**ROBERTSON APPEAL, INVESTIGATOR'S REPORT: CONTENTS**

**PART 1: APPELLANT'S COMPLAINT; APPEALS to the DISTRICT; DISTRICT'S RESPONSES; APPEAL to the ODE and ACCEPTANCE; DISTRICT'S RESPONSE**

**Findings**

In its responses to Appellant's complaint and appeals, the District acknowledged it was not in compliance with OAR 581-022-2500 regarding rate and level instruction and asserted it had plans and procedures in place to achieve compliance, but it did not directly respond to Appellant's complaints regarding OAR 581-022-2335 identifications of TAG students.

Neither Appellant's complaint and appeals to the District regarding communications nor the Districts responses directly addressed each part of OAR 581-022-2330 on rights of parents of TAG students.

**Appellant's Complaint, District's Responses, Appellant's Appeals to the District**

Appellant submitted the Exhibit 1 Step 1 complaint to the District April 29, 2019. The ODE has copies of the complaint and all attachments. The complaint presents these allegations about the District's TAG programs and services.

> The district did make efforts to improve student identification, but the problems indicated in the [District's TAG] plan, such as the lack of a system-wide approach to identify special education or English-language learning students remain unresolved. (Ibid., p.6.)

> PPS has failed to meet the basic academic needs of gifted and talented students, much to their academic, social and emotional detriment. At every grade level and for every demographic group throughout the district, the great majority of TAG students are failing to receive regular classroom instruction at their assessed levels and accelerated rates of learning. (Ibid., p.2.)

> A consistent failure by the district to evaluate its implementation of TAG services including each component plan and service. (Ibid., p.5.)

> Inadequate or simply nonexistent communication of critical information to families and students including communication about testing, student performance, relevant district and school meetings, rights as TAG parents, procedures (including early entry to Kindergarten, admission to ACCESS Academy, complaints) and accelerative opportunities (especially for high school students). This creates and perpetuates serious inequities. (Ibid., p.4.)

> A dysfunctional complaint process that prevents parents from receiving a timely response to their concerns. (Ibid., p.3.) Consistent with OAR 581-022-2330(4), this investigation is limited to whether parents are informed of their right to file a complaint under OAR 581-002-0001 to OAR 581-002-0023. Appellant does not allege any specific District violations of OAR 581-022-2370, Complaint Procedures.

District's Step 1 Response

Appellant filed and appealed the Exhibit 1 complaint to the District consistent with the complaint and appeal process steps described in the Exhibit 2 copy of the District's Formal Complaints Board Policy 4.50.032-P.

By the Exhibit 3 letter dated May 29, 2019, the District's Senior Director for College and Career Readiness replied to Appellant's complaint. In pertinent parts the Senior Director's letter responds to these specific allegations in Appellant's complaint related to the subject of this investigation: At the time of Appellant's complaint to the District and appeal to the ODE, was the District in compliance with the OAR governing identification of academically talented and intellectually gifted (TAG) students, programs and services for TAG Students, and rights of parents of TAG students?

Appellant's Complaint re: Inadequate or Nonexistent Communications

> Inadequate or simply nonexistent communication of critical information to families and students including communication about testing, student performance, relevant district and school meetings, rights as TAG parents, procedures (including early entry to Kindergarten, admission to ACCESS Academy, complaints) and accelerative opportunities (especially for high school students). This creates and perpetuates serious inequities.

District's Step 1 Response

Based on the following verbatim examples, the Senior Director found "communication is currently adequate and could be improved." (Exhibit 3, p.9.)

> Communication of TAG updates, information, processes and procedures to families are accessible on the district site. The district site includes parent information regarding the ACCESS Academy, early entry to kindergarten, applications during the application window and the admission cycle for both programs.

> The TAG department communicates information through the district TAG-family listserv regarding TAG family events, Talented and Gifted Advisory Council (TAGAC) parent meeting dates and agendas, district events for TAG families and TAG parent workshops.

> At the beginning of the school year each TAG facilitator will provide parents with information about TAG during Fall Parent TAG Night.

> TAG facilitators and site administrators are responsible for communicating campus level information and updating the designated TAG bulletin board on each campus with TAG forms, upcoming testing, events and contact information.

> The parent appeal process guide and appeal form for TAG identification are located on the district site. (Ibid.)

Appellant's Complaint re: Lack of Consistent Rate and Level Instruction

> Inconsistent and inequitable access to services and to appropriate classes from school to school at every level--elementary, middle and high. (Exhibit 1, p.4.) That relates to Appellant's general complaint that at "every grade level and for every demographic group throughout the district, the great majority of TAG students are failing to receive regular classroom instruction at their assessed levels and accelerated rates of learning." (Ibid., p.2.)

The Senior Director found there were "inconsistent practices across the district. The district has plans to address access for students." The Senior Director's response continues in the detail provided here for later comparison to information obtained during the investigation.

> [T]hrough the creation of the guaranteed and viable core curriculum (GVC), PPS is creating and compiling a comprehensive curriculum so that all students, no matter what school they attend, have consistent access to rich and rigorous learning experiences. In 2019-2020, teachers will plan lessons that reflect the initial implementation of the GVC scope and sequence in ELA K-12, math K-12, and science 6-12. ELA, math and science will have pilot units of study available for all teachers and principals to use and provide feedback. The units of study will include priority and supporting standards, unwrapped priority standards, big ideas and essential questions, tasks and assessments using different levels of rigor for students from Bloom's Taxonomy, Webb's DOK, and Costa's Levels of questioning. Additionally, the units will include enrichment and extension ideas for serving the rate and level of TAG students and strategies for challenging gifted learners.

Appellant's Complaint re: Lack of Consistent Rate and Level Instruction at High Schools

> Lack of any high school TAG programs or services that offer appropriately advanced options (Ibid., p.4.) That relates to Appellant's general complaint that at "every grade level and for every demographic group throughout the district, the great majority of TAG students are failing to receive regular classroom instruction at their assessed levels and accelerated rates of learning." (Ibid., p.2.)

District's Step 1 Response

The Senior Director found "services vary by campus," acknowledging that "enrollment in an IB, AP, or Honors class does not automatically show that a TAG student's rate and level of learning are being addressed." In addition, "The classroom teacher, in cooperation with the school's TAG facilitator, administrative team and district policy, should still be monitoring the student's academic needs to assure that his or her rate and level of learning are being appropriately addressed in the classroom instruction." (Exhibit 3, p.8.)

Appellant's Complaint re: District Fails to Evaluate Implementation of TAG Services

> The district fails to evaluate implementation of its TAG Services.

District's Step 1 Response

The Senior Director found "currently there are inconsistent practices across the district." In response, "PPS has created a plan to address implementation and evaluation in the future." (Exhibit 3, p.9.) The plan referred to is the Portland Public School District Talented and Gifted Education Plan 2019-2022. The District revised that plan after the Senior Director's May 2019 letter. Part 5 of this report discusses that plan. The Senior Director's response states, "The district uses data through the use of nationally normed instruments for identification of talented and gifted students. Information gathered through these assessment instruments allows the TAG department to analyze the effectiveness of our processes to identify historically underserved Portland Public School students." In addition, "School services will be assessed and modified in the building plan based on TAG student needs. The TAG department will provide a year-end survey to building leaders to assist in evaluating their TAG Building Plans. TAG

instructional "look fors" will be provided to school leaders by the TAG department as a tool for classroom observations to support rate and level of TAG students." (Exhibit 3, p.11.)

Appellant's Complaint re: Complaint Process

A dysfunctional complaint process . . . prevents parents from receiving a timely response to their concerns.

District's Step 1 Response

The Senior Director's response states "Portland Public Schools welcomes expressions of concern as opportunities to learn, clarify our intentions, and engage in continuous improvement to benefit all students." Also, "The formal complaint process is one of a set of tools available to resolve school-based problems and other issues. The instructions, action steps and timelines are outlined in the PPS Complaint Policy 4.50.032-P." (Exhibit 3, p.6.) The Senior Director found "parents receive responses to their complaints that are consistent with Division 22 requirements." (Ibid., p. 7.)

Neither Appellant's appeal for the Step 1 review nor the Senior Director's response directly address OAR 581-022-2330(4): whether parents of TAG students are informed of their right to file a complaint under OAR 581-002-0001 to OAR 581-002-0023.

Appellant's Complaint re: Identification of TAG Students

The district did make efforts to improve student identification, but the problems indicated in the plan, such as the lack of a system-wide approach to identify special education or English-language learning students remain unresolved.

Not Addressed in the District's Step 1 Response

The District's Step 1 Response does not respond to that allegation. That could be because that allegation is in the narrative at page 6 of Appellant's Exhibit 1 complaint but is not in the numbered list of allegations at other pages. Identification of TAG students is specific to OAR 581-022-2325 and is a subject for this investigation.

District's Step 1 General Response to Appellant's Allegations

In general, the Senior Director found "there is not a system-wide approach to instructional practices for talented and gifted students in classrooms across Portland Public Schools. Targeted TAG instructional practices vary by campus and teacher. In 2019, PPS will again self-report being out of compliance in the Division 22 area of meeting rate and level of TAG students in the instructional setting." (Exhibit 3, p.11.)

District's Step 1 Response Next Steps

The Senior Director concluded the District's complaint step 1 response by referring back to the Portland Public School District Talented and Gifted Education Plan 2019-2022 (since revised). The District's update of that  plan was "an attempt to address the variability in TAG services across PPS." (Exhibit 3, p.11.) The District's May 29, 2019 complaint step 1 response concludes with a discussion of the District's then five-year goal to implement individual TAG instructional plans. (Ibid., p. 12.)

Appellant's Step 2 Appeal

Appellant's Exhibit 4 letter dated June 3, 2019, pages not numbered, responded to the District's Step 1 review and requested a Step 2 review by the District's superintendent. Appellant's letter repeats statements from the District's Step 1 review, which acknowledged the following. Emphases are in the original.

> In responses to the complainants' statement that there is inadequate and inequitable communication of critical TAG-related information to families, PPS allows that "Communication of TAG updates, information, processes and procedures to families are accessible on the district site….Communication is currently adequate and could be improved."

> There are "inconsistent practices across the district" regarding access to services and to appropriate classes at every level-elementary, middle and high. "The district has  plans to address access for students" by creating the guaranteed and viable core curriculum (GVC) which it says "will offer differing levels of rigor" and "will include enrichment and extension ideas for serving the rate and level of TAG students, and strategies for challenging gifted learners." Pilot units of study are planned for the 2019-20 school year.

> PPS' finding regarding the complainants' assertion that it lacks appropriate high school TAG services "is that practices vary by campus" and that TAG "services vary by campus."

> In response to the complainants' assertion that the district consistently fails to evaluate its TAG services, PPS says that currently "there are inconsistent practices across the district" and that it " has created a plan to address implementation and evaluation in the future." (ibid.)

Appellant's response does not address the allegation in the formal complaint regarding identification of TAG students.

Appellant states the District's Step 1 response "confirms that PPS has been out of compliance with the Oregon TAG mandate and will remain out of compliance for the next year and for years to come. Yet the district has offered no specific steps to remediate the many problems listed in the complaint." In closing, "For these reasons, we request a review of our complaint by the Superintendent's Office (Step 2)."

District's Step 2 Response

The Exhibit 5 letter dated July 3, 2019 from the District's Chief Academic Officer (CAO) responded to Appellant's appeal for a Step 2 review. At page 1, the CAO's letter quotes from assertions in Appellant's Step 2 appeal, for example, that "PPS has been out of compliance with the Oregon TAG mandate and will remain out of compliance for next year and for years to come," and "has offered no specific steps to remediate the many problems listed in the complaint." The letter then goes on to a limited discussion of governing authorities.

Page 2 includes references to the District's Exhibit 6 Policy 6.10.15-P, Talented and Gifted Education. It quotes from OAR 581-022-2500(4), that "instruction provided to identified students shall be designed to accommodate their assessed levels of learning and accelerated rates of learning." It states Policy 6.10.15-P "directs staff to provide classroom or school programs designed to promote educational opportunity for talented and gifted students commensurate with their ability." The CAO's response then declares, "In practice, every campus in PPS should have a campus TAG plan that is unique to their school and their programs. These campus TAG plans will be posted on the district website and will be updated annually

with input from TAG facilitators, campus administration, and the district TAG department. Currently, the district provides individual TAG plans for students based on parent request." Page 3 quotes the goals in the District's then current Talented and Gifted Education Plan 2019-2022.

> 1. TAG identification improvement- improve universal screening practices to automate identification and to increase identification of historically underserved students.
> 2. Professional development for staff- train TAG facilitators, teachers, and administrators in rate and level, depth of knowledge, classroom look fors, and using formative assessments to inform instruction.
> 3. Curriculum development- include in-depth DOK/TAG extensions and differentiated lessons, activities, opportunities, and projects into each GVC unit written in the new common core curriculum documents.
> 4. Use formative assessment to inform instruction- use MAP assessment results/RIT scores to provide personalized learning opportunities for each student.
> 5. Create individual instructional plans - work with campus committees that include teachers, TAG facilitators, and parents to create individual instructional plans to identify learning goals and identify classroom practices that would meet individual TAG students' learning needs.

Much of the discussion at pages 4 – 10 of the CAO's July 3, 2019, letter relates to issues that are not subject to findings from this investigation. Those include staff and resource allocations and details regarding specific classes and enrichment programs. These are the CAO's Step 2 findings and their relevance to this investigation.

The guiding purpose of this investigation is to determine if the District is in present, not future, compliance with the TAG OAR. It is not to dictate how the District allocates FTE or offers specific courses to achieve compliance. That is a local control issue left to the District to decide.

The CAO's letter does not address Appellant's original complaint regarding inadequate or nonexistent communications regarding TAG programs and services. The letter discusses the District's processes for identifying TAG students, but it does not tackle Appellant's concern regarding identifications of TAG students who might also be eligible for special education or English-language learning services.

The conclusion of the CAO's letter includes a statement that "Completing this investigation was a helpful and informative process and will be used as we continuously improve our practices for serving TAG students." It then describes Appellant's options to "either request an appeal to the Board of Education by emailing the Board Office at schoolboard@pps.net or you may appeal directly to the Oregon Department of Education. Please note, Portland Public Schools does not determine which complaints the ODE will review." (Exhibit 5, p. 11.)

Appellant's Step 3 Appeal

Appellant's Exhibit 7 letter dated July 22, 2019, responded to the District's Step 2 review and requested a Step 3 review by the District's Board of Directors. It addresses these concerns in Appellant's original complaint and Steps 1 and 2 appeals related to the OAR that define the subjects of this investigation.

> Portland Public Schools (PPS) has been out of compliance with Oregon TAG law for most of the last 20 years and that this represents a pervasive, long -term, district -wide pattern of non-compliance with state mandates. We raise these issues on behalf of all students who are or should be identified as talented and gifted (TAG) or whose rate and level of learning requires above - benchmark instruction. (Ibid., p.1.)

In short, PPS does not, and has no substantive plan to, "accommodate [students'] assessed levels of learning and accelerated rates of learning." (Ibid., p.3.)

The Step 1 findings close with the statement that " PPS will again self-report being out of compliance in the Division 22 area of meeting rate and level of TAG students in the instructional setting." (Ibid., p.1.)

Regarding our statement that PPS lacks appropriate high school TAG services, the district agrees that "[E]nrollment in an IB, AP, or Honors class does not automatically show that a TAG student's rate and level of learning are being addressed…. [T]he finding regarding this complaint is that services vary by campus." (Ibid., p.2.)

There are "inconsistent practices across the district" regarding access to services and to appropriate classes at every level. "The district has plans to address access for students" by creating the guaranteed and viable core curriculum; pilot units of study are planned for the 2019-20 school year. (Ibid.)

"…[T]he new core curriculum being developed by Portland Public Schools will include rate and level descriptors and enrichment opportunities for students in every unit in order to meet measurable full compliance of Division 22 TAG requirements in the next five years." (Ibid.)

Regarding our assertion that the district consistently fails to evaluate its TAG services, PPS says that "there are inconsistent practices across the district" and that it "has created a plan to address implementation and evaluation in the future." (Ibid.)

"Communication of TAG updates, information, processes and procedures to families are accessible on the district site…. Communication is currently adequate and could be improved." (Ibid.)

Regarding our frustration with PPS' dysfunctional complaint process, PPS found that "… parents receive responses to their complaints that are consistent with Division 22 requirements." (Ibid.)

At page 3, Appellant's Exhibit 7 letter concludes, "We ask the PPS Board of Directors to review the related materials and to issue a final decision that provides immediate and substantive mitigation measures to meet the rate and level of learning of its students."

District's Response: Emails

The District's Senior Manager, Board of Education, sent Appellant the Exhibit 8 July 23, 2019, email acknowledging the District Board Office received Appellant's Step 3 appeal. The District's Confidential Executive Assistant to the Executive Chief of Staff sent Appellant the Exhibit 8 August 5, 2019, email saying the District's Board of Education was "tentatively scheduled" to hear Appellant's formal complaint Tuesday August 13th. An earlier Exhibit 8 email dated July 24, 2019, shared by the Senior Board Manager and others, discussed preparations needed before the District Board's August 13 meeting.

> This appeal is scheduled to be voted on by the board at their August 13th meeting. Since this complaint about TAG programs and services, lists several concerns, I think this may be a little tricky for the board to figure out exactly what they are deciding to uphold or overturn. Based on prior complaints where there is not a clear "verdict" on whether to uphold a decision, I recommend that prior to the August 13th meeting, that we have an idea of what it would mean to

"provide immediate and substantive mitigation measures to meet the rate and level of learning of students" and what it would take to implement immediately.

It is not clear from the available documentation whether District staff or board members attempted to determine "what it would mean to 'provide immediate and substantive mitigation measures to meet the rate and level of learning of students' and what it would take to immediately implement those measures."

District's Response: Board's Final Decision

The August 13, 2019, meeting agenda for the District's Board of Directors included Appellant's Step 3 appeal for review. (Exhibit 9-A.) Three members of the public testified in support of Appellant's formal complaint. The meeting overview does not describe any other testimony. (Exhibit 9-B, p2.) The meeting minutes report "The Board of Education has received and reviewed Complaint #2019-04 and the Superintendent's response to it." Resolution No. 5945 for Board action stated, "The Board of Education upholds the Superintendent's decision of the Step 3 appeal as the final decision." (Exhibit 9-C, p. 11.) The Board adopted Resolution 5945 by a 7-0 voice vote. The Board's student representative was absent. (Ibid., p.6.) That was the District's final decision regarding Appellant's Exhibit 1 complaint.

**Appellant's Appeal to the ODE**

Appeal Submitted

August 8, 2019, Appellant submitted an appeal to the ODE for a review of the District's decision regarding Appellant's Exhibit 1 complaint to the District. Appellant submitted the appeal through the ODE's online form.

Eligibility for Review

Appellant's appeal is eligible for acceptance and investigation under the Chapter 581, Division 2 OAR governing such appeals. The District is within the definitions of OAR 581-002-0001. Appellant's appeal alleges violations of Chapter 581, Division 22 of the OAR.  (OAR 581-002-003(6)).  The appeal to the ODE is of the District's final decision regarding Appellant's original complaint, and Appellant submitted the appeal consistent with the other requirements of OAR 581-002-0005.

ODE's Acceptance

On August 21, 2019, the ODE' Rules Coordinator wrote Appellant and the District that it accepted Appellant's appeal. (Exhibit 10).

**District's Response to ODE's Acceptance of Appellant's Appeal**

On September 20, 2019, the District sent its Exhibit 11 written response to the ODE's acceptance of Appellant's appeal,

The District's response provides details regarding these topics.

- The District's TAG department's structure, staffing and roles.
- Roles of TAG facilitators at each school.
- Parent participation in and the role of the District's TAG Parent Advisor Council (TGAC).

- The process for identifying second grade students "using the CogAT 7 screener" to identify second grade students who meet "the screener threshold to take the full CogAT."
- The total number of TAG assessments performed in 2018-2019.
- The total number of students identified as TAG for 2019-2020.
- Processes that lead to identifications of TAG students at a District special school program and at one of the District-sponsored charter schools.
- A TAG student's digitalized cumulative folder.
- Adoption of the non-verbal Naglieri Nonverbal Ability Test (NNAT3) assessment tool "to identify intellectual abilities in students instead of the CogAT used in previous years" because it "is a culture-fair, nonverbal measure of reasoning and problem-solving abilities" and "does not require English language skills or mathematics." (Ibid., p.2.)

The response describes the general structure of the District's TAG program and services.

- "TAG services in PPS elementary schools center primarily within each student's classroom. These classrooms are mixed-ability classrooms, where the teacher differentiates instruction according to classroom assessments."
- The structure is different at middle schools. "Students are either randomly placed in classrooms or they are placed in classrooms for math and/or reading according to ability, determined by pre-assessment. In classrooms where students are randomly assigned, we expect to see instruction differentiated for each student's level and rate of learning [sic]. In of like-ability students, we expect to see instruction at a higher rate and level."
- Expectations are the same for differentiated instruction at the District's high schools. "The enrollment in most PPS high school classes is by mixed ability, and instruction should be differentiated to meet the student's rate and level of learning." In addition, the response states, "High Schools also offer a variety of advanced courses. These include AP (Advanced Placement), IB (International Baccalaureate), Dual Credit (High School and College Credit using the college text and syllabus), and Honors level courses. Some high school students take online courses, independent study or correspondence courses; or co-enroll in high school and college at the same time to meet their academic and intellectual needs." (Ibid., pp.2-3.)

The response provides examples of how the District prepares and supports teachers to provide TAG instruction.

- "ODE had PPS conduct training under a February 2018 corrective action plan." In response, "PPS successfully conducted the training for 2,600 PPS teachers." (The District submitted copies of training materials (PowerPoint and activity sheets) and copies of the sign-in sheets showing full attendance by 2,600 participants.)
- "Additionally, PPS provided rate and level training at the new educator orientation in August of 2019, as well as to the paraeducators in the district. PPS is providing another TAG rate and level training for all teachers this fall semester 2019 that will build on the training from last school year." (Ibid., p.3.)

The District's response addresses specific issues raised in Appellant's appeal to the ODE that are subject to this investigation.

- Regarding the OAR 581-022-2500(3) requirement that districts have a plan for programs and services for TAG students, "PPS does have a comprehensive plan that addresses all areas required by the regulation. PPS submitted the plan to ODE on January 15, 2019, and has not had any indication from ODE that the plan is not sufficient." (Ibid, p.4.)

- Regarding rights of parents, "PPS has a variety of communication methods and processes. We inform parents of identification of programs and services available; we have comprehensive information on the PPS TAG Department website; and we provide parents an opportunity to provide input through TAGAC, K-5 Parent Surveys, building TAG Family Nights, and teacher conferences." (Ibid.)
- Regarding identifications of TAG students, "The TAG Department receives OSAS scores from the state in the fall and notifies parents by mail when their child has a score that could qualify their student as TAG. The TAG Department universally tests all second graders for intellectual identification and informs parents of possible qualification. The TAG Department assesses any student that a parent has nominated in the spring of each year for academic and intellectual giftedness if not already identified in that area." (Ibid.)
- Regarding the District's complaint process, "PPS has a complaint process consistent with the requirements of OAR 581-022-2370." (Ibid.)
- Regarding the OAR 581-022-2500 requirements for assessing and teaching to TAG students' rates and levels of learning, "PPS is diligently working in a systematic way to comply" with those requirements "by supporting schools to provide the classroom best practices appropriate for their students. As explained above, especially with recent training, our teachers use assessments to differentiate curriculum, provide individualized instruction, and, when appropriate, opportunities for independent study. PPS offers utilizes single-subject and whole-grade acceleration as appropriate. These strategies are offered throughout grade levels, and high schools have AP, IB, Dual Credit courses, among other opportunities to meet assessed levels of learning and rates of instruction." In addition, "PPS is implanting NWEA MAP exams," allowing the District to "train teachers in a comprehensive manner to use student rate and level reports to provide flexible grouping opportunities across the system." (Ibid. pp.4-5.)
- Regarding professional development to support compliance with OAR 581-022-2500, "PPS is providing professional development to educators on how to read and use the MAP results/ Rasch unIT [sic] scale (RIT) scores to inform instruction at students' rate and level. NWEA RIT score represents a student's achievement level at any given moment and helps measure their academic growth over time." The response also reports the District is "developing a system-wide approach to the incorporation of the dimensions of depth and complexity, which is a practice that currently varies by campus and teacher. PPS is creating a guaranteed and viable common core curriculum across the district. This guaranteed and common core curriculum will include depth of knowledge ("DOK") dimensions and extension opportunities in math and ELA units as developed." (Ibid. p.5.)

In closing, the District's asserts it is "committed to follow through on the TAG Plan and continually strives to improve in all aspects of work with talented and gifted children and their families." (Ibid.)

Attachments

The response includes 17 categories of attachments. Category titles are verbatim. The cited exhibits are of documents provided by the District. The ODE has copies of all attachments. Rotate exhibits for viewing when necessary.

1. Rate and Level Training Materials

Exhibit 12-A includes a copy of professional development (PD) materials titled Talented and Gifted Rate & Level Professional Development and dated 2018-2019 School Year. The materials indicate the training included review of the ORS. The documents also show

training covered nomination forms and processes; definitions of rate and level (no authorities cited); a rate and level table activity; and an opportunity for reflection. The last page indicates this was PD for teachers. The Attachment 16 description below discusses copies of rate and level training sign-in sheets. All but one are dated sometime in January 2019.

Exhibit 12-B is a copy of PD materials also titled Talented and Gifted Rate & Level Professional Development dated 2019-2020. Some pages are similar to the 2018-2019 materials. Others include ways for teachers to ensure they are "in compliance with state law regarding rate and level." Additional topics include examples of pre-assessments and formative assessments, examples of differentiation strategies, and scenarios for discussion. There are no copies of related sign-in sheets. It is not clear where and when the District conducted the PD during the 2019-2020 school year.

2. Nomination and Identification Training Materials

Exhibit 13-A includes a copy of an agenda titled TAG Facilitators Meeting dated January 10, 2019. Agenda items include the nominations form process and testing for TAG identification such as selecting the testing venue, scheduling the testing, arranging for proctors, and notices to parents regarding results. The agenda states, "SBAC testing is coming around. These scores will be the scores used for identification in the fall for grades 3-12."

Exhibit 13-B is a copy of a District letter to parents or guardians regarding nominations of students for TAG services and of a District form titled Nomination/Permission Form for Identification for Talented and Gifted Education 2019-2020. Both are in English. The District provided copies of the nomination form in multiple languages.

3. Identification of Underserved Students through the use of Culturally Linguistic and Economically Diverse
   [sic] Scale Training Materials

Exhibit 14 is a copy of an agenda titled TAG Facilitators Meeting dated March 14, 2019, and of documents titled Supplemental Behavior Rating Scale, PPS Talented and Gifted Educator Guide to Identification Process, and High Potential Culturally, Linguistically, and Economically Diverse Learner: Teacher Rating Scales. The materials include ways to identify students from diverse cultural, ethnic, and linguistic backgrounds who have TAG potential but are not identified by traditional methods.

Exhibit 15 is a copy of a document titled An Educator's Guide: Gifted and Talented English Language Learners. It appears relevant to a March 14, 2019, agenda item: "support of ESL Dept [sic] and identification of ESL students for TAG." There are no accompanying sign-in sheets. It is not clear where and when the District conducted those PD sessions.

4. High Leverage Instructional Strategy Training Materials

Includes the Exhibit 15 copy of the document titled An Educator's Guide: Gifted and Talented English Language Learners.

5. Differentiation Training Materials

Exhibit 16 is a copy of training materials titled Differnting [sic] for Gifted Learners dated January 10, 2019. The materials cover 3 of 5 listed topics: Content, Process, and Product. It

is not clear if or when another training focused on the other two topics: Assessment, and Learning Environment.

- The materials define content to include curriculum, concepts, or themes that "Reflects PPS [sic] core curriculum standards" and "Presents essential facts and skills." Differentiating content involves providing students "choices in order to add depth to learning" and "additional resources that match their level or understanding."
- Process "Refers to how students make sense or understand [sic] the information, ideas and skills being studied." It "Reflects student learning styles and preferences. Differentiation is "Providing varied options at different levels of difficulty or based on student interest," "different amounts of teacher and student support for a task," "choices about how students express their understanding," and "varying the learning process depending on how students learn."
- Product "Tends to be tangible" such as "reports, tests, brochures, speeches or performance" and "Reflects student understanding." Differentiation involves "Providing challenging variety and choice," and giving students "options about how to express required learning" as through "puppet shows, writing a letter, [or] an annotated diagram."

The materials include Now You Try It! practice opportunities. They also included a list of Instructional  Strategies for Advanced Learners.

6. Examples of email communication with TAG facilitators

Exhibit 17 is copies of these emails from the District's TAG Director to TAG facilitators.
- An October 2018 email sending copies of important TAG dates and of descriptions of instructional strategies to post at schools.
- An October 29, 2018, reminder about details regarding the student identification using test scores, and instructions on how to identify students who "fall into the historically underserved student group and you feel should be nominated."
- A November 2018 reminder about an OMSI night and about an upcoming rate and level training.
- A February 2019 message about the ACCESS program application process going live and how facilitators access information about the process.
- A March 2019 email inviting TAG families to a 3-part series on giftedness.
- A September start of the 2019-2020 school year message about a shared data drive for facilitators and reminders about an upcoming facilitators meeting; scheduling meetings with TAG Teachers on Special Assignment (TOSAs); scheduling rate and level trainings for teachers at their schools; and scheduling their TAG parent information nights.

7. TAG facilitator meeting agendas and materials

Exhibit 13-AA is a copy of sample TAG facilitator agendas and materials from 2018. Some agenda items are about budgetary and procedural topics. Others include a review of the District's nomination and identification process and the second grade CogAT assessment process.

Exhibit 13-BB is a copy of sample TAG facilitator meeting agendas and materials from 2019.  September meeting topics include fall assessment scores, "2 identification windows this year," and delivery of rate and level "PD delivered to staff by October 31, 2019" with "Staff attendance files to TAG Dept." Another topic is "Nomination/Testing Changes"

regarding use of the NNAT. The copied sign-in sheet shows some facilitators attended, some would attend a make-up meeting, and some did not attend or indicate they would attend a make-up meeting.

November meeting topics are mostly procedural. One is "Rate and Level PD." There is no sign-in sheet. March 2019 meeting topics include procedural issues and "Single Subject Acceleration" and "Whole Grade Acceleration." The meeting materials include these topics: "How do we encourage students to not 'just get it done'?" Also, "Types of Feedback That Encourages Addressing Students' Level." April meeting topics again include procedural issues and "Single Subject Acceleration" and "Whole Grade Acceleration." There are no copies of sign-in sheets for those sessions.

Duplicates from other attachments are not included here.

8. A School's Building TAG Plan

Each school's plan was available at https://www.pps.net/Page/2598 . A random selection of online plans showed they shared common focus areas. Details varied in the subparts. None showed submission dates or approval signatures.

Exhibit 18 is a copy of a building TAG plan provided by the District and redacted by the investigator. It shows these focus areas.
- Acknowledgment of TAG Identified Students, or "Method used to ensure all teachers know TAG students enrolled in their class(es)."
- Identification of Students Who Perform in the 97th Percentile of Demonstrate Potential to Perform.
  - Identification and nomination of underrepresented or underserved students using the CLED scale and characteristics of gifted ELL students.
  - Descriptions of identification and nomination tools and procedures.
- TAG Services
  - Descriptions of classroom strategies and school-wide structures used to meet students' rates and levels of learning.
  - Methods to determine when students need acceleration.
  - Processes for using data to measure TAG students' growth.
  - List of available acceleration options.
  - List of ways students can access a course or experience beyond what is typically available and of additional available services.
  - Ways the administrator ensures differentiated and appropriate rate and level instruction.
- Responsibilities of TAG Coordinator (Listed Twice on Separate Pages)
  - The administrator ensures the TAG Coordinator is trained and knows the job requirements, including "mandatory attendance at TAG sponsored PD and coordinating the ID process."
- Professional Development (Listed Twice on Separate Pages)
  - Staff will use meeting and collaborative planning time to integrate strategies into instruction.
  - "After understanding the areas covered by the district professional development," the school will provide additional PD in topics including flexible grouping, using assessment to inform compacting, tiering, increasing rigor and relevance.

