

TAGAC Meeting Minutes 2/8/17

Present: Erinne Coit, **Deborah F.**, Traci Kirkpatrick, **Mike Marsden**, **Meghan Whitaker**, Andrew Johnson, Helen Shum, Jane Chaddick, Noel Tamez, **Nicole Iroz Elardo**, **Jessica Colby**, **J. Grab**, **Eric Houghton**, Margaret DeLacy, Scott Bailey, Ben Turner, **Scholle McFarland**. (TAGAC members in bold)

Approved 1/25/17 meeting minutes.

Announcements:

- Young Scholars program @ Reed - accepting applications from 11th graders for next year: http://www.reed.edu/outreach_programs/young_scholars/
- ET Tours - study abroad service tours and leadership summits. Some schools already use this organization. Would need to be initiated by parents (not PPS). Would like to have a 25 person TAG oriented trip for summer 2018 to allow for fundraising, perhaps Dominican Republic. Completed 6th grade through High School. Andrew would serve as team leader. Question: do they offer scholarships? Kind of. Perhaps do a community fundraising to help deflect cost. Like year lead time to help facilitate that.
- OATAG
 - Legislative session
 - 2 TAG funding bills. Has seen Parrish's and is very similar to last bill. Tiered rollout going towards \$500/student/year.
 - Question: how does spending per pupil at PPS compare? Has 14-15. State funding is up slightly from last year but still lower than the \$8 high.

Discussion: TAG department's draft plan for a continuum of TAG services

Entire meeting spent discussing the draft of the TAG continuum plan. Here are questions that the group compile ahead of time:

Overarching Questions

- Where are the 2E kids??
- How are we leveraging Sped kids.
- Can we get mention of block scheduling in the K-5 as a suggestion? Walk to math, walk to read?
- Can we get strategies to address these logistical challenges. FAQ style?
- If the technical hurdles are too tough at the neighborhood school, a satellite school and increased ACCESS.
- Dialing up the rigor for all kids.
- How do we get consistency and long term.
- Be as specific as possible.
 - If we don't articulate the actual service or program, it risks becoming a labeling system.
- We identify students not to say something nice, we identify so we can match services and approaches. So services needs to be front and centered.
- Implementation
 - Acknowledge that implementation in PPS is hard
 - Roll out plan -

- 5 years - we just need to see a plan
- Relational piece
- Leverage natural transition points (new principals, new middle schools, new high schools)

Page 1

.... programs or services. ~~but~~ A flexible system of viable program options.....

Page 2

NIE - I like the notion of “exceptional scholars” for 99%+

NIE - How come young scholars goes down to 95%? because we want to capture the potential.

MW-- Happy to see specific age appropriate examples for differentiation here.

MW- Will the profile stay in their file from year to year? Or recreated new with each teacher? Seems there is always a lag in the beginning of the school year, would like to see profile from previous year given to new teacher until new one is filled out.

Page 3

Comments here

MW- Example of classroom clustering at bottom is very helpful.

MW- I’m concerned about the option to provide “one of two instructional models”. Option 1 seems very intentional and an example of best practices; Option 2 seems less intentional and easier to “fudge” and provides much less time with like peers. Equity concern? Does option 1 put us in “tracking” territory, which has been an issue in the past? For the record, I’m in favor of pushing option 1 and disappointed at the difference in options.

SMS: “TAG students are grouped or clustered with non-TAG students and receive differentiated TAG instruction...” I think you mean to say that they are “grouped or clustered with **other TAG students in an otherwise heterogeneous classroom....**”

SMS: What does “TAG trained teacher” mean in this context? Will there be some sort of requirement for a certain # of teachers to receive specific PD?

SMS: Options 1 and 2 don’t seem different enough to me. Need clarification as to why one would work better than another in different settings. The less vague the proposal is the better.

Don’t love “may be”. Require when at all possible.

“A group of a minimum of 2” - let’s emphasize grouping and up to 6.

Like the “teacher who is TAG trained.” But what does TAG trained mean?? Is there implications that there is some requirements for teachers? And is there budget. Note that there is a state TAG specialization and there could be an expectation over time.

Page 4

SMS: I like that this table breaks down some specific ways of meeting rate and level. Might consider grouping these by grade level, so it’s clear what is available when.

SMS: Note that somewhere in this proposal there needs to be a discussion of what support schools need to uniformly implement Single Subject Acceleration. Can’t in good conscious leave that unsaid.

SMS: I notice that single subject acceleration is listed as for grades 1-7. Glad to see that expansion and hope the online materials are updated to reflect that if that's the plan. (Right now documents say grades 2-5.)

