**Section V: Supporting Addenda Forms**

**For Administrative Units with Gifted Education Programs**

Administrative Units (AU) must complete this form to document Gifted Education program plan requirements for student performance. AUs responsible for multiple districts may collaborate with districts, this is especially true for AUs with member district that have small n-counts. Numbers can be aggregated to the AU level and common targets can be recorded, as appropriate, in district documents. As a part of the improvement planning process, districts are strongly encouraged to weave appropriate requirements into earlier sections of the UIP. This form provides a way to ensure all components of the program are met through assurances and by (1) describing the requirements in this addendum or by (2) listing the page numbers of where the gifted education elements are located in the UIP.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Description of Gifted Education Program Requirements | Recommended location in UIP | Description of requirement or Crosswalk of Description in UIP Data Narrative or Action Plan (include page number) |
| Record reflection on progress towards previous year’s targets. | Section III: Data Narrative | As this is a new area for the consortium and the only solid trend data that can be pulled from all our districts is the decrease in achievement on the TCAP by grade level spans From elementary to middle to high school. The individual districts use a wide variety of assessments to track GT student performance. Some examples are NWEA, Gallieo, District common assessments, and building level assessments. These assessments vary between districts in the consortium so as we engaged in conversation regarding a target/goal for the CBOCES consortium it was unanimously agreed that we would focus on high school math due to the decreased performance on the only common assessment the state assessment. The next section will show a data dig supporting our target/goal. |
| Disaggregate gifted student performance by sub-groups (e.g., grade ranges, minority, and FRED) to reveal strengths and/or gaps (disparities) in achievement and/or growth on state and/or district assessments.  **They want to see disaggregation of multiple sub-groups AND subjects which then makes it obvious why you picked high school math.** | Section III: Data Narrative | Elementary School 87.7 / Middle School 70.8 / High School 42.9  Elementary School 88.3 / Middle School 71 / High School 33.9  Elementary School 92.2 / Middle School 69.5 / High School 36.8 |
| Provide a data analysis that includes trend statements, prioritized performance challenges and root causes that investigates the needs of selected student groups. | Section III: Data Narrative | Our trend data indicates a consistent decrease in advanced performance from the elementary to middle to high school levels in 2011, 2012, and 2013 through our CBOCES GTAU. Although there is inconsistent performance data within our individual districts, the decrease in performance from elementary to high school results in the focus being on professional development for secondary math teachers as the priority challenge that the North Central GTAU will be addressing in this UIP.  Math growth is a prioritized performance challenge. Root causes include lack of implementation of appropriate leveled curriculum in universal instruction, also a need for increased opportunities for differentiated tier two and tier three instructional strategies for secondary GT students within our GTAU. Increased need in professional development in the areas of identification and instructional strategies for gifted programming and instruction.  The GT trend does match the trend for non-identified GT students at the different grade levels but at a significantly higher achievement rate. One root cause is a lack of implementation of appropriate leveled math curriculum in universal instruction (at all grades?). Providing appropriated leveled curriculum to our GT math students would support performance challenge of increasing the number of GT students at the advanced level going from elementary to high school. . A second root cause is a need for increased opportunities for differentiated instructional strategies with secondary GT. Professional development in differentiated instructional strategies for gifted students would support our performance challenge. |
| Set targets for gifted students’ performance that meet or exceed state expectations that facilitate gifted students’ achievement and growth (e.g., move-up, keep-up) in their area(s) of strength. | Section IV: Target Setting Form (expectations) | As a consortium the target for growth is a 5% increase of advanced scores on the state assessment from the North Central GTAU Consortium in 2014-2015 school year. It is noted that with the change in the state assessment to PARCC that there will be a statistical dip in student performance we will look for assistance from CDE GT department for guidance on the interpretation of advance scoring for students. |
| Describe gifted student performance targets in terms of either the district targets (convergence) or as a specific gifted student target/s (divergence) based upon performance challenges of gifted students. | Section IV: Target Setting Form **(relationship to UIP)** | Increasing the number of advanced students in math at the secondary level is convergent from each GTAU districts’ mutually agreed targets for GTAU UIP goals. The goal of increasing high school GT math performance has been mutually agreed upon by the member districts. As a GTAU, the math performance challenge in the UIP is specific to identified high school GT student needs because has been clearly identified that the decline in GT Math performance at the high school level compared to the middle school and elementary level is an area of concern. |
| Describe the interim measures to monitor progress of individual student performance for the selected student sub-group or grade level range. | Section IV: Target Setting Form (progress monitor) | Districts will utilize district adopted and developed formative assessments to monitor individual student performance and growth. All North Central GTAU school will use the state assessment system to determine student performance and growth. All GT students within the GTAU will have their ALP updated on a yearly basis. The Building/District GT coordinators will use the following to determine programming changes for secondary Math specific GT students: grades, assessment performance, participation rates in enrichment activities. Classroom teachers in collaboration with GT staff will use performance on district benchmark testing and end of unit assessments as interim measures to monitor student progress**.** |
| Identify major (differentiated) strategies to be implemented that support and address the identified performance challenges and will enable the AU to meet the performance targets.  DISTRICTS ARE RESPONSIBLE FOR TEACHER PARTICIPATION OR provide comparable secondary math pd. | Section IV: Action Plan (strategies) | 1. **Northern Colorado Mathematics Collaborative to Support Teacher Quality Project**   The Mathematics and Science Teaching Institute (MAST) Institute at the University of Northern Colorado in partnership with Centennial BOCES and the Colorado Legacy Foundation are pleased to present the Northern Colorado Mathematics Collaborative to Support Teacher Quality.  **Who**: Enrollment is open to northern Colorado mathematics teachers of students (GT Students) from grades 6-12 and mathematics coaches. We strongly encourage and offer a stipend and credit to mathematic teachers and coaches at all school in the region for participation in the project. The project is presented jointly by mathematics education experts from the Colorado Legacy Foundation and mathematics faculty from the University of Northern Colorado.  **What**: A one-year program providing professional development on building mathematical and teaching knowledge by understanding and using Common Core State Standards and formative assessments. This will address the root cause of a lack of implementation of appropriate leveled math curriculum in universal instruction at all grade levels.Participants will gain an awareness of the Mathematics Design Collaborative (MDC) tools and experience and understand how the Formative Assessment Lessons support big ideas of mathematics and help students make connections within and across concepts, as described in the Common Core State Standards. The instructional strategies that will be presented will focus on differentiation for students which will address root cause of a need for increased opportunities for differentiated instructional strategies with secondary GT. A generous participation stipend is provided by a grant from the Colorado Department of Higher Education. In addition, participants may use a portion of the stipend for UNC graduate credit.  2) Developing Mathematical Thinking in Gifted Learners 1.5 credit online course available through the Colorado Department of Gifted Education and facilitated by NC Gifted Education Regional Consultant. Participation in this course will address root cause of the need for increased opportunities for differentiated instructional strategies with secondary GT.  Participants will:   * Identify mathematically promising students * Use a variety of evidenced-based programming and instructional strategies to create environments that promote the growth of the mathematically promising * Select, modify and/or create materials to use with these students * Assess the effectiveness of the strategies and materials used with mathematically promising students. Each section in this module is designed to help increase teacher expertise in working with students with mathematical promise. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Description of Gifted Education Program Requirements (cont.) | Recommended location in UIP | Description of requirement or Crosswalk of Description in UIP Data Narrative or Action Plan (include page number) |
| Describe steps and timeline for major improvement strategies and professional development that will have positive and long term impact to improve gifted student performance. | Section IV: Action Plan steps/timeline | 1. **Northern Colorado Mathematics Collaborative to Support Teacher Quality Project**   Online April 16th – April 30th , and face-to-face at UNC on June 9th-12th from 9am to 5pm. Participants will meet with project staffatleast three times during fall semester at their school during flexible times during the Fall 2014 semester. The grant is designed to build capacity at the district level to sustain the goals of the grant in future years.  2) Developing Mathematical Thinking in Gifted Learners   * Districts will be responsible to register a minimum of 2 math teachers for the course and support them through funding their registration fee ($35 per teacher) * Participants can also obtain optional graduate credit from Adams State University for an additional cost. * The course will be offered (dates to be determined) |
| Describe who has primary responsibility for implementing action steps for improvement of gifted student performance**.** | Section IV: Action Plan responsibilities | Building level GT teachers/coordinators create and monitor student progress on ALP’s, provides direct instruction as needed, as well as, develop a communication plan with staff, parents and administration in regards to students achievement and needs. District GT coordinator monitors and supports the implementation of enrichment/advancement programs and activities on a monthly basis. The coordinator will provide professional development for building GT coordinators, implement and communicate program service delivery options and budgetary items. The district GT coordinator will work with CBOCES staff to determine teacher participation in grant related professional development opportunities. The GT coordinator will review data to evaluate if GT math kids are improving advanced scores and monitoring interim assessments? …particularly in the classrooms where the teachers received additional training at UNC and/or through the online module. |
| Indicate how student achievement is reported to parents and students, especially when gifted students are above grade level instruction in one or more contents at a grade level. | Section IV: Action Plan | Student achievement is reported consistently through ALP conferences, regular Parent/Teacher conferences, and report cards. If a student is accelerated within the regular classroom setting that acceleration will be noted on their report card and in face to face parent conferences. If the student is accelerated through scheduling into higher level classes that will be identified on their report card and in face to face parent conferences. |