- Communication
  - With parents through meetings, emails, school newsletters, a TAG bulletin board, a fall parent meeting, conferences, back to school night, phone calls, course syllabi and, if necessary, an individual student's TAG plan.
  - "Teachers will solicit input from parents."
  - Parents will have opportunities to evaluate TAG services through an information meeting, the building TAG plan, and requested conversations with the TAG Coordinator.
  - Parents with concerns may contact the teacher, TAG Coordinator, school principal, of the District's TAG office.

9. Sample completed individual instruction plans

   Exhibit 19 is copies of these documents redacted by the District.
   - A statement that the parent provided input to help the teacher meet the student's needs and that the parent and teacher reviewed the strategies used to meet the student's current rate and level of learning. If the parent has concerns, (s)he may ask the teacher for an individual written instruction plan, which the teacher will present to the parent within 30 calendar days.
   - A cover note delivering a student's individual instruction plan. It asks the parent to review and return it "in a timely manner." The parent will receive a copy of the final plan. If the parent has concerns. (s)he may contact the teacher or TAG facilitator.
   - An individual student's TAG plan requested by the parent. It describes specific instructional practices "implemented to meet the student's rate and level." Those include placement in an accelerated reading group and in a word study group and individual conference time to set writing goals. Mathematics activities are available when the student completes other classwork. Page 4 of the plan lists a wide variety of Possible Instructional Strategies/Best Practices. It appears the teacher used those choice options when constructing the individual plan.

10. Meeting dates for Parent Workshops

    Exhibit 20 is a copy of schedules for three parent workshops for the spring of 2019 and four for the 2019-2020 school year. There is also a copy of what is apparently a portion of a PowerPoint presentation titled Partnering with your school for student success, and subtitled Characteristics of Giftedness. Without explanation it is not clear how the following slide relates to the Giftedness theme or to a parent audience. The activities focus on "background information about the person you are discussing" such as "Childhood experience," "higher education," and "Significant event" descriptions.

11. TAGAC meeting agendas and future meeting dates

    Exhibit 21 is a copy of 1) the District's TAG Advisory Council (TAGAC) Website; and 2) of TAGAC meeting minutes dated October 10, 2018, January 9, 2019, March 13, 2019, April 10, 2019, and May 8, 2019.

    The Website at https://www.pps.net/Page/1548 states the TAGAC "reviews all aspects of the Portland Public Schools' Talented and Gifted Programs and makes recommendations to the District with respect to TAG services in Portland Public Schools." TAGAC membership

includes "parents from all quadrants of the city" and that the "council seeks parent members that represent the demographics of the students served by the district."

The Website provides the TAGAC's monthly meeting dates and location. It states the TAGAC "organizes its work around the following areas."

- Consistent identification and services for English language learner (ELL) students.
- Consistent identification and services for twice-exceptional (2E) students.
- Appropriate and consistent rate and level opportunities in all elementary schools.
- Accelerated learning opportunities in all middle and high schools.
- Predictable automatic TAG services.

Council-approved results from these committees will be included in a yearly written report of the Council's activities provided to the Program Director of Talented and Gifted Education K-12, the Superintendent and the School Board."

These are sample topics from the TAGAC meeting minutes provided by the District and related to TAG OAR.

- October 10, 2018.
  - Universal screening in 2nd grade administered by TOSAs and proctors. Decision to use screener was prior to the new director's hiring. Parents will get results by mail, email.
  - Opting in versus opting out of identification. It was not clear if opting out would be consistent with state TAG law. Interpretation was parents "must opt in or agree to identification."
  - The District's 2015 TAG plan and extension of time to complete rate and level PD by January 2019. PD would be by train the trainer model through TOSAs. Discussion about inviting the ODE's TAG specialist to assist. District's commitment was to "Reach as many as we can during already-scheduled staff PD opportunities. Not sure we can get other time."
  - Difficulties appearing on school board agendas "except by using public comment opportunities."
  - ACCESS program's admissions process, lack of clarity regarding who reviews the application and admissions process.
- January 9, 2019.
  - Discussion of District's draft 2019 TAG plan. Concern public is not seeing TAG services happening.
  - Discussion of how District middle school staff are using MAP assessment results to move some students to higher math classes.
  - TAG mandates should be universal. Programs like IB are not part of the mandate.
  - Discussion of uses of MAP, CogAT, Naglieri, of SBAC results for identification. Ways for parents to access MAP results through the ParentVue application.
  - Update of the ACCESS program application and admission cycle.
- March 13, 2019.
  - Discussion of the TAG identification cycle. "Testing complete. Scoring is close to completion. 99th %ile eligibility letters will go out over spring break. The general TAG ID process is carried out at the building level; TAG facilitators are receiving training, with TAG ID letters sent by 5/1."

- Discussion of the ACCESS admissions cycle, including how it does not synch with the District's TAG identification and budget cycles.
- Communications. "The TAG listserv is now up-to-date thanks to the TAG dept's investment in removing obsolete recipients and adding current parents-resulting in over 10,500 parents on the listserv."
- Nominations of ELL students. District's TAG department "is working with the ESL department on communication and education around TAG, leveraging training sessions that are already occurring; empowering parents and ESL teachers to nominate."
- Supporting students with MAP. Description of MAP assessments and processes. What growth targets could mean for TAG students. Ways MAP could be used for TAG screening. Limitations on MAP based on possible workload grievances. For example, "PPS cannot dictate that teachers print out report for each student."

- April 10, 2019.
  - Discussion of upcoming OMSI night.
  - How TAGAC might work with TAG coordinators in schools.
  - Requests for data on single subject and whole grade accelerations, MAP growth data for TAG students, and TAG trainings for teachers.
  - High school science standards and "what is the path for accelerated students who, for example, already have the math exposure for more rigorous physics?"

- May 8, 2019.
  - Most agenda items relate to TAGAC business such as membership, updating bylaws, nominations and elections of officers, community outreach, and the end of year report.
  - Response to request for information from April 10th meeting. Includes comment that "Basic rate & level training was provided by facilitators to teachers at the school level. Additionally, PD at monthly facilitator meetings, offering differentiation implementation strategies and resources to take back to teachers."
  - Review of ACCESS program application process and numbers of new and returning applicants.

12. 2019-2022 TAG Education Plan

The District revised and re-submitted its plan. See Part 5 on TAG Services-Rate and Level Instruction.

13. PPS's School Board Policy 6.10.015-P, talented and Gifted Education

Part 9 discuss the District's Exhibit 6 policy 6.10.015-P Talented and Gifted Education.

14. Full Complaint File

Provides documents cited throughout and in attached exhibits.

15. Nomination and identification process.

With its September 2019 response, the district submitted information about and copies of its TAG nomination, testing and identification process. The information was taken from the District's Identification and Testing Webpage at https://www.pps.net/Page/1546 .

Since that time, the information on that Webpage has changed. It is discussed in Part 4, Student Nominations and Identifications for TAG Eligibility.

16. Sign-in sheets for all educator rate and level training

This table shows the total numbers of schools or programs within a grade range or type compared to the numbers represented by copies of their rate and level training sign-in sheets. The District totals are as reported July 1, 2020, on its Website. Numbers with sign-in sheet copies represent schools or programs named on sign-in sheet copies.

GO to NEXT PAGE

| Grade Range or Type | Total Schools in Range/Type | Numbers With Sign-In Copies |
|---|---|---|
| K-8 or Elementary | 58 | 22 |
| Middle | 13 | 7 |
| High | 9 | 5 |
| ACCESS | 2 | 1 |
| Alternative/Other | 11 | 4 |
| Totals | 93 | 39 |

Almost all sign-in copies are dated January 29, 2019. A few show a different date that month. One is dated January 29, 2018. Copies from six schools appear to use staff roster printouts. Signatures on those forms indicate participation rates varied. Other schools used a standard form titled TAG RATE AND LEVEL TRAINING. It provides a column for participants to print their names, and another for their signatures, but does not necessarily represent all staff or the participation rate.

The sign-in sheet copies are not redacted and are not with this report. The ODE has the copies in its file.

17. Samples of high school syllabus differentiation information

Exhibit 22 is a copy of two course syllabi. One dated 2019 is titled Freshman Syllabus Lit and Comp. English 1 & 2. The Class Structure section includes statements possibly intended to indicate differentiation or rate and level of learning. Information from an administrator's pre-observation meeting with the teacher, classroom observation, and debrief focused on those two topics might have confirmed that.
- As a group, we will reflect a number of different learning styles; some students will have identified educational needs (emphasis in original) . . . and my design for your lessons will reflect this.
- Many activities will be project-based learning. You will have time to work on your own, in pairs, and in small groups, developing a variety of personal and interpersonal skills.
- You can help me by letting me know your strengths and challenges, and by telling me how you would like me to help you grow.

The other is titled Physics 1-2 8th Grade Science. The description begins, "Physics 1-2: NGSS is an introductory high school science course that will focus on developing students' understanding of fundamental scientific knowledge, their ability to think like scientists, and creating arguments from evidence." The District might have provided this syllabus to show offering a high school class to students in eighth grade indicates TAG rate and level instruction. However, the syllabus describes unit topics and tasks for all students. The course title and description alone are not evidence of rate and level instruction.

Scope of Investigation and Limitations

Part 2 discusses the scope and limitations of this investigation.

END of PART 1 – GO to NEXT PAGE

**PART 2: SCOPE of INVESTIGATION; ALLEGATIONS of CONTRIBUTING PROBLEMS and LIMITATIONS on INVESTIGATION; GOVERNING OAR; DISTANCE LEARNING GUIDANCE**

**Scope of Investigation**

Exhibit 10 is a copy of the ODE's August 21, 2019, letter to Appellant and the District accepting Appellant's appeal. In closing, it defines the scope of this investigation. "[T]he Oregon Department of Education will investigate the following: Is Portland Public Schools in compliance with Oregon standards of instruction that apply to talented and gifted (TAG) students?"

Exhibit 23 is a copy of the February 3, 2020, email from the ODE's TAG Education Specialist notifying parents of TAG-identified students about the subjects for this investigation and about their participation in a survey. In pertinent part, the email clarifies the scope of this investigation. "The Oregon Department of Education is conducting an investigation specific to Talented and Gifted identification practices, rights of parents, and programs and services in Portland Public Schools."

**Allegations of Contributing Problems, Limits on Investigation**

At pages 3-5 of the Exhibit 1 Complaint, Appellant lists various allegations about "problems that contribute to an overall lack of rate and level instruction in our classrooms." The TAG OAR limit any consideration of those alleged contributing problems.

Exhibit 23 is a copy of a February 1, 2018, email from the ODE's then acting and now Government and Legal Affairs Manager Emily Nazarov to a parent in another Oregon district who raised concerns about that district's TAG program. In this pertinent part, her email explains the ODE's limited authority regarding a district's TAG programs and why a district has discretion to determine how to deliver its TAG programs and services consistent with the TAG OAR.

> Oregon is a local control state, which means that unless there is a state statute granting responsibility to the Department, the responsibility for overseeing schools rests with the locally elected school boards. With respect to TAG, the Department of Education is charged with ensuring that students are identified, parents have access to information, and instruction is provided in a way that is designed to accommodate the identified students' rate and level. However, state law does not specify exactly how TAG services must be offered in the State. In the absence of a state law, the school districts have discretion to make decisions about whether to offer specialized TAG programs, where such programs are located, and how students are assigned to those programs.

Consistent with that limitation, concerns about alleged contributing problems such as these regarding how the District offers TAG services should be directed to the District.

> Staffing; budgeting; allocations of human and other resources; job descriptions and functions; central office support; trainings; academy, program or school structures; single subject acceleration programs; student or school level TAG plans; lack of named high school services, programs, or learning options; and student transfers among neighborhood schools.

Parts 10 and 11 of this report, TAG Facilitators-Roles and Responsibilities, and TAG Advisory Committee (TAGAC), are for the District's consideration during improvement planning and actions. TAG OAR do not require either TAG facilitators or a TAGAC. Parts 10 and 11 are not intended to produce

final orders. They acknowledge the District's response to the ODE's acceptance of Appellant's appeal includes information about the TAG facilitators and TAGAC.

Appellant and others should direct any concerns regarding TAG facilitators or the TAGAC to the District.

Website links in this section are active as of this report.

**Oregon Administrative Rules (OAR)**

TAG OAR are in Chapter 581 Oregon Department of Education, Division 22 Standards for Public Elementary and Secondary Schools, at https://secure.sos.state.or.us/oard/displayDivisionRules.action?selectedDivision=2563.

> OAR 581-022-2325 Identification of Academically Talented and Intellectually Gifted (TAG) Students at https://secure.sos.state.or.us/oard/viewSingleRule.action?ruleVrsnRsn=145311.

> OAR 581-022-2500 Programs and Services for TAG Students at https://secure.sos.state.or.us/oard/viewSingleRule.action?ruleVrsnRsn=145372.

> OAR 581-022-2330 Rights of Parents of TAG Students at https://secure.sos.state.or.us/oard/viewSingleRule.action?ruleVrsnRsn=256781.

**No OAR Above were Temporarily Suspended Due to COVID-19**

During the time subject to this investigation and report, Oregon Governor Brown's March 8, 2020, Executive Order No. 20-03 temporarily suspending specific OAR due to COVID-19 did not affect any TAG OAR listed above. The list of temporarily suspended OAR, including a link to the Executive Order, is at https://www.oregon.gov/gov/Pages/OAR-temporary-suspensions.aspx.

**The ODE Published Guidance for "Supporting Talented and Gifted through Hybrid and Comprehensive Distance Learning" During the 2020-2021 School Year**

To help districts provide TAG programs and services during the COVID-19 school closures, the ODE published guidance at https://www.oregon.gov/ode/students-and-family/healthsafety/Documents/TAG%20Ready%20Schools,%20Safe%20Learners%20Guidance.pdf. In pertinent parts it states, "All schools must continue to serve students identified as TAG by accommodating assessed levels of learning and accelerated rates of learning." As part of that responsibility, "An important focus in serving TAG students is continuing to provide instruction at the assessed rate and level through daily or weekly formative assessment data or evidence of learning in a Comprehensive Distance Learning model. While it may be challenging for educators to gauge the social-emotional impacts of the assigned work, it is imperative to keep social-emotional needs at the center of learning." To help districts do that, the guidance provides practical "considerations, suggestions, and resources for meeting the needs of talented and gifted learners through distance learning."

Page 14 of the ODE' January 19, 2021, Comprehensive Distance Learning document at https://www.oregon.gov/ode/students-and-family/healthsafety/Documents/Comprehensive%20Distance%20Learning%20Guidance.pdf provides required and recommended distance learning processes for Students Who Receive Talented and Gifted (TAG) Services.

Required
- ❏ Review TAG plans and ensure there is a district process for TAG identification and services.
- ❏ Provide opportunities for educational acceleration, which has long been used to match high-level

    students' general abilities and specific talents with optimal learning opportunities.
- ❏ Design learning experiences that allow for curriculum compacting, which condenses, modifies, or

    streamlines curriculum to reduce repetition of previously mastered material.

Recommended
- ⇨ Review TAG specific guidance on serving students identified as TAG during Comprehensive Distance Learning in the TAG Ready Schools, Safe Learners guidance and check the ODE TAG website for updated information and resources.
- ⇨ Ensure TAG students have access to peers with similar interests and abilities.
- ⇨ Consider the social and emotional strengths and needs of students identified as TAG.

The ODE's guidance and the OAR that remained in effect did not take away the District's discretion on how to deliver TAG programs and services. However, transitioning from in-person to distance learning did not give it or any other district permission to leave TAG programs, services, and students behind.

END of PART 2

GO to NEXT PAGE

**PART 3: FINDINGS for TAG OAR**

Below are findings listed by TAG OAR numbers. For each there is a general or overall finding followed by findings related to specific sources of information (e.g. classroom observations; surveys of administrators, teachers, and parents; the District's TAG Webpages; materials provided by the District; and TAG Building Plans). Details about the findings are in other related parts of the report.

**OAR 581-022-2325, Identification of Academically Talented and Intellectually Gifted Students**

Each school district shall have local district policies and procedures for the identification of talented and gifted students as defined in ORS 343.395 who demonstrate outstanding ability or potential. (OAR 581-022-2325(1))

*Findings*

The District has a TAG policy. However, it is not consistent with current TAG OAR or with the District's administrative directives. The District last amended that policy in 2002.

The District should amend its TAG policy to be consistent with current TAG OAR.

The District should consider adopting an administrative directive to strengthen and support implementation of its amended TAG policy.

The District should review and amend any TAG information to parents to ensure any citations to or quotes from TAG OAR are current, correct, and consistent with the District's TAG policy and administrative directive.

See Part 9 of the report for more information about those findings.

See Part 9 for additional information.

Districts shall use research based best practices to identify students from underrepresented populations including: ethnic minorities, students with disabilities, students who are culturally and/or linguistically diverse, or economically disadvantaged. (OAR 581-022-2325(2)(a)).

*General Finding*

During the 2019-2020 school year the District implemented a new data collection specific to nominations of students from historically underserved populations. The investigator commends the District for beginning that data collection. It should continue that collection and take necessary actions to ensure the data from that collection and other sources inform and improve the District's nominations and identifications of historically underrepresented or underserved students consistent with OAR 581-022-2325(2).

*Findings from Classroom Visits*

Teachers reported the District was a major source of nominations, especially in grades 3-8. A high reliance on assessment scores signifies the District should take steps to ensure all schools are in compliance with OAR 581-022-2325(2) requirements regarding uses of "research based best practices to identify students from underrepresented populations," school teams to "make the final decisions on the identification of students," and inclusions of "behavioral, learning and performance information . . . in all procedures for the identification of students."

Noticeable percentages of teachers across grade ranges reported or volunteered comments that they did not understand the TAG nomination process. That indicates the District needs to determine if that is true and, if it is, take consistent and regular actions to ensure teachers understand and implement nomination processes consistent with the OAR and District policies and procedures.

*Findings from Surveys of Administrators, Teachers, and Parents*

**Administrators**

The survey did not generate responses specific to identifying students from underrepresented or historically underserved populations.

Administrators' volunteered comments indicate needs for trainings in recognizing, identifying and serving TAG students generally. The District should take necessary actions to ensure administrators continue to receive those PD or trainings and implement the information gained from them.

Administrators' volunteered comments indicate needs for recognizing, identifying and serving TAG students generally.

**Teachers**

The survey did not include prompts specific to identifying students from underrepresented or historically underserved populations.

Teachers' volunteered comments indicate needs for the District to provide PD or trainings in identifying and nominating students for TAG eligibility. The District should take necessary actions to ensure teachers continue to receive those PD or trainings and implement the information gained from them.

Some volunteered comments expressed a need to address general equity issues. The District should review teachers' volunteered comments to help inform implementation of its TAG nomination and identification services.

**Parents**

The survey did not include prompts specific to identifying students from underrepresented or historically underserved populations.

Some volunteered comments expressed concerns about equity in TAG programs and services, including nominations and identifications of students. The District should review parents'

volunteered comments to help inform implementation of its TAG nomination and identification services.

*Finding from Information on the District's Webpages*

TAG FAQ 27 on the District's Webpage at https://www.pps.net/Page/13106 states, "What about the schools that have historically underserved populations?" The response is "The TAG Department actively monitors schools who [sic] have historically underserved populations and supports the TAG facilitator and the school to notify families of good candidates for TAG. Professional development is also given to facilitators to help identify students." The District's recent adoption of the data collection described in the general finding above indicates a need to improve identifications of TAG students in historically underserved populations. TAG facilitators and schools might have key roles in making those improvements.

*Finding from Training Materials Provided by the District*

The District provided copies of the example materials below either with its Exhibit 11 September 2019 written response to the ODE's acceptance of Appellant's appeal or later on request. The materials included Exhibit 14, a copy of an agenda titled TAG Facilitators Meeting dated March 14, 2019, and of documents titled Supplemental Behavior Rating Scale, PPS Talented and Gifted Educator Guide to Identification Process, and High Potential Culturally, Linguistically, and Economically Diverse Learner: Teacher Rating Scales. The agenda includes ways to identify students from diverse cultural, ethnic, and linguistic backgrounds who have TAG potential but are not identified by traditional methods.

The District also submitted Exhibit 15, a copy of a document titled An Educator's Guide: Gifted and Talented English Language Learners. It appears relevant to a March 14, 2019, agenda item: "support of ESL Dept [sic] and identification of ESL students for TAG."

When asked who monitors the use of the CLED scale and resources for identifying characteristics of gifted ELL students, the TAG Director reported, "The classroom teacher would be the one that sees students day-to-day. "The TAG facilitator provides PD to teachers in the building regarding this. Principals must provide the time for facilitators to present PD. Administrators and other educators will access . . . the modules for this training this year through CDL." The District should use information from its new data collection described in Part 4 and from other sources to monitor how effectively the District implements trainings such as those described above and to inform necessary improvement plans and actions.

*Findings from TAG Building Plans*

The TAG OAR do not require the District's TAG Building Plans linked for each school at https://www.pps.net/Page/2598. The Building Plans contain information relevant to OAR 581-022-2325. The investigator reviewed ten randomly selected examples for information regarding the identification and nomination of students for TAG eligibility. The ten building TAG plans randomly reviewed for this investigation lacked research based reasons for the methods used to identify students from underrepresented populations. To help satisfy the OAR 581-022-2325(2) requirement that "Districts shall use research based best practices to identify students from underrepresented populations," the plans should include a research citation or a phrase explaining why the school chose a particular method.

*Findings from TAG Nomination and Identification Data Reported by the District*

The Exhibit 25 TAG student identification data reported by the District to the ODE for the 2018-2019 school year indicate a significantly higher percentage of TAG identified students within the White, Asian, and Multi-Racial subgroups than within each other subgroup.

Exhibit 26, last updated May 27, 2020, is an internal District report of TAG student nominations and identifications within demographic subgroups. It includes categories of students in historically underrepresented and underserved groups. The data trends are consistent with the data reported to the ODE.

- The White subgroup shows the most TAG nominations and identifications.
- The multi-racial (Two or More) subgroup shows the next highest number of TAG identifications and identifications.

The District's TAG Director reported that is a new data collection begun at her request "so that we could have conversations with facilitators and administrators regarding nominations." The investigator commends the District for beginning that data collection. It should continue that collection and take necessary actions to ensure the data from that report and other sources inform and improve the District's nominations and identifications of historically underrepresented or underserved students consistent with OAR 581-022-2325(2).

A team shall make the final decisions on the identification of students using the information collected under paragraphs (c) and (d) of this section. No single test, measure or score shall be the sole criterion. A record of the team's decision, and the data used by the team to make the decision, shall become part of the education record for each student considered. (OAR 581-022-2325(2)(b-e).

*General Finding*

Seven of ten randomly selected TAG Building Plans reviewed did not mention or describe a TAG team. That indicates widespread inconsistencies with the OAR 581-022-2500 (5) and 581-022-2325(2) requirements regarding a TAG team and its responsibilities. If the District's procedure is to form school level TAG teams, it should take necessary actions to ensure its schools establish, operate, and maintain TAG teams consistent with the OAR. For example, each building TAG plan could name the standing TAG nomination team by position title, with ad hoc members included as needed depending on the student being considered to TAG eligibility. If the District's procedure is to have one or more TAG teams formed at school cluster or district levels, then it should make that clear to all stakeholders and operate the teams consistent with TAG OAR.

*Findings from Classroom Visits*

Teachers reported the District was a major source of nominations, especially in grades 3-8. One reason some teachers gave for not nominating students indicates they substantially relied on test results or other information provided by the District. A high reliance on assessment scores signifies the District should take actions to ensure all schools implement identifications of TAG students consistent with OAR 581-022-2325(2) requirements, including forming teams to make identification decisions based on performance, behavioral, and learning information and that do not rely on any single test or other measure.

Noticeable percentages of teachers across grade ranges reported or volunteered comments that they did not understand the TAG nomination process. Percentages of teachers reporting TAG nominations

significantly declined after grades K-2. Those results indicate the District needs to take consistent and regular actions to ensure teachers understand and implement nomination processes consistent with the OAR and District policies and procedures.

Across grade ranges teachers reported using a variety of methods to identify TAG eligible students. A plurality reported using observed TAG characteristics. Work samples were the least used method. Given noticeable percentages of teachers report they do not understand the nominations process and that nominations by teachers decline after grades K-2, the District should help schools select and use the most effective methods for identifying and nominating students within grade ranges and provide necessary trainings and follow-up to ensure teachers identify and nominate students consistent with OAR 581-022-2325.

In grades K-2, 29.8% of teachers in a sample reported they did not nominate students for TAG eligibility because they did not believe in early identification in early grades; 52.7% in another sample volunteered comments that they did not believe in early identification; and 21.1% in that sample said they believed students would "level out" by third grade. The district should inform schools that compliance with OAR 581-022-2325 is not discretionary, clarify how TAG eligibility benefits students and schools, and support schools in carrying out effective and equitable methods to identify students for TAG eligibility.

*Findings from Surveys of Administrators, Teachers, and Parents*

### Administrators

Majorities, but not all, of surveyed administrators responded they had received researched-based trainings in identifying TAG students, in recognizing students TAG characteristics, and in meeting their social and emotional needs. Majorities, but not all, also responded they provided their staffs trainings on those topics. Minorities of surveyed administrators reported they had received training in identifying and meeting the social and emotional needs of underachieving students or that they had provided their staffs trainings about that.

Administrators' volunteered comments indicate needs for those trainings . The District should take necessary actions to ensure administrators continue to receive those PD or trainings and implement the information gained from them.

### Teachers

A significant 36% average of teachers surveyed reported having no TAG nominated students in their classes; 19.6% reported having no TAG identified students. The District should consider that result and take necessary actions to ensure teachers implement the District's processes for nominating and identifying students for TAG eligibility consistent with OAR 582-022-2325 and the District's policies and procedures.

Teachers volunteered comments indicate needs for the District to provide clarity about why TAG identification is important, expectations for students, and if and how TAG relates to kindergarten students and teachers. The comments also express a need for the District to provide PD or trainings in identifying and nominating students for TAG eligibility. The District should take necessary actions to ensure teachers continue to receive those PD or trainings and implement the information gained from them.

**Parents**

The District's TAG Director and various TAG Teachers on Special Assignment (TOSAs) reported the TAG identification process includes several data sources, including behavioral evidence checklists, parent checklists, work samples, and assessment results. A 54% majority of surveyed parents agreed or strongly agreed the District assessed their students for TAG identification in a variety of ways (e.g. testing, work samples, parent and teacher checklists/feedback). However, 25% disagreed or strongly disagreed; and 21% neither agreed nor disagreed. That split of opinion indicates the District should clarify for parents the variety of sources the OAR requires and the District uses to identify TAG students.

A 44% plurality of surveyed parents disagreed or strongly disagreed they understood their students' TAG identifications (Academically Talented Reading, Academically Talented Math, Intellectually Gifted, or Potential to Perform) and the available programs and services. That indicates the District should clarify for parents of TAG identified students the TAG meanings of identification categories and the benefits, programs, and services available in those categories.

*Findings from Information on the District's TAG Webpages*

At the time of this report, the District's TAG Webpage states "testing is paused due to Comprehensive Distance Learning. As more guidance is provided by the state, PPS will make decisions on testing."

In second grade, the NNAT3 test of intellectual ability given every student and the IOWA test for reading and mathematics available on request by a teacher or parent are consistent with OAR 581-022-2325 because they are nationally standardized.

The Oregon State Assessment System (OSAS) assessments and NWEA MAP for students in grades 3 and higher are also consistent with OAR 581-022-2325.

Prior to the COVID-19 school closures, the TAG Director reported the District fully implements the NNAT3, MAP, and OSAS assessments described on its Website.

The statement that the District only conducts TAG testing for District sponsored charter schools that have TAG in their charter is accurate. Oregon charter schools are not required to include TAG programs or services in their charter contracts. (ORS 338.115.)

The Webpage information is not consistent with OAR 581-022-2325 to the extent it does not address these OAR 581-022-2325(2) requirements.
- How the District "shall use research based best practices to identify students from underrepresented populations including: ethnic minorities, students with disabilities, students who are culturally and/or linguistically diverse, or economically disadvantaged."
- How a "team shall make the final decisions on the identification of students using the information collected under paragraphs (c) and (d) of this section."

The District's TAG Director and various TAG Teachers on Special Assignment (TOSAs) reported the TAG identification process includes several data sources, including behavioral evidence checklists, parent checklists, work samples, and assessment results. The Website should clarify how each District school will use those data sources to identify TAG students consistent with the OAR.

The Website should also clarify that each school has a TAG team, and the team's responsibilities. Webpages identifying each school's TAG facilitator should also list the school's TAG team membership by job titles.

The statement regarding "TAG potential" is not consistent with OAR 581-022-2325 because it states the District "may identify students who have potential to perform at high levels either in talent or giftedness." ORS 581-022-2325(2)(e) states "districts, by local policies and procedures, shall identify students who demonstrate the potential to perform at the 97th percentile." (Emphases added.) The District should clarify how it will implement the "shall identify" requirement.

The statement regarding "New to PPS?" is consistent with OAR 581-022-2325 because the OAR does not address students who transfer into at district, and because the statement allows that, if the student is not "previously identified or the documentation submitted [from the sending district] does not fit for PPS requirements for a transfer of TAG identification, you can complete a Nomination Form to have your child assessed for a PPS identification." However, some suggestions.

- If a student transfers to the District from another standard Oregon district, it is reasonable to assume the sending district's TAG policies and procedures comply with the TAG OAR. It is also reasonable to assume that if the sending district identified the transferring student as TAG in any or all TAG categories, then the receiving district could, or should, recognize and accept that student as a TAG student without any further review or action by a parent or guardian.
- The District should consider revising its policies to grant TAG status to any student identified as TAG by a sending and standard Oregon district.
- The ODE should consider proposing amendments to OAR 581-022-2325 to say a student identified TAG in a standard Oregon district retains the same TAG status if and when the student transfers to and enrolls in any other Oregon district. A student identified TAG in a standard Oregon district should have the right to expect that other Oregon districts will recognize that identification.

The Welcome to the TAG Parent Page! at https://www.pps.net/Page/3884 includes links to a PPS TAG Parent Information Fall 2020 PowerPoint presentation in English, Chinese, Russian, Somali, Spanish, and Vietnamese. Two slides discuss the nomination categories and process. They focus on assessments but do not mention the other OAR 581-022-2325 sources of information or the involvement of a TAG team in the nomination and identification process.

*Findings from Training Materials Provided by the District*

The District's TAG Director and TAG facilitators who were available to interview before the COVID-19 school closures reported the District relies on a "train-the-trainer" model to provide TAG related professional development and trainings for school staff. TAG facilitators attend trainings, then are responsible to present the information learned to their school staffs.

The District provided copies of example materials either with its Exhibit 11 September 2019 written response to the ODE's acceptance of Appellant's appeal or later on request. They demonstrate facilitators had opportunities to receive trainings and materials in a variety of TAG subjects, including nominations and identifications of TAG students.

Consistent with OAR 581-022-2325, the trainings included methods for identifying and nominating students from underrepresented or historically underserved groups. Some materials were specific to "High Potential Culturally, Linguistically, and Economically Diverse Learner[s]."

Evidence from observations, surveys, and documents reviewed indicates inconsistent identifications and nominations of TAG students across the District. That suggests the effectiveness of "train the trainer" is also inconsistent.

TAG OAR do not require TAG facilitators or train-the-trainer staff development. If the District chooses the train-the-trainer method to deliver TAG-related information to schools and ensure compliance with OAR 581-022-2325, it should take necessary actions to ensure the trainers are trained, and that they train their school's staff.

