

The following issues were amongst those discussed: the identification of gifted students to increase diversity; the expansion of standards to differentiate teaching in the classroom; the elimination of private testing with the current school year as the last to accept private test results. Clark Bryant addressed assessment protocols and mentioned the possible use of the HOPE scale by third grade teachers, as a way to include teacher input into the assessment process and also increase diversity in the AIM student population. Also discussed was the issue of student fulfillment, how that is determined, and the notion of gifted students being interest driven and serving low-achieving AIM students. Clark also explained the separate duties being assumed at the District in conjunction with the AIM program, and that the search for an AIM coordinator continues; he also stated that secretarial support for the program had been increased by .25 FTE.

DJUSD
DAVIS JOINT UNIFIED
SCHOOL DISTRICT

Winfred B. Roberson, Jr.
Superintendent

526 B Street ◆ Davis, CA 95616 ◆ (530) 757-5300 ◆ FAX: (530) 757-5323 ◆ www.djusd.net

Memo

Input Meeting with AIM School Principals

August 14, 2015

Present at the meeting were: Winfred Roberson, Clark Bryant, Matt Best, Stephanie Gregson, Derek Brothers, Ramon Cusi, Stacy Desideri, Matt Duffy, Kerin Kelleher, Heidi Perry and Mary Ponce.

1. **Current Division of Duties in Program:** These were described as generally divided as follows: Clark Bryant (primary grade placement); Matt Best (secondary grade placement), Stephanie Gregson (articulation); Katherine Luna (secondary grade placement, secondary AIM articulation, testing); Susan Palsa (primary grade placement, primary AIM articulation). Aim Advisory will be handled by all members of the team, with the current exception of Susan Palsa.

2. **General AIM Issues Discussed:** These included progress on finding an AIM Coordinator, placement of additional students, and other general issues.

3. **Certification of AIM Teachers:** The importance of finding a standardized means of certifying all AIM teachers was discussed; such certification is a goal for the District.

4. **Identification of AIM Students:** Discussion of what means would be used to identify AIM students. A suggestion was made that a committee be formed, including elementary principals, a psychologist, and parents to determine if the District would use the HOPE scale to identify AIM students in conjunction with the OLSAT currently being used. The HOPE scale would be used by third grade teachers to assist in the identification of AIM students. A potential process was described as follows: Step One would consist of the administration of the OLSAT and HOPE scale to identify students. Step Two would consist of

further assessment of nonqualifying AIM students through the use of a different test (such as the Slossen or TONI) plus the HOPE scale.

The idea underlying the possible modification to the current means of assessment would be to diversify the AIM student population and to get a more accurate identification of AIM students, in particular by including teachers' assessments via the HOPE scale.

5. **The Board's June 4 Motion regarding AIM:** This was read and it was stated then and throughout the meeting that the goal is to implement the direction set for the District by the Board.

6. **Next Board Meeting at Which AIM will be Discussed:** September 17 is the next board meeting at which information on AIM will be presented to the Board. At present the District is at the thinking stage regarding AIM. The Board will direct the District on the way in which it will proceed once it further clarifies its vision for the AIM program.

Appendix H:

Assessment Analysis

Assessment Summary

Assessment	Population	Administration	Who	Description	Reviews
Cognitive Abilities Test (CogAT)	Grades K-12	Group - for third grade - 3 separate administrations of approximately 45 minutes each	Students who fall in the Standard Error of Measure on the OLSAT	The Cognitive Abilities Test, Form 6 (CogAT-6) is a group-administered test of students' general reasoning abilities. The authors state that the purpose of the test is to appraise "the level and pattern of cognitive development of students from kindergarten through grade 12" (Interpretive Guide for Teachers and Counselors, p. 1). The authors identify three intended uses for scores from the CogAT-6. The first use is to guide instruction so it matches the cognitive abilities and needs of each student in a classroom. The second is to provide an "alternative" measure of cognitive development relative to more commonly used measures such as standardized achievement tests or grades. The third and final purpose is to identify achievement-ability discrepancies.	DiPerna, J. C. (2005). [Test review of Cognitive Abilities Test, Form 6]. In R. A. Spies & B. S. Plake (Eds.), The sixteenth mental measurements yearbook. Retrieved from http://marketplace.unl.edu/buros/ and Rogers, B. G. (2005). [Test review of Cognitive Abilities Test, Form 6]. In R. A. Spies & B. S. Plake (Eds.), The sixteenth mental measurements yearbook. Retrieved from http://marketplace.unl.edu/buros/
Differential Aptitude Test (DAT)	Grades 7-9, grades 10-12 and adults	Group 156 - 206 Minutes	Not Applicable	Designed to measure students' ability to learn or to succeed in a number of different areas.	Hattrup, K. (1995). [Test review of Differential Aptitude Tests, Fifth Edition]. In J. C. Conoley & J. C. Impara (Eds.), The twelfth mental measurements yearbook. Retrieved from http://marketplace.unl.edu/buros/ and Schmitt, N. (1995). [Test review of Differential Aptitude Tests, Fifth Edition]. In J. C. Conoley & J. C. Impara (Eds.), The twelfth mental measurements yearbook. Retrieved from http://marketplace.unl.edu/buros/