\* Note that the Gifted Education Program budget is due in April. The budget can be found at: http://www.cde.state.co.us/gt/director.htm.

**Gifted Program Assurances**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Description of General Program Assurances | Mark one box: | Description of General Program Assurances | Mark one box: |
| The district uses multiple pathways and tools to ensure equal and fair access to identification, especially in traditionally underserved student groups; and makes progress toward proportional representation in the gifted population. | 🞎 Completed  🞎 In progress  🞎 No | The district/BOCES maintains a local database of gifted students that records the students’ area(s) of strength as defined in regulations: general ability, a specific academic area(s), visual arts, music, performing arts, creativity, and/or leadership. | 🞎 Yes  🞎 In progress  🞎 No |
| Gifted students receive special provisions, Tier II and Tier III, for appropriate instruction and content extensions in the academic standards that align with individual strengths.  Note: The AU’s program plan should describe the key programming options matched to areas of giftedness and utilized in serving gifted students. | 🞎 Yes  🞎 In progress  🞎 No | ALPS are implemented and annually reviewed for every gifted student for monitoring individual achievement and affective goals. (Districts may choose to substitute the ALP with the School Readiness Plan at the kindergarten level; and with the ICAP at the secondary level, if conditions of individual affective and achievement goals and parental engagement are fulfilled.) | 🞎 Yes  🞎 In progress  🞎 No |
| The budget and improvement planning process is a collaboration among stakeholders of schools or districts within the administrative unit. | 🞎 Yes  🞎 In progress  🞎 No | The district/BOCES provides a certified person to administer the gifted education program plan, provide professional development, and facilitate implementation of the READ Act to accelerate reading skills of advanced readers. | 🞎 Yes  🞎 In progress  🞎 No |

**Report on State Performance Indicators as Recorded on the 2012-2016 Program Plan**

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