SMS: This page comes the closest of any part of this section to focusing on tangible benefits that a new policy could give to TAG students. I encourage you to go further in this direction so that parents know, in simple terms, what they can expect *no matter where their student is enrolled in PPS*. For example:

- Automatic, teacher-initiated ability grouping for elementary students who are TAG in math
- Automatic, school-initiated testing for SSA of elementary students who are TAG in math (and possibly intellectual ability) at certain grades. For example, end of 5th so students can go right into compacted math in middle school.
- Automatic, school-initiated consideration for whole grade acceleration if a student is TAG across the board.
- NIE - automatic differentiated homework

NIE: Can you get something about pacing in there under rate? I am finding that it isn't necessarily curriculum rate but rather daily pacing is what is beneficial at ACCESS.

"May consider" to "will implement"

A page of examples of implementation would be helpful.

Page 5

MW- How does Scholars program differ from IB? Our coordinator brought this question up last year and I am curious, too. (Neighborhood school is IB and thus reluctant to add on Scholars)

SMS: What's the main thing you're trying to communicate here? There's repetition that is probably unnecessary. Perhaps refocus on program goals?

Q: How come 95th and not 97th? *Because we want to capture the potential.*

NIE - Guide both educator and teachers. Add "for teachers" after PD type stuff.

Equity needs to be more specific.

- Equity: consistency. Doesn't require parental advocacy.
- Or spell it out. "Every student will have x, y, and z."

Clustering comment

Page 6

MW-- Different field trips for TAG students? Why?

SMS: I'm not sure how most of these items are program benefits. For example, how is "Talented and Gifted Requirements" or summer camp a benefit? Perhaps this could be a list of enrichment options that can bolster a TAG program?

SMS: So far the parameters for Young Scholars don't seem to be dramatically different from what we have on paper now. For instance, it is awesome to have a well-documented single subject acceleration policy for the first time, but we know that schools are refusing to implement it even for the very few students who end up qualifying.

SMS: To make the continuum of services real to parents and students, it needs to be predictable and tangible. Also, as far as compliance, ODE has instructed PPS in previous corrective actions to take steps to guarantee *uniform* services. If it is not possible to get all district school to implement a TAG

program--whether because of philosophical objections or problems with economies of scale--should the district focus on delivering *all* TAG services through a distributed model (only at certain schools) to guarantee services are delivered at all? This is the time to think about that.

NH: I would like to see the Scholars Program implemented by the Superintendent as a standardized policy district-wide. (No "we'll do this but not that as we [the administrator] see fit", no "we'll spend our TAG budget on any old thing we want including "enrichment" which is outside of school time and costs families to participate).

NH: My personal preference (in a perfect world but since we're in the development stages, why not?) would be that [satellites at a number of schools] were functional not only in middle school but elementary and high school as well in a select number of subjects (math for sure). I would like to see this for benchmark to the 98%.

NIE Why no measurable outcomes for K-7.

Too much enrichment. Not enough in classroom.

Worried about "no pullout." what about ability grouping.

NIE: If not available this year (2016-17), it needs to have an asterisk that says *in development.

NIE: Why to 7th not 8th grade??

Challenges of a critical mass.

- What if TAG clusters were placed at underserved schools - perhaps similar to DLI? But there are still consequences on the neighborhood side. That said, kids most hurt by lack of TAG services are most certainly the gifted minority kids. And then it gives the neighborhood out.
- Can pullouts help when there are small n in a certain grades.
- Question: is there a best practice for when there is only 1 kid in a grade level? Can we offer guidance?
- One way to address this is FTE per every X students. Push-in model. Gives a staffing/budget model.

Is the faster (and more equitable rollout) might be a differentiated curricular materials?

SIT/RTI and Sped teacher need to be leveraged, particularly in younger grades and in lower identification schools,

Page 7

Comments here

MW- Measurable Outcomes-- are we tracking these things now so as to show improvement post Scholars? Are we tracking for all TAG students or just Scholar schools?

MW-- Appreciate the attention given here to 99%, but it is also incredibly frustrating to see everything that should be done/is not currently being done for my (non Access) student and others across district
SMS: All of the measured outcomes seem to refer to high school students. What are the measurable outcomes for elementary and high school students? Thinking about that may help to refocus Young Scholars description more specifically on tangible services.

SMS: I like that in the Exceptional Scholars outline that students would automatically get individual TAG plans *initiated by the school*. NIE I want it to say **required** individual TAG plan **updated annually**.

SMS: I like that the Academic column in this table is more action oriented and less theoretical.

Note the 3+ students; different numbers in different places.

Does this table apply from K-12? Exceptional scholars may need to differentiate in how it looks for K-5 vs 6-12.