Kaufman Assessment Battery for Children	Ages 3 - 18	Individual - 25 - 70 minutes	Not Applicable	Designed to measure the processing and cognitive abilities of children and adolescents	Braden, J. P. (2005). [Test review of Kaufman Assessment Battery for Children, Second Edition]. In R. A. Spies & B. S. Plake (Eds.), The sixteenth mental measurements yearbook. Retrieved from http://marketplace.unl.edu/buros/ and Thorndike, R. M. (2005). [Test review of Kaufman Assessment Battery for Children, Second Edition]. In R. A. Spies & B. S. Plake (Eds.), The sixteenth mental measurements yearbook. Retrieved from http://marketplace.unl.edu/buros/
Naglieri Nonverbal Abilities Test	K-12	Group 30-45 minutes	Students who have identified risk factors that may unfairly bias the results of the OLSAT. These may include low socioeconomic status or students from underrepresented groups.	A measure of nonverbal reasoning and problem solving independent of educational curricula and cultural or language background.	Stinnett, T. A. (2001). [Test review of Naglieri Nonverbal Ability Test]. In B. S. Plake & J. C. Impara (Eds.), The fourteenth mental measurements yearbook. Retrieved from http://marketplace.unl.edu/buros/ and Trevisan, M. S. (2001). [Test review of Naglieri Nonverbal Ability Test]. In B. S. Plake & J. C. Impara (Eds.), The fourteenth mental measurements yearbook. Retrieved from http://marketplace.unl.edu/buros/

| Otis Lennon School Ability Test (OLSAT) | Ages 4.6 to 18.2 | Group - Third grade 1 session of approximately 50 - 60 minutes | This would be provided to all third graders as our initial assessment | Designed to measure those verbal, quantitative, and figural reasoning skills that are most closely related to scholastic achievement. The Eighth Edition of the Otis-Lennon School Ability Test (OLSAT 8) is the most recent version of a series of instruments, the first of which was published in 1918. The purpose of the test is "to measure those verbal, quantitative, and figural reasoning skills that are most closely related to scholastic achievement" (technical manual, p. 5). The test is designed to measure the thinking and reasoning abilities that are most important in school achievement. The manual states that the title of the test includes the words "school ability" to emphasize the school-related nature of the abilities that are assessed and to avoid over interpretation of what is measured. Prior to the Sixth Edition, the title of the OLSAT 8 is based upon the same theory of the nature and organization of cognitive ability and seeks to serve the same purposes as earlier editions in the Otis series (p. 5) | Maddux, C. D. (2010). [Test review of Otis-Lennon School Ability Test(r), Eighth Edition]. In R. A. Spies, J. F. Carlson, & K. F. Geisinger (Eds.), The eighteenth mental measurements yearbook. Retrieved from http://marketplace.unl.edu/buros/ and Morse, D. (2010). [Test review of Otis-Lennon School Ability Test(r), Eighth Edition]. In R. A. Spies, J. F. Carlson, & K. F. Geisinger (Eds.), The eighteenth mental measurements yearbook. Retrieved from http://marketplace.unl.edu/buros/ |