*Findings from TAG Building Plans*

The TAG OAR do not require building level TAG plans. If the District chooses to implement building-level TAG plans, then it should ensure the plans are consistent with the TAG identification OAR.

The ten building TAG plans randomly reviewed for this investigation lacked research based reasons for the methods used to identify students from underrepresented populations. To help satisfy the OAR 581-022-2325(2) requirement that "Districts shall use research based best practices to identify students from underrepresented populations," the plans could include a research citation or a phrase explaining why the school chose a particular method.

Seven of ten plans reviewed did not mention or describe a TAG team. That indicates widespread inconsistencies with the OAR 581-022-2500 (5) and 581-022-2325(2) requirements regarding a TAG team and its responsibilities. If the District's procedure is to form school level TAG teams, it should take necessary actions to ensure its schools establish, operate, and maintain TAG teams consistent with the OAR. For example, each building TAG plan could include a section naming the standing TAG nomination team by position title, with ad hoc members included as needed depending on the student being considered to TAG eligibility. If the District's procedure is to have one or more TAG teams formed at school cluster or district levels, then it should make that clear to all stakeholders and operate the teams consistent with TAG OAR.

The District's TAG Director and various TAG Teachers on Special Assignment (TOSAs) reported the District's TAG identification process includes several data sources, including behavioral evidence checklists, parent checklists, work samples, and assessment results. The District should inform parents how TAG teams use those data sources to identify TAG students consistent with the OAR.

On all ten plans reviewed, lines for submission and review dates, initials, or signatures were blank. If the District uses a process to review TAG building plans, it should document the submission dates and individuals who submitted, reviewed, and approved them.

*Findings from TAG Nominations Data Reported by the District*

The Exhibit 25 TAG student identification data reported by the District to the ODE for the 2018-2019 school year indicate a significantly higher percentage of TAG identified students within the White, Asian, and Multi-Racial subgroups than within other subgroups.

The District's Exhibit 26 internally reported TAG student identification data regarding students in historically underrepresented and underserved groups indicate trends that are consistent with the data reported to the ODE.
- The White subgroup shows the most TAG nominations and identifications.
- The multi-racial (Two or More) subgroup shows the next highest number of TAG identifications and identifications.

The District's TAG Director reported that is a new data collection begun at her request to get more details about nominations "and so that we could have conversations with facilitators and administrators regarding nominations." The investigator commends the District for beginning that data collection. It should continue that collection and take necessary actions to ensure the data inform nominations and identifications of historically underrepresented or underserved students consistent with OAR 581-022-2325(2).

At least one internal data report did not include certain District schools. The District's TAG Director reported she would research that and make necessary corrections. The District should ensure its internal TAG data reports account for all eligible District schools across all grade levels and types.

The District's internal TAG nomination and identification data did not include results for its in-district and community based alternative education programs. The District and ODE should clarify if and how the District should include students attending those programs in its TAG programs, services, and reports. The District should then inform administrators, teachers, and parents about any TAG services available to its students in those programs.

Word and phrase searches did not find eligible District sponsored charter schools in the data report samples. The District and ODE should clarify how TAG data from eligible District sponsored charter schools are included in the District's external and internal TAG data reports. (An eligible charter school's charter contract includes TAG services.)

General trends in the District's internal data were consistent with data from school visits and surveys of administrators and teachers.
- High schools and middle schools reported fewer nominations and identifications within their clusters. Some report significantly fewer.
- Some elementary schools within clusters reported significantly fewer or significantly more nominations or identifications than others within the same cluster. One school reported no nominations or identifications.
- The intellectually gifted category received significantly fewer nominations.

The district should look for reporting patterns and other data to detect needs for information, trainings, processes, or other supports that ensure effective nomination and identification services among all schools and nomination categories consistent with OAR 581-022-2325.

School districts may identify additional students who are talented and gifted as defined in ORS 343.395, as determined by local district policies and procedures, if the students demonstrate outstanding creative or leadership ability or ability in the visual or performing arts. (OAR 581-022-2325(3))

*Finding*

The District's TAG Policy 6.10.015-P does not address the OAR 581-022-2325(3) identifications. The OAR gives districts the option to include those identification categories, or not.

See Part 4 of the report for more information about the OAR 581-022-2325 findings.

**OAR 581-022-2500, Programs and Services for Talented and Gifted Students**

<u>The District's</u> Written plan for Programs and Services Beyond Those Normally Provided by the Regular School Program (OAR 581-022-2500(1-3))

*Finding*

The District's Exhibit 28 revised and current TAG plan is consistent with OAR 581-022-2500(1-3).
- The revised and current plan describes programs and services beyond those the District normally provides, and was submitted to and accepted by the ODE in the required format.
- It includes:
    - A statement of the District's Policy 6.10.015-P, Talented and Gifted Education. However, the 6.10.015-P version at page 1 of the written plan does not match the version on the District's Website at https://www.pps.net/cms/lib/OR01913224/Centricity/Domain/4814/6.10.015-P.pdf . The written plan version includes the TAG Potential to Perform Category; the Website version does not. The policy adoption and amended dates are the same in both versions. The District should determine which version is accurate and correct the one that is not.
    - An assessment of current TAG programs and services provided by the district for TAG students.
    - A statement of the District's goals for providing comprehensive special programs, the services to be provided, and a span of time for the District to achieve those goals.
    - A description of the programs and services to be provided to accomplish the goals written plan's goals.
    - A plan for evaluating progress on each component of the district's plan.

<u>Instruction provided to identified students shall be designed to accommodate their assessed levels of learning and accelerated rates of learning</u>. (OAR 581-022-2500(4))

*General Finding*

The District does not provide appropriate rate and level instruction for most of its TAG students most of the time.

*Findings from Classroom Visits*

During classroom visits by the ODE's TAG specialist accompanied by school and district staff, across all grade ranges K-12,
- 13.95% of observed classes met rate and level instruction requirements;
- 1.38% almost met;
- 83.23% did not; and
- 1.45% were ineligible for observation because they were taking exams.

That result is consistent with this statement at page 11 of the Exhibit 3 May 2019 letter from the District's Senior Director of College and Career Readiness in response to Appellant's complaint: "[T]here is not a system-wide approach to instructional practices for talented and gifted students in classrooms across Portland Public Schools. Targeted TAG instructional practices vary by campus and teacher. In 2019, PPS will again self-report being out of compliance in the Division 22 area of meeting rate and level of TAG students in the instructional setting."

During the majority of classroom visits students were either in whole group instruction or doing the same assignment without observable differentiation. Students were rarely doing tiered option or other activities at challenge levels that adequately met rate and level requirements.

Across grades K-5, an average of 11% of teachers reported they did not apply rate and level practices. In grades 6-8, 36.9% of teachers reported that. In grades 9-12, none reported that. The District should ensure all certified staff understand and carry out their TAG OAR and district policy obligations to provide rate and level instruction and other services for TAG identified students.

Across and within grade ranges, teachers reported using a wide variety of information sources to determine a student's rate and level of learning. Some reported using more than one. That is inconsistent with evidence from the classroom observations.

Seating practices reported or observed involving TAG identified students during the classroom visits were seldom consistent with the District's best practices advice provided at FAQ 17 on its Talented and Gifted FAQs page at https://www.pps.net/Page/13106. The District should ensure certified staff understand and implement the District's recommended best practice as needed to provide rate and level instruction consistent with OAR 581-022-2500(4).

Though the TAG OAR do not require them, the District provided evidence parents can request individual TAG plans for their TAG identified students. That is a commendable and valuable option for providing appropriate rate and level instruction. However, large majorities of teachers reported parents do not request individualized plans, and that they do not have students with those plans. It is not clear how the District informs parents about individual TAG plans and how to request them. The District should take actions to ensure parents of TAG identified students get that information.

*Findings from Course Syllabi Examples*

Exhibit 22 is a copy provided by the District of two course syllabi. One dated 2019 is titled Freshman Syllabus Lit and Comp. English 1 & 2. The Class Structure section includes statements possibly intended to indicate differentiation or rate and level of learning. Information from an administrator's pre-observation meeting with the teacher, classroom observation, and debrief focused on those two topics might have confirmed that.

- As a group, we will reflect a number of different learning styles; some students will have identified educational needs (emphasis in original) . . . and my design for your lessons will reflect this.
- Many activities will be project-based learning. You will have time to work on your own, in pairs, and in small groups, developing a variety of personal and interpersonal skills.
- You can help me by letting me know your strengths and challenges, and by telling me how you would like me to help you grow.

The other syllabus is titled Physics 1-2 8th Grade Science. The description begins, "Physics 1-2: NGSS is an introductory high school science course that will focus on developing students' understanding of fundamental scientific knowledge, their ability to think like scientists, and creating arguments from evidence." The District might have provided this syllabus to show offering a high school class to students in eighth grade indicates TAG rate and level instruction. However, the syllabus describes unit topics and tasks for all students. The course title and description alone are not evidence of rate and level instruction.

*Findings from Surveys of Administrators, Teachers, and Parents*

**Administrators**

The teacher administrator results are inconsistent with the classroom visits result indicating 83.23% of the observed classes did not meet rate and level instruction requirements. Administrators generally reported more familiarity or skill with rate and level instructional strategies than were evident during the classroom visits. The District should take actions to ensure administrators are trained in and able to help their schools implement TAG rate and level instructional strategies.

Large majorities of administrators reported they had received researched-based trainings in identifying TAG students, in recognizing students TAG characteristics, and in meeting their social and emotional needs.

An 81% majority reported they had provided their staff training on TAG students profiles and characteristics. A 54.7% majority had provided staff training in meeting the social and emotional needs of gifted students. A 57.1% majority reported having special programs or services for TAG students in their schools.

Administrators surveyed reported receiving and providing trainings in a variety of instructional strategies. The strategies with highest response rates include flexible grouping, differentiated instruction, and high level questioning strategies.

Most administrators surveyed rated their expertise intermediate or higher in every strategy listed in the survey. Highest rated strategies include Flexible Grouping, High Level Questioning, Differentiated Instruction, and Formative Assessment as a Process. Differentiated instruction received one of the highest ratings among all strategies included in the survey.

A 61.3% majority of administrators surveyed expected teachers to document rate and level instruction in their gradebooks; 33.9% reported using other methods such as electronic files, parent conferences, TAG planning forms and lesson plans.

A 70.3% majority of surveyed administrators reported teachers review and adjust TAG instructional plans as needed; 34.4% responded teachers do that yearly. A 65.1% majority administrators reported they review and monitor TAG instructional plans; 34.9% the TAG facilitator or someone else does that.

**Teachers**

The teacher survey results are inconsistent with the classroom visits result indicating 83.23% of the observed classes did not meet rate and level instruction requirements. Teachers generally reported more familiarity or skill with rate and level instructional strategies than were evident during the classroom visits. The District should take actions to ensure teachers are trained in and able to implement TAG rate and level instructional strategies.

Teachers' most reported information sources used to determine students' rates and levels of learning were samples of student work, daily observations, formative assessments, students' demonstrations and presentations, and students' input and self-assessment.

Responses indicate 70% or more of teachers surveyed were familiar with differentiated instruction, high level questioning, flexible grouping, individualized instruction, formative assessment, identification of gifted students, and use of extensions. Fewer (58% or less) were familiar with compacting curriculum, Socratic method, student agency and Webb's Depth of Knowledge.

Survey results show 92.2% of teachers who responded had received training in differentiated instruction. Other strategies earned lower response rates.

Majorities (>50%) of teaches surveyed rated themselves intermediate or higher in each instructional strategy listed in the survey except for compacting curriculum, Socratic method, student agency, and Webb's Depth of Knowledge. The highest rated strategies included differentiated instruction.

Most teachers reported using their grade books or a student file to document instruction provided to TAG-identified students' rates and levels.

Surveyed teachers reported the most often used method to meet the TAG students' academic needs was by a teacher in a regular classroom. A next most often used was small groups which included other "highly able" students.

Of 634 surveyed teachers surveyed, 624 responded they were familiar with differentiated instruction. Those survey results are inconsistent with the classroom visits results showing a majority did not meet rate and level instruction during the visits.

**Parents**

The parent survey responses are consistent with the classroom visits result indicating 83.23% of the observed classes did not meet rate and level instruction requirements.

An 18.7% minority of parents surveyed agreed or strongly agreed they knew what learning evidence and information the teacher uses about their student to plan for rate and level of instruction. A 63.8% majority disagreed or strongly disagreed, and17.5% neither agreed nor disagreed.

An 11% minority agreed or strongly agreed classroom teachers use their children's TAG plans to meet student's rates and levels of learning on a consistent basis, and 30% neither agreed nor disagreed. A 59% majority disagreed or strongly disagreed.

A 29% minority agreed or strongly agreed their students' academic and/or intellectual needs are being met, and 25% neither agreed nor disagreed. A plurality of 46% disagreed or strongly disagreed.

A 27% minority agreed or strongly agreed their students' academic and/or intellectual needs are met daily through classroom instruction, and 28% neither agreed nor disagreed. A plurality of 45% disagreed or strongly disagreed.

When asked how students' academic needs are met at school, of a variety of choices, 66.7% of parents chose "In the regular classroom by their classroom teachers." Other options received lower response rates.

Parents' volunteered comments that TAG students' educational needs are not met at the District's schools outnumbered comments that students' needs are met. The District should review all parents' volunteered comments to inform its plans and actions to improve its TAG services.

*Findings from Information on the District's TAG Webpages*

The District's TAG Definitions Webpage at https://www.pps.net/Page/7932 states students identified TAG and students identified TAG potential "will receive TAG services." The page announces, "At this time, TAG services center primarily within each student's classroom. We encourage each school to provide differentiated curriculum and opportunities that would promote the following," then lists eleven items. One of those is "Learning experiences of students are relevant, engaging and at their rate and level." That is an encouraging signal that the District intends to provide instruction consistent with OAR 581-022-2500. However, evidence from classroom observations and surveys indicates the District has not yet achieved that result.

The District's Accelerated Pathways page at https://www.pps.net/Page/2885 stated "Due to current circumstances, all SGA [Single Grade Acceleration] and WGA [Whole Grade Acceleration] applications and testing are on hold. We will keep you informed as processes are determined and updated." A link on that page titled Accelerated Learners, Definitions, is to an undated document attributed to the ODE titled Talented and Gifted Learners, Best Practices to Maximize Student Learning at https://www.pps.net/cms/lib/OR01913224/Centricity/Domain/196/Accelerated_Learners_Definitions.pdf. It states acceleration "is access to higher level activities and skill development. Acceleration is addressed through pacing, complexity, and depth of the planned course work. Acceleration means moving at a faster pace though academic content." As it returns to in-person instruction and normal order, the District should implement its acceleration options for TAG students consistent with the TAG OAR on identification and programs and services.

The District's Talented and Gifted FAQ's page at https://www.pps.net/Page/13106 includes definitions of "rate of learning" (FAQ 15) and "level of learning" (FAQ 16). It would be helpful to have the source citations for those definitions. A total of 33 TAG FAQs are listed on that page. The District should periodically review them for accuracy.

*Findings from Training Materials Provided by the District*

With its September 2019 response to the ODE's acceptance of Appellants appeal, the District provided the Exhibits 12-A and 12-B training materials dated for the 2018-2019 and 2019-2020 school years. Topics include Talented and Gifted Rate & Level Professional Development and Differnting [sic] for Gifted Learners. Evidence gathered during the investigation indicates the trainings were not implemented consistently or with fidelity.

The District also provided copies of unredacted sign-in sheets for a January 2019 rate and level training. They represented a minority of the District's schools. It is not clear if the District eventually presented that rate and level training to all of its schools. The District should take actions to ensure each school's staff receives rate and level training consistent with the TAG OAR and the district's TAG policies and procedures.

Assessments for the development of an appropriate academic instructional program shall include the information used by the team for identification purposes and also may include one or more of the following: (OAR 581-022-2500(5)(a-d)).

*General Finding*

A random review of ten TAG Building Plans found their plans to assess the development of academic programs included sources of information used for the purpose of identifying TAG students. However, it is not clear if or how schools use that information because few of the Building Plans included a team to implement the use of identification information.

*Findings from TAG Building Plans*

The TAG OAR do not require the District's TAG Building Plans linked for each school at https://www.pps.net/Page/2598. The Building Plans contain information relevant to OAR 581-022-2500(5). The investigator reviewed ten randomly selected examples for information regarding plans for providing rate and level differentiated instruction and assessing student growth. All plans had relevant focus areas such as TAG Services, which includes categories such as strategies and structures to deliver rate and level instruction, using data to measure TAG students' growth, and ways students can access courses or experiences beyond what is typically available at the school. The plans also include sections describing relevant professional development and methods the principal uses to ensure "the use of differentiated strategies, rigorous and relevant coursework, and instruction provided at the appropriate rate and level."

The District's TAG Director and various TAG Teachers on Special Assignment (TOSAs) reported the TAG identification process includes several data sources consistent with OAR 581-022-2500(5), including behavioral evidence checklists, parent checklists, work samples, and assessment results. However, there was little evidence that schools formed and used OAR 581-022-2500(5) TAG teams to use that information.

Seven of ten plans reviewed did not mention or describe a TAG team. That indicates widespread inconsistencies with the OAR 581-022-2500 (5) and 581-022-2325(2) requirements regarding a TAG team and its responsibilities. If the District's procedure is to form school level TAG teams, it should take necessary actions to ensure its schools establish, operate, and maintain TAG teams consistent with the OAR. For example, each building TAG plan could include a section naming the standing TAG nomination team by position title, with ad hoc members included as needed depending on the student being considered to TAG eligibility. If the District's procedure is to have one or more TAG teams formed at school cluster or district levels, then it should make that clear to all stakeholders and operate the teams consistent with TAG OAR.

On all ten plans reviewed, lines for submission and review dates, initials, or signatures were blank. If the District uses a process to review building TAG plans and makes the plans available to the public, it should publish the submission dates and indicate who, by title if not by name, submitted, reviewed, and approved them.

See Part 5 of the report for more information about the OAR 581-022-2500 findings.


**OAR 581-022-2330, Rights of Parents of TAG Students**

Inform parents at the time of the identification of the child and the programs and services available. (581-022-2330(1))

*General Finding*

There is no evidence of a procedure to ensure parents get that information at the time a child is TAG identified.

*Findings from Classroom Visits*

There is no information from classroom visits specific to OAR 581-022-2330(1).

*Findings from Surveys of Administrators, Teachers, and Parents*

**Administrators**

There were no survey prompts or volunteered comments specific to OAR 581-022-2330.

**Teachers**

There were no survey prompts or volunteered comments specific to OAR 581-022-2330(1).

**Parents**

There were no survey prompts or volunteered comments specific to OAR 581-022-2330(1).

Findings from Information on the District's TAG Webpages

A scan of the District's TAG FAQs titles at https://www.pps.net/Page/13106 did not find FAQs that directly address parents' OAR 581-022-2330(1) right to information.

The Welcome to the TAG Parent Page! at https://www.pps.net/Page/3884 includes links to a PPS TAG Parent Information Fall 2020 PowerPoint presentation in English, Chinese, Russian, Somali, Spanish, and Vietnamese. There are no slides specific to parents' rights under OAR 581-022-2330(1).

*Findings from Training and Other Materials Provided by the District*

The training and other materials covered TAG nominations and related materials but not OAR 581-022-2330(1).

*Findings from TAG Building Plans*

All ten randomly selected plans included a Communication focus area that addressed methods for communicating with parents and families. Non addressed OAR 581-022-2330(1).


Provide an opportunity for the parents to provide input to and discuss with the district the programs and services to be received by their child. (OAR 581-022-2330(2))

*General Finding*

There are plans in place for parents to provide input about and discuss their students' TAG services with District staff, but most parents surveyed responded there are actually few if any opportunities to do that.

*Findings from Classroom Visits*

On average, teachers reported that when they did discuss TAG plans with families, they most often did that either during fall conferences or at the beginning of the year with ongoing communications after that.

Most teachers across grade levels reported either the parent or the teacher initiated discussions about students' TAG plans. The exception was in grades 6-8, where teachers mostly reported teachers initiated those conversations.

*Findings from Surveys of Administrators, Teachers, and Parents*

**Administrators**

There were no survey prompts or volunteered comments specific to OAR 581-022-2330.

**Teachers**

An 84.2% majority reported they conferenced with parents of TAG students regarding students' learning in a meeting, by phone or through email as needed. Fewer, 32.7%, reported they conferenced at the beginning of the year. Weekly, monthly, quarterly, twice a year, and end of the year conferences with TAG parents occurred at significantly lower rates.

**Parents**

A small minority of parents surveyed agreed or strongly agreed they could frequently or often discuss and develop their student's TAG plans with the teacher. A small minority also agreed or strongly agreed they were frequently or often informed about the TAG student's progress. Large majorities of responses included those who disagreed or strongly disagreed or who neither agreed nor disagreed.

Minorities of parents surveyed agreed or strongly agreed
- they were frequently or often given the opportunity to discuss and develop their student's TAG plan with the teacher.
- they were frequently or often informed about their student's progress.
- they could easily arrange to discuss TAG concerns with their student's teacher, principal, building representative, or District administrator.
- if they address concerns specific to TAG services/classroom instruction (e.g. differentiation, acceleration, rate and level instructional practices, etc.) with their student's teacher, the teacher explains how the student's academic and/or intellectual needs are being met in the classroom.

Majorities of responses included those who disagreed or strongly disagreed with those statements or who neither agreed nor disagreed.

A theme from parents' volunteered comments is there are few if any staff/parent communications

*Findings from Information on the District's TAG Webpages*

A scan of the District's TAG FAQs titles at https://www.pps.net/Page/13106 did not find FAQs that directly address parents' OAR 581-022-2330 rights. The text FAQ 33 directs parents with questions at TAG to contact a school's TAG facilitator.

The Welcome to the TAG Parent Page! at https://www.pps.net/Page/3884 includes links to a PPS TAG Parent Information Fall 2020 PowerPoint presentation in English, Chinese, Russian, Somali, Spanish, and Vietnamese. There are no slides specific to parents' rights under OAR 581-022-2330(1).

*Findings from Training and Other Materials Provided by the District*

The training and other materials covered TAG nominations and related materials but not OAR 581-022-2330(2).

*Findings from TAG Building Plans*

Each of the ten randomly selected plans included a Communication focus area that addressed methods such as these for communicating with parents and families.
- A TAG bulletin board for parents maintained by the TAG Facilitator or by
- Communications through methods such as fall TAG parent meetings, school or teacher newsletters, blogs,
- Methods for families to evaluate the school's TAG services such as through parent meetings, conferences with teachers, informal meetings with the principal,
- Methods for parents to communicate concerns, such as through conferences with teachers or direct communications to a teacher, the TAG facilitator, the school administrator, or the District. One school did not provide any methods for parents to do that.

The TAG Building Plan form included a statement that, at a parent conference, the parent signs a form that the parent had an opportunity to provide input into and review the school's plan for meeting a student's rate and level of learning.

The parents may, at any time, request the withdrawal of their child from programs and services provided under OAR 581-022-2330. The school district shall notify parents of identified students of this right. (OAR 581-022-2330(3))

*General Finding*

A minority of parents surveyed agreed or strongly agreed they were aware of their rights to withdraw students from the District's TAG services and programs, and there is little if any attempt to inform parents about that right.

*Findings from Classroom Visits*

There is no information from classroom visits specific to OAR 581-022-2330(3).

*Findings from Surveys of Administrators, Teachers, and Parents*

**Administrators**

There were no survey prompts or volunteered comments specific to OAR 581-022-2330.

**Teachers**

There were no survey prompts or volunteered comments specific to OAR 581-022-2330(3).

**Parents**

A 33% minority agreed or strongly agreed they were aware of their rights to withdraw students from the District's TAG services and programs.

*Findings from Information on the District's TAG Webpages*

A scan of the District's TAG FAQs titles at https://www.pps.net/Page/13106 did not find FAQs that directly address parents' OAR 581-022-2330 rights. The text FAQ 33 directs parents with questions at TAG to contact a school's TAG facilitator.

The Welcome to the TAG Parent Page! at https://www.pps.net/Page/3884 includes links to a PPS TAG Parent Information Fall 2020 PowerPoint presentation in English, Chinese, Russian, Somali, Spanish, and Vietnamese. There are no slides specific to parents' rights under OAR 581-022-2330(3).

*Findings from Training and Other Materials Provided by the District*

The training and other materials covered TAG nominations and related materials but not OAR 581-022-2330(3).

*Findings from TAG Building Plans*

The ten randomly reviewed TAG building plans did not address OAR 581-022-2330(3).

Parents shall be informed of their right to file a complaint under OAR 581-002-0001 to OAR 581-002-0023. (OAR 581-022-2330(4))

*General Finding*

A small minority of parents surveyed agreed or strongly agreed they were aware of their right to file such a complaint, and information about that from the District is limited, difficult to find, and in one source inconsistent with the TAG OAR.

*Findings from Classroom Visits*

There is no information from classroom visits specific to OAR 581-022-2330(4).

*Findings from Surveys of Administrators, Teachers, and Parents*

**Administrators**

There were no survey prompts or volunteered comments specific to OAR 581-022-2330.

**Teachers**

There were no survey prompts or volunteered comments specific to OAR 581-022-2330(4)

**Parents**

An 18.1% minority agreed or strongly agreed they had been informed about their rights to file a complaint with the district and how to file a formal complaint. A 58.7% majority disagreed or strongly disagreed, and 23.2% neither agreed nor disagreed.

*Findings from Information on the District's TAG Webpages*

The District's Board Policy 4.50.032-P, Formal Complaints, at https://www.pps.net/cms/lib/OR01913224/Centricity/Domain/4814/4.50.032-P.pdf includes a link to OAR 581-022-2370, which describes a complainant's right to appeal a district's final decision to the Deputy Superintendent of Public Instruction under OAR 581-002-0001 to 0023. That gives parents of TAG identified students a technically actual but not easily accessible notice of their right under those OAR.

The Webpage on TAG identification and testing at https://www.pps.net/Page/1546 provides links to a document titled A Parent's Guide to the Appeals Process and to a form titled PPS Appeals Form Department of Talented and Gifted. It appears the documents only allow appeals of assessment scores. The Guide begins, "Families of students, who have been deemed ineligible for services and or do not agree with assessment scores, may appeal the decision in some circumstances." It gives parents instructions on how and when to make their appeal and what to provide. Among the items a parent could provide are teachers' written comments, evidence of exceptionally high quality classroom work, and information about a child's cultural and linguistic needs.
- The appeal process does not include any references to the OAR 581-022-2325(2) behavioral, learning, and other research based sources districts shall use when determining TAG identifications.
- The appeal process does not mention or include the involvement of the TAG team referenced in both OAR 581-022-2325 and OAR 581-022-2500.

*Findings from Training and Other Materials Provided by the District*

The training and other materials covered TAG nominations and related materials but not OAR 581-022-2330(4).

*Findings from TAG Building Plans*

The ten randomly reviewed TAG building plans did not address OAR 581-022-2330(4).

See Part 6 of the report for more information about the OAR 581-022-2330 findings.

**PART 4: STUDENT NOMINATIONS and IDENTIFICATIONS for TAG ELIGIBILITY –
FINDINGS and ADDITIONAL INFORMATION**

Appellant's Complaint

In the Exhibit 1 complaint to the District, Appellant alleges "The district did make efforts to improve student identification, but the problems indicated in the [District's TAG] plan, such as the lack of a system-wide approach to identify special education or English-language learning students remain unresolved." (Ibid., p.6.)

Scope of This Investigation

The Exhibit 10 copy of the ODE's August 21, 2019, letter to Appellant and the District accepting Appellant's appeal defines the overall scope of this investigation. "[T]he Oregon Department of Education will investigate the following: Is Portland Public Schools in compliance with Oregon standards of instruction that apply to talented and gifted (TAG) students?"

The Exhibit 23 copy of the ODE TAG Specialist's February 3, 2020 email to parents of TAG-identified students further clarifies the subjects for this investigation, "The Oregon Department of Education is conducting an investigation specific to Talented and Gifted identification practices, rights of parents, and programs and services in Portland Public Schools."

**OAR 581-022-2325, Identification of Academically Talented and Intellectually Gifted Students**

OAR 581-022-2325 is at https://secure.sos.state.or.us/oard/viewSingleRule.action?ruleVrsnRsn=145311. The full text is below for reference.

1) Each school district shall have local district policies and procedures for the identification of talented and gifted students as defined in ORS 343.395 who demonstrate outstanding ability or potential in one or more of the following areas:
(a) General intellectual ability as commonly measured by measures of intelligence and aptitude.
(b) Unusual academic ability in one or more academic areas.
(2) The policies and procedures must meet the following requirements:
(a) Districts shall use research based best practices to identify students from underrepresented populations including: ethnic minorities, students with disabilities, students who are culturally and/or linguistically diverse, or economically disadvantaged.
(b) A team shall make the final decisions on the identification of students using the information collected under paragraphs (c) and (d) of this section. No single test, measure or score shall be the sole criterion. A record of the team's decision, and the data used by the team to make the decision, shall become part of the education record for each student considered.
(c) Districts shall collect behavioral, learning and performance information and include the information in all procedures for the identification of students.
(d) The following measures and criteria for identifying the intellectually gifted and the academically talented shall be used by the team:
(A) Intellectually gifted students shall score at or above the 97th percentile on a nationally standardized test of mental ability; and
(B) Academically talented students shall score at or above the 97th percentile on a test of total reading or a test of total mathematics from a nationally standardized test battery, a nationally standardized test of reading or mathematics, or a test of total English Language Arts/Literacy or total mathematics on the Smarter Balanced Assessment.

(e) Despite a student's failure to qualify under paragraphs (d) (A) and (B) of this subsection, districts, by local policies and procedures, shall identify students who demonstrate the potential to perform at the 97th percentile.

(3) School districts may identify additional students who are talented and gifted as defined in ORS 343.395, as determined by local district policies and procedures, if the students demonstrate outstanding ability or potential in one or more of the following areas:

(a) Creative ability in using original or nontraditional methods in thinking and producing.

(b) Leadership ability in motivating the performance of others either in educational or non-educational settings.

(c) Ability in the visual or performing arts, such as dance, music or art.

Statutory/Other Authority: ORS 343.391 - 343.413

Statutes/Other Implemented: ORS 326.051

Findings regarding OAR 581-022-2325 and details related to those findings are in sections below.

Each school district shall have local district policies and procedures for the identification of talented and gifted students as defined in ORS 343.395 who demonstrate outstanding ability or potential. (OAR 581-022-2325(1))

See Part 9, DISTRICT'S TAG POLICY

Districts shall use research based best practices to identify students from underrepresented populations including: ethnic minorities, students with disabilities, students who are culturally and/or linguistically diverse, or economically disadvantaged. (OAR 581-022-2325(2)(a)).

*General Finding*

During the 2019-2020 school year the District implemented a new data collection specific to nominations of students from historically underserved populations. The investigator commends the District for beginning that data collection. It should continue that collection and take necessary actions to ensure the data from that collection and other sources inform and improve the District's nominations and identifications of historically underrepresented or underserved students consistent with OAR 581-022-2325(2).

*Findings from Classroom Visits*

Teachers reported the District was a major source of nominations, especially in grades 3-8. A high reliance on assessment scores signifies the District should take steps to ensure all schools are in compliance with OAR 581-022-2325(2) requirements regarding uses of "research based best practices to identify students from underrepresented populations," school teams to "make the final decisions on the identification of students," and inclusions of "behavioral, learning and performance information . . . in all procedures for the identification of students."

Noticeable percentages of teachers across grade ranges reported or volunteered comments that they did not understand the TAG nomination process. That indicates the District needs to determine if that is true and, if it is, take consistent and regular actions to ensure teachers understand and implement nomination processes consistent with the OAR and District policies and procedures.

Findings from Surveys of Administrators, Teachers, and Parents

**Administrators**

The survey did not generate responses specific to identifying students from underrepresented or historically underserved populations.