Page 8

SMS: Rephrase this: "TAG school work should replace current school work not CREATE ADDITIONAL work" and make sure this is also included in Young Scholars description.

SMS: Appreciate the note that students of color may underperform or mask giftedness. Consider adding a note about studies showing female students do the same.

SMS: Proposal to have middle school satellites for 99th percentile students should be included in this section and fleshed out.

SMS: Need to discuss whether middle school satellites should only address 99th percentile students or if they should address all TAG students. On the one hand, there are fewer 99th percentile students and their needs may be more extreme. As long as the qualification is simply a 99th percentile score (not the combination of scores demanded by Beaverton's Summa program) maybe that would catch students who need the services the most. On the other hand, this could be a chance to offer all TAG students uniform services starting in middle school. Focusing on concrete services at middle school may make it easier to make an impact, because:

- It may be easier to guarantee uniform services at middle schools since there are fewer of them.
- There may be less resistance from principals and teachers around ability grouping as students are older.
- Because of how the middle school is set up--with individual periods--the technical aspects of ability grouping may be vastly simplified.
- If parents know for sure that students will get services starting in the middle grades, this may ease discontent.

SMS: TAG department should talk to Beaverton to get an idea of what additional math instruction might be necessary at middle school satellites. They do see significant acceleration in math. Offering additional classes has budget implications.

NIE 1st column - Add annual "updating" to the individual TAG plan.

NIE - 3rd column - "TAG school/**home** work should replace current school/**home** work."

Page 9

Comments here

MW-Thank you for the "Additional concerns"-- a good reminder to notice anxiety, etc in child as an impetus for further advocacy/ red flag for potential unmet needs

SMS: I like the idea of doing a targeted intervention for historically underserved students who may not quite meet the score requirements but might still benefit from TAG services. However, I'm not sure from this write up what the services would be. Need to carefully consider how this program could make a difference to avoid creating a label-only situation.

NIE: I'm wondering if we can have something, maybe at the end of this table, that acknowledges that underperforming and/or historically underserved may be that way also because of poor identification of 2E issues, RTI, etc.

How is the developing scholar different than any other school?

NIE: Does this reach the parents of the underserved? How does this support families in getting their children's needs met? Not specific enough.

Page 10

Comments here

Page 11

Comments here

Page 12-13

SMS: I'm not sure why this section takes up so much room here, especially since the TOSA information is identical except for the district focus section at the beginning. I would include this as an appendix and eliminate repeated information.

- NIE - or just merge the columns across all 4 teachers.

Page 15 (now page 24)

SMS: There is not a realistic scenario that would leave BCS and ACCESS in the same building long-term. (Rose City Park is Beverly Cleary's third campus and was supposed to be a one-year solution until enrollment balancing happened.) I recommend removing that scenario.

SMS: All scenarios should address demonstrated need for program (currently 500-550 students) with goal of getting as close as possible to eliminating wait list.

SMS: I recommend you start with something like this:

- Scenario 1: One ACCESS location that serves grades 1-8 with no fewer than 3 sections for grades 3-8. Cohort has option to same high school.
- Scenario 2: One ACCESS location that serves grades 1-8 with no fewer than 3 sections for grades 3-8. Cohort has option to same high school. In addition, 5-10 Summa-like middle school satellite programs with guaranteed admissions for any student with 99th percentile score. Satellites' core program would be ability placement for math plus cohort for science and language arts.
- Scenario 3: Two ACCESS locations sited to reduce bussing time for students. Explore possibility of these being elementary only with cohorts flowing to same middle and high schools. (Note that supporting math needs may not work outside of 1-8 model without additional funding.) In addition, 5-10 Summa-like middle school satellites with guaranteed admissions for any student with 99th percentile score. Satellites' core program would be ability placement for math plus cohort for science and language arts.

SMS: Any outline of budgetary implications for middle school TAG satellites or two-campus ACCESS should include transportation costs.

NH: I would like to see ACCESS grown to accommodate the full population of 99 percentiles based not on vague "need" terminology (this information, no matter how carefully worded to skirt SpEd identification issues is useful only to the district for balancing purposes. It does nothing to address the needs of the applicant, for the recommendation process is subjective and flawed [according to the perceptions of admin and teachers who do not necessarily understand the gifted population and/or associated issues] and there is currently no "fall back" plan to accommodate those students at their home school). The only way to truly be "fair" would be to institute a strict lottery at ACCESS based only upon test score and this, as mentioned, does nothing to address the needs of those left out as there is currently no school other than ACCESS to mainstream SpEd students at rate and level not to mention those who simply need the school based on their gifted status.

1st column - take away collocation and specify 3-strands per grade. Slight increase in transportation? Perhaps take out RCP and say "building that can accommodate 3-strand"