Slosson Intelligence Test	Ages 4.0 and up	Individual 10 - 20 minutes	Students that fall within the standard error of measure on the OLSAT. Could be used for those that have indicated special needs.	Designed as a quick estimate of general verbal cognitive ability	Kamphaus, R. W. (1995). [Test review of Slosson Intelligence Test [1991 Edition]]. In J. C. Conoley & J. C. Impara (Eds.), The twelfth mental measurements yearbook. Retrieved from http://marketplace.unl.edu/buros/ and Watson, T. S. (1995). [Test review of Slosson Intelligence Test [1991 Edition]]. In J. C. Conoley & J. C. Impara (Eds.), The twelfth mental measurements yearbook. Retrieved from http://marketplace.unl.edu/buros/
Test of Non-Verbal Intelligence (TONI)	Ages 6.0 to 89.11	Individual 15-20 minutes	Students who are English learners or have other language, hearing or motor difficulties. These may include aphasia or other expressive language disorders, those who are deaf or hard of hearing.	"Developed to assess aptitude, intelligence, abstract reasoning, and problem solving in a completely language-free format."	Evans-McCleon, T. N. (2014). [Test review of Test of Nonverbal Intelligence, Fourth Edition]. In J. F. Carlson, K. F. Geisinger, & J. L. and Maddux, C. D. (2014). [Test review of Test of Nonverbal Intelligence, Fourth Edition]. In J. F. Carlson, K. F. Geisinger, & J. L. Jonson (Eds.), The nineteenth mental measurements yearbook. Retrieved from http://marketplace.unl.edu/buros/
Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children (WISC)	Ages 6.0 to 16.11	Individual 65-80 minutes	Students where a more in-depth assessment would be beneficial. Due to the time and personnel investment, use of the WISC would be low.	Designed to assess the cognitive ability of children	Maller, S. J. (2005). [Test review of Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children-Fourth Edition]. In R. A. Spies & B. S. Plake (Eds.), The sixteenth mental measurements yearbook. Retrieved from http://marketplace.unl.edu/buros/ and Thompson, B. (2005). [Test review of Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children-Fourth Edition]. In R. A. Spies & B. S. Plake (Eds.), The sixteenth mental measurements yearbook. Retrieved from http://marketplace.unl.edu/buros/

Appendix I:

Teacher Rating Scales Review

When considering which of these tools to employ, the number of items, norms, and a focus on underrepresented students was examined.

Scale	Number of Items	Subscales or Dimensions	Focus on Underrepresented Populations	Description
Scales for Rating Behavioral Characteristics of Superior Students (SRBCSS)	96	10	Not addressed in the description.	Now in its third edition, the *Renzulli Scales* are the nation's most popular tool for identifying gifted children. Supported by 40 years of research, the *Renzulli Scales* are used by gifted and talented programs across the country. This standardized instrument is completed by teachers and provides an effective method for identifying gifted children. From Prufrock Press Scales for Rating the Behavioral Characteristics of Superior Students (SRBCSS), Joseph F. Renzulli, Ed.D, and Linda Smith http://www.prufrock.com/Scales-for-Rating-the-Behavioral-Characteristics-of-Superior-Students-Technical-and-Administration-Manual-3rd-ed-P1823.aspx
Gifted Rating Scales (GRS)	72	6	Works well across different racial/ethnic groups	The Gifted Rating Scales are norm-referenced rating scales based on current theories of giftedness and federal and state guidelines regarding the definition of gifted and talented students. From Pearson, Gifted Rating Scales (GRS), Steven Pfeiffer, Ph.D., and Tania Jarosewich, Ph.D. http://www.pearsonclinical.com/psychology/products/100000180/gifted-rating-scales-grs.html
Having Opportunities Promotes Excellence (HOPE)	11	2	Provides valid information regarding the academics and social strength for all learners with special attention to	The HOPE Teacher Rating Scale items have been well-developed and subjected to research using more than 12,000 diverse students in five validity studies to date. From Prufrock Press HOPE Teacher Rating Scale (Manual): Involving Teachers in Equitable Identification of Gifted and Talented Students in K-12. Marsha Gentry, Ph.D., Scott Peters, Ph.D., Nielson Pereira, Ph.D., Jason McIntosh, Matthew Fugate, Ph.D., http://www.prufrock.com/HOPE-Teacher-Rating-Scale-Manual-Involving-Teachers-in-Equitable-Identification-of-Gifted-and-Talented-Students-in-K-12-P2525.aspx

			underrepresented groups	
Scales for Identifying Gifted Students (SIGS)	84	14	The potential bias of every item on the test on the basis of gender and ethnic group was studied. Only non-bias items were included.	*Scales for Identifying Gifted Students (SIGS)* offers the most comprehensive observational instrument available for identifying gifted students ages 5–18. Used as part of a comprehensive process for identifying gifted children, *SIGS* offers schools an instrument with extensive statistical and research support. This standardized, norm-referenced instrument is completed by teachers or parents and provides an effective method for identifying gifted children. From Prufrock Press SIGS Complete Kit: Scales for Identifying Gifted Students. Gail R. Ryser, Ph.D., and Kathleen McConnell, Ph.D. http://www.prufrock.com/SIGS-Complete-Kit-Scales-for-Identifying-Gifted-Students-P123.aspx

