

Roaring Fork School District External Review

October 14 & 15, 2013

Evaluation Feedback Form

Performance Indicator/Statute	Data/Artifacts	Themes Derived	Conclusions/Recommendations
<p>Communication 12.02 (1) (a)</p> <p>The program plan shall describe how the AU will communicate to parents and educators about available gifted programming options within the AU and how those options may be accessed.</p>	<p>A. Student, teacher, parent, administrator surveys</p> <p>B. Parent, PEAK teachers, student focus groups</p> <p>C. PEAK Coordinator interview</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Communication to parents regarding the services that the PEAK Program offers for students is inconsistent or unavailable. ▪ Many parents, teachers, administrators and students are unaware of the identification process. ▪ Some parents were unaware that their child was in PEAK. ▪ Transitions from elementary to middle to high school are lacking or inconsistent between schools. ▪ The district website page for information regarding the PEAK Program is minimal. ▪ Parents report that communication with some GT teachers is exemplary, while others report that there is little 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Create a district website or specific page on the district website for the PEAK Program. This is where parents and staff (staff portal) can access all information relative to the program, specifically, the PEAK contact at each school. ▪ Develop and disseminate via the website and at each school a brochure detailing the vision/mission of the PEAK Program. Provide details regarding the identification process and programming for gifted students in English and Spanish. ▪ Implement a quarterly PEAK parent newsletter or update that covers information from each school site, upcoming parent, student and school events and a calendar of key programming deadlines. ▪ Develop, communicate, and implement clear guidelines for yearly transition meetings

		to no communication	between school PEAK leaders.
<p>Identification 12.02 (1) (c) 12.01 (1) (c) (i) 12.01 (1) (c) (ii) 12.01 (1) (c) (iii) 12.01 (1) (c) (iv) 12.01 (1) (c) (v) 12.01 (1) (c) (vi)</p>	<p>A. Gifted student Transitional Colorado Assessment Program (TCAP) data B. Advanced Learning Plans C. Documents developed to guide identification process a. PEAK Identification/Response to Intervention (RtI) Form b. Nomination Letter c. Qualification Letter d. Identification Process e. Parent Letter – English and Spanish D. Demographic data from 2012 E. Parent, PEAK teacher, and student focus groups F. Student, teacher, parent, administrator surveys</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Screening occurs at 2nd and 6th grade using the Naglieri Nonverbal Ability Test (NNAT). • Cognitive and/or achievement scores are sometimes used to deny consideration for PEAK as opposed to using multiple sources of data in a body of evidence as stated in statute. • Although documentation exists to guide identification processes and procedures, stakeholders are unaware of such procedures and the procedures are inconsistently applied. • Parents and students are unclear about how students are identified. • Representative populations are not 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Clarify and implement a district-wide identification process that is consistent from school-to-school. ▪ Monitor and support PEAK teachers throughout the identification process. ▪ Consistently implement the RtI Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) process and include teachers who have students nominated or in the PEAK program. ▪ Include all stakeholders in the Advanced Learning Plan (ALP) process, developing goals based on student strengths. ▪ Ensure that an annual ALP review occurs. ▪ Review data to ascertain identification patterns and percentages. ▪ Review body of evidence (BOE) and identification instruments to ensure both meet the need to address student demographics .

		<p>currently reflected in identified student groups (e.g. Twice Exceptional, Free and Reduced Lunch, and English Language Learners).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ALPs are in place in some buildings but not in others; ALPs do not exist at the high school. • ALPs are not consistently used for programming or monitoring purposes. 	
<p>Programming 12.02 (1) (d) 12.02 (1) (d) (i) 12.02 (1) (d) (ii) 12.02 (1) (d) (iii) 12.02 (1) (d) (iv) 12.02 (1) (d) (v) 12.02 (1) (d) (vi) 12.02 (1) (d) (viii)</p>	<p>A. Surveys (students, parents, teachers, administrators) B. Focus group meeting: Parents, students C. PEAK teacher interviews D. PEAK Coordinator interview</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Programming varies from building to building. • There is a lack of continuity of programming between elementary, middle, and high school. • Time and opportunities to meet or work with PEAK students varies greatly; at one school, the students meet with 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Research and implement curriculum that meets the needs of gifted learners. For example, provide acceleration, differentiation, flexible grouping, pre-assessment, and higher order thinking skills. ▪ Provide opportunities for PEAK staff to work with classroom teachers (co-teach, plan) to support gifted learners in the regular classroom. ▪ Utilize and share materials