Administrators' volunteered comments indicate needs for trainings in recognizing, identifying and serving TAG students generally. The District should take necessary actions to ensure administrators continue to receive those PD or trainings and implement the information gained from them.

Administrators' volunteered comments indicate needs for recognizing, identifying and serving TAG students generally.

**Teachers**

The survey did not include prompts specific to identifying students from underrepresented or historically underserved populations.

Teachers' volunteered comments indicate needs for the District to provide PD or trainings in identifying and nominating students for TAG eligibility. The District should take necessary actions to ensure teachers continue to receive those PD or trainings and implement the information gained from them.

Some volunteered comments expressed a need to address general equity issues. The District should review teachers' volunteered comments to help inform implementation of its TAG nomination and identification services.

**Parents**

The survey did not include prompts specific to identifying students from underrepresented or historically underserved populations.

Some volunteered comments expressed concerns about equity in TAG programs and services, including nominations and identifications of students. The District should review parents' volunteered comments to help inform implementation of its TAG nomination and identification services.


*Finding from Information on the District's Webpages*

TAG FAQ 27 on the District's Webpage at https://www.pps.net/Page/13106 states, "What about the schools that have historically underserved populations?" The response is "The TAG Department actively monitors schools who [sic] have historically underserved populations and supports the TAG facilitator and the school to notify families of good candidates for TAG. Professional development is also given to facilitators to help identify students." The District's recent adoption of the data collection described in the general finding above indicates a need to improve identifications of TAG students in historically underserved populations. TAG facilitators and schools might have key roles in making those improvements.

*Finding from Training Materials Provided by the District*

The District provided copies of the example materials below either with its Exhibit 11 September 2019 written response to the ODE's acceptance of Appellant's appeal or later on request. The materials included Exhibit 14, a copy of an agenda titled TAG Facilitators Meeting dated March 14, 2019, and of documents titled Supplemental Behavior Rating Scale, PPS Talented and Gifted Educator Guide to Identification Process, and High Potential Culturally, Linguistically, and Economically Diverse Learner: Teacher Rating Scales. The agenda includes ways to identify students from diverse cultural, ethnic, and linguistic backgrounds who have TAG potential but are not identified by traditional methods.

The District also submitted Exhibit 15, a copy of a document titled An Educator's Guide: Gifted and Talented English Language Learners. It appears relevant to a March 14, 2019, agenda item: "support of ESL Dept [sic] and identification of ESL students for TAG."

When asked who monitors the use of the CLED scale and resources for identifying characteristics of gifted ELL students, the TAG Director reported, "The classroom teacher would be the one that sees students day-to-day. "The TAG facilitator provides PD to teachers in the building regarding this. Principals must provide the time for facilitators to present PD. Administrators and other educators will access . . . the modules for this training this year through CDL." The District should use information from its new Exhibit 26 data collection described at page 45 and from other sources to monitor how effectively the District implements trainings such as those described above and to inform necessary improvement plans and actions.

*Findings from TAG Building Plans*

The TAG OAR do not require the District's TAG Building Plans linked for each school at https://www.pps.net/Page/2598. The Building Plans contain information relevant to OAR 581-022-2325. The investigator reviewed ten randomly selected examples for information regarding the identification and nomination of students for TAG eligibility. The ten building TAG plans randomly reviewed for this investigation lacked research based reasons for the methods used to identify students from underrepresented populations. To help satisfy the OAR 581-022-2325(2) requirement that "Districts shall use research based best practices to identify students from underrepresented populations," the plans should include a research citation or a phrase explaining why the school chose a particular method.

*Findings from TAG Nomination and Identification Data Reported by the District*

The Exhibit 25 TAG student identification data reported by the District to the ODE for the 2018-2019 school year indicate a significantly and proportionally higher percentage of TAG identified students within the White, Asian, and Multi-Racial subgroups than within each other subgroup.

Exhibit 26, last updated May 27, 2020, is an internal District report of TAG student nominations and identifications within demographic subgroups. It includes categories of students in historically underrepresented and underserved groups. The data trends are consistent with the data reported to the ODE.
- The White subgroup shows the most TAG nominations and identifications.
- The multi-racial (Two or More) subgroup shows the next highest number of TAG identifications and identifications.

The District's TAG Director reported that is a new data collection begun at her request "so that we could have conversations with facilitators and administrators regarding nominations." The investigator

commends the District for beginning that data collection. It should continue that collection and take necessary actions to ensure the data from that report and other sources inform and improve the District's nominations and identifications of historically underrepresented or underserved students consistent with OAR 581-022-2325(2).

A team shall make the final decisions on the identification of students using the information collected under paragraphs (c) and (d) of this section. No single test, measure or score shall be the sole criterion. A record of the team's decision, and the data used by the team to make the decision, shall become part of the education record for each student considered. (OAR 581-022-2325(2)(b-e).

*General Finding*

Seven of ten randomly selected TAG Building Plans reviewed did not mention or describe a TAG team. That indicates widespread inconsistencies with the OAR 581-022-2500 (5) and 581-022-2325(2) requirements regarding a TAG team and its responsibilities. If the District's procedure is to form school level TAG teams, it should take necessary actions to ensure its schools establish, operate, and maintain TAG teams consistent with the OAR. For example, each building TAG plan could name the standing TAG nomination team by position title, with ad hoc members included as needed depending on the student being considered to TAG eligibility. If the District's procedure is to have one or more TAG teams formed at school cluster or district levels, then it should make that clear to all stakeholders and operate the teams consistent with TAG OAR.

*Findings from Classroom Visits*

Teachers reported the District was a major source of nominations, especially in grades 3-8. One reason some teachers gave for not nominating students indicates they substantially relied on test results or other information provided by the District. A high reliance on assessment scores signifies the District should take actions to ensure all schools implement identifications of TAG students consistent with OAR 581-022-2325(2) requirements, including forming teams to make identification decisions based on performance, behavioral, and learning information and that do not rely on any single test or other measure.

Noticeable percentages of teachers across grade ranges reported or volunteered comments that they did not understand the TAG nomination process. Percentages of teachers reporting TAG nominations significantly declined after grades K-2. Those results indicate the District needs to take consistent and regular actions to ensure teachers understand and implement nomination processes consistent with the OAR and District policies and procedures.

Across grade ranges teachers reported using a variety of methods to identify TAG eligible students. A plurality reported using observed TAG characteristics. Work samples were the least used method. Given noticeable percentages of teachers report they do not understand the nominations process and that nominations by teachers decline after grades K-2, the District should help schools select and use the most effective methods for identifying and nominating students within grade ranges and provide necessary trainings and follow-up to ensure teachers identify and nominate students consistent with OAR 581-022-2325.

In grades K-2, 29.8% of teachers in a sample reported they did not nominate students for TAG eligibility because they did not believe in early identification in early grades; 52.7% in another sample volunteered comments that they did not believe in early identification; and 21.1% in that sample said they believed students would "level out" by third grade. The district should inform schools that compliance with OAR

581-022-2325 is not discretionary, clarify how TAG eligibility benefits students and schools, and support schools in carrying out effective and equitable methods to identify students for TAG eligibility.

*Findings from Surveys of Administrators, Teachers, and Parents*

**Administrators**

Majorities, but not all, of surveyed administrators responded they had received researched-based trainings in identifying TAG students, in recognizing students TAG characteristics, and in meeting their social and emotional needs. Majorities, but not all, also responded they provided their staffs trainings on those topics. Minorities of surveyed administrators reported they had received training in identifying and meeting the social and emotional needs of underachieving students or that they had provided their staffs trainings about that.

Administrators' volunteered comments indicate needs for those trainings . The District should take necessary actions to ensure administrators continue to receive those PD or trainings and implement the information gained from them.

**Teachers**

A significant 36% average of teachers surveyed reported having no TAG nominated students in their classes; 19.6% reported having no TAG identified students. The District should consider that result and take necessary actions to ensure teachers implement the District's processes for nominating and identifying students for TAG eligibility consistent with OAR 582-022-2325 and the District's policies and procedures.

Teachers volunteered comments indicate needs for the District to provide clarity about why TAG identification is important, expectations for students, and if and how TAG relates to kindergarten students and teachers. The comments also express a need for the District to provide PD or trainings in identifying and nominating students for TAG eligibility. The District should take necessary actions to ensure teachers continue to receive those PD or trainings and implement the information gained from them.

**Parents**

The District's TAG Director and various TAG Teachers on Special Assignment (TOSAs) reported the TAG identification process includes several data sources, including behavioral evidence checklists, parent checklists, work samples, and assessment results. A 54% majority of surveyed parents agreed or strongly agreed the District assessed their students for TAG identification in a variety of ways (e.g. testing, work samples, parent and teacher checklists/feedback). However, 25% disagreed or strongly disagreed; and 21% neither agreed nor disagreed. That split of opinion indicates the District should clarify for parents the variety of sources the OAR requires and the District uses to identify TAG students.

A 44% plurality of surveyed parents disagreed or strongly disagreed they understood their students' TAG identifications (Academically Talented Reading, Academically Talented Math, Intellectually Gifted, or Potential to Perform) and the available programs and services. That indicates the District should clarify for parents of TAG identified students the TAG meanings of identification categories and the benefits, programs, and services available in those categories.

*Findings from Information on the District's TAG Webpages*

At the time of this report, the District's TAG Webpage states "testing is paused due to Comprehensive Distance Learning. As more guidance is provided by the state, PPS will make decisions on testing."

In second grade, the NNAT3 test of intellectual ability given every student and the IOWA test for reading and mathematics available on request by a teacher or parent are consistent with OAR 581-022-2325 because they are nationally standardized.

The Oregon State Assessment System (OSAS) assessments and NWEA MAP for students in grades 3 and higher are also consistent with OAR 581-022-2325.

Prior to the COVID-19 school closures, the TAG Director reported the District fully implements the NNAT3, MAP, and OSAS assessments described on its Website.

The statement that the District only conducts TAG testing for District sponsored charter schools that have TAG in their charter is accurate. Oregon charter schools are not required to include TAG programs or services in their charter contracts. (ORS 338.115.)

The Webpage information is not consistent with OAR 581-022-2325 to the extent it does not address these OAR 581-022-2325(2) requirements.
- How the District "shall use research based best practices to identify students from underrepresented populations including: ethnic minorities, students with disabilities, students who are culturally and/or linguistically diverse, or economically disadvantaged."
- How a "team shall make the final decisions on the identification of students using the information collected under paragraphs (c) and (d) of this section."

The District's TAG Director and various TAG Teachers on Special Assignment (TOSAs) reported the TAG identification process includes several data sources, including behavioral evidence checklists, parent checklists, work samples, and assessment results. The Website should clarify how each District school will use those data sources to identify TAG students consistent with the OAR.

The Website should also clarify that each school has a TAG team, and the team's responsibilities. Webpages identifying each school's TAG facilitator should also list the school's TAG team membership by job titles.

The statement regarding "TAG potential" is not consistent with OAR 581-022-2325 because it states the District "may identify students who have potential to perform at high levels either in talent or giftedness." ORS 581-022-2325(2)(e) states "districts, by local policies and procedures, shall identify students who demonstrate the potential to perform at the 97th percentile." (Emphases added.) The District should clarify how it will implement the "shall identify" requirement.

The statement regarding "New to PPS?" is consistent with OAR 581-022-2325 because the OAR does not address students who transfer into at district, and because the statement allows that, if the student is not "previously identified or the documentation submitted [from the sending district] does not fit for PPS requirements for a transfer of TAG identification, you can complete a Nomination Form to have your child assessed for a PPS identification." However, some suggestions.

- If a student transfers to the District from another standard Oregon district, it is reasonable to assume the sending district's TAG policies and procedures comply with the TAG OAR. It is also reasonable to assume that if the sending district identified the transferring student as TAG in any

or all TAG categories, then the receiving district could, or should, recognize and accept that student as a TAG student without any further review or action by a parent or guardian.

- The District should consider revising its policies to grant TAG status to any student identified as TAG by a sending and standard Oregon district.
- The ODE should consider proposing amendments to OAR 581-022-2325 to say a student identified TAG in a standard Oregon district retains the same TAG status if and when the student transfers to and enrolls in any other Oregon district. A student identified TAG in a standard Oregon district should have the right to expect that other Oregon districts will recognize that identification.

The Welcome to the TAG Parent Page! at https://www.pps.net/Page/3884 includes links to a PPS TAG Parent Information Fall 2020 PowerPoint presentation in English, Chinese, Russian, Somali, Spanish, and Vietnamese. Two slides discuss the nomination categories and process. They focus on assessments but do not mention the other OAR 581-022-2325 sources of information or the involvement of a TAG team in the nomination and identification process.

*Findings from Training Materials Provided by the District*

The District's TAG Director and TAG facilitators who were available to interview before the COVID-19 school closures reported the District relies on a "train-the-trainer" model to provide TAG related professional development and trainings for school staff. TAG facilitators attend trainings, then are responsible to present the information learned to their school staffs.

The District provided copies of example materials either with its Exhibit 11 September 2019 written response to the ODE's acceptance of Appellant's appeal or later on request. They demonstrate facilitators had opportunities to receive trainings and materials in a variety of TAG subjects, including nominations and identifications of TAG students.

Consistent with OAR 581-022-2325, the trainings included methods for identifying and nominating students from underrepresented or historically underserved groups. Some materials were specific to "High Potential Culturally, Linguistically, and Economically Diverse Learner[s]."

Evidence from observations, surveys, and documents reviewed indicates inconsistent identifications and nominations of TAG students across the District. That suggests the effectiveness of "train the trainer" is also inconsistent.

TAG OAR do not require TAG facilitators or train-the-trainer staff development. If the District chooses the train-the-trainer method to deliver TAG-related information to schools and ensure compliance with OAR 581-022-2325, it should take necessary actions to ensure the trainers are trained, and that they train their school's staff.

*Findings from TAG Building Plans*

The TAG OAR do not require building level TAG plans. If the District chooses to implement building-level TAG plans, then it should ensure the plans are consistent with the TAG identification OAR.

The ten building TAG plans randomly reviewed for this investigation lacked research based reasons for the methods used to identify students from underrepresented populations. To help satisfy the OAR 581-022-2325(2) requirement that "Districts shall use research based best practices to identify students from underrepresented populations," the plans could include a research citation or a phrase explaining why the school chose a particular method.

Seven of ten plans reviewed did not mention or describe a TAG team. That indicates widespread inconsistencies with the OAR 581-022-2500 (5) and 581-022-2325(2) requirements regarding a TAG team and its responsibilities. If the District's procedure is to form school level TAG teams, it should take necessary actions to ensure its schools establish, operate, and maintain TAG teams consistent with the OAR. For example, each building TAG plan could include a section naming the standing TAG nomination team by position title, with ad hoc members included as needed depending on the student being considered to TAG eligibility. If the District's procedure is to have one or more TAG teams formed at school cluster or district levels, then it should make that clear to all stakeholders and operate the teams consistent with TAG OAR.

The District's TAG Director and various TAG Teachers on Special Assignment (TOSAs) reported the District's TAG identification process includes several data sources, including behavioral evidence checklists, parent checklists, work samples, and assessment results. The District should inform parents how TAG teams use those data sources to identify TAG students consistent with the OAR.

On all ten plans reviewed, lines for submission and review dates, initials, or signatures were blank. If the District uses a process to review TAG building plans, it should document the submission dates and individuals who submitted, reviewed, and approved them.

*Findings from TAG Nominations Data Reported by the District*

The Exhibit 25 TAG student identification data reported by the District to the ODE for the 2018-2019 school year indicate a significantly higher percentage of TAG identified students within the White, Asian, and Multi-Racial subgroups than within other subgroups.

The District's Exhibit 26 internally reported TAG student identification data regarding students in historically underrepresented and underserved groups indicate trends that are consistent with the data reported to the ODE.
- The White subgroup shows the most TAG nominations and identifications.
- The multi-racial (Two or More) subgroup shows the next highest number of TAG identifications and identifications.

The District's TAG Director reported that is a new data collection begun at her request to get more details about nominations "and so that we could have conversations with facilitators and administrators regarding nominations." The investigator commends the District for beginning that data collection. It should continue that collection and take necessary actions to ensure the data inform nominations and identifications of historically underrepresented or underserved students consistent with OAR 581-022-2325(2).

At least one internal data report did not include certain District schools. The District's TAG Director reported she would research that and make necessary corrections. The District should ensure its internal TAG data reports account for all eligible District schools across all grade levels and types.

The District's internal TAG nomination and identification data did not include results for its in-district and community based alternative education programs. The District and ODE should clarify if and how the District should include students attending those programs in its TAG programs, services, and reports. The District should then inform administrators, teachers, and parents about any TAG services available to its students in those programs.

Word and phrase searches did not find eligible District sponsored charter schools in the data report samples. The District and ODE should clarify how TAG data from eligible District sponsored charter

schools are included in the District's external and internal TAG data reports. (An eligible charter school's charter contract includes TAG services.)

General trends in the District's internal data were consistent with data from school visits and surveys of administrators and teachers.

- High schools and middle schools reported fewer nominations and identifications within their clusters. Some report significantly fewer.
- Some elementary schools within clusters reported significantly fewer or significantly more nominations or identifications than others within the same cluster. One school reported no nominations or identifications.
- The intellectually gifted category received significantly fewer nominations.

The district should look for reporting patterns and other data to detect needs for information, trainings, processes, or other supports that ensure effective nomination and identification services among all schools and nomination categories consistent with OAR 581-022-2325.

School districts may identify additional students who are talented and gifted as defined in ORS 343.395, as determined by local district policies and procedures, if the students demonstrate outstanding creative or leadership ability or ability in the visual or performing arts. (OAR 581-022-2325(3))

*Finding*

The District's TAG Policy 6.10.015-P does not address the OAR 581-022-2325(3) identifications. The OAR gives districts the option to include those identification categories, or not.

Below are underlined sections with additional information related to the findings above.

Classroom Visits Results

Results are from observations and comments made during the classroom visits held during the 2020-2021 school year. Part 7 of this report presents details about the visits and results. Percentages of teachers who responded to prompts are based on numbers of classroom visits, not on total teachers in the District. See the Part 7 tables for the numbers (N=) of teachers.

Summary Information from Classroom Visits

- The District was a major source of nominations, especially in grades 3-8.
- An average of 71.6% of teachers reported parents did not nominate students that year. Only 13% reported parents did make nominations.
- Parent nominations declined dramatically after grades K-2.
- Percentages of teachers reporting students were nominated for TAG declined after grades K-2.
- Noticeable percentages of teachers reported they were unsure about the nomination process.
- Across grade ranges, a plurality of teachers consistently reported using Observed TAG Characteristics to identify TAG eligible students. Other most used sources varied by grade ranges. Student Work Samples were the least used source.
- Reasons teachers reported for not nominating students varied by grade ranges. They could report more than one reason.

- In grades K-2, a 50% majority reported second grade screening identifies TAG students; 29.8% reported they did not believe in early identification; 23.4% reported did not have enough information to meet the District's then November nomination deadline.
- In grades 3-5, 98.6% of teachers responded they either did not have the District's test results or did not have other information they needed to meet the then November nomination deadline; 12.9% did not understand the nomination process.
- In grades 6-8, 91.7% of teachers responded they did not have the District's test results or did not have other information they needed to meet the November nomination deadline; 36.1% did not understand the identification process.
- In grades 9-12, 39.5% of teachers reported they did not have enough information. All classes were in CDL, which affected the ability to collect the data.
- Relevant themes from teachers' volunteered comments (grades 9-12 not included due to CDL).
  - Grades K-2.
    - Discouraged parents from moving forward with nominations.
    - Did not believe in early identification in either kindergarten or first grade.
    - Believed students would "level off" by third grade.
  - Grades 3-8.
    - Did not understand the identification process, especially grades 3-8.
    - Only saw TAG as a "score," especially grades 3-8.

Summaries of Survey Results: Administrators, Teachers, and Parents

Numbers of respondents varied depending on the group surveyed and on the instructions for a specific prompt. The survey gave respondents opportunities to make comments. Percentages are based on the numbers or administrators, teachers, and parents who responded to the survey, not on the total possible numbers of District administrators, teachers, or parents. Part 7 of this report presents survey details and tables including numbers surveyed (N=).

**Administrators**

- A majority represented grades K-8.
- A vast majority had been employed in their positions long enough to be familiar with the District's TAG policies, programs, and services.
- An average of 78% reported 1-5 TAG-nominated students per class in any category. Averages of 8.2% reported 6-10 such students per class; 2.7% reported 11-15; 0.5% reported more than 15; and 11% reported none.
- An average of 73% reported having 1-5 TAG-identified students per class in each category. Averages of 10% reported 6-10 such students per class; 0.8% reported 11-15; 2.9% reported more than 15; and 13% reported none per class.
- Large majorities of administrators had received researched-based trainings in identifying TAG students, in recognizing students TAG characteristics, and in meeting their social and emotional needs.
- A minority had received training in meeting the social and emotional needs of underachieving students.
- An 81% majority had provided their staff training on TAG students profiles and characteristics.
- A 54.7% majority had provided staff training in meeting the social and emotional needs of gifted students.
- A 37.5% minority had provided staff training in meeting the social and emotional needs of underachieving gifted students.
- Relevant volunteered comments.

- Administrators and teachers need more training on how to meet the needs of TAG students.
- We need more professional development and support for teachers to meaningfully support TAG learners.
- With our very diverse population and the number of languages spoken we feel it is vital to have continual ability to identify students.

## Teachers

- An 82.83% majority represented schools serving grades K-8, and an 88.6% majority identified as classroom teachers.
- A vast majority had been employed in their positions long enough to be familiar with the District's TAG policies, programs, and services.
- Most taught either in self-contained elementary classrooms or in general education subjects such as English-language arts, world languages, mathematics, health education, science or social science.
- A 66.1% majority reported they had TAG-identified students in their classrooms 6 or more years. Of the others, 18.1% reported having TAG students for 1-2 years, and 15.7% reported having those students for 3-5 years.
- An average of 60% reported 1-5 TAG-nominated students per class in any of the TAG categories; 36% reported having none. Averages of 3.45% reported 6-10 such students; 0.3% reported 11-15; and 0.6% reported more than 15.
- An average of 70% reported 1-5 TAG-identified students per class in any category; 19.6% reported none. Averages of 7.6% reported 6-10 such students; 1.4% reported 11-15; and 1.3% reported more than 15.
- Relevant themes from Individual Teachers' Volunteered Comments: See Part 8 for all comments.
  - Needs for clarification about why TAG identification is important and the expectations for students.
  - Needs for professional development or trainings in nominating or identifying students for TAG eligibility.
  - Clarifications about if and how TAG applies to kindergarten students and teachers.
  - Needs to address TAG equity issues.

## Parents

- A 79% majority of responses represented parents of students in grades K-8.
- A 54% majority agreed or strongly agreed the District assessed their students for TAG identification in a variety of ways (e.g. testing, work samples, parent and teacher checklists/feedback); 25% disagreed or strongly disagreed, and 21% neither agreed nor disagreed.
- A 44% plurality disagreed or strongly disagreed they understood their students' TAG identifications (Academically Talented Reading, Academically Talented Math, Intellectually Gifted, or Potential to Perform) and the available programs and services.
- Examples from Individual Parents' Volunteered Comments: See Part 8 for all comments.
  - I understand that our neighborhood school has bigger things to worry about than TAG kids, but I also think that the lack of understanding about TAG may lead to lower identification in this community.
  - Overall, [PPS] does not have tag services, only tag identification.
  - [The TAG coordinator] could not even provide a single example of how TAG identification might practically manifest in a classroom.

Information Currently Available on the District's TAG Webpages

TAG Parent Welcome Page![sic]

The Welcome to the TAG Parent Page! at https://www.pps.net/Page/3884 includes links to a PPS TAG Parent Information Fall 2020 PowerPoint presentation in English, Chinese, Russian, Somali, Spanish, and Vietnamese. One slide on TAG Law describes the requirements to identify TAG students and provide services. One slide encourages parents to discuss their child's learning; another encourages parents to not wait until November to do that. Two slides discuss the nomination categories and process. They focus on assessments but do not mention the other OAR 581-022-2325 sources of information or the involvement of a TAG team in the nomination and identification process.

Statement Under "Welcome to the PPS Talented and Gifted Website!" at https://www.pps.net/Page/986

> Generally, TAG is used when referring to a student who is identified as Talented and Gifted though pre-established identification procedures and criteria.

FAQs

These are examples of relevant FAQs on the District's Webpage at https://www.pps.net/Page/13106.
- FAQs 4-13 on the TAG identification process, including test scores.
- FAQ 27: "What about the schools that have historically underserved populations?" The response is "The TAG Department actively monitors schools who [sic] have historically underserved populations and supports the TAG facilitator and the school to notify families of good candidates for TAG. Professional development is also given to facilitators to help identify students."

Information Currently Available on the Districts TAG Identification and Testing Webpage at https://www.pps.net/Page/1546

"Currently, testing is paused due to Comprehensive Distance Learning. As more guidance is provided by the state, PPS will make decisions on testing."

There are specifics regarding identifications of 2nd grade students, students in other grades, and students in District-sponsored charter schools. Emphases are in the originals.

> 2nd Grade Universal NNAT - TBD due to COVID-19
> Portland Public Schools is testing every second grader in the district to screen for students who have high reasoning and problem-solving abilities. The NNAT3 (Naglieri Nonverbal Ability Test) is a culture-fair, nonverbal measure of reasoning and problem solving abilities. This test does not require English language skills or mathematics, instead consisting of problems that use a complex set of geometric shapes and designs. The NNAT3 assesses how your child does on things that are new to them.
> Please note that the process of TAG nomination for intellectual ability has not changed. All students will be tested in 2nd grade using the NNAT3. A teacher or parent can still request NNAT3 testing for a student at any other time.
>
> OSAS - TBD due to COVID-19
> The TAG Department has transitioned to using OSAS and NWEA MAP scores for students in 3rd grade and higher who are interested in testing for academic achievement in reading and math. Students in grades K-2 will still be given the IOWA achievement tests when a teacher or parent requests TAG testing for reading or math achievement

Prior to the COVID-19 school closures, the TAG Director reported the NNAT3, and MAP, and OSAS assessments are fully implemented.

Charter Schools
The PPS TAG department will no longer be TAG testing students that are not attending a Portland Public School. The exception is for a PPS Charter school with TAG specified in their charter. For information regarding Charter's please click here. (That is consistent with the OAR on charter schools.)

Information about identification of students with TAG potential is at https://www.pps.net/Page/7932

TAG Potential (official identification, students will receive TAG services)
Defined as a group of students who demonstrate an advanced or even exceptional ability in a particular area, and score between the 95th and 96th percentile. Through the use of an assessment tool and process, PPS may identify students who have potential to perform at high levels either in talent or giftedness. This definition of potential includes the intentional and substantive development of our students so their talents and gifts can be recognized, supported, and nurtured. The gifts and talents of our students are critical to the health and contribution to our society, and our community, and gives them hope and focus as productive citizens.

The District's TAG nomination and identification page at https://www.pps.net/Page/1546 describes nomination and identification processes subject to conditions related to the then current COVID-19 protocols. Emphases are in the originals.

NOMINATION FORMS 2020-2021 - Digital forms are now available from your school. Forms are due to your school by December 4th for possible TAG identification this year.  Please contact your school's TAG Facilitator or contact your child's teacher if you would like to nominate your child. The school will provide the digital form unique to your school.  Building TAG Facilitators can be found on our website under the "Parent" tab. (Emphases in the original)

A "TAG Nomination Forms by School" button on that page links to an alphabetical list of District Schools. Clicking a school name opens the online English language "TAG nomination – Parent/guardian form." The form states nominations were due by December 4th. Early on it asks for the student's name. The investigator was not able to enter and review the entire form because he does not have a student in the District.

The page listing schools includes a statement that "Nominations forms in different languages can be accessed by contacting the TAG facilitator at your child's school." There is a link to an alphabetic list of schools their facilitators' contact information. That page states the District extended the nominations deadline to December 18th. The District's Webpage provides translation buttons for Chinese, Russian, Somali, Spanish, and Vietnamese languages. Since the investigator spoke and read only English, he assumed but was not able to confirm that the translation buttons worked to open the online nominations form in a language other than English.

There is a specific process for students who are new to the District.

New to PPS?

If your child has previously been identified in your former school/district, there is the possibility of transferring the identification into PPS.  Once the school year has begun, request that your

building TAG Facilitator submit a Move-In Transfer Application on behalf of your child. The application will require the original letter indicating identification AND the assessment data used. If the assessment and identification materials submitted are similar to those used by PPS, the PPS TAG Department can grant an immediate transfer of identification. If not previously identified or the documentation submitted does not fit for PPS requirements for a transfer of TAG identification, you can complete a Nomination Form to have your child assessed for a PPS identification.

If a student transfers to the District from another standard Oregon district, it is reasonable to assume the sending district's TAG policies and procedures are consistent with the TAG OAR. It is also reasonable to assume that if the sending district identified the transferring student as TAG in any or all TAG categories, then the receiving district should recognize and accept that student as a TAG student.

The District should consider revising its policies to grant TAG status to any student identified as TAG by a sending and standard Oregon district.

The ODE should consider proposing amendments to OAR 581-022-2325 to say a student identified TAG in a standard Oregon district retains the same TAG status when the student enrolls in any other Oregon district. High school credits transfer with a student; so should TAG identification.


Training Materials Provided by the District

The District provided copies of the example materials below either with its Exhibit 11 September 2019 written response to the ODE's acceptance of Appellant's appeal or later on request. They demonstrate facilitators had opportunities to receive trainings and materials in a variety of TAG subjects, including nominations and identifications of TAG students.

Training Materials Provided-Example Copies

Exhibit 13-A includes a copy of an agenda titled TAG Facilitators Meeting dated January 10, 2019. Agenda items include the nominations form process and testing for TAG identification such as selecting the testing venue, scheduling the testing, arranging for proctors, and notices to parents regarding results. The agenda states, "SBAC testing is coming around. These scores will be the scores used for identification in the fall for grades 3-12."

Exhibit 13-B is a copy of a District letter to parents or guardians regarding nominations of students for TAG services and of a District form titled Nomination/Permission Form for Identification for Talented and Gifted Education 2019-2020. Both are in English. The District provided copies of the nomination form in multiple languages.

Exhibit 14 is a copy of an agenda titled TAG Facilitators Meeting dated March 14, 2019, and of documents titled Supplemental Behavior Rating Scale, PPS Talented and Gifted Educator Guide to Identification Process, and High Potential Culturally, Linguistically, and Economically Diverse Learner: Teacher Rating Scales. The materials include ways to identify students from diverse cultural, ethnic, and linguistic backgrounds who have TAG potential but are not identified by traditional methods.

Exhibit 15 is a copy of a document titled An Educator's Guide: Gifted and Talented English Language Learners. It appears relevant to a March 14, 2019, agenda item: "support of ESL Dept

[sic] and identification of ESL students for TAG." There are no accompanying sign-in sheets. It is not clear where and when the District conducted those PD sessions.

When asked who monitors the use of the CLED scale and resources for identifying characteristics of gifted ELL students, the TAG Director reported, "The classroom teacher would be the one that sees students day-to-day. "The TAG facilitator provides PD to teachers in the building regarding this. Principals must provide the time for facilitators to present PD. Administrators and other educators will access . . . the modules for this training this year through CDL."

Exhibit 13-BB is a copy of sample TAG facilitator meeting agendas and materials from 2019. September meeting topics include fall assessment scores, "2 identification windows this year," and delivery of rate and level "PD delivered to staff by October 31, 2019" with "Staff attendance files to TAG Dept." Another topic is "Nomination/Testing Changes" regarding use of the NNAT. The copied sign-in sheet shows some facilitators attended, some would attend a make-up meeting, and some did not attend or indicate they would attend a make-up meeting.