Appendix J:

Discussion of Multiple Measures

McBee, et al (2014) explores three approaches to combining scores to determine qualification as a gifted student. The conjunctive, disjunctive, and compensatory models are described below. In the conjunctive model, the "and" rule, students must meet the minimum criterion on each measure. This approach to the use of multiple measures ultimately results in a smaller number of students being identified for AIM since students would need to qualify on each of the criterion. This approach could lead to missing some students gaining access to the program.

In the disjunctive model, or the "or" rule, students must meet the minimum criterion on one of the measures. This approach would result in a larger identification rate. Students could qualify on any of the assessments and be eligible for the program. This may qualify students that ultimately may not need the services of the AIM program. This is the most inclusive approach which could also lead to incorrect placement decisions.

The compensatory model, or the "mean" rule, allows high scores in one area to offset score in a low area. This approach takes the average of the scores and produces a more heterogeneous group than the "and" model but a more homogeneous group than the "or" model. Since the size of the group is governed by the qualification score, this approach also allows for a more predictive size of the identified population.

	OLSAT	Teacher Rating Scale	Mean Score	And	Or	Mean
Student 1	100	100	100	DNQ	DNQ	DNQ
Student 2	130	130	130	Q	Q	Q
Student 3	120	140	130	DNQ	Q	Q
Student 4	140	120	130	DNQ	Q	Q
Student 5	100	140	120	DNQ	Q	DNQ
Student 6	140	100	120	DNQ	Q	DNQ

This example assumes qualification score of 126. Q = Qualified; DNQ = Did not Qualify

Appendix K:

Recommended Assessment Process Outline

Recommended Assessment Process

The steps below outline the identification process recommended by the DJUSD Administration. It is important to note that this is not a process where students are screened out at each phase but rather that students are given the opportunity to demonstrate their potential and for teachers to provide structured feedback on their student's characteristics and traits. If risk factors indicate that additional assessments are needed, the AIM Assessment Team will identify which assessment will best serve the student's needs.

ORDER OF TESTING OPERATIONS
1. HOPE Scale completed by teachers for all 3rd grade students (used for informational purpose only in 2015-16 and will not be used in the identification process for 2016-17).
2. OLSAT administered to all 3rd grade students
3. Qualify students at 98th percentile

Steps 4 through 12 will occur in parallel determined by AIM Assessment Team
1. Screen for students in the standard error of measure without other risk factors.
2. Administer CogAT or Slosson to students in the standard error of measure.
3. Qualify students at 98th percentile
4. Screen for language ~~and culture~~ risk factors.
5. Administer the TONI to students with language ~~and culture~~ risk factors.
6. Qualify students at 98th percentile
7. Screen for Economics (Low SES) and culture risk factors
8. Administer the Naglieri
9. Qualify students at 98th percentile

The WISC will be administered to any student(s) who the identification team determines needs an individual test.

TIMELINE

September 17 - presentation of Special Report to the Board of Education on the Review of the Alternative Instructional Model (AIM), 2015

Week of September 21– OLSAT Universal Testing for all 3rd Graders

November - HOPE Survey in 3rd grade

January/February - Additional Assessments as determined by AIM Assessment Team

March – AIM Lottery and placement process

Appendix L:

AIM Differentiation Specialist Job Description

AIM Differentiation Specialist (Coordinator Salary Schedule – 194 Days) Job Description

Summary:
Under the direction of the Director of Curriculum, Assessment and Learning the AIM Differentiation Specialist will provide in-service to ~~AIM~~ teachers, participate in the AIM Identification Team and support the goals of the program.