		<p>the teacher only 1-2 times per month.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opportunities for acceleration are limited and in some cases are non-existent. For example, students who have successfully passed a class may have to repeat the same class the next year. 	<p>across schools that will support programming needs. Establish a “District Directory” in order to share materials and maximize usage.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Continue to implement cluster grouping in schools in order to provide PEAK students with strength-based programming and social-emotional support. ▪ Use “Advisory” time to cluster and work with PEAK students for social-emotional needs.. ▪ Review achievement data for PEAK students; identify what is working and where changes need to occur. Implement practices proven effective for gifted students.
<p>Personnel 12.02 (1) (f) (i) (B) (I,II) 12.02 (1) (f) (iii)</p>	<p>A. End of Year Report: Roaring Fork School District B. Administrative checklist C. 4-year PEAK plan D. Interviews with PEAK, parents, students E. Surveys (parent, student, administrator, teacher) F. PEAK district coordinator</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some professional development for PEAK teachers exists through regional trainings: social/emotional needs, cluster grouping, rigor. • 5 of the 7 PEAK teachers are highly qualified and endorsed in gifted education. • Some PEAK teachers have 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide district-wide training for all teachers in nature and needs of gifted (traits, identification, programming) in an ongoing way. • Support specific teachers (“Pilots”) to use a push-in model that supports PEAK student needs. • Increase part-time status for teacher/s with a large number of identified PEAK students.

		<p>a large number of students and responsibilities, given their part-time status (*see attached table outlining part-time status and duties).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The PEAK Coordinator is currently staffed at .20. • There is no PEAK teacher at the high schools. • There is no evidence of training for regular classroom teachers in gifted education. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide a PEAK person to monitor and work with students at the high school level. • Increase the PEAK Coordinator position to .5 or more. To bring the program into compliance, there is a lot of work to be done.
<p>Budget 12.02 (1) (g) (i - v)</p>	<p>A. PEAK district coordinator B. PEAK team C. End of Year report</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Funding is allocated per building based on total student population, not on the number of identified PEAK students. • A lack of clarity exists regarding how funding is spent at each school. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review past budgets; identify spending patterns. • Create a committee to jointly decide budget and allocations. • Require that schools seek pre-approval for spending from the GT budget. • Review and reallocate funding based on the needs (personnel) and number of identified PEAK students.

After reviewing the Roaring Fork School District's Unified Improvement Plan (UIP) for 2012-13, we found the following contents that align with the PEAK recommendations above:

- Page 2: Academic Growth Gaps, Median Growth Percentile
Description: Growth for reading, writing, and math by disaggregated groups
Has the district analyzed growth for gifted students?
- Page 6: Brief reflection... Addresses professional development on differentiating instruction: "where students needs are addressed at their instructional level."
Have teachers been trained in differentiation methods for gifted students?
- Page 7: Description of Notable Trends: "increases in the percentage of students who are at or above proficient."
Has the district analyzed data to ensure that students identified in a strength area (Reading, Writing, Math) are performing at the advanced level in their strength area/s?
- Page 8: Priority Performance challenges: Mention is made regarding disaggregated groups of Hispanic, English Language Learners (ELL), and Special Education students.
When looking at the data, is there growth for gifted students? If not, how might this impact Post Secondary and Workforce readiness?
- Page 10: "It is imperative that all subgroups who are not performing and growing receive our priority attention."
When looking at the data, how are your subgroups performing (achievement)?
- Page 13: "Reduce achievement gaps and increase overall academic achievement for all students."
"Increase differentiation of instruction and intervention where needed..."
"Increased professional development and attention to consistent high quality writing instruction across the school district."
How does the current training for differentiated instruction and writing address the needs of gifted learners?

- Page 14: “Increased data analysis and utilization of common formative assessments to drive instructional decision making...”
In what way is formative assessment data being used to inform instructional decisions for gifted students?
- Page 16: “Analysis of strengths and weaknesses in the RtI process.”
“Professional development for results teams, RtI process, and differentiation of instruction.”
“Increased monitoring and measuring of students progress through common formative assessments and formative, interim, and summative assessments.”
Has the RtI process analysis as referred to in the Unified Improvement Plan (UIP) resulted in improved monitoring and measuring of gifted student progress?
- Page 18: “Provide professional development in instruction with a focus on vocabulary, critical thinking, and differentiated instruction for ELL and Tier 2 interventionists.”
How are the needs of gifted learners included in professional development that is focused on vocabulary development, critical thinking, and differentiated instruction?