Other Materials Provided-Example Copies

Exhibit 17 includes a copy of an October29, 2018, email from the TAG Director to TAG facilitators reminding them about details regarding the student identification using test scores, and instructions on how to identify students who "fall into the historically underserved student group and you feel should be nominated."

Exhibit 13-BB includes a copy of sample TAG facilitator meeting agendas and materials from 2019. Meeting topics include fall assessment scores, "2 identification windows this year," and "Nomination/Testing Changes" regarding use of the NNAT. The unredacted sign-in sheet shows some facilitators attended, some would attend a make-up meeting, and some did not attend or indicate they would attend a make-up meeting.

TAG Building Plans for 2019-2022

TAG OAR Do Not Require Building-Level TAG Plans

Each school's Building TAG Plan is listed and linked at
https://www.pps.net/Page/2598https://www.pps.net/Page/2598 . The TAG OAR do not require districts to provide building-level TAG plans. If the District chooses to implement building-level TAG plans, then it should ensure the plans are implemented consistent with the TAG OAR and District TAG policies and procedures. A review of ten randomly chosen building plans found these results related to identifications of TAG students.

Building-Level TAG Plans Lacked Research Based Reasons for Methods Used to Identify Students from Underrepresented Populations.

The investigator reviewed ten randomly chosen TAG Building Plans. All but one included this statement or one closely similar to it in the plan section titled Focus: Identification of Students who Perform in the 97th Percentile of Demonstrate the Potential to Perform.

> School staff has a discussion about school data and the identification of under-represented and under-served students and develops a plan to identify students, recognize leadership ability and develop talents.

All ten plans reviewed listed at least some of these assessments or other measures used to identify TAG students: MAP, SBAC, DIBLES, information about characteristics of TAG students and/or of underachieving TAG students, and about Culturally and Linguistically Diverse gifted students (CLED). Some specified involvements by teachers of ELL and SpEd students. One plan stated teachers would look for TAG characteristics using a "pre-screening," but did not describe the pre-screening tool or the research supporting it. Two of the plans did not consider TAG characteristics. Without further explanation, one plan stated the "Administrator will ensure nominations using a student list review, data review, past nominations, teacher recommendations."

None of the plans expressed how research supports their chosen assessments or other measures. It is not clear if the plans assumed research supported using them to identify TAG student from underrepresented "or historically underserved populations. That does not comply with the OAR 581-022-2325(2) requirement that "Districts shall use research based best practices to identify students from underrepresented populations.

Building-Level TAG Plans Indicate a Lack of Teams Responsible to Make the Final Decisions on the Identification of TAG Students

One of the ten plans described the school's TAG team and listed members by their titles. That team discussed possible nominations, but it was not clear if it made final decisions.

Two plans mentioned their teams but did not list their memberships. One team was to "conclude" the nomination process in the spring; the other was to review test results and make recommendations. The plan did not explain whether the team considered any other information.

Seven of ten plans reviewed did not mention or describe a TAG team. That indicates widespread inconsistencies with the OAR 581-022-2500 (5) and 581-022-2325(2) requirements regarding a TAG team and its responsibilities. If the District's procedure is to form school level TAG teams, it should take necessary actions to ensure its schools establish, operate, and maintain TAG teams consistent with the OAR. For example, each building TAG plan could include a section naming the standing TAG nomination team by position title, with ad hoc members included as needed depending on the student being considered to TAG eligibility. If the District's procedure is to have one or more TAG teams formed at school cluster or district levels, then it should make that clear to all stakeholders and operate the teams consistent with TAG OAR.

It is Not Clear If or When Schools Submitted their Plans for Review or District TAG Staff Reviewed Them

On all ten plans reviewed, lines for submission and review dates, initials, or signatures were blank. If the District uses a process to review building TAG plans and makes the plans available to the public, it should publish the submission dates and indicate who, by title if not by name, submitted, reviewed, and approved them.

The plans did not include provisions for periodic reviews and updates. One referred to the statewide assessment system as "OAKS." That term went out of use long ago. That suggest no one had carefully reviewed that plan for some time.

TAG Nomination and Identification Data Reported by the District

The District and ODE provided the data cited in this section in 2020 before the COVID-19 school closures.

*District's Data Reported to the ODE*

Exhibit 25 is an Excel file of TAG data reported to the ODE. The ODE generated the report in January 2020, before the COVID-19 school closures. It provides data for the 2018-2019 school year. Click the District 2018-2019 tab for the District's data. Click Schools 2018-2019 for data by school and program.

Student demographic subgroups are in descending order based on the percentage of TAG identified students within the total population of each subgroup.

The data indicate a significantly higher percentage of TAG identified students within the White, Asian, and Multi-Racial subgroups than within each other subgroup. The results are consistent with the district's data discussed below regarding TAG identifications among historically underserved students.

| PPS DISTRICT TAG DATA REPORTED to the ODE JANUARY 2020 | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Student Group | Total in Group | Total TAG | % TAG in Student Group | % of All Students |
| All Students | 48,147 | 6,992 | 14.52 | 100.00 |
| White | 27,286 | 4,951 | 18.14 | 56.57 |
| Asian | 3258 | 531 | 16.30 | 6.77 |
| Multi-Racial | 4,978 | 765 | 15.37 | 10.34 |
| Native American | 290 | 21 | 7.24 | <5.00 |
| Hispanic | 7,748 | 539 | 6.96 | 16.09 |
| Black/African Am. | 4.232 | 175 | <5.00 | 8.79 |
| Pacific Islander | 355 | 10 | <5.00 | <5.00 |
| | | | | |
| Economically Dis. | 18,911 | 1,055 | 5.58 | 39.28 |
| Special Education | 7,686 | 380 | <5.00 | 15.96 |
| English Learners | 3,750 | 19 | <5.00 | 7.79 |
| | | | | |
| Potentially TAG | TAG Identified-Intellectual | TAG Identified-Reading | TAG Identified-Mathematics | TAG Identified Creative, Leadership, Performing Arts |
| 2411 | 2641 | 2942 | 2422 | 0 |

The District's TAG categories do not include creative ability, leadership, or performing arts. OAR 581-022-2325 gives districts the option to include those categories, or not.

The Exhibit 25 report includes TAG data for individual schools. A word and phrase search found data for some but not all of the community based alternative programs listed on the District's Website at https://www.pps.net/Page/1353. The District and ODE should clarify if and how students in those programs are included in the District's responsibilities to provide TAG programs and services and report data to the ODE. A search also found data for each of the District sponsored charter schools. That is consistent with the District's commitment to TAG test students at "a PPS Charter school with TAG specified in their charter." (District's Identification and Testing Webpage at https://www.pps.net/Page/1546.)

*Data Reported Internally*

Exhibits 27 shows TAG nominations and identifications data for schools within high school clusters. Exhibit 26 shows TAG nominations and identifications data by school for demographic groups including historically underserved students. The District provided those documents through a Google Web-based file sharing application. The District's Director of TAG Services reported the Google application was a live document updated periodically. Numbers are subject to change by the end of the school year. The last update was May 27, 2020, and the investigator downloaded the data September 2020.

A word and phrase search indicated the Exhibit 27 list of schools by cluster did not include these schools or programs: Alliance High School, Benson Polytechnic High School, district-sponsored charter schools that have TAG in their charter contracts, and community based alternative programs. The Exhibit 25 report to the ODE does include Alliance, Benson, and the alternative and charter schools described above. The TAG Director stated she would research that.

The Exhibit 26 nominations and identifications data by school includes Benson Polytechnic High. The data show one white student nominated and identified TAG for reading. A word and phrase search for samples indicates Exhibit 26 does not report data for Alliance High School, alternative programs, or District sponsored charter schools. The District and ODE should clarify if and how students in community-based and in-district alternative education programs are included in TAG-related data reports. The District should then inform administrators, teachers, and parents about any TAG services available to students in those programs.

The District should ensure it internally reports and evaluates TAG nomination and identification data for each eligible school and program involved when drafting and implementing goals and actions to improve TAG programs and services and compliance with the TAG OAR.

Programs for special-education students, kindergarten to 21 years old, who are unable to be successful in less restrictive school placements are not within the scope of this report.

*Nominations and Identifications by School Type*

School types are from those reported by the District at https://www.pps.net/site/Default.aspx?PageID=2142 . Elementary includes K-8 schools and other schools or programs listed in the Exhibit 27 report for school clusters that are not middle or high schools.

At-a-glance observations about the Exhibit 27 data.

- High schools and middle schools reported fewer nominations and identifications within their clusters. Some report significantly fewer.
- Some elementary schools within clusters reported significantly fewer or significantly more nominations or identifications than others within the same cluster. One school reported no nominations or identifications.

Go to next page.

| SCHOOLS | NOMINATIONS= N | IDENTIFICATIONS | % of N IDENTIFIED |
|---|---|---|---|
| Elementary | 3244 | 1967 | 52% |
| Middle | 422 | 302 | 72% |
| High | 133 | 92 | 69% |
| Total | 3799 | 2361 | 62% |

*Nominations and Identifications by TAG Category*

Significantly fewer students were identified in the intellectual category. The district should look for reporting patterns in its TAG nominations and identifications data to detect needs for information, trainings, processes, or other supports to ensure effective nomination and identification services among all schools and nomination categories.

*Nominations and Identifications of Historically Underserved Students*

Exhibit 26 lists schools by name. In a table format it shows nominations and identifications for these student demographic subgroups in this order for each TAG category: Intellectual, Mathematics, and Reading.
- Hispanic
- Black/African American
- Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander
- American Indian/Alaskan Native
- Two or More
- Asian
- White

The Exhibit 26 District totals section is blank and does not run calculations. The data do not include the numbers of enrolled students within each subgroup. A scan reading of the data reveals these general outcomes. More definitive conclusions require calculations including numbers of enrolled students within subgroups and of the total numbers and percentages of students nominated and identified within those subgroups.
- The White subgroup shows the most TAG nominations and identifications.
- The Two or More subgroup shows the next highest number of TAG identifications and identifications.
- Those data are consistent with the District's overall data reported to the ODE discussed below.

The Districts TAG Director reported Exhibit 26 is a new data collection at her request to get more details about nominations "and so that we could have conversations with facilitators and administrators regarding nominations."

Exhibit 17 includes a copy of an October 29, 2018, email from the District's Director of TAG and IB to TAG facilitators. It includes details about using test scores to identify TAG students, and instructions on how to identify students who "fall into the historically underserved student group and you feel should be nominated." The email encourages facilitators to "reach out to those parents to encourage them to apply."

<div align="center">END of PART 4 – GO to NEXT PAGE</div>

**PART 5: SERVICES-TAG RATE and LEVEL INSTRUCTION – FINDINGS and ADDITIONAL INFORMATION**

Appellant's Complaint

In the Exhibit 1 complaint to the District, Appellant alleges "PPS has failed to meet the basic academic needs of gifted and talented students, much to their academic, social and emotional detriment." Also, "At every grade level and for every demographic group throughout the district, the great majority of TAG students are failing to receive regular classroom instruction at their assessed levels and accelerated rates of learning."

Scope of This Investigation

The Exhibit 10 copy of the ODE's August 21, 2019, letter to Appellant and the District accepting Appellant's appeal defines the overall scope of this investigation. "[T]he Oregon Department of Education will investigate the following: Is Portland Public Schools in compliance with Oregon standards of instruction that apply to talented and gifted (TAG) students?"

The Exhibit 23 copy of the ODE TAG Specialist's February 3, 2020 email to parents of TAG-identified students further clarifies the subjects for this investigation, "The Oregon Department of Education is conducting an investigation specific to Talented and Gifted identification practices, rights of parents, and programs and services in Portland Public Schools."

**OAR 581-022-2500, Programs and Services for Talented and Gifted Students**

OAR 581-022-2500 is at https://secure.sos.state.or.us/oard/viewSingleRule.action?ruleVrsnRsn=145372. The full text is below for reference.

581-022-2500 **Programs and Services for Talented and Gifted Students**
(1) Each school district shall have a written plan for programs and services beyond those normally provided by the regular school program in order to realize the contribution of talented and gifted children to self and society.
(2) The written plan for programs and services for talented and gifted children shall be submitted to the Oregon Department of Education on a date and in a format provided in guidance documents provided by the Oregon Department of Education.
(3) The written plan shall include, but is not limited to:
(a) A statement of school district policy on the education of talented and gifted children;
(b) An assessment of current special programs and services provided by the district for talented and gifted children;
(c) A statement of district goals for providing comprehensive special programs and services and over what span of time the goals will be achieved;
(d) A description of the nature of the special programs and services which will be provided to accomplish the goals; and
(e) A plan for evaluating progress on the district plan including each component program and service.
(4) The instruction provided to identified students shall be designed to accommodate their assessed levels of learning and accelerated rates of learning.
(5) Assessments for the development of an appropriate academic instructional program shall include the information used by the team for identification purposes and also may include one or more of the following:

(a) An academic history which may include grades, portfolio assessment records or other progress records and achievement information that demonstrates the student's level of learning and rate of learning;
(b) Other evaluation methods such as formal tests or informal assessment methods designed by teachers to determine the student's instructional level and rate of learning related to specific academic programs;
(c) Student interest, style, and learning preferences information from inventories or interviews; and
(d) Other measures determined by the school district to be relevant to the appropriate academic instructional program for the student.
**Statutory/Other Authority:** ORS 343.391 - 343.413
**Statutes/Other Implemented:** ORS 326.051

Findings regarding OAR 581-022-2500 and details related to those findings are in the sections below.

The District's Written plan for Programs and Services Beyond Those Normally Provided by the Regular School Program (OAR 581-022-2500(1-3))

*Finding*

The District's Exhibit 28 TAG plan is consistent with OAR 581-022-2500(1-3).
- It describes programs and services beyond those the District normally provides, and was submitted to and accepted by the ODE in the required format.
- It includes:
  - A statement of the District's Policy 6.10.015-P, Talented and Gifted Education. However, the 6.10.015-P version at page 1 of the written plan does not match the version on the District's Website at https://www.pps.net/cms/lib/OR01913224/Centricity/Domain/4814/6.10.015-P.pdf . The written plan version includes the TAG Potential to Perform Category; the Website version does not. The policy adoption and amended dates are the same in both versions. The District should determine which version is accurate and correct the one that is not.
  - An assessment of current TAG programs and services provided by the district for TAG students.
  - A statement of the District's goals for providing comprehensive special programs, the services to be provided, and a span of time for the District to achieve those goals.
  - A description of the programs and services to be provided to accomplish the goals written plan's goals.
  - A plan for evaluating progress on each component of the district's plan.

Instruction provided to identified students shall be designed to accommodate their assessed levels of learning and accelerated rates of learning. (OAR 581-022-2500(4))

*General Finding*

The District does not provide appropriate rate and level instruction for most of its TAG students most of the time.

*Findings from Classroom Visits*

During classroom visits by the ODE's TAG specialist accompanied by school and district staff, across all grade ranges K-12,
- 13.95% of observed classes met rate and level instruction requirements;

- 1.38% almost met;
- 83.23% did not; and
- 1.45% were ineligible for observation because they were taking exams.

That result is consistent with this statement at page 11 of the Exhibit 3 May 2019 letter from the District's Senior Director of College and Career Readiness in response to Appellant's complaint: "[T]here is not a system-wide approach to instructional practices for talented and gifted students in classrooms across Portland Public Schools. Targeted TAG instructional practices vary by campus and teacher. In 2019, PPS will again self-report being out of compliance in the Division 22 area of meeting rate and level of TAG students in the instructional setting."

During the majority of classroom visits students were either in whole group instruction or doing the same assignment without observable differentiation. Students were rarely doing tiered option or other activities at challenge levels that adequately met rate and level requirements.

Across grades K-5, an average of 11% of teachers reported they did not apply rate and level practices. In grades 6-8, 36.9% of teachers reported that. In grades 9-12, none reported that. The District should ensure all certified staff understand and carry out their TAG OAR and district policy obligations to provide rate and level instruction and other services for TAG identified students.

Across and within grade ranges, teachers reported using a wide variety of information sources to determine a student's rate and level of learning. Some reported using more than one. That is inconsistent with evidence from the classroom observations.

Seating practices reported or observed involving TAG identified students during the classroom visits were seldom consistent with the District's best practices advice provided at FAQ 17 on its Talented and Gifted FAQs page at https://www.pps.net/Page/13106. The District should ensure certified staff understand and implement the District's recommended best practice as needed to provide rate and level instruction consistent with OAR 581-022-2500(4).

Though the TAG OAR do not require them, the District provided evidence parents can request individual TAG plans for their TAG identified students. That is a commendable and valuable option for providing appropriate rate and level instruction. However, large majorities of teachers reported parents do not request individualized plans, and that they do not have students with those plans. It is not clear how the District informs parents about individual TAG plans and how to request them. The District should take actions to ensure parents of TAG identified students get that information.

*Findings from Course Syllabi Examples*

Exhibit 22 is a copy provided by the District of two course syllabi. One dated 2019 is titled Freshman Syllabus Lit and Comp. English 1 & 2. The Class Structure section includes statements possibly intended to indicate differentiation or rate and level of learning. Information from an administrator's pre-observation meeting with the teacher, classroom observation, and debrief focused on those two topics might have confirmed that.

- As a group, we will reflect a number of different learning styles; some students will have **identified educational needs** (emphasis in original) . . . and my design for your lessons will reflect this.
- Many activities will be project-based learning. You will have time to work on your own, in pairs, and in small groups, developing a variety of personal and interpersonal skills.
- You can help me by letting me know your strengths and challenges, and by telling me how you would like me to help you grow.

The other syllabus is titled Physics 1-2 8th Grade Science. The description begins, "Physics 1-2: NGSS is an introductory high school science course that will focus on developing students' understanding of fundamental scientific knowledge, their ability to think like scientists, and creating arguments from evidence." The District might have provided this syllabus to show offering a high school class to students in eighth grade indicates TAG rate and level instruction. However, the syllabus describes unit topics and tasks for all students. The course title and description alone are not evidence of rate and level instruction.

*Findings from Surveys of Administrators, Teachers, and Parents*

### Administrators

The teacher administrator results are inconsistent with the classroom visits result indicating 83.23% of the observed classes did not meet rate and level instruction requirements. Administrators generally reported more familiarity or skill with rate and level instructional strategies than were evident during the classroom visits. The District should take actions to ensure administrators are trained in and able to help their schools implement TAG rate and level instructional strategies.

Large majorities of administrators reported they had received researched-based trainings in identifying TAG students, in recognizing students TAG characteristics, and in meeting their social and emotional needs.

An 81% majority reported they had provided their staff training on TAG students profiles and characteristics. A 54.7% majority had provided staff training in meeting the social and emotional needs of gifted students. A 57.1% majority reported having special programs or services for TAG students in their schools.

Administrators surveyed reported receiving and providing trainings in a variety of instructional strategies. The strategies with highest response rates include flexible grouping, differentiated instruction, and high level questioning strategies.

Most administrators surveyed rated their expertise intermediate or higher in every strategy listed in the survey. Highest rated strategies include Flexible Grouping, High Level Questioning, Differentiated Instruction, and Formative Assessment as a Process. Differentiated instruction received one of the highest ratings among all strategies included in the survey.

A 61.3% majority of administrators surveyed expected teachers to document rate and level instruction in their gradebooks; 33.9% reported using other methods such as electronic files, parent conferences, TAG planning forms and lesson plans.

A 70.3% majority of surveyed administrators reported teachers review and adjust TAG instructional plans as needed; 34.4% responded teachers do that yearly. A 65.1% majority administrators reported they review and monitor TAG instructional plans; 34.9% the TAG facilitator or someone else does that.

### Teachers

The teacher survey results are inconsistent with the classroom visits result indicating 83.23% of the observed classes did not meet rate and level instruction requirements. Teachers generally reported more familiarity or skill with rate and level instructional strategies than were evident during the classroom visits. The District should take actions to ensure teachers are trained in and able to implement TAG rate and level instructional strategies.

Teachers' most reported information sources used to determine students' rates and levels of learning were samples of student work, daily observations, formative assessments, students' demonstrations and presentations, and students' input and self-assessment.

Responses indicate 70% or more of teachers surveyed were familiar with differentiated instruction, high level questioning, flexible grouping, indivualized instruction, formative assessment, identification of gifted students, and use of extensions. Fewer (58% or less) were familiar with compacting curriculum, Socratic method, student agency and Webb's Depth of Knowledge.

Survey results show 92.2% of teachers who responded had received training in differentiated instruction. Other strategies earned lower response rates.

Majorities (>50%) of teaches surveyed rated themselves intermediate or higher in each instructional strategy listed in the survey except for compacting curriculum, Socratic method, student agency, and Webb's Depth of Knowledge. The highest rated strategies included differentiated instruction.

Most teachers reported using their grade books or a student file to document instruction provided to TAG-identified students' rates and levels.

Surveyed teachers reported the most often used method to meet the TAG students' academic needs was by a teacher in a regular classroom. A next most often used was small groups which included other "highly able" students.

Of 634 surveyed teachers surveyed, 624 responded they were familiar with differentiated instruction. Those survey results are inconsistent with the classroom visits results showing a majority did not meet rate and level instruction during the visits.

**Parents**

The parent survey responses are consistent with the classroom visits result indicating 83.23% of the observed classes did not meet rate and level instruction requirements.

An 18.7% minority of parents surveyed agreed or strongly agreed they knew what learning evidence and information the teacher uses about their student to plan for rate and level of instruction. A 63.8% majority disagreed or strongly disagreed, and17.5% neither agreed nor disagreed.

An 11% minority agreed or strongly agreed classroom teachers use their children's TAG plans to meet student's rates and levels of learning on a consistent basis, and 30% neither agreed nor disagreed. A 59% majority disagreed or strongly disagreed.

A 29% minority agreed or strongly agreed their students' academic and/or intellectual needs are being met, and 25% neither agreed nor disagreed. A plurality of 46% disagreed or strongly disagreed.

A 27% minority agreed or strongly agreed their students' academic and/or intellectual needs are met daily through classroom instruction, and 28% neither agreed nor disagreed. A plurality of 45% disagreed or strongly disagreed.

When asked how students' academic needs are met at school, of a variety of choices, 66.7% of parents chose "In the regular classroom by their classroom teachers." Other options received lower response rates.

Parents' volunteered comments that TAG students' educational needs are not met at the District's schools outnumbered comments that students' needs are met. The District should review all parents' volunteered comments to inform its plans and actions to improve its TAG services.

*Findings from Information on the District's TAG Webpages*

The District's TAG Definitions Webpage at https://www.pps.net/Page/7932 states students identified TAG and students identified TAG potential "will receive TAG services." The page announces, "At this time, TAG services center primarily within each student's classroom. We encourage each school to provide differentiated curriculum and opportunities that would promote the following," then lists eleven items. One of those is "Learning experiences of students are relevant, engaging and at their rate and level." That is an encouraging signal that the District intends to provide instruction consistent with OAR 581-022-2500. However, evidence from classroom observations and surveys indicates the District has not yet achieved that result.

The District's Accelerated Pathways page at https://www.pps.net/Page/2885 stated "Due to current circumstances, all SGA [Single Grade Acceleration] and WGA [Whole Grade Acceleration] applications and testing are on hold. We will keep you informed as processes are determined and updated." A link on that page titled Accelerated Learners, Definitions, is to an undated document attributed to the ODE titled Talented and Gifted Learners, Best Practices to Maximize Student Learning at https://www.pps.net/cms/lib/OR01913224/Centricity/Domain/196/Accelerated_Learners_Definitions.pdf. It states acceleration "is access to higher level activities and skill development. Acceleration is addressed through pacing, complexity, and depth of the planned course work. Acceleration means moving at a faster pace though academic content." As it returns to in-person instruction and normal order, the District should implement its acceleration options for TAG students consistent with the TAG OAR on identification and programs and services.

The District's Talented and Gifted FAQ's page at https://www.pps.net/Page/13106 includes definitions of "rate of learning" (FAQ 15) and "level of learning" (FAQ 16). It would be helpful to have the source citations for those definitions. A total of 33 TAG FAQs are listed on that page. The District should periodically review them for accuracy.

*Findings from Training Materials Provided by the District*

With its September 2019 response to the ODE's acceptance of Appellants appeal, the District provided the Exhibits 12-A and 12-B training materials dated for the 2018-2019 and 2019-2020 school years. Topics include Talented and Gifted Rate & Level Professional Development and Differnting [sic] for Gifted Learners. Evidence gathered during the investigation indicates the trainings were not implemented consistently or with fidelity.

The District also provided copies of unredacted sign-in sheets for a January 2019 rate and level training. They represented a minority of the District's schools. It is not clear if the District eventually presented that rate and level training to all of its schools. The District should take actions to ensure each school's staff receives rate and level training consistent with the TAG OAR and the district's TAG policies and procedures.

<u>Assessments for the development of an appropriate academic instructional program shall include the information used by the team for identification purposes and also may include one or more of the following:</u> (OAR 581-022-2500(5)(a-d)).

*General Finding*

A random review of ten TAG Building Plans found their plans to assess the development of academic programs included sources of information used for the purpose of identifying TAG students. However, it is not clear if or how schools use that information because few of the Building Plans included a team to implement the use of identification information.

*Findings from TAG Building Plans*

The TAG OAR do not require the District's TAG Building Plans linked for each school at https://www.pps.net/Page/2598. The Building Plans contain information relevant to OAR 581-022-2500(5). The investigator reviewed ten randomly selected examples for information regarding plans for providing rate and level differentiated instruction and assessing student growth. All plans had relevant focus areas such as TAG Services, which includes categories such as strategies and structures to deliver rate and level instruction, using data to measure TAG students' growth, and ways students can access courses or experiences beyond what is typically available at the school. The plans also include sections describing relevant professional development and methods the principal uses to ensure "the use of differentiated strategies, rigorous and relevant coursework, and instruction provided at the appropriate rate and level."

The District's TAG Director and various TAG Teachers on Special Assignment (TOSAs) reported the TAG identification process includes several data sources consistent with OAR 581-022-2500(5), including behavioral evidence checklists, parent checklists, work samples, and assessment results. However, there was little evidence that schools formed and used OAR 581-022-2500(5) TAG teams to use that information.

Seven of ten plans reviewed did not mention or describe a TAG team. That indicates widespread inconsistencies with the OAR 581-022-2500 (5) and 581-022-2325(2) requirements regarding a TAG team and its responsibilities. If the District's procedure is to form school level TAG teams, it should take necessary actions to ensure its schools establish, operate, and maintain TAG teams consistent with the OAR. For example, each building TAG plan could include a section naming the standing TAG nomination team by position title, with ad hoc members included as needed depending on the student being considered to TAG eligibility. If the District's procedure is to have one or more TAG teams formed at school cluster or district levels, then it should make that clear to all stakeholders and operate the teams consistent with TAG OAR.

On all ten plans reviewed, lines for submission and review dates, initials, or signatures were blank. If the District uses a process to review building TAG plans and makes the plans available to the public, it

should publish the submission dates and indicate who, by title if not by name, submitted, reviewed, and approved them.

Below are underlined sections with more information related to the findings above.

Classroom Visits Results

Results are from observations and comments made during the classroom visits held during the 2020-2021 school year. Details about the visits and results are in Part 7 of this report. Percentages of teachers who responded to prompts are based on numbers of classroom visits, not on total teachers in the District. See the Part 7 tables for the numbers (N=) of teachers.

*Summary Information from Classroom Visits*

- In grades K-2, 39% of teachers reported having TAG students in their classes. In grades 3-12, an average of 75% reported having TAG students in their classes.

**How Teachers Reported They Determined Students' Rates and Levels of Learning**

- Across and within grade ranges, teachers reported using a wide variety of information sources to determine a student's rate and level of learning. Some reported using more than one source. Their reports indicate these general trends. In descending order, these were the sources reported most used within grade ranges.
    - Grades K-2: Curriculum Created Assessments, Progress Reports From Learning Apps, District Assessments, Daily Classwork, and Learning Evidence and Unit Pre-Assessments (tied).
    - Grades 3-5: Curriculum Created Assessments, District Assessments, Unit Pre-Assessments, and State Assessments.
    - Grades 6-8: District Assessments, Curriculum Created Assessments, and State Assessments.
    - Grades 9-12: Classroom Summative Assessments and Classroom Formative Assessments (tied); Daily Classwork; Learning Evidence; and Exit Tickets. (Exit tickets are a type of formative assessment typically used at the end of a lesson or day. Students write short responses and teachers collect them as evidence of levels of student learning.)
- In ascending order, these were the sources reported least used within grade ranges.
    - Grades K-2: Exit Tickets; Daily Pre-Assessments; State Assessments (there are none); Chapter Pre-Assessments; and Classroom Summative Assessments.
    - Grades 3-5: Daily Pre-Assessments, Exit Tickets, Chapter Pre-Assessments, and Classroom Summative Assessments.
    - Grades 6-8: Daily Pre-Assessments, Progress Reports From Learning Apps, Chapter Pre-Assessments, and Learning Evidence.
    - Grades 9-12: Chapter Pre-Assessments, District Assessments, and Daily Pre-Assessments and State Assessments (tied).
- Across grades K-5, an average of 11% of teachers reported they did not apply rate and level practices. In grades 6-8, 36.9% of teachers reported that. In grades 9-12, none reported that. However, 28.3% of those teachers' responses are unknown because high school classes were in the Comprehensive Distance Learning Model due to COVID-19 protocols.

**Written TAG Plans for Individual Students**

- Across grades K-8, an average of 86.2% of teachers reported parents did not request written TAG plans for their students; 71.7% of teachers in grades 9-12 reported the same.
- Across grades K-8, an average of 84.5% of teachers reported they did not have students with written TAG plans in their classes; 60.8% of teachers in grades 9-12 reported the same.
- On average, teachers reported that when they did discuss TAG plans with families, they most often did that either during fall conferences or at the beginning of the year with ongoing communications after that.
- Teachers reported these trends when asked who initiates the discussion of a student's TAG plan.
  - In grades K-5, a parent, teacher, or both initiated the discussion.
  - In grades 6-8, a plurality reported the teacher initiated it.
  - In grades 9-12, a majority reported both the parent and teacher initiated it during a "conversation about the student."
  - Across all grades it is not clear if the "conversation about the student" might be either formal or informal.

The District provided these partially redacted copies (staff's names revealed) documenting a student's individual TAG plan. The copies are in the ODE's file. They include these items.
- A statement that the parent provided input to help the teacher meet the student's needs and that the parent and teacher reviewed the strategies used to meet the student's current rate and level of learning. If the parent has concerns, (s)he may ask the teacher for an individual written instruction plan, which the teacher will present to the parent within 30 calendar days.
- A cover note delivering a student's individual instruction plan. It asks the parent to review and return it "in a timely manner." The parent will receive a copy of the final plan. If the parent has concerns. (s)he may contact the teacher or TAG facilitator.
- An individual student's TAG plan requested by the parent. It describes specific instructional practices "implemented to meet the student's rate and level." Those include placement in an accelerated reading group and in a word study group and individual conference time to set writing goals. Mathematics activities are available when the student completes other classwork. Page 4 of the plan lists a wide variety of Possible Instructional Strategies/Best Practices. It appears the teacher used those choice options when constructing the individual plan.

The OAR do not require TAG plans for individual students. That is a commendable and valuable option for providing appropriate rate and level instruction. It is not clear how the District informs parents about the individual plan and how to request one. For example, FAQ 25 at https://www.pps.net/Page/13106, asks, "What should I do if I feel my child is not being instructed at the right rate and level?" The District's response does not mention an individual TAG plan option. The District should take actions to ensure parents of TAG identified students understand the process for requesting an individual TAG plan.

**What Students Were Doing in Classes as Observed or Reported**

- In grades K-5, on average, students were doing whole group instruction during 48.9% of the visits or were doing the same assignment without differentiation during 56.8% of the visits. In grades 6-12, those averages were 87.9% doing whole group instruction and 82.4% doing the same undifferentiated assignment.
- On average, during 10.2% of visits students were doing tiered option activities at challenge levels that adequately met rate and level requirements. That occurred most often in grades K-2, least often in grades 6-8.

**Rate and Level Met or Not Met During Classroom Observations**

These are definitions for the terms used here.

Met: There were examples of apparent and appropriate rate and level learning activities.

Almost Met: Rate and level practices were in place but needed improvements or modifications to meet the requirements of rate and level learning. For example, where students were ready and able to proceed to more advanced lessons but were first required to do prerequisite work they had already mastered.

Not Met: There were few or no examples of apparent and appropriate rate and level learning activities.

During classroom visits by the ODE's TAG specialist accompanied by school and district staff, in grades K-5,
- 17% of observed classes met rate and level instruction;
- 1.65% almost met; and
- 79.5% did not.

In grades 6-12,
- 11% met rate and level instruction;
- 1.1% almost met; and
- 87% did not.

Across all grade ranges,
- 13.95% met rate and level instruction;
- 1.38% almost met;
- 83.23% did not; and
- 1.45% were ineligible for observation because they were taking exams.

**Student Seating or Grouping TAG Identified Students: Teachers' Comments During Classroom Visits**

Teachers often reported using multiple seating or grouping patterns involving TAG identified students.
- Across grades K-8, teachers most often described student seating or grouping patterns that
  - intentionally partnered "high" students with "struggling" students, or
  - were heterogeneous groups of 4 with at least 1 "high" or TAG student.
- Teachers frequently described seating or grouping patterns that
  - had "high" or TAG students helping other students, or
  - that were behavior based.
- Teachers seldom described using flexible or readiness-based seating or grouping patterns that relied on current information about students' learning.

The investigation did not collect comments by teachers of grades 9-12 because those classes were in Comprehensive Distance Learning.

On the District's Talented and Gifted FAQs page at https://www.pps.net/Page/13106, FAQ 17 asks, "How will my child be grouped with other TAG students?" This is the District's response.

Best practices suggest that TAG students be grouped together for at least part of the day. There are many options for grouping students: some may be grouped with other high ability students [in] specific subjects, some may be clustered together in a classroom, and some may be grouped

together in an accelerated school.  This may look different depending on the grade level of the students.

Seating practices reported or observed involving TAG identified students during the classroom visits were seldom consistent with the District's best practices advice.

Summaries of Survey Results: Administrators, Teachers, and Parents

Numbers of respondents varied depending on the group surveyed and on the instructions for a specific prompt. The survey gave respondents opportunities to make comments. Percentages are based on the numbers or administrators, teachers, and parents who responded to the survey, not on the total possible numbers of District administrators, teachers, or parents. Survey details and tables including numbers surveyed (N=) are in Part 8 of this report.

*Summary Results from Survey of Administrators*

**Experience and Training in TAG Characteristics**

- A majority of administrators surveyed represented grades K-8.
- A vast majority reported being in their positions long enough to be familiar with the District's TAG policies, programs, and services.
- An average of 73% reported having 1-5 TAG-identified students per class in each category. Averages of 10% reported 6-10 such students per class; 0.8% reported 11-15; 2.9% reported more than 15; and 13% reported none per class.
- Large majorities of administrators had received researched-based trainings in identifying TAG students, in recognizing students TAG characteristics, and in meeting their social and emotional needs.
- An 81% majority reported they had provided their staff training on TAG students profiles and characteristics.
- A 54.7% majority had provided staff training in meeting the social and emotional needs of gifted students.

**Programs and Instructional Strategies Trainings Received and Given**

- A 57.1% majority reported having special programs or services for TAG students in their schools.
- Administrators surveyed reported receiving and providing trainings in a variety of instructional strategies.
  - The strategies with highest response rates include flexible grouping, differentiated instruction, and high level questioning strategies.
  - Some, such as compacting curriculum and Socratic method, show administrators received more trainings than they provided.
  - Socratic method and student agency ranked lowest in trainings received and given.

**Self-Reported Levels of Instructional Strategy Expertise**

- Most administrators surveyed rated their expertise intermediate or higher in every strategy listed in the survey: Acceleration, Flexible Grouping, High Level Questioning Strategies, Compacting Curriculum, Differentiated Instruction, Identification of Gifted Students, Socratic Method, Individualized Instruction, Formative Assessment as a Process, Student Agency, Webb's Depth of Knowledge, and Extensions.

- Highest rated strategies include Flexible Grouping, High Level Questioning, Differentiated Instruction, and Formative Assessment as a Process.
- One administrator volunteered a comment: I am looking for a book of projects appropriate for . . . TAG and by grade bands. I would like to see our gifted students more engaged in projects. Additionally, we would like more guidance on identifying TAG students.

**How Administrators Expected Teachers to Document Rate and Level Instruction for TAG Students**

- A 61.3% majority expected teachers to document rate and level instruction in their gradebooks; 33.9% reported using other methods such as electronic files, parent conferences, TAG planning forms and lesson plans.
- Some commented "I'm not sure;" there was no "explicit expectation to the staff" that year; documentation was not required "[u]nless creating a TAG plan for a student;" "I am not aware of a required process;" and "I don't think this has been clearly communicated from the district."

**Who Reviews and Adjusts TAG Instructional Plans**

- A 70.3% majority of surveyed administrators reported teachers review and adjust TAG instructional plans as needed; 34.4% responded teachers do that yearly.
- One response reported, "PPS teachers are not required to create TAG instructional plans."
- A 65.1% majority of surveyed administrators reported they review and monitor TAG instructional plans; 34.9% the TAG facilitator or someone else does that.
    - A 54% majority reported the TAG coordinator, facilitator or specialist individually monitors TAG instructional plans.
    - Other responses indicated another administrator or a TAG coordinator working with teachers or others monitor TAG plans.

**How Teachers Learn About Oregon Statutes and Rules Regarding Gifted Education**

- A 67.2% majority reported teachers learn about the statutes and rules through professional development opportunities.
- A 17.2% reported teachers receive copies.

**Administrators Volunteered Comments**

Administrators volunteered few comments. Examples are incorporated where relevant. See Part 8 for all of the comments.

*Summary Results from Survey of Teachers*

**Experience and Training in TAG Characteristics**

- An 82.83% majority of teachers surveyed represented schools serving grades K-8.
- A 62.3% majority reported 6 to 20 years of teaching experience. A 14.9% minority reported 5 or fewer years of experience, and 22.8% reported 21 or more years of experience.
- A 64% majority had been at their then current assignment for 2 to 10 years; 22.1% had been at their assignment 11 years or more. Only 13.9% had been at their assignment for 1 year or less.
- Most teachers taught either in self-contained elementary classrooms or in general education subjects such as English-language arts, world languages, mathematics, health education, science or social science.

- A 66.1% majority reported they had TAG-identified students in their classrooms 6 or more years. The rest had those students for 1-5 years.

**Information Sources Teachers Used to Determine a Student's Assessed Level and Rate of Learning**

- Their most reported information sources used to determine students' rates and levels of learning were samples of student work, daily observations, formative assessments, students' demonstrations and presentations, and students' input and self-assessment.
- Least used were statewide assessment results, online learning applications, and progress reports from other sources.

**Instructional Strategies Teachers were Familiar With**

- Responses indicate 70% or more of teachers surveyed were familiar with differentiated instruction, high level questioning, flexible grouping, individualized instruction, formative assessment, identification of gifted students, and use of extensions.
- Fewer (58% or less) were familiar with compacting curriculum, Socratic method, student agency and Webb's Depth of Knowledge.

**Instructional Strategies Teachers were Trained In**

- Survey results show 92.2% of teachers who responded had received training in differentiated instruction.
- The next highest ranked strategies were high level questioning (74.5%); formative assessment (63.8%); flexible grouping  (61.5%); and individualized instruction (57%).
- The remaining strategies ranked between 38% for identification of gifted students and 17.5% for student agency.

**How Teachers Rated Their Levels of Expertise in Instructional Strategies**

- Majorities (>50%) rated themselves intermediate or higher in each strategy except for compacting curriculum, Socratic method, student agency, and Webb's Depth of Knowledge.
- Highest rated were differentiated instruction, formative assessment, individualized instruction, flexible grouping, and high level questioning.
- Lowest rated were Depth of Knowledge, student agency, compacting curriculum, and Socratic method.
- Acceleration rated nearly evenly split between higher and lower ranges of expertise.

**How Teachers Documented Instruction was Provided to TAG-Identified Students' Rates and Levels**

- Most teachers reported using their grade books or a student file to document instruction provided to TAG-identified students' rates and levels.
- These are sample volunteered comments from the Part 8 teacher survey results. A review of all comments might help inform the District's planning going forward.
    - "I've never been asked to do this. I don't have a formal documentation system for instructing TAG students' rates and levels of learning."
    - "How do you document if a student is identified as TAG but does not take advantage of high level differentiated activities, acceleration, extensions, or revision opportunities?"

- "If a kid is doing well on a [redacted], I give them a harder [challenge]. The fact that the kid can [do] it is my documentation."
- "I don't know how to document it other than writing that I provided it."
- "It's in my brain."
- "I don't have TAG students. Ever. Because TAG sucks at identifying [specific] students."

## Teachers' Reviews of a Student's Previous TAG Instruction Plan Prior to Writing or Adjusting a Current Plan

- A 55.1% majority reported they did not review a student's previous TAG instructional plan prior to writing or adjusting a current TAG instructional plan.

## Did Teachers Write TAG Instructional Plans?

- A 75% majority of respondents reported they did not write TAG instructional plans.
- An 86% majority reported parents do not often request a written instructional plan.

## Most and Least Often Used Ways to Meet the Academic Needs of Gifted Students

- Most Often Used: In the regular classroom by the classroom teacher.
- Next Most Often Used:
  - In the regular classroom in small cluster groups which include other "highly able" students.
  - In the regular classroom with occasional assistance from staff familiar with the particular topic of instruction.
  - In acceleration in areas of strength.
- Least Used:
  - In a resource room, where children work in small groups or independently.
  - In a full-time classroom where all the children are identified as gifted or highly capable.
  - In a pull-out program once or twice a week.
  - In college or community college classes.
  - In honors, or Advance Placement, or International Baccalaureate, or college dual credit classes.

## Did Teachers Make Course Recommendations for TAG Students?

- A 51% majority of respondents reported they did not make course recommendations for TAG students.

## How Often Teachers Conferenced with Parents of TAG Students by Meeting, Phone, or Email Regarding Students' Learning

- An 84.2% majority reported they conferenced with parents of TAG students regarding students' learning in a meeting, by phone, or through email as needed.
- Fewer, 32.7%, reported they conferenced at the beginning of the year.
- Weekly, monthly, quarterly, twice a year, and end of the year conferences with TAG parents occurred at significantly lower rates.

## How Often Teachers Conferenced with TAG Students by Meeting, Phone, or Email Regarding Their Learning

- A majority 82% of responding teachers conferenced with TAG students regarding their learning in a meeting, by phone, or through email as needed.
- Fewer reported they conferenced with students weekly (17.8%), at the beginning of the year (14.2%), or quarterly (11.9%).
- Monthly, twice a year and end of the year conferences occurred at significantly lower rates.

**Themes from Teachers' Volunteered Comments**

The survey included this open-ended prompt: "Is there anything you would like to tell me that I did not ask in this survey?" Teachers submitted 233 comments. Below are themes from their responses. See Part 8 for examples and for all of the comments. A review of all comments might help inform the District's planning going forward.

- Needs for professional development or training in meeting TAG students' needs.
- Needs for materials, time, other resources.
- Lack of clarity about whether TAG policies apply to kindergarten.
- Concerns about the teachers' or District's ability to deliver TAG services.

*Summary Results from Survey of Parents*

**Grade Levels Represented**

A 79% majority of responses represented parents of students in grades K-8.

**Evidence the Teacher Uses to Plan Rate and Level Instruction**

- An 18.7% minority of parents surveyed agreed or strongly agreed they knew what learning evidence and information the teacher uses about their student to plan for rate and level of instruction.
- A 63.8% majority disagreed or strongly disagreed, and
- 17.5% neither agreed nor disagreed.

**Teacher Uses the TAG Plan to Meet the Child's Rate and Level of Learning**

- An 11% minority agreed or strongly agreed their child's TAG plan is being utilized by the classroom teacher to meet my student's rate and level of learning on a consistent basis, and
- 30% neither agreed nor disagreed.
- A 59% majority disagreed or strongly disagreed.

**The Student's Academic and/or Intellectual Needs are Met**

- A 29% minority agreed or strongly agreed their students' academic and/or intellectual needs are being met, and
- 25% neither agreed nor disagreed.
- A plurality of 46% disagreed or strongly disagreed.

**The Student's Academic and/or Intellectual Needs are Met Daily through Classroom Instruction**

- A 27% minority agreed or strongly agreed their students' academic and/or intellectual needs are met daily through classroom instruction, and
- 28% neither agreed nor disagreed.
- A plurality of 45% disagreed or strongly disagreed.

**How Students' Academic Needs are Met at School**

Parents could select more than one option.

- When asked how students' academic needs are met at school, of a variety of choices, 66.7% of parents chose "In the regular classroom by their classroom teachers."
- "Other" got 29%.
- "Acceleration in areas of strength (subject acceleration (e.g. advancing to the next grade level or course level in a certain subject area)" got 12.5%.
- "In Honors, Advanced Placement, International Baccalaureate, or college dual credit classes" got 11.8%.
- The remaining options (e.g. "In a full-time classroom where all students are identified as gifted or highly able," or "In the regular classroom with occasional assistance from staff familiar with TAG populations," "In the regular classroom in TAG cluster groups," or "In a pull-out program once or twice a week.") got 7% or less.
- Note: "Through online programs/college level courses" got 2.6%. Given the District's recent and extended experience with Comprehensive Distance Learning, it could be informative to find out if parents have a different response, and if the District should make online learning options more widely available for TAG students.

**Themes from Parents' Volunteered Comments: Other Ways Students' Academic Needs are Met at School**

The parent survey included this open-ended prompt: "Please indicate how your student's academic needs are met at school." Parents submitted 363 voluntary comments, including duplicates. Below are themes from their responses. See Part 8 for examples and for all of the comments.

- Students' needs are not being met in the District's schools.
- Students' needs were met only at ACCESS, not in other schools or programs.
- Examples of ways parents reported students' needs are met.
  - [A]fter school TAG program with librarian (or) after school option (multiple similar comments).
  - We . . . worked with the teacher to create a special program with a variety of modalities, including independent worktime with another student, small group work, and extended studies.
  - With councilor approval, we paid for and enrolled my student in an ORVED class, and my student has been given permission to do work for the extra online class in the regular classroom.
  - In specific courses (e.g. computer, mathematics, performing arts, bilingual class, IB, AP, self-study) (multiple similar responses).
  - I created curriculum for my daughter to be done as independent learning during the school day. After a few days of going to the library to do this learning, she was told she had to stay in the classroom because a "certified teacher was not present in the library." We . . . decided to pull her out of . . . classes in the middle of the day and have her bike home to do her independent learning before returning for her final two classes.

- o At home (or) home schooling (or) Extra work we provide (or) supports parents provide outside of school (or) non-PPS program (multiple similar comments).
- o By taking her out of PPS.
- o This is driven by my child.

**Themes from Parents' Other Comments**

The parent survey included this open-ended prompt: Other comments I would like to share. Parents submitted 683 other comments, duplicates included. Below are themes from their responses and example comments. Below are themes from their responses. See Part 8 for examples and for all of the comments.

- My student is bored.
- My student is not bored (far fewer comments than the theme above).
- TAG instruction, programs or services for TAG identified students are not provided or are underdeveloped or unclear.
- Some parents commented that the TAG program is beneficial or helpful.
- Most, but not all, comments about ACCESS Academy are positive.
- To some parents, OMSI events are the TAG program.
- Personal stories that deserve recognition. Some parents described frustrating attempts to get TAG services for their children. See Part 8 for examples and for all of the comments.

Information on the District's TAG Webpages

*Welcome to the TAG Parent Page! [sic]*

The Welcome to the TAG Parent Page! at https://www.pps.net/Page/3884 includes links to a PPS TAG Parent Information Fall 2020 PowerPoint presentation in English, Chinese, Russian, Somali, Spanish, and Vietnamese. One slide states, "Teachers are required to meet TAG students Rate and Level of learning." [sic] The slide defines rate and level. Other slides discuss topics such as in person and distance learning rate and level strategies, Depth of Knowledge levels 3 and 4, when a parent can request an individual TAG plan, and an update about requests for single subject acceleration.

*The TAG Definitions Webpage*

The District's TAG Definitions Webpage at https://www.pps.net/Page/7932 states students identified TAG and students identified TAG potential "will receive TAG services." The page announces, "At this time, TAG services center primarily within each student's classroom. We encourage each school to provide differentiated curriculum and opportunities that would promote the following," then lists eleven items. One of those is "Learning experiences of students are relevant, engaging and at their rate and level." That is an encouraging signal that the District intends to provide instruction consistent with OAR 581-022-2500. However, evidence from classroom observations and surveys indicates the District has not yet achieved that result.

*TAG Instructional Plans Webpage*

The District's TAG Instructional Plans Webpage at https://www.pps.net/Page/13445 provides this information.

Regarding school TAG plans, "All PPS schools are in the process of having an approved TAG plan that addresses how a school meets the needs of all TAG children within that school. A copy of the

Building TAG plan is available at the school for your review and will [be] available on the TAG website for the 2020-21 school year." The discussion of school building TAG plans is below.

In all courses receiving high school credit, the primary method of communicating TAG services is found in the course syllabus. If after reviewing the school plan and/or specific course syllabi, you think there may be a need for additional support, you may contact your child's teacher and or campus leadership. It is possible to collaborate with your child's school to develop an individual plan. Please keep in mind, this is not a requirement to receive services. Please contact your child's teacher to develop a plan if additional support is needed. The link to the written plan is found below and may be used as a formal request at this time. (There was no link on the page at the time.)

*Accelerated Pathways Page*

The District's Accelerated Pathways page at https://www.pps.net/Page/2885 stated "Due to current circumstances, all SGA [Single Grade Acceleration] and WGA [Whole Grade Acceleration] applications and testing are on hold. We will keep you informed as processes are determined and updated." A link on that page titled Accelerated Learners, Definitions, is to an undated document attributed to the ODE titled Talented and Gifted Learners, Best Practices to Maximize Student Learning at https://www.pps.net/cms/lib/OR01913224/Centricity/Domain/196/Accelerated_Learners_Definitions.pdf . It states acceleration "is access to higher level activities and skill development. Acceleration is addressed through pacing, complexity, and depth of the planned course work. Acceleration means moving at a faster pace though academic content." Examples of acceleration are:

        Acceleration in the Content [sic] area for specific areas of giftedness
        Advanced Placement Classes in high school or sooner
        Concurrent enrollment
        Early entrance to Kindergarten (with caution and prior test scores)
        Grade skipping
        Post-secondary options to earn high school credit and college credit at the same time
        International Baccalaureate

The Accelerated Pathways page provides links to pages specific to single and whole grade acceleration information. The single subject acceleration page includes a statement that, "Usually, the student has been identified as Talented and Gifted." The whole grade page has a similar statement: "Customarily, the students has been identified as TAG." Of parents surveyed, 12.5% reported acceleration met their TAG students' needs. As stated on the Pathways page, those processes are on hold.

As it returns to in-person instruction and normal order, the District should implement its acceleration options for TAG students consistent with the TAG OAR on identification and programs and services.

*Talented and Gifted FAQ's Page*

The District's Talented and Gifted FAQ's page at https://www.pps.net/Page/13106 includes definitions of "rate of learning" (FAQ 15) and "level of learning" (FAQ 16).

- "'Rate of learning' means that students are challenged at the highest rate of speed at which they can comprehend and process information, concepts, and ideas while making it their own. A student would be able to demonstrate, work with, show relationships and synthesize new understandings from this new knowledge.
- The FAQ defined level of learning as "Students working at their appropriate "level of learning" would be challenged at their highest ability to take in, process and respond to

> information.  Instruction would take them to an appropriate depth and complexity of understanding about a topic or subject for each student."

It would be helpful to have the source citations for those definitions. A total of 33 TAG FAQs are listed on that page. The District should periodically review them for accuracy.

Training Materials Provided by the District

*Example Training and Participation Materials Provided by the District*

The District provided these example rate and level training materials with its September 2019 response to the ODE's acceptance of Appellants appeal.

Exhibit 12-A includes a copy of professional development (PD) materials titled Talented and Gifted Rate & Level Professional Development and dated 2018-2019 School Year. The materials indicate the training included review of the ORS. The documents also show training covered nomination forms and processes; definitions of rate and level (no authorities cited); a rate and level table activity; and an opportunity for reflection. The last page indicates this was PD for teachers.

Exhibit 12-B is a copy of PD materials also titled Talented and Gifted Rate & Level Professional Development dated 2019-2020. Some pages are similar to the 2018-2019 materials. Others include ways for teachers to ensure they are "in compliance with state law regarding rate and level." Additional topics include examples of pre-assessments and formative assessments, examples of differentiation strategies, and scenarios for discussion.

The District provided unredacted copies of participant sign-in sheets dated January 29, 2019. Those unredacted copies are not included with this report. The ODE has copies in their file.

A few copies show a different date that month. One is dated January 29, 2018. Copies from six schools appear to use staff roster printouts. Signatures on those forms indicate participation rates varied. Other schools used a standard form titled TAG RATE AND LEVEL TRAINING. It provides a column for participants to print their names, and another for their signatures, but does not necessarily represent all staff or the participation rate.

The table below shows the participation rate for schools based on the schools named on the January 2019 sign-in sheet copies. The total schools within a range are calculated from the list of schools on the District's Website as of July 1, 2020.

| Grade Range or Type | Total Schools in Range/Type | Numbers With Sign-In Copies |
|---|---|---|
| K-8 or Elementary | 58 | 22 |
| Middle | 13 | 7 |
| High | 9 | 5 |
| ACCESS | 2 | 1 |
| Alternative/Other | 11 | 4 |
| Totals | 93 | 39 |

That information is from one example provided by the District. Standing alone, it indicates low participation in one January 2019 training. However, that result is consistent with the results showing

a majority of classrooms visited did not meet rate and level instruction during the visits. The District should take actions to ensure each teacher receives rate and level training consistent with the TAG OAR and the district's TAG policies and procedures.

Exhibit 16 is a copy of training materials titled Differnting [sic] for Gifted Learners dated January 10, 2019. The materials cover 3 of 5 listed topics: Content, Process, and Product. It is not clear if or when another training focused on the other two topics: Assessment, and Learning Environment.
- The materials define content to include curriculum, concepts, or themes that "Reflects PPS [sic] core curriculum standards" and "Presents essential facts and skills." Differentiating content involves providing students "choices in order to add depth to learning" and "additional resources that match their level or understanding."
- Process "Refers to how students make sense or understand [sic] the information, ideas and skills being studied." It "Reflects student learning styles and preferences. Differentiation is "Providing varied options at different levels of difficulty or based on student interest," "different amounts of teacher and student support for a task," "choices about how students express their understanding," and "varying the learning process depending on how students learn."
- Product "Tends to be tangible" such as "reports, tests, brochures, speeches or performance" and "Reflects student understanding." Differentiation involves "Providing challenging variety and choice," and giving students "options about how to express required learning" as through "puppet shows, writing a letter, [or] an annotated diagram."
The materials include Now You Try It! practice opportunities. They also included a list of Instructional  Strategies for Advanced Learners.

Most administrators surveyed rated their expertise in differentiated instruction as intermediate or higher, and differentiated instruction received one of the highest ratings among all strategies included in the survey. Of 634 surveyed teachers surveyed, 624 responded they were familiar with differentiated instruction. Those survey results are inconsistent with the classroom visits results showing a majority did not meet rate and level instruction during the visits.

TAG Building Plans for 2019-2022

Each school's Building TAG Plan is listed and linked at https://www.pps.net/Page/2598 . The TAG OAR do not require districts to provide building-level TAG plans. If the District chooses to implement building-level TAG plans, then it should ensure the plans are implemented consistent with the TAG OAR and District TAG policies and procedures. A review of ten randomly chosen building plans found these results related to planning for rate and level instruction or differentiated instruction for TAG students.

*Plans for TAG Services*

The ten plans reviewed share common focus areas. One is TAG Services. The categories there include:
- Descriptions of classroom strategies and school-wide structures used to meet students' rates and levels of learning.
- Methods to determine when students need acceleration.
- Processes for using data to measure TAG students' growth.
- List of available acceleration options.
- List of ways students can access a course or experience beyond what is typically available and of services available at the school.
- Ways the administrator ensures differentiated and appropriate rate and level instruction.

The TAG Services focus section includes a description such as this of how the principal "ensures the use of differentiated strategies, rigorous and relevant coursework, and instruction provided at the appropriate rate and level" (e.g. reviews of lesson plans, informal and formal observations or walk-throughs, trainings, PLC meetings, goal-setting conferences). One plan reviewed included the statement but omitted the information.

Another building TAG plan focus area is Professional Development. That includes PD in methods to inform and improve TAG instructions.

Most of the ten plans reviewed are ambitious. They include specific details describing the delivery of differentiated rate and level instruction and other services for TAG students. However, the written plans are inconsistent with the classroom visits results showing a clear majority did not meet rate and level instruction during the visits. The District should ensure schools implement well-conceived plans for providing TAG services.

*Most Plans Did Not Include a TAG Team*

Seven of ten plans reviewed did not mention or describe a TAG identification or nominations team. That indicates widespread noncompliance with the OAR 581-022-2500 (5) and 581-022-2325(2) requirements regarding a TAG team and its responsibilities. If the District's procedure is to form school level TAG teams, it should take necessary actions to ensure its schools establish, operate, and maintain TAG teams consistent with the OAR. For example, each building TAG plan could include a section naming the standing TAG nomination team by position title, with ad hoc members included as needed depending on the student being considered to TAG eligibility. If the District's procedure is to have one or more TAG teams formed at school cluster or district levels, then it should make that clear to all stakeholders and operate the teams consistent with TAG OAR.

*It is Not Clear If or When Schools Submitted their Plans for Review or District TAG Staff Reviewed Them*

On all ten plans reviewed, lines for submission and review dates, initials, or signatures were blank. If the District uses a process to review building TAG plans and makes the plans available to the public, it should publish the submission dates and indicate who, by title if not by name, submitted, reviewed, and approved them.

<div align="center">

END of PART 5

GO to NEXT PAGE

</div>

**PART 6: RIGHTS of PARENTS of TAG STUDENTS – FINDINGS and ADDITIONAL INFORMATION**

<u>Appellant's Complaint</u>

Appellant's Exhibit 1 complaint to the District includes this allegation.

> Inadequate or simply nonexistent communication of critical information to families and students including communication about testing, student performance, relevant district and school meetings, rights as TAG parents, procedures (including early entry to Kindergarten, admission to ACCESS Academy, complaints) and accelerative opportunities (especially for high school students). This creates and perpetuates serious inequities. (Ibid., p.4.)

<u>Scope of This Investigation</u>

The Exhibit 10 copy of the ODE's August 21, 2019, letter to Appellant and the District accepting Appellant's appeal defines the overall scope of this investigation. "[T]he Oregon Department of Education will investigate the following: Is Portland Public Schools in compliance with Oregon standards of instruction that apply to talented and gifted (TAG) students?"

The Exhibit 23 copy of the ODE TAG Specialist's February 3, 2020 email to parents of TAG-identified students further clarifies the subjects for this investigation, "The Oregon Department of Education is conducting an investigation specific to Talented and Gifted identification practices, rights of parents, and programs and **O**

**OAR 581-022-2330, Rights of Parents of TAG Students**

OAR 581-022-2330 is at https://secure.sos.state.or.us/oard/viewSingleRule.action?ruleVrsnRsn=256781. The full text is below for reference.

In carrying out the requirements of OAR 581-022-2325 and OAR 581-022-2500, the school district shall:
(1) Inform parents at the time of the identification of the child and the programs and services available.
(2) Provide an opportunity for the parents to provide input to and discuss with the district the programs and services to be received by their child.
(3) The parents may, at any time, request the withdrawal of their child from programs and services provided under OAR 581-022-2330. The school district shall notify parents of identified students of this right.
(4) Parents shall be informed of their right to file a complaint under OAR 581-002-0001 to OAR 581-002-0023.
Statutory/Other Authority: ORS 326.051
Statutes/Other Implemented: ORS 343.391 - 343.413

Findings regarding OAR 581-022-2330 and details related to those findings are in the sections below.

<u>Inform parents at the time of the identification of the child and the programs and services available</u>. (581-022-2330(1))

*General Finding*

There is no evidence of a procedure to ensure parents get that information at the time a child is TAG identified.

*Findings from Classroom Visits*

There is no information from classroom visits specific to OAR 581-022-2330(1).

*Findings from Surveys of Administrators, Teachers, and Parents*

**Administrators**

There were no survey prompts or volunteered comments specific to OAR 581-022-2330.

**Teachers**

There were no survey prompts or volunteered comments specific to OAR 581-022-2330(1).

**Parents**

There were no survey prompts or volunteered comments specific to OAR 581-022-2330(1).

*Findings from Information on the District's TAG Webpages*

A scan of the District's TAG FAQs titles at https://www.pps.net/Page/13106 did not find FAQs that directly address parents' OAR 581-022-2330(1) right to information.

The Welcome to the TAG Parent Page! at https://www.pps.net/Page/3884 includes links to a PPS TAG Parent Information Fall 2020 PowerPoint presentation in English, Chinese, Russian, Somali, Spanish, and Vietnamese. There are no slides specific to parents' rights under OAR 581-022-2330(1).

*Findings from Training and Other Materials Provided by the District*

The training and other materials covered TAG nominations and related materials but not OAR 581-022-2330(1).

*Findings from TAG Building Plans*

All ten randomly selected plans included a Communication focus area that addressed methods for communicating with parents and families. Non addressed OAR 581-022-2330(1).


Provide an opportunity for the parents to provide input to and discuss with the district the programs and services to be received by their child. (OAR 581-022-2330(2))

*General Finding*

There are plans in place for parents to provide input about and discuss their students' TAG services with District staff, but most parents surveyed responded there are actually few if any opportunities to do that.

*Findings from Classroom Visits*

On average, teachers reported that when they did discuss TAG plans with families, they most often did that either during fall conferences or at the beginning of the year with ongoing communications after that.

Most teachers across grade levels reported either the parent or the teacher initiated discussions about students' TAG plans. The exception was in grades 6-8, where teachers mostly reported teachers initiated those conversations.

*Findings from Surveys of Administrators, Teachers, and Parents*

### Administrators

There were no survey prompts or volunteered comments specific to OAR 581-022-2330.

### Teachers

An 84.2% majority reported they conferenced with parents of TAG students regarding students' learning in a meeting, by phone or through email as needed. Fewer, 32.7%, reported they conferenced at the beginning of the year. Weekly, monthly, quarterly, twice a year, and end of the year conferences with TAG parents occurred at significantly lower rates.

### Parents

A small minority of parents surveyed agreed or strongly agreed they could frequently or often discuss and develop their student's TAG plans with the teacher. A small minority also agreed or strongly agreed they were frequently or often informed about the TAG student's progress. Large majorities of responses included those who disagreed or strongly disagreed or who neither agreed nor disagreed.

Minorities of parents surveyed agreed or strongly agreed
- they were frequently or often given the opportunity to discuss and develop their student's TAG plan with the teacher.
- they were frequently or often informed about their student's progress.
- they could easily arrange to discuss TAG concerns with their student's teacher, principal, building representative, or District administrator.
- if they address concerns specific to TAG services/classroom instruction (e.g. differentiation, acceleration, rate and level instructional practices, etc.) with their student's teacher, the teacher explains how the student's academic and/or intellectual needs are being met in the classroom.

Majorities of responses included those who disagreed or strongly disagreed with those statements or who neither agreed nor disagreed.

A theme from parents' volunteered comments is there are few if any staff/parent communications

*Findings from Information on the District's TAG Webpages*

A scan of the District's TAG FAQs titles at https://www.pps.net/Page/13106 did not find FAQs that directly address parents' OAR 581-022-2330 rights. The text FAQ 33 directs parents with questions at TAG to contact a school's TAG facilitator.

The Welcome to the TAG Parent Page! at https://www.pps.net/Page/3884 includes links to a PPS TAG Parent Information Fall 2020 PowerPoint presentation in English, Chinese, Russian, Somali, Spanish, and Vietnamese. There are no slides specific to parents' rights under OAR 581-022-2330(1).

*Findings from Training and Other Materials Provided by the District*

The training and other materials covered TAG nominations and related materials but not OAR 581-022-2330(2).

*Findings from TAG Building Plans*

Each of the ten randomly selected plans included a Communication focus area that addressed methods such as these for communicating with parents and families.
- A TAG bulletin board for parents maintained by the TAG Facilitator or by
- Communications through methods such as fall TAG parent meetings, school or teacher newsletters, blogs,
- Methods for families to evaluate the school's TAG services such as through parent meetings, conferences with teachers, informal meetings with the principal,
- Methods for parents to communicate concerns, such as through conferences with teachers or direct communications to a teacher, the TAG facilitator, the school administrator, or the District. One school did not provide any methods for parents to do that.

The TAG Building Plan form included a statement that, at a parent conference, the parent signs a form that the parent had an opportunity to provide input into and review the school's plan for meeting a student's rate and level of learning.

The parents may, at any time, request the withdrawal of their child from programs and services provided under OAR 581-022-2330. The school district shall notify parents of identified students of this right. (OAR 581-022-2330(3))

*General Finding*

A minority of parents surveyed agreed or strongly agreed they were aware of their rights to withdraw students from the District's TAG services and programs, and there is little if any attempt to inform parents about that right.

*Findings from Classroom Visits*

There is no information from classroom visits specific to OAR 581-022-2330(3).

*Findings from Surveys of Administrators, Teachers, and Parents*

**Administrators**

There were no survey prompts or volunteered comments specific to OAR 581-022-2330.

**Teachers**

There were no survey prompts or volunteered comments specific to OAR 581-022-2330(3).

**Parents**

A 33% minority agreed or strongly agreed they were aware of their rights to withdraw students from the District's TAG services and programs.

*Findings from Information on the District's TAG Webpages*

A scan of the District's TAG FAQs titles at https://www.pps.net/Page/13106 did not find FAQs that directly address parents' OAR 581-022-2330 rights. The text FAQ 33 directs parents with questions at TAG to contact a school's TAG facilitator.

The Welcome to the TAG Parent Page! at https://www.pps.net/Page/3884 includes links to a PPS TAG Parent Information Fall 2020 PowerPoint presentation in English, Chinese, Russian, Somali, Spanish, and Vietnamese. There are no slides specific to parents' rights under OAR 581-022-2330(3).

*Findings from Training and Other Materials Provided by the District*

The training and other materials covered TAG nominations and related materials but not OAR 581-022-2330(3).

*Findings from TAG Building Plans*

The ten randomly reviewed TAG building plans did not address OAR 581-022-2330(3).

Parents shall be informed of their right to file a complaint under OAR 581-002-0001 to OAR 581-002-0023. (OAR 581-022-2330(4))

*General Finding*

A small minority of parents surveyed agreed or strongly agreed they were aware of their right to file such a complaint, and information about that from the District is limited, difficult to find, and in one source inconsistent with the TAG OAR.

*Findings from Classroom Visits*

There is no information from classroom visits specific to OAR 581-022-2330(4).

*Findings from Surveys of Administrators, Teachers, and Parents*

**Administrators**

There were no survey prompts or volunteered comments specific to OAR 581-022-2330.

**Teachers**

There were no survey prompts or volunteered comments specific to OAR 581-022-2330(4)

**Parents**

An 18.1% minority agreed or strongly agreed they had been informed about their rights to file a complaint with the district and how to file a formal complaint. A 58.7% majority disagreed or strongly disagreed, and 23.2% neither agreed nor disagreed.

*Findings from Information on the District's TAG Webpages*

The District's Board Policy 4.50.032-P, Formal Complaints, at https://www.pps.net/cms/lib/OR01913224/Centricity/Domain/4814/4.50.032-P.pdf includes a link to OAR 581-022-2370, which describes a complainant's right to appeal a district's final decision to the Deputy Superintendent of Public Instruction under OAR 581-002-0001 to 0023. That gives parents of TAG identified students a technically actual but not easily accessible notice of their right under those OAR.

The Webpage on TAG identification and testing at https://www.pps.net/Page/1546 provides links to a document titled A Parent's Guide to the Appeals Process and to a form titled PPS Appeals Form Department of Talented and Gifted. It appears the documents only allow appeals of assessment scores. The Guide begins, "Families of students, who have been deemed ineligible for services and or do not agree with assessment scores, may appeal the decision in some circumstances." It gives parents instructions on how and when to make their appeal and what to provide. Among the items a parent could provide are teachers' written comments, evidence of exceptionally high quality classroom work, and information about a child's cultural and linguistic needs.

- The appeal process does not include any references to the OAR 581-022-2325(2) behavioral, learning, and other research based sources districts shall use when determining TAG identifications.
- The appeal process does not mention or include the involvement of the TAG team referenced in both OAR 581-022-2325 and OAR 581-022-2500.

*Findings from Training and Other Materials Provided by the District*

The training and other materials covered TAG nominations and related materials but not OAR 581-022-2330(4).

*Findings from TAG Building Plans*

The ten randomly reviewed TAG building plans did not address OAR 581-022-2330(4).

Below are underlined sections with more information related to the findings above.

Classroom Visits Results

Results are from observations and comments made during the classroom visits held during the 2020-2021 school year. Details about the visits and results are in Part 7 of this report. Percentages of teachers who responded to prompts are based on numbers of classroom visits, not on total teachers in the District. See the Part 7 tables for the numbers (N=) of teachers.

Summary Information from Classroom Visits

- Across grades K-8, an average of 84.5% of teachers reported they did not have students with written TAG plans in their classes; 60.8% of teachers in grades 9-12 reported the same.

- Across grades K-8, and average of 86.2% of teachers reported parents did not request written TAG plans for their students; 71.7% of teachers in grades 9-12 reported the same.
- On average, teachers reported that when they did discuss TAG plans with families, they most often did that either during fall conferences or at the beginning of the year with ongoing communications after that.
- Teachers reported these trends when asked who initiates the discussion of a student's TAG plan.
  - In grades K-5, a parent, teacher, or both initiated the discussion.
  - In grades 6-8, a plurality reported the teacher initiated it.
  - In grades 9-12, a majority reported both the parent and teacher initiated it during a "conversation about the student."
  - Across all grades it is not clear if the "conversation about the student" is either formal or informal.
- There was no information specific to conversations with parents at the time students were identified TAG.

Summaries of Survey Results: Administrators, Teachers, and Parents

Numbers of respondents varied depending on the group surveyed and on the instructions for a specific prompt. The survey gave respondents opportunities to make comments. Percentages are based on the numbers or administrators, teachers, and parents who responded to the survey, not on the total possible numbers of District administrators, teachers, or parents. Survey details and tables including numbers surveyed (N=) are at Part 8.

Summary of Results from Survey of Administrators

There were no survey prompts or volunteered comments specific to OAR 581-022-2330.

Summary of Results from Survey of Teachers

- An 86% majority of teachers surveyed reported parents do not often request a written instructional plan.
- An 84.2% majority reported they conferenced with parents of TAG students regarding students' learning in a meeting, by phone or through email as needed. Fewer, 32.7%, reported they conferenced at the beginning of the year. Weekly, monthly, quarterly, twice a year, and end of the year conferences with TAG parents occurred at significantly lower rates.
- A majority 82% of responding teachers conferenced with TAG students regarding their learning in a meeting, by phone or through email as needed. Fewer reported they conferenced with students weekly (17.8%), at the beginning of the year (14.2%), or quarterly (11.9%). Monthly, twice a year and end of the year conferences occurred at significantly lower rates.

Summary of Results from Survey of Parents

- A 3% minority agreed or strongly agreed they were frequently or often given the opportunity to discuss and develop their student's TAG plan with the teacher, and 6% reported that happened regularly. A 55% majority reported that happened never or not at all, and 36% reported that happened sometimes.
- A 9.9% minority agreed or strongly agreed they were frequently or often informed about their student's progress, and 21.8% reported that happened regularly. A 39.3% plurality reported that happened sometimes, and 29% reported that happened never or not at all.

- A 24.3% minority agreed or strongly agreed the student and parent have adequate opportunities to suggest ways to meet their student's needs. A 47.1% plurality disagreed or strongly disagreed, and 28.6% neither agreed nor disagreed.
- A 31.4% minority agreed or strongly agreed they could easily arrange to discuss TAG concerns with their student's teacher, principal, building representative, or District administrator, and 32.5% disagreed or strongly disagreed. A plurality of 36.2% neither agreed nor disagreed.
- A 22% minority agreed or strongly agreed if they address concerns specific to TAG services/classroom instruction (e.g. differentiation, acceleration, rate and level instructional practices, etc.) with their student's teacher, the teacher explains how the student's academic and/or intellectual needs are being met in the classroom. A total of 29% disagreed or strongly disagreed. A plurality of 49% neither agreed nor disagreed.
- An 18.1% minority agreed or strongly agreed they had been informed about their rights to file a complaint with the district and how to file a formal complaint. A 58.7% majority disagreed or strongly disagreed, and 23.2% neither agreed nor disagreed.
- A 33% minority agreed or strongly agreed they were aware of their rights to withdraw students from the District's TAG services and programs. A 37% plurality disagreed or strongly disagreed: 30% neither agreed nor disagreed.
- A theme from parents' volunteered comments is there are few if any staff/parent communications.

Information on the District's TAG Webpages

- A scan of the District's TAG FAQs titles at https://www.pps.net/Page/13106 did not find FAQs that directly address parents' OAR 581-022-2330 rights.
    - FAQ 14 asks, "What should I realistically expect once my child is identified as TAG?" The answer does not provide information at the time the child is identified as required by OAR 581-022-2330(1). The District should revise it to be consistent with the OAR.
        - Each school has a TAG building plan to address the needs of TAG students on each campus. The plan addresses ways in which the classroom teacher can differentiate the curriculum in order for the student to be challenged at their individual rate and level of learning. These plans will be updated each year as programming evolves.
    - FAQ 33 directs parents with questions about TAG to contact a school's TAG facilitator.
- The District's Board Policy 4.50.032-P, Formal Complaints, at https://www.pps.net/cms/lib/OR01913224/Centricity/Domain/4814/4.50.032-P.pdf includes a link to OAR 581-022-2370, which describes a complainant's right to appeal a district's final decision to the Deputy Superintendent of Public Instruction under OAR 581-002-0001 to 0023. That gives parents of TAG identified students technically actual but not efficiently accessible notice of their right under those OAR.
- The Webpage on TAG identification and testing at https://www.pps.net/Page/1546 provides links to a document titled A Parent's Guide to the Appeals Process and to a form titled PPS Appeals Form Department of Talented and Gifted. It appears the documents only allow appeals of assessment scores. The Guide begins, "Families of students, who have been deemed ineligible for services and or do not agree with assessment scores, may appeal the decision in some circumstances." It gives parents instructions on how and when to make their appeal and what to provide. Among the items a parent could provide are teachers' written comments, evidence of exceptionally high quality classroom work, and information about a child's cultural and linguistic needs.
    - The appeal process does not include any references to the OAR 581-022-2325(2) behavioral, learning, and other research based sources districts shall use when determining TAG identifications.

- The appeal process does not mention or include the involvement of the TAG team referenced in both OAR 581-022-2325 and OAR 581-022-2500.
- The Welcome to the TAG Parent Page! at https://www.pps.net/Page/3884 includes links to a PPS TAG Parent Information Fall 2020 PowerPoint presentation in English, Chinese, Russian, Somali, Spanish, and Vietnamese. One slide on TAG Law describes the requirements to identify TAG students and provide services. One slide encourages parents to discuss their child's learning; another encourages parents to not wait until November to do that. One advises parents with concerns about their children's needs to contact the teacher, TAG facilitator, school administrator, or TAG office. There are no slides specific to parents' rights under OAR 581-022-2330(1), (3), or (4).

Training and Other Materials Provided by the District

- Exhibit 13-A includes a copy of an agenda titled TAG Facilitators Meeting dated January 10, 2019. Agenda items include the nominations form process and testing for TAG identification such as selecting the testing venue, scheduling the testing, arranging for proctors, and notices to parents regarding results.
- Exhibit 13-B is a copy of a District letter to parents or guardians regarding nominations of students for TAG services and of a District form titled Nomination/Permission Form for Identification for Talented and Gifted Education 2019-2020. Both are in English. The District provided copies of the nomination form in multiple languages.
- Exhibit 17 is copies of emails from the District's TAG Director to TAG facilitators. A September start of the 2019-2020 school year message includes information about scheduling their TAG parent information nights.
- Exhibit 20 is a copy of schedules for three parent workshops for the spring of 2019 and four for the 2019-2020 school year. There is also a copy of what is apparently a portion of a PowerPoint presentation titled Partnering with your school for student success, and subtitled Characteristics of Giftedness.

Those training and other materials are not specific to OAR 581-022-2330.

TAG Building Plans

Each school's Building TAG Plan is listed and linked at https://www.pps.net/Page/2598 . The TAG OAR do not require districts to provide building-level TAG plans. If the District chooses to implement building-level TAG plans, then it should ensure the plans are implemented consistent with the TAG OAR and District TAG policies and procedures. A review of ten randomly chosen building plans found these results related to parents' rights under OAR 581-022-2330.

Each plan included a Communication focus area that addressed methods such as these for communicating with parents and families.
- A TAG bulletin board for parents maintained by the TAG Facilitator or by
- Communications through methods such as fall TAG parent meetings, school or teacher newsletters, blogs,
- Methods for families to evaluate the school's TAG services such as through parent meetings, conferences with teachers, informal meetings with the principal,
- Methods for parents to communicate concerns, such as through conferences with teachers or direct communications to a teacher, the TAG facilitator, the school administrator, or the District. One school did not provide any methods for parents to do that.

The TAG Building Plan form includes a statement that, at a parent conference, the parent signs a form that the parent had an opportunity to provide input into and review the school's plan for meeting a student's rate and level of learning.

On all ten plans reviewed, lines for submission and review dates, initials, or signatures were blank. If the District uses a process to review building TAG plans and makes the plans available to the public, it should publish the submission dates and indicate who, by title if not by name, submitted, reviewed, and approved them.

END of PART 6

GO to NEXT PAGE

**PART 7: SCHOOL VISITS PROCEDURES and RESULTS**

Procedures

The results reported in this section are from observations or teachers' comments made during classroom visits.

In-person classroom visits occurred during the period of January-March 2020. Those ended when schools closed due to COVID-19. Virtual visits to schools and classes using Comprehensive Distance Learning (CDL) occurred during October 2020.

This was the in-person school and classroom visit procedure.
- Each visiting team included the ODE's TAG Specialist; a district TAG or other administrator; a district TAG Teacher on Special Assignment (TOSA); and a school administrator (occasionally called away for school business). The ODE contractor attended some visits to observe the protocol.
- The ODE's TAG Specialist used identical data collection tools for each visit. The Specialist observed for the same activities in each class.
- Each visit lasted from 20 to 45 minutes, depending on the class activities and the teacher's availability to respond to questions.
- Because some teachers were not available to respond to questions, numbers of teachers responding vary.

This was the virtual visits procedure.
- The school or teacher provided a link for the visiting team to enter the class. Most links were through a Google application, and some were through Zoom.
- Consistent with the in-person visits, each virtual visit team included the ODE's TAG Specialist, a district TAG or other administrator, and a district TAG TOSA.
- The ODE's TAG Specialist used identical data collection tools for each virtual visit. The Specialist observed for the same activities in each class.
- The visiting team members muted their microphones. They observed CDL classes but did not interact. The Specialist communicated with those teachers through emails and surveys.

Contents

This section's contents are presented in these parts.

**Schools, Programs, and Classrooms Visited**

Schools or Programs Visited

The investigation included visits to 43 District schools or programs, including 46% of the District's elementary schools, 44% of its K-8 schools, 71% of its middle schools, 64% of its high schools, both of its ACCESS alternative programs, and its Metropolitan Learning Center K-12 alternative school. Below are details for the school types.

Four of the sixteen elementary schools visited delivered instruction through the CDL Model due to COVID-19 protocols. So did four of the ten middle schools and all seven high schools.

Totals of the District's schools or programs are from taken from its Website list of schools and programs as of July 2020.

| PPS Elementary Schools | 35 |
|---|---|
| Elementary Schools  Visited | 16 |
| Percent of Elementary Schools Visited | 46% |

| PPS K-8 Schools (Not Including MLC Below) | 16 |
|---|---|
| K-8 Schools  Visited | 7 |
| Percent of K-8 Schools Visited | 44% |

| PPS Middle Schools | 14 |
|---|---|
| Middle Schools  Visited | 10 |
| Percent of Middle Schools Visited | 71% |

| PPS High Schools (Not Including Pioneer Schools) | 11 |
|---|---|
| High Schools  Visited | 7 |
| Percent of High Schools Visited | 64% |

| PPS ACCESS Programs | 2 |
|---|---|
| ACCESS Programs Visited | 2 |
| Percent of ACCESS Programs Visited | 100% |

| PPS Multnomah Learning Center (MLC) K-12 | 1 |
|---|---|
| MLC Visited | 1 |
| Percent of MLCs Visited | 100% |

Classrooms Visited by Grade Ranges

The visits included 132 grades K-2 classrooms and 104 grades 3-5 classrooms. This table shows how visits were distributed among grade levels.

| Grades K-2 Schools 132 Classes Visited | | Grades 3-5 Schools 104 Classes Visited | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Kindergarten | 30.2% | 3rd Grade | 26.9% |
| 1st Grade | 31.1% | 4th Grade | 32.7% |
| 2nd Grade | 34.1% | 5th Grade | 29.8% |
| Blended Grades | 2.3% | Blended Grades | 4.8% |
| Special Program | 2.3% | Special Program | 5.8% |
| Total | 100.0% | Total | 100.0% |
| Total Visited | 132 | Total Visited | 104 |

The visits also included 159 grades 6-8 classrooms and 46 grades 9-12 classrooms. Subjects observed depended on those offered within specific grade ranges and on a class's schedule on the visit day.

| Grades 6-8 Schools-Subjects Observed 159 Classes Visited | | | | Grades 9-12 Schools-Subjects Observed 46 Classes Visited | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Subject | Gr 6 | Gr 7 | Gr 8 | Subject | Gr 9 | Gr 10 | Gr 11 | Gr 12 |
| Math-Grade Level | X | X | X | Math-Grade Level | X | X | X | |
| Math-Compacted 1 | | X | | Advanced Math | X | X | X | X |
| Math-Compacted 2 | | X | X | Science | X | X | X | |
| Algebra | | X | X | Social Science | X | X | X | X |
| Science | X | X | X | Language Arts | X | X | X | X |
| Social Science | X | X | X | ELD | X | | | |
| Language Arts | X | X | X | ELD Immersion | X | | | |
| ELD | X | X | | IB/AP | | X | X | X |
| ELD Push-In | X | X | X | | | | | |
| ELD Immersion | | X | X | | | | | |
| Intervention Focus | | | X | | | | | |
| Advanced/Honors | | | X | | | | | |

GO to NEXT PAGE

**Numbers of TAG Students Reported by Teachers**

Reported Numbers of TAG Students in Classes

In grades K-2, 39% of teachers reported having TAG students in their classes. In grades 3-12, an average of 75% reported having TAG students in their classes. Consistent with that result, 54% of grades K-2 teachers reported having no TAG students. Across grades 3-12, an average of 7% of teachers reported having no TAG students.

| Do you have any TAG students in your class? | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Responses | Grades K-2 | Grades 3-5 | Grades 6-8 | Grades 9-12 |
| Yes | 39% | 77% | 78% | 71% |
| No | 54% | 10% | 9% | 2% |
| Unknown (Unavailable to Ask) | 6% | 7% | 7% | 0% |
| Did Not Know Due to Students' Ages or Lack of Scores | 1% | 1% | 0% | 0% |
| Unknown (Did Not Return Survey) | 1% | 6% | 6% | 27% |
| Totals | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| # Teachers Who Responded | 132 | 104 | 158 | 45 |

Teachers' reports of numbers of TAG students by grade range vary. Teachers of grades K-5 tended to report having fewer TAG students; teachers of grades 6-12 tended to report having more. Significantly more grades 6-12 teachers reported having more than ten TAG students. There was no option to report no TAG students.

| If yes, how many TAG students? | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Grades K-2 N=61 Teachers | | Grades 3-5 N=92 Teachers | | Grades 6-8 N= 147 Teachers | | Grades 9-12 N=44 Teachers | |
| # TAG Students | Responses | % of N | Responses | % of N | Responses | % of N | Responses | % of N |
| 1 | 18 | 29.5% | 23 | 25.0% | 13 | 8.8% | 2 | 4.5% |
| 2 | 13 | 21.3% | 7 | 7.6% | 18 | 12.2% | 5 | 11.4% |
| 3 | 6 | 9.8% | 6 | 6.5% | 14 | 9.5% | 1 | 2.3% |
| 4 | 2 | 3.3% | 8 | 8.7% | 3 | 2.0% | 3 | 6.8% |
| 5 | 4 | 6.6% | 7 | 7.6% | 6 | 4.1% | 2 | 4.5% |
| 6 | 0 | 0.0% | 7 | 7.6% | 7 | 4.8% | 2 | 4.5% |
| 7 | 0 | 0.0% | 4 | 4.3% | 5 | 3.4% | 1 | 2.3% |
| 8 | 1 | 1.6% | 5 | 5.4% | 8 | 5.4% | 1 | 2.3% |
| 9 | 1 | 1.6% | 3 | 3.3% | 1 | 0.7% | 1 | 2.3% |
| 10 | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 5 | 3.4% | 3 | 6.8% |
| >10 | 1 | 1.6% | 4 | 4.3% | 33 | 22.4% | 11 | 25.0% |
| Teacher NA | 12 | 19.7% | 14 | 15.2% | 21 | 14.3% | 12 | 27.3% |
| Teacher DNK | 3 | 4.9% | 4 | 4.3% | 13 | 8.8% | 0 | 0.0% |
| Teacher NA=Teacher unavailable to ask.  Teacher DNK=Teacher did not know. | | | | | | | | |

Note: (Note: The "Unknown" and "Teacher NA" percentages for grades 9-12 reflects all high school classes being in the Comprehensive Distance Learning Model due to COVID-19 protocols.)

**Nominations and Identifications of Students for TAG Eligibility**

How Most Students are Nominated for TAG Eligibility

Reports by teachers of grades K-12 indicate these overall trends regarding how most students were nominated for TAG eligibility.
- An average of 43.4% reported the District nominated students, 24.2% reported teachers did, and 16% reported parents did.
- Reported parent nominations declined dramatically after grades K-2. The range was 35.1% of nominations in grades K-2 to 3.1% in grades 6-8.
- Reports of parent and teacher nominations were lowest for grades 6-8.

Teachers of grades K-2 reported a somewhat equal distribution of TAG eligibility nominations by teachers, parents, and the District. The 35.1% plurality were by parents. (In this report, "plurality" means the highest number or percentage within the total number of classes, teachers, observations or responses.)

In grades 3-5, a plurality of 44.2% of teachers reported most nominations were by the District, and 30.8% reported most were by teachers. Only 11.5% reported most were by parents, significant decline from the 35.1% reported by teachers of grades K-2.

In grades 6-8, the 72% majority of teachers reported most nominations were by District, compared to 31.3% in grades K-2, 44.2% in grades 3-5, and 26.1% in grades 9-12. Only 11.5% reported most were by a teacher, and only 3.1% reported most were by parents. As noted below, the data for grades 6-8 are significantly different from trends across other grade ranges.

Given almost a third of teachers in grades 9-12 were unavailable to comment, 28.6% reported most nominations were by a teacher, 26.1% reported they were by the District, and 14.3% reported they were by parents.

| How are most students nominated for TAG in your classroom? | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Responses** | **Grades K-2** | **Grades 3-5** | **Grades 6-8** | **Grades 9-12** |
| Teacher | 26.0% | 30.8% | 11.5% | 28.6% |
| Parent | 35.1% | 11.5% | 3.1% | 14.3% |
| District | 31.3% | 44.2% | 72.0% | 26.1% |
| Unknown (teacher unavailable to ask) | 7.6% | 13.5% | 13.4% | 31.0% |
| Totals | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |
| # Teachers Who Responded | 131 | 104 | 157 | 42 |

Note: The data for grades 6-8 are significantly different from trends across other grade ranges. The District should investigate further to determine why.

Note: High school classes were in the Comprehensive Distance Learning Model due to COVID-19 protocols. Almost a third of the grades 9-12 teachers were unavailable to comment.

GO to NEXT PAGE

Nominations by Parents

Across all K-12 grade ranges, an average 71.6% majority of teachers reported parents did not nominate students for TAG eligibility that year. Only an average of 13% reported parents did nominate students.

The percentage of teachers in grades 6-8 reporting parents did not nominate students for TAG eligibility that year is significantly higher than for other grade ranges.

The percentage of teachers reporting parents did nominate students drops dramatically from a high of 31.1% in grades K-2 to 13.5% in grades 3-5. The percentage again drops significantly to 5% in grades 6-8, then to 2.2% in grades 9-12.

The percentages of teachers in grade ranges K-2, 3-5 and 6-8 reporting parents did nominate students that year are consistent with if not exactly the same as the percentages reporting parent nominations in the "How are most students nominated for TAG in your classroom" data table above.

The 2.2% percentage of teachers in grades 9-12 reporting parents did nominate students that year is significantly less than the 14.3% percentage reporting parent nominations in the "How are most students nominated for TAG in your classroom" data table above.

| Did any parents nominate students for TAG eligibility in your class this year? | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Responses | Grades K-2 | Grades 3-5 | Grades 6-8 | Grades 9-12 |
| Yes | 31.1% | 13.5% | 5.0% | 2.2% |
| No | 62.1% | 73.0% | 81.8% | 69.6% |
| Unknown (teacher unavailable to ask) | 6.8% | 13.5% | 13.2% | 28.2% |
| Totals | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |
| # Teachers Who Responded | 132 | 104 | 159 | 46 |

GO to NEXT PAGE

Nominations Within Grade Ranges

A 48.5% plurality of teachers in grades K-2 reported students were nominated for TAG eligibility during the school year; 30.3% reported no student were nominated; and 11.4% reported students might be nominated, but the teachers were unsure about the process.

A 45.2% plurality of teachers in grades 3-5 reported students were not nominated; 36.5% reported students were nominated; and 4.8% reported students might be nominated, but the teachers were unsure about the process.

| Question for Teachers Grades K-5: Have any students in your class been nominated for TAG eligibility this year? | | |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Responses | Grades K-2 | Grades 3-5 |
| Yes | 48.5% | 36.5% |
| No | 30.3% | 45.2% |
| Maybe (Teacher is unsure of the process.) | 11.4% | 4.8% |
| Unknown (teacher unavailable to ask) | 6.8% | 13.5% |
| Not Sure (CDL Implication) | 3.0% | 0.0% |
| Totals | 100.0% | 100.0% |
| # Teachers Who Responded | 132 | 104 |

In grades 6-8, a 50.3% majority reported they had not nominated or would not nominate students for TAG eligibility during the school. A 14.5% minority reported they had nominated or would nominate students, and 18.9% reported they were unsure.

In grades 9-12, a 39.1% plurality reported they had not nominated or would not nominate students for TAG eligibility during the school year. An 15.2% minority reported they had nominated or would nominate students. and 17.4% reported they were unsure. A significant percentage were unavailable to respond.

| Question for Teachers Grades 6-12: Have/will you nominate students in your class for TAG eligibility this year? | | |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Responses | Grades 6-8 | Grades 9-12 |
| Yes | 14.5% | 15.2% |
| No | 50.3% | 39.1% |
| Maybe or Unsure | 18.9% | 17.4% |
| Unknown (teacher unavailable to ask) | 13.2% | 28.3% |
| Not Sure (CDL Implication) | 3.1% | 0.0% |
| Totals | 100.0% | 100.0% |
| # Teachers Who Responded | 159 | 46 |

GO to NEXT PAGE

Most teachers in grades K-5 classrooms reported one to three nominations of students for TAG eligibility that year. A small percentage reported four to five nominations. Almost none reported more than five.

Teachers in grades 6-12 reported far fewer nominations. However, many teachers were unavailable. In grades 9-12, classes were in Comprehensive Distance Learning due to COVID-19 protocols.

| Grades K-8: How many students have been nominated from your class this year? | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grades 9-12: How many students do you have in mind to nominate this year, or how many have you nominated? | | | | | | | | |
| | Grades K-2 N=73 Total Responses | | Grades 3-5 N=53 Total Responses | | Grades 6-8 N=52 Total Responses | | Grades 9-12 N=47 Total Responses | |
| # TAG | Responses | % of N | Responses | % of N | Responses | % of N | Responses | % of N |
| 1 | 26 | 35.6% | 15 | 28.3% | 14 | 26.9% | 2 | 4.3% |
| 2 | 19 | 26.0% | 14 | 26.4% | 5 | 9.6% | 1 | 2.1% |
| 3 | 12 | 16.4% | 2 | 3.8% | 4 | 7.7% | 2 | 4.3% |
| 4 | 5 | 6.8% | 4 | 7.5% | 1 | 1.9% | 1 | 2.1% |
| 5 | 1 | 1.4% | 3 | 5.7% | 1 | 1.9% | 0 | 0.0% |
| >5 | 1 | 1.4% | 1 | 1.9% | 0 | 0.0% | 3 | 6.4% |
| None Unidentified | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 8 | 17.0% |
| Teacher NA | 9 | 12.3% | 14 | 26.4% | 21 | 40.4% | 13 | 27.7% |
| Undetermined | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 6 | 11.5% | 17 | 36.2% |
| Totals | 73 | 100.0% | 53 | 100.0% | 52 | 100.0% | 47 | 100.0% |
| None Unidentified=Teacher reported there were no unidentified students. Teacher NA=Teacher unavailable to ask. Undetermined=Unable to determine through CDL Includes "None" for grades 9-12. | | | | | | | | |

Teachers reported a variety of information sources for nominating students for TAG eligibility. Some reported more than one. Across grade ranges, teachers most consistently reported using Observed TAG Characteristics. Other most used sources varied by grade ranges. Student Work Samples were the least used source.
- In grades K -2, most used sources were Parent Request, Observed TAG Characteristics, and 2nd Grade Screening (CogAt).
- In grades 3-5 and 6-8, they were MAP Testing results and Observed TAG Characteristics.
- In grades 9-12, Observed TAG Characteristics was most reported. (Note: The Teachers Unavailable to Ask result reflects classes being in the Comprehensive Distance Learning Model due to COVID-19 protocols.)

| Grades K-12: What led to nominating students? Or, what compelled you to nominate students? | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Grades K-2 N=87 Teachers | | Grades 3-5 N=55 Teachers | | Grades 6-8 N=54 Teachers | | Grades 9-12 N=27 Teachers | |
| Response Options | Responses | % of N | Responses | % of N | Responses | % of N | Responses | % of N |
| MAP Testing | 12 | 13.8% | 21 | 38.2% | 15 | 27.8% | 0 | 0.0% |
| 2nd Grade Screening (CogAT) | 26 | 29.9% | 2 | 3.6% | 1 | 1.9% | 1 | 3.7% |
| Observed TAG Characteristics | 27 | 31.0% | 18 | 32.7% | 21 | 38.9% | 11 | 40.7% |
| Teacher Unavailable to Ask | 9 | 10.3% | 14 | 25.5% | 20 | 37.0% | 13 | 48.1% |
| Parent Request | 31 | 35.6% | 10 | 18.2% | 6 | 11.1% | 0 | 0.0% |
| MAP/OSAT/Other Results | 0 | 0.0% | 3 | 5.5% | 5 | 9.3% | 4 | 14.8% |
| Student Work Samples | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 1 | 1.9% | 2 | 7.4% |

Why Teachers Did Not Nominate Students for TAG Eligibility

Reasons teachers reported for not nominating students varied by grade ranges. In grades K-2, a 50% majority reported second grade screening identifies TAG students. A significant 29.8% reported they did not believe in early identification, and 23.4% reported they did not have enough information to meet the District's then November nomination deadline.

In grades 3-5, 98.6% of teachers responded they either did not have the District's test results or did not have other information they needed to meet the then November nomination deadline; 12.9% did not understand the nomination process.

In grades 6-8, 91.7% of teachers responded they did not have the District's test results or did not have other information they needed to meet the November nomination deadline. Another 36.1% added they did not understand the identification process.

In grades 9-12, 39.5% of teachers reported they did not have enough information. They reported few other reasons. All classes were in CDL, which affected the ability to collect the data.

| Grades K-12: If you did not nominate students, why not? | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Grades K-2 N=94 Teachers | | Grades 3-5 N=70 Teachers | | Grades 6-8 N=133 Teachers | | Grades 9-12 N=38 Teachers | |
| **Responses** | **Responses** | **% of N** | **Responses** | **% of N** | **Responses** | **% of N** | **Responses** | **% of N** |
| No Test Results from District | 11 | 11.7% | 30 | 42.9% | 58 | 43.6% | 3 | 7.9% |
| That is Done in 2nd Grade | 47 | 50.0% | 6 | 8.6% | 9 | 6.8% | 0 | 0.0% |
| Don't Believe in Early IDing | 28 | 29.8% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% |
| Not Enough Information | 22 | 23.4% | 39 | 55.7% | 64 | 48.1% | 15 | 39.5% |
| Did Not Understand Process | 8 | 8.5% | 9 | 12.9% | 48 | 36.1% | 0 | 0.0% |
| Teacher Unavailable to Ask | 9 | 9.6% | 14 | 20.0% | 21 | 15.8% | 13 | 34.2% |
| CDL Implication | 1 | 1.1% | 0 | 0.0% | 2 | 1.5% | 11 | 28.9% |
| Not Enough Information=Not enough information to meet November nomination deadline. | | | | | | | | |

GO to NEXT PAGE

TAG Eligibility Identification: Teachers' Comments During Classroom Visits

Teachers' general comments about TAG eligibility made during classroom visits indicate these general themes. Teachers could make multiple comments on the same subject. The investigation did not collect comments by teachers of grades 9-12 because those classes were in Comprehensive Distance Learning.

- Only 9.2% of K-2 teachers in the classrooms visited commented they did not understand the identification process. A higher 36.4% of grades 3-5 teachers said they did not understand it. In grades 6-8, 80.6% reported they did not understand it.
- Of the K-2 teachers, 22.4% commented they only see TAG "as a score." In grades 3-5, 36.4% reported that, as did 50.7% in grades 6-8.
- Significant numbers of comments by K-2 teachers indicate they discouraged parents from moving forward with identification, did not believe in early identification, or believed students' performance would "level out" by third grade.

| Teachers' Comments About TAG Identification: Themes | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Theme Expressed by % of Teachers in the Sample | Grades K-2 | Grades 3-5 | Grades 6-8 |
| Does not understand identification process | 9.2% | 36.4% | 80.6% |
| Only sees TAG as a score | 22.4% | 36.4% | 50.7% |
| Discourages parents to move forward with identification | 35.5% | 3.0% | 0.0% |
| Does not believe in early identification (kindergarten) | 31.6% | 3.0% | 0.0% |
| Does not believe in early identification (1st grade) | 21.1% | 3.0% | 0.0% |
| Believes students will level out by 3rd grade | 21.1% | 3.0% | 0.0% |

Below are details within each grade range.

GO to NEXT PAGE

Grades K-2

Significant numbers of comments indicate the teachers discouraged parents from moving forward with identification, did not believe in early identification, or believed students' performance would "level out" by third grade. A noticeable number of comments indicate the teachers believed negative behaviors, which are undefined here, are reasons not to identify students for TAG eligibility. Some teachers made multiple comments on the same subject.

| K-2 Teachers' Comments About Identification: N=76 Teachers | # Noted | % of N |
|---|---|---|
| Does not have enough data by November to nominate | 6 | 7.9% |
| Does not understand identification process | 7 | 9.2% |
| Only sees TAG as a score | 17 | 22.4% |
| Discourages parents to move forward with identification | 27 | 35.5% |
| Does not believe in early identification (kindergarten) | 24 | 31.6% |
| Does not believe in early identification (1st grade) | 16 | 21.1% |
| Believes students will level out by 3rd grade | 16 | 21.1% |
| Uses TAG characteristics to inform identification, nomination,  final decision | 3 | 3.9% |
| Negative behaviors are reasons not to identify students | 7 | 9.2% |
| Unknown (teacher unavailable to ask) | 4 | 5.3% |
| Unknown (comments from teachers were not expressed through CDL) | 2 | 2.6% |

GO to NEXT PAGE

Grades 3-5

Significant numbers of comments indicate the teachers did not understand the TAG identification process, or they only saw TAG as a score. A noticeable number of comments indicate the teachers believed negative behaviors, which are undefined here, are reasons not to identify students for TAG eligibility. Teachers might have made multiple comments on the same subject.

| Grades 3-5 Teachers' Comments About Identification: N=33 Teachers | # Noted | % of N |
|---|---|---|
| Does not have enough data by November to nominate | 2 | 6.1% |
| Does not understand identification process | 12 | 36.4% |
| Only sees TAG as a score | 12 | 36.4% |
| Discourages parents to move forward with identification | 1 | 3.0% |
| Does not believe in early identification (kindergarten) | 1 | 3.0% |
| Does not believe in early identification (1st grade) | 1 | 3.0% |
| Believes students will level out by 3rd grade | 1 | 3.0% |
| Uses TAG characteristics to inform identification, nomination, final decision | 0 | 0.0% |
| Negative behaviors are reasons not to identify students | 7 | 21.2% |
| Unknown (teacher unavailable to ask) | 5 | 15.2% |
| Unknown (comments from teachers were not expressed through CDL) | 0 | 0.0% |

GO to NEXT PAGE

Grades 6-8

An attention-getting 80.6% of comments indicate the teachers did not understand the TAG eligibility identification process. A significant 50.7% indicate the teachers only saw TAG as a score. A noticeable number of comments indicate the teachers believed negative behaviors, which are undefined here, are reasons not to identify students for TAG eligibility. Teachers might have made multiple comments on the same subject.

| Grades 6-8 Teachers' Comments About Identification: N=67 Teachers | # Noted | % of N |
|---|---|---|
| Does not have enough data by November to nominate | 18 | 26.9% |
| Does not understand identification process | 54 | 80.6% |
| Only sees TAG as a score | 34 | 50.7% |
| Discourages parents to move forward with identification | 7 | 10.4% |
| Does not believe in early identification (kindergarten) | 0 | 0.0% |
| Does not believe in early identification (1st grade) | 0 | 0.0% |
| Believes students will level out by 3rd grade | 0 | 0.0% |
| Uses TAG characteristics to inform identification, nomination, final decision | 0 | 0.0% |
| Negative behaviors are reasons not to identify students | 9 | 13.4% |
| Unknown (teacher unavailable to ask) | 5 | 7.5% |
| Unknown (comments from teachers were not expressed through CDL) | 0 | 0.0% |

GO to NEXT PAGE

**Rates and Levels of Student Learning: Determinations, TAG Plans, and Instructional Practices**

How Teachers Determined Students' Rates and Levels of Learning

Across and within grade ranges, teachers reported using a wide variety of sources to determine a student's rate and level of learning. Some reported using more than one source. Their reports indicate these general trends. See the table on the next page for details.

Teachers did not report using any of the listed sources consistently across all grade ranges.

Least used sources across grade ranges were Chapter Pre-Assessments and Daily Pre-Assessments.

In descending order, these were the sources reported most used within grade ranges.
- Grades K-2: Curriculum Created Assessments, Progress Reports From Learning Apps, District Assessments, Daily Classwork, and Learning Evidence and Unit Pre-Assessments (tied).
- Grades 3-5: Curriculum Created Assessments, District Assessments, Unit Pre-Assessments, and State Assessments.
- Grades 6-8: District Assessments, Curriculum Created Assessments, and State Assessments.
- Grades 9-12: Classroom Summative Assessments and Classroom Formative Assessments (tied); Daily Classwork; Learning Evidence; and Exit Tickets. (Exit tickets are a type of formative assessment typically used at the end of a lesson or day. Students write short responses and teachers collect them as evidence of levels of student learning.)

In ascending order, these were the sources reported least used within grade ranges.
- Grades K-2: Exit Tickets; Daily Pre-Assessments; State Assessments (there are none); Chapter Pre-Assessments; and Classroom Summative Assessments.
- Grades 3-5: Daily Pre-Assessments, Exit Tickets, Chapter Pre-Assessments, and Classroom Summative Assessments.
- Grades 6-8: Daily Pre-Assessments, Progress Reports From Learning Apps, Chapter Pre-Assessments, and Learning Evidence.
- Grades 9-12: Chapter Pre-Assessments, District Assessments, and Daily Pre-Assessments and State Assessments (tied).

Across grades K-5, an average of 11% of teachers reported they [Did] Not Apply Rate and Level Practices. In grades 6-8, 36.9% of teachers reported that. In grades 9-12, none reported that. However, 28.3% of those teachers' responses are unknown because high school classes were in the Comprehensive Distance Learning Model due to COVID-19 protocols.

See the table on the next page for details.

| How do you determine a student's rate and level of learning? | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Grades K-2 N=132 | | Grades 3-5 N=104 | | Grades 6-8 N=160 | | Grades 9-12 N=46 | |
| Teachers' Responses (N=Teachers) | # | % of N | # | % of N | # | % of N | # | % of N |
| Progress Reports From Learning Apps | 61 | 46.2% | 32 | 30.8% | 8 | 5.0% | 10 | 21.7% |
| Daily Classwork | 40 | 30.3% | 23 | 22.1% | 32 | 20.0% | 29 | 63.0% |
| Exit Tickets | 1 | 0.8% | 4 | 3.8% | 20 | 12.5% | 23 | 50.0% |
| Unit Pre-Assessments | 39 | 29.5% | 38 | 36.5% | 37 | 23.1% | 13 | 28.3% |
| Chapter Pre-Assessments | 8 | 6.1% | 10 | 9.6% | 10 | 6.3% | 2 | 4.3% |
| Daily Pre-Assessments | 2 | 1.5% | 3 | 2.9% | 4 | 2.5% | 4 | 8.7% |
| Formative Assessments | 42 | 31.8% | 23 | 22.1% | 27 | 16.9% | 32 | 69.6% |
| Learning Evidence | 39 | 29.5% | 27 | 26.0% | 19 | 11.9% | 25 | 54.3% |
| State Assessments | 7 | 5.3% | 35 | 33.7% | 53 | 33.1% | 4 | 8.7% |
| District Assessments | 47 | 35.6% | 57 | 54.8% | 71 | 44.4% | 3 | 6.5% |
| Classroom Summative Assessments | 21 | 15.9% | 14 | 13.5% | 42 | 26.3% | 32 | 69.6% |
| Curriculum Created Assessments | 91 | 68.9% | 69 | 66.3% | 58 | 36.3% | 13 | 28.3% |
| Does Not Apply Rate and Level Practices | 20 | 15.2% | 7 | 6.7% | 59 | 36.9% | 0 | 0.0% |
| Unknown (teacher unavailable to ask) | 8 | 6.1% | 14 | 13.5% | 20 | 12.5% | 13 | 28.3% |

TAG Plans for Individual Students

Across grades K-8, an average of 84.5% of teachers reported they did not have students with written TAG plans in their classes; 60.8% of teachers in grades 9-12 reported the same.

> Note: All observed high school classes were in the Comprehensive Distance Learning Model due to COVID-19 protocols.

| Do you have students with written TAG plans in your class? | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Responses | Grades K-2 121 Tchrs | Grades 3-5 104 Tchrs | Grades 6-8 159 Tchrs | Grades 9-12 46 Tchrs |
| Yes | 3.3% | 5.8% | 3.2% | 10.9% |
| No | 89.3% | 80.7% | 83.6% | 60.8% |
| Unknown (teacher unavailable to ask) | 7.4% | 13.5% | 13.2% | 28.3% |
| Totals | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

GO to NEXT PAGE

Across grades K-8, and average of 86.2% of teachers reported parents did not request written TAG plans for their students; 71.7% of teachers in grades 9-12 reported the same.

| Do parents request written TAG plans for their students? | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Responses | Grades K-2 121 Tchrs | Grades 3-5 104 Tchrs | Grades 6-8 159 Tchrs | Grades 9-12 46 Tchrs |
| Yes | 2.5% | 3.8% | 1.9% | 0.0% |
| No | 90.9% | 82.7% | 84.9% | 71.7% |
| Unknown (teacher unavailable to ask) | 6.6% | 13.5% | 13.2% | 28.3% |
| Totals | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

On average, teachers reported that when they did discuss TAG plans with families, they most often did that either during fall conferences or at the beginning of the year with ongoing communications after that.

| When do you discuss the students' TAG plans with families? | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Responses | Grades K-2 129 Tchrs | Grades 3-5 104 Tchrs | Grades 6-8 159 Tchrs | Grades 9-12 46 Tchrs |
| At Back to School Event | 3.9% | 5.8% | 8.2% | 6.5% |
| Fall Conferences | 51.1% | 38.5% | 50.9% | 23.9% |
| Beginning of Year + Ongoing Communication | 20.2% | 36.5% | 17.0% | 34.8% |
| Do Not Communicate | 17.8% | 5.7% | 10.7% | 6.5% |
| Unknown (Teacher unavailable to ask.) | 7.0% | 13.5% | 13.2% | 28.3% |
| Totals | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

Teachers reported these trends when asked who initiates the discussion of a student's TAG plan.
- In grades K-5, a parent, teacher, or both initiated the discussion.
- In grades 6-8, a plurality reported the teacher initiated it.
- In grades 9-12, a majority reported both the parent and teacher initiated it during a "conversation about the student."
- Across all grades it is not clear if the "conversation about the student" is either formal or informal.

| Who initiates the conversation to discuss students' TAG plans? | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Responses | Grades K-2 120 Tchrs | Grades 3-5 100 Tchrs | Grades 6-8 157 Tchrs | Grades 9-12 46 Tchrs |
| Parent | 26.7% | 22.0% | 17.8% | 4.3% |
| Teacher | 23.3% | 29.0% | 45.2% | 13.0% |
| Both (comes up in conversation about the student) | 42.5% | 35.0% | 23.6% | 54.4% |
| Unknown (teacher unavailable to ask) | 7.5% | 14.0% | 13.4% | 28.3% |
| Totals | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

What Students Were Doing in Classes as Observed or Reported

All Grade Levels

Activities described in the tables here were either observed by the visitor(s) or reported by the teachers.

In grades K-5, on average, students were doing whole group instruction during 48.9% of the visits or were doing the same assignment without differentiation during 56.8% of the visits. In grades 6-12, those averages were 87.9% doing whole group instruction and 82.4% doing the same undifferentiated assignment.

On average, during 10.2% of visits students were doing tiered option activities at challenge levels that adequately met rate and level requirements. That occurred most often in grades K-2, least often in grades 6-8.

| What are students working on today? | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Observed or Reported During Classroom Visits | Gr K-2 | Gr 3-5 | Gr 6-8 | Gr 9-12 | Averages |
| Whole group instruction | 51.5% | 46.2% | 80.0% | 95.7% | 68.4% |
| All students have the same assignment – no differentiation | 56.8% | 56.7% | 80.0% | 84.8% | 69.6% |
| Tiered options (at level/challenge) adequately meets rate and level | 13.6% | 8.7% | 7.5% | 10.9% | 10.2% |

Below are details within each grade range.

GO to NEXT PAGE

Grades K-2

During most visits students were doing either whole group instruction or working on the same, non-differentiated assignment. Students worked on tiered options that adequately met rate and level during 13.6% of the visits. Students rarely worked on other activities with targeted differentiation and learning goals.

| What are students working on today? Grades K-2. | | |
|---|---|---|
| **Observed or Reported During Classroom Visits: N=132 Visits** | **Count** | **% of N** |
| Tiered options (at level/challenge) adequately meets rate and level | 18 | 13.6% |
| Silent Reading | 7 | 5.3% |
| Whole group instruction | 68 | 51.5% |
| Whole group instruction – introduction to new lesson | 1 | 0.8% |
| Early finishers are asked to complete more work related to content standards | 6 | 4.5% |
| Early finishers are asked to complete more work unrelated to content standards | 7 | 5.3% |
| Math centers with targeted differentiation and learning goals | 1 | 0.8% |
| Reading groups with targeted differentiation and learning goals | 10 | 7.6% |
| Writing assignments with rubrics to encourage depth and complexity differentiation | 1 | 0.8% |
| Writing assignments | 7 | 5.3% |
| All students have the same assignment – no differentiation | 75 | 56.8% |
| Taking an assessment | 1 | 0.8% |
| Unstructured learning – no clear learning target or observed learning | 4 | 3.0% |
| Stations with appropriate differentiation | 7 | 5.3% |
| Stations/Tiered assignments with choice but no differentiation | 15 | 11.4% |
| Stations with choice but no differentiation | 0 | 0.0% |
| Unknown (teacher unavailable to ask) | 2 | 1.5% |

GO to NEXT PAGE

Grades 3-5

During most visits students were doing either whole group instruction or working on the same, non-differentiated assignment. Students worked on tiered options that adequately met rate and level during 8.7% of the visits. Students rarely worked on other activities with targeted differentiation and learning goals.

| What are students working on today? Grades 3-5 | | |
|---|---|---|
| Observed or Reported During Classroom Visits: N=104 Visits | Count | % of N |
| Tiered options (at level/challenge) adequately meets rate and level | 9 | 8.7% |
| Silent Reading | 11 | 10.6% |
| Whole group instruction | 48 | 46.2% |
| Whole group instruction – introduction to new lesson | 4 | 3.8% |
| Early finishers are asked to complete more work related to content standards | 7 | 6.7% |
| Early finishers are asked to complete more work unrelated to content standards | 7 | 6.7% |
| Math centers with targeted differentiation and learning goals | 3 | 2.9% |
| Reading groups with targeted differentiation and learning goals | 3 | 2.9% |
| Writing assignments with rubrics to encourage depth and complexity differentiation | 3 | 2.9% |
| Writing assignments | 18 | 17.3% |
| All students have the same assignment – no differentiation | 59 | 56.7% |
| Taking an assessment | 6 | 5.8% |
| Unstructured learning – no clear learning target or observed learning | 4 | 3.8% |
| Stations with appropriate differentiation | 4 | 3.8% |
| Stations/Tiered assignments with choice but no differentiation | 3 | 2.9% |
| Stations with choice but no differentiation | 0 | 0.0% |
| Unknown (teacher unavailable to ask) | 0 | 0.0% |

GO to NEXT PAGE

Grades 6-8

During a clear majority of visits students were doing either whole group instruction or working on the same, non-differentiated assignment. Students worked on tiered options that adequately met rate and level during 7.5% of the visits. Students rarely worked on other activities with targeted differentiation and learning goals.

| What are students working on today? Grades 6-8 | | |
|---|---|---|
| Observed or Reported During Classroom Visits: N=160 Visits | Count | % of N |
| Tiered options (at level/challenge) adequately meets rate and level | 12 | 7.5% |
| Silent Reading | 2 | 1.3% |
| Whole group instruction | 128 | 80.0% |
| Whole group instruction – introduction to new lesson | 3 | 1.9% |
| Early finishers are asked to complete more work related to content standards | 20 | 12.5% |
| Early finishers are asked to complete more work unrelated to content standards | 14 | 8.8% |
| Math centers with targeted differentiation and learning goals | 1 | 0.6% |
| Reading groups with targeted differentiation and learning goals | 4 | 2.5% |
| Writing assignments with rubrics to encourage depth and complexity differentiation | 3 | 1.9% |
| Writing assignments | 18 | 11.3% |
| All students have the same assignment – no differentiation | 128 | 80.0% |
| Taking an assessment | 4 | 2.5% |
| Unstructured learning – no clear learning target or observed learning | 6 | 3.8% |
| Stations with appropriate differentiation | 4 | 2.5% |
| Stations/Tiered assignments with choice but no differentiation | 9 | 5.6% |
| Stations with choice but no differentiation | 0 | 0.0% |
| Unknown (teacher unavailable to ask) | 2 | 1.3% |

GO to NEXT PAGE

Grades 9-12

During a clear majority of visits students were doing either whole group instruction or working on the same, non-differentiated assignment. Students worked on tiered options that adequately met rate and level during 10.9% of the visits. Students rarely worked on other activities with targeted differentiation and learning goals.

| What are students working on today? Grades 9-12 | | |
|---|---|---|
| Observed or Reported During Classroom Visits: N=46 Visits | Count | % of N |
| Tiered options (at level/challenge) adequately meets rate and level | 5 | 10.9% |
| Silent Reading | 0 | 0.0% |
| Whole group instruction | 44 | 95.7% |
| Whole group instruction – introduction to new lesson | 1 | 2.2% |
| Early finishers are asked to complete more work related to content standards | 3 | 6.5% |
| Early finishers are asked to complete more work unrelated to content standards | 0 | 0.0% |
| Math centers with targeted differentiation and learning goals | 0 | 0.0% |
| Reading groups with targeted differentiation and learning goals | 2 | 4.3% |
| Writing assignments with rubrics to encourage depth and complexity differentiation | 2 | 4.3% |
| Writing assignments | 6 | 13.0% |
| All students have the same assignment – no differentiation | 39 | 84.8% |
| Taking an assessment | 0 | 0.0% |
| Unstructured learning – no clear learning target or observed learning | 1 | 2.2% |
| Stations with appropriate differentiation | 2 | 4.3% |
| Stations/Tiered assignments with choice but no differentiation | 0 | 0.0% |
| Stations with choice but no differentiation | 0 | 0.0% |
| Unknown (teacher unavailable to ask) | 0 | 0.0% |

Rate and Level Met or Not Met During Classroom Observations

These are definitions for the terms used here.

Met: There were examples of apparent and appropriate rate and level learning activities.

Not Met: There were few or no examples of apparent and appropriate rate and level learning activities.

Almost Met: Rate and level practices were in place but needed improvements or modifications to meet the requirements of rate and level learning. For example, where students were ready and able to proceed to more advanced lessons but were first required to do prerequisite work they had already mastered.

In grades K-5, an average of 17% of observed classes met rate and level instruction; 79.5% did not. In grades 6-12, an average of 11% met; 87% did not. On average, 1.45% of classes were ineligible for this observation because they were taking exams.

| Rate and Level Met, Not Met During Classroom Visits | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **Grades K-2** | **Grades 3-5** | **Grades 6-8** | **Grades 9-12** | **Averages** |
| Met | 17.6% | 16.3% | 8.9% | 13.0% | 13.95% |
| Not Met | 80.1% | 78.8% | 89.2% | 84.8% | 83.23% |
| Almost | 2.3% | 1.0% | 0.0% | 2.2% | 1.38% |
| NA (entire class taking exam) | 0.0% | 3.9% | 1.9% | 0.0% | 1.45% |
| Total | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | NA |
| Observations | 131 | 104 | 158 | 46 | NA |

Below are details within each grade range.


Grades K-2

No rate and level practices occurred during 76% of the classroom observations. Tiered assignments that met students' rate and level, self-pacing and other practices were evident during some observations.

| Observations of Rate and Level of Learning: Grades K-2 N=129 Classroom Visits | | |
|---|---|---|
| **Practices Observed For** | **Observed** | **% of N** |
| Flexible readiness grouping based on data | 11 | 8.5% |
| Student agency with choice of DOK 2+ | 8 | 6.2% |
| Tiered assignments that meet rate and level of students | 22 | 17.1% |
| Self-pacing | 16 | 12.4% |
| DOK 2 or 3 options/expectations | 7 | 5.4% |
| Rubrics/success criteria (clear expectations of "excellence") | 0 | 0.0% |
| Pre-assessments used to drive instruction | 8 | 6.2% |
| "In lieu of" projects/assignments | 11 | 8.5% |
| Curriculum compacting | 3 | 2.3% |
| Standards acceleration | 1 | 0.8% |
| Socratic method | 0 | 0.0% |
| Extensions/extension menu/enrichment | 1 | 0.8% |
| Unknown (teacher unavailable to ask) | 1 | 0.8% |
| No rate and level practices observed | 98 | 76.0% |


GO to NEXT PAGE

Grades 3-5

No rate and level practices occurred during 76% of the classroom observations. Tiered assignments that met students' rate and level, self-pacing, activities or assignments done "in lieu of" others, or other practices were evident during some observations.

| Observations of Rate and Level of Learning: Grades 3-5 N=100 Classroom Visits | | |
|---|---|---|
| **Practices Observed For** | **Observed** | **% of N** |
| Flexible readiness grouping based on data | 11 | 11.0% |
| Student agency with choice of DOK 2+ | 3 | 3.0% |
| Tiered assignments that meet rate and level of students | 12 | 12.0% |
| Self-pacing | 8 | 8.0% |
| DOK 2 or 3 options/expectations | 4 | 4.0% |
| Rubrics/success criteria (clear expectations of "excellence") | 2 | 2.0% |
| Pre-assessments used to drive instruction | 2 | 2.0% |
| "In lieu of" projects/assignments | 6 | 6.0% |
| Curriculum compacting | 3 | 3.0% |
| Standards acceleration | 2 | 2.0% |
| Socratic method | 0 | 0.0% |
| Extensions/extension menu/enrichment | 2 | 2.0% |
| Unknown (teacher unavailable to ask) | 2 | 2.0% |
| No rate and level practices observed | 76 | 76.0% |

Grades 6-8

No rate and level practices occurred during 86.8% of the classroom observations. Tiered assignments that met students' rate and level, Depth of Knowledge (DOK) levels 2 and 3 options or expectations, flexible grouping based on readiness data, and other practices were evident during some observations.

| Observations of Rate and Level of Learning: Grades 6-8 N=159 Classroom Visits | | |
|---|---|---|
| **Practices Observed For** | **Observed** | **% of N** |
| Flexible readiness grouping based on data | 9 | 5.7% |
| Student agency with choice of DOK 2+ | 8 | 5.0% |
| Tiered assignments that meet rate and level of students | 12 | 7.5% |
| Self-pacing | 2 | 1.3% |
| DOK 2 or 3 options/expectations | 9 | 5.7% |
| Rubrics/success criteria (clear expectations of "excellence") | 3 | 1.9% |
| Pre-assessments used to drive instruction | 1 | 0.6% |
| "In lieu of" projects/assignments | 3 | 1.9% |
| Curriculum compacting | 0 | 0.0% |
| Standards acceleration | 0 | 0.0% |
| Socratic method | 2 | 1.3% |
| Extensions/extension menu/enrichment | 1 | 0.6% |
| Unknown (teacher unavailable to ask) | 2 | 1.3% |
| No rate and level practices observed | 138 | 86.8% |

GO to NEXT PAGE

Grades 9-12

No rate and level practices occurred during 82.2% of the classroom observations. Tiered assignments that met students' rate and level or Depth of Knowledge (DOK) levels 2 and 3 options or expectations and other practices  were evident during some observations.

| Observations of Rate and Level of Learning: Grades 9-12 N=45 Classroom Visits | | |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Practices Observed For** | **Observed** | **% of N** |
| Flexible readiness grouping based on data | 0 | 0.0% |
| Student agency with choice of DOK 2+ | 6 | 13.3% |
| Tiered assignments that meet rate and level of students | 5 | 11.1% |
| Self-pacing | 1 | 2.2% |
| DOK 2 or 3 options/expectations | 6 | 13.3% |
| Rubrics/success criteria (clear expectations of "excellence") | 3 | 6.7% |
| Pre-assessments used to drive instruction | 0 | 0.0% |
| "In lieu of" projects/assignments | 1 | 2.2% |
| Curriculum compacting | 0 | 0.0% |
| Standards acceleration | 0 | 0.0% |
| Socratic method | 1 | 2.2% |
| Extensions/extension menu/enrichment | 0 | 0.0% |
| Unknown (teacher unavailable to ask) | 1 | 2.2% |
| No rate and level practices observed | 37 | 82.2% |

**Student Seating or Grouping**

Student Seating or Grouping: Teachers' Comments During Classroom Visits

Teachers often reported using multiple seating or grouping patterns.
- Across grades K-8, teachers most often described student seating or grouping patterns that
    o intentionally partnered "high" students with "struggling" students, or
    o were heterogeneous groups of 4 with at least 1 "high" or TAG student.
- Teachers frequently described seating or grouping patterns that
    o had "high" or TAG students helping other students, or
    o that were behavior based.
- Teachers seldom described using flexible or readiness-based seating or grouping patterns that relied on current information about students' learning.

The investigation did not collect comments by teachers of grades 9-12 because those classes were in Comprehensive Distance Learning.

| Teachers' Comments About Student Seating or Grouping: Themes | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Theme and % Who Commented | Grades K-2 | Grades 3-5 | Grades 6-8 |
| Intentionally partners "high" students with "struggling" students | 55.0% | 48.1% | 51.2% |
| Heterogeneous groups of 4 w/at least 1 "high" or TAG student | 48.3% | 40.4% | 41.7% |
| Has TAG students/'high" students help other students | 23.3% | 26.9% | 27.4% |
| Behavior based | 18.3% | 15.4% | 16.7% |
| Readiness (based on current learning evidence/data) | 8.3% | 11.5% | 10.7% |
| Flexible | 15.0% | 9.6% | 8.3% |

Below are the details within each grade range.

Grades K-2

| Grades K-2 Teachers' Comments About Seating or Grouping: N=60 Teachers | # Noted | % of N |
|---|---|---|
| Readiness (based on current learning evidence/data) | 5 | 8.3% |
| Flexible | 9 | 15.0% |
| Intentionally partners "high" students with "struggling" students | 33 | 55.0% |
| Has TAG students/'high" students help other students | 14 | 23.3% |
| Heterogeneous groups of 4 w/at least 1 "high" or TAG student | 29 | 48.3% |
| Behavior based | 11 | 18.3% |
| Health/needs based | 0 | 0.0% |
| Cluster grouping | 1 | 1.7% |
| Unknown (teacher unavailable to ask) | 3 | 5.0% |
| Unknown (data not available through CDL) | 2 | 3.3% |

Grades 3-5

| Grades 3-5 Teachers' Comments About Seating or Grouping: N=52 Teachers | # Noted | % of N |
|---|---|---|
| Readiness (based on current learning evidence/data) | 6 | 11.5% |
| Flexible | 5 | 9.6% |
| Intentionally partners "high" students with "struggling" students | 25 | 48.1% |
| Has TAG students/'high" students help other students | 14 | 26.9% |
| Heterogeneous groups of 4 with at least 1 "high" or TAG student in a group | 21 | 40.4% |
| Behavior based | 8 | 15.4% |
| Health/needs based | 1 | 1.9% |
| Cluster grouping | 4 | 7.7% |
| Unknown (teacher unavailable to ask) | 5 | 9.6% |
| Unknown (data not available through CDL) | 0 | 0.0% |

Grades 6-8

| Grades 6-8 Teachers' Comments About Seating or Grouping: N=84 Teachers | # Noted | % of N |
|---|---|---|
| Readiness (based on current learning evidence/data) | 9 | 10.7% |
| Flexible | 7 | 8.3% |
| Intentionally partners "high" students with "struggling" students | 43 | 51.2% |
| Has TAG students/'high" students help other students | 23 | 27.4% |
| Heterogeneous groups of 4 with at least 1 "high" or TAG student in a group | 35 | 41.7% |
| Behavior based | 