Essential Duties:
- Works closely with teachers and principals ~~in providing~~to provide in-service training for classroom teachers
- ~~Possess technology skills to access student information in Illuminate and to use Excel and Word.~~
- Develop and present staff development, focused on differentiated instruction.
- Provide demonstration lessons and coaching for classroom teachers focused on differentiation.
- Plan ~~&~~and provide professional development activities for teachers, which include differentiation practices for all students.
- Provide focused staff development for individuals and teams of teachers.
- Provide training and technical assistance to school staffs in the area of interpretation of multiple measures analysis and performance improvement.
- Work with AIM Secretary to help maintain ~~GATE~~ AIM program and student records.
- Work with AIM ~~Identification~~ Assessment Team to coordinate identification and testing of potential GATE students.
- Coordinate support services for GATE students, including working with teachers and counselors to identify at-risk GATE students and making appropriate referrals.
- Provide support for AIM Articulation for both elementary and secondary AIM teachers.
- Attend AIM/GATE Advisory Committee meetings
- Possess technology skills to access student information in Illuminate and to use Excel and Word.
- Perform other related duties as assigned.

Ability to:
- Work cooperatively and effectively with teachers and families.
- Work independently.
- Work collaboratively with district staff and community members.
- Produce a variety of written materials (i.e. brochure, semi-annual progress reports)
- ~~Evidence of~~demonstrate successful leadership ~~ability~~.
- Understand the importance of confidentiality issues relating to students/families.
- Communicate effectively.

- Be flexible with duty hours (will require attendance at some meetings outside of normal school hours).
- Support/enhance AIM related efforts across many school sites.

Qualifications:
- A valid clear California ~~credential~~ teaching credential.
- Knowledge of GATE Program Standards.
- Understanding of the instructional, social and emotional development needs of GATE students and effective strategies to address those needs.
- Knowledge of core curriculum grades K-6 and honors and Advanced Placement course content grades 7-12.
- Understanding and knowledge of differentiation and differentiated instruction.
- Demonstrate understanding of currently accepted and research-based pedagogy in instructional strategies for both adults and children.
- Demonstrated ability to direct and facilitate adult learners and have experience in developing and presenting staff development.
- At least 5 years of successful classroom teaching experience, preferably in a GATE classroom.

Appendix M:

Differentiation Discussion

This section is provided as background on differentiated learning and includes information from experts, useful strategies and important terms and definitions.

Definition and Key Elements

Based on research by Carol Ann Tomlinson & Marcia B. Imbeau, Leading a Differentiated Classroom, 2010.

Definition: Differentiation can best be described as classroom practice with a balanced emphasis on individual students and course content. More specifically, a differentiated classroom includes the following key principles:

- Students differ as learners when they come to the classroom. They come with different background experiences, cultures, languages, gender, interests, readiness to learn, modes of learning, speed of learning, support systems of learning, self-awareness as a learner, confidence as a learner, independence as a learner, and much more. These differences impact how students learn and the nature of scaffolding they will need throughout the learning process.
- Since teachers have a responsibility to ensure that all students master the important content this will require a flexible approach to teaching that makes room for student variance. The key questions that teachers will need to continually ask is, "What does *this* student need at *this* moment in order to be able to progress with *this* key content, and what do I need to do to make that happen?"

The core of differentiation requires the modification of these curriculum-related elements:

- <u>Content</u>: The knowledge, understanding, and skills we want students to learn.
- <u>Process</u>: How students come to understand or make sense of the content.
- <u>Product</u>: How students demonstrate what they have come to know, understand, and are able to do after an extended period of learning.
- <u>Affect</u>: How students' emotions and feelings impact their learning and includes the following:
  - Readiness: A student's current proximity to specified knowledge, understanding, and skills.
  - Interest: That which engages the attention, curiosity, and involvement of a student.
  - Learning Profile: A preference for taking in, exploring, or expressing content.

Examples of how differentiation translates into classroom practice:

Examples of Differentiation Based on Student Need			
	Readiness	Interest	Learning Profile
C O N T E N T	· materials at varied readability levels · spelling assigned by proficiency · alternative presentation methods · targeted small group instruction · front-loading vocabulary · highlighted texts	· range of materials that apply key ideas and skills to a variety of real-world situations · teacher presentations designed to link to student interests	· varied teaching modes (e.g., verbal, visual, rhythmic, practical) · video or audio notes for students who learn better with repeated listening
P R O C E S S	· tiered activities · mini-workshops · flexible use of time · learning contracts · varied homework assignments	· expert groups · interest centers · supplementary materials based on student interests · jigsaw · independent studies · interest-based application options	· choice of working conditions (alone, partner, group) · tasks designed around intelligence preferences · blogs to share ideas
P R O D U C T	· tiered products · personal goal-setting · varied resource options · check-in requirements based on student independence · providing samples of good student work at varied level of complexity	· use of student interests in designing products · ·Design a Day options · ·use of contemporary technologies for student expression	· complex instruction · varied formats for expressing key content · varied working assignments · ·varied modes of expressing learning

C. Tomlinson & M. Imbeau, 2010

Differentiated Instruction: A principle guided method to approach teaching and learning, and is implemented in the context of a classroom system that contains these interdependent elements: learning environment, curriculum, assessment, and instruction.

Learning Environment: The physical and emotional context in which learning occurs. This includes the appearance, organization and structure of a classroom that is inviting to learn with appealing colors, effective displays of student work, spaces for both solitary and collaborative work, easy access to materials and supplies, furniture arrangements that focus attention on peer input rather than solely on the teacher, and visible cues to support quality work. More importantly this includes a learning environment where students feel safe, respected, involved, non-judged, challenged and supported.

Curriculum: An organized plan to engage learners with important knowledge, understanding, and skills. Using standards, curriculum and the art of teaching, teachers delineate the essential knowledge students should have and the skills they should possess as the result of a particular segment of learning. This includes incorporating summative and formative assessment to determine student proficiency, carefully planned sequence of lessons or learning experiences that are designed to engage students in the essential content and to ensure students success with the essential knowledge, understanding and skills. Students will be expected to think and be supported as thinkers and work with respectful tasks that are interesting and engaging and promote the use of the collaboration, communication, and critical thinking.

Assessment: A data gathering and analysis process that determines the degree to which students have achieved essential outcomes and informs decisions about and planning for instruction. This includes diagnostic, formative and summative assessments all with the purpose understanding how each student is progress towards understanding the essential content, knowledge and skills of the planned unit of study.

Instruction: The process of teaching, educating, and engaging students with content. Instruction is how the teacher delivers the curriculum and connects content to the learners. this is where the teacher becomes the facilitator of the learning and includes providing various routes to accomplishing the learning outcomes, help students develop proficiency in collaborative learning, provide classroom routines that balance students' needs for guidance and freedom, align with the essential knowledge and skills, and is designed with student differences in mind.

Appendix N:

Method for Speculating Impact of Private Testing

Method for Speculating Impact of Private Testing

Method One uses a 3 year average number of AIM students qualifying via private testing. Method two uses the latest year's data (2014-15) on the number of students qualifying via private assessment. These numbers will represent a range of potential program size for the 2016-17 incoming fourth grade AIM cohort. (Appendix C). Note, this model does not attempt to account for the many reasons that AIM-identified students may or may not choose to request placement in the AIM self-contained program. These reasons include lottery result, site preference, enrollment in choice magnet program, etc. Currently there are 116 available 4th grade seats in four (4) self-contained classrooms (class size of 29:1).

Method One: Three Year (2012-2015) Average Analysis

The three-year average of students qualifying for AIM is 188 students and 23% of those students qualified for AIM via private testing. 31% of students who qualified for AIM did not requested a self-contained classroom placement.

If 188 students qualified on average over three years and we reduce that number by 23% (students no longer qualifying via private testing) we speculate that approximately 145 students would qualify for AIM with the elimination of private testing. Of the 145 who may qualify 31% of those students would likely not request a self-contained placement (45 students). As a result approximately 100 AIM qualified students would request self-contained placement.

Method Two: Latest Year (2014-2015) Analysis

In the 2014-2015 school year 147 students were AIM-identified and 28.5% of those students qualified for AIM via private testing. 27% if students who qualified for AIM did not request a self-contained classroom placement.

If 147 students qualified in 2014-15 and we reduce that number by 28.5% (students no longer qualifying via private testing) we speculate that approximately 105 students would qualify for AIM with the elimination of private testing. Of the 105 students who may qualify 27% of those students would likely not request a self-contained classroom placement. As a result approximately 77 students would request a self-contained placement.

Summary

The administration speculates that the elimination of private testing may have an effect on program size. Using a simplified model based on data and trends from the last three years, the administration projects that the approximate size of the AIM program would fall between 77 and 100 students with the elimination of private testing if the number of students tested remain constant. These numbers would suggest that the district would

offer between three and four sections of self-contained AIM classrooms. These projections are strictly based on the elimination of private testing and does not account for potential changes in qualification scores or to the location of AIM strands.

Appendix O:

Method for Speculating Impact of Raising Qualification Score

Method for Speculating Impact of Raising Qualification Score

Method One uses a 3 year average number of AIM students qualifying via private testing and students requesting a self-contained classroom placement. Method two uses the latest year's data (2014-15) on the number of students qualifying via private assessment and students requesting a self-contained classroom placement. These numbers will represent a range of potential program size for the 2016-17 incoming fourth grade AIM cohort. (Appendix C). Note, this model does not attempt to account for the many reasons that AIM-identified students may or may not choose to request placement in the AIM self-contained program. These reasons include lottery result, site preference, enrollment in choice magnet program, etc.   Currently there are 116 available 4th grade seats in four (4) self-contained classrooms (class size of 29:1).

Method One: Three Year (2012-2015) Average Analysis

The three year average of students qualifying for AIM with a 98th percentile or higher on a district assessment is 106. Using the assumption that 31% of AIM qualified students would not request a self-contained classroom placement (see Key Considerations) one may speculate that 73 students would request a self-contained classroom placement.

Method Two: Latest Year (2014-2015) Analysis

In the 2014-15 school year 86 students qualified for AIM with a 98th percentile or higher on a district assessment. Using the assumption that 27% of AIM qualified students would not request a self-contained classroom placement (see Key Considerations) we speculate that 63 students would request a self-contained classroom placement.

Summary

The projections suggest that if the qualification score were raised to the 98th percentile and after private testing has been eliminated, the range of self-contained requests will be between 63 and 73 students. These numbers suggest that the district would offer between two and three sections of self-contained classrooms. This analysis does not account for changes in requests for self-contained requests based on potential changes in self-contained strand placement.

Appendix P:

DJUSD GATE/AIM Certificate Outline

This document describes the requirements for teachers to obtain a DJUSD GATE Certificate to work with Gifted and Talented students at the elementary level and secondary levels.

<u>Who</u> - All teachers who currently teach GATE/AIM identified students or who hope to teach at a GATE/AIM school will especially benefit from obtaining their GATE Certificate. This series of courses is designed in alignment with the California Association for the Gifted and the National Association for Gifted Children's position papers on teacher training in the field of Gifted Education. Sessions will help participants understand and meet the unique academic and psychological needs of gifted students. Teachers will build awareness of gifted student characteristics and learning needs, understand differentiation for advanced learners, expand their knowledge of content appropriate for gifted learners, gain an understanding of gifted student's social and emotional needs, and build a repertoire of teaching strategies to maximize potential for gifted behavior.

Sessions are designed to include participant involvement in planning, activity-oriented components and concrete, specific examples in the development of a differentiated unit of study.

<u>GATE Certification</u> - for current GATE/AIM teachers who have not completed a program of professional development in Gifted Education and for other teachers who are interested in receiving GATE certification. To complete DJUSD GATE Certification, each participant must earn 40 hours of professional development related to Gifted Education. The 40 hours will be completed over 2 years:

- 20 hours of after-school training (7 courses). Courses consist of 1-2, two-hour sessions.
    - Course sessions include:
        - Identification & Programming for the Gifted
        - Characteristics of GATE identified students
        - Social/Emotional Needs of the Gifted
        - Differentiated Instruction for the Advanced Learner
        - Learning Styles
        - Common Core State Standards in ELA & Math

- - Depth of Knowledge
- 20 hours to plan, collaborate, implement, and reflect on lessons using the course content provided during the after-school training. A professional portfolio of lessons, work samples, and reflections will be compiled from the courses. The 20 hours may also include some of the following activities, as assigned by the course instructors:
    - Attend a GATE/AIM workshop or conference (Annual CAG Conference)
    - Attend GATE/AIM parent meetings at the school site
    - Plan with grade level/school site AIM teachers (principal must sign an agenda or lesson plans created as a result of the meeting(s))
    - Participate in AIM Articulation Meetings throughout the school year

- **Alternate option to District Certification:** Completion of a Certificate in Gifted and Talented Education from an accredited university (must be pre-approved by the Director of Curriculum, Assessment and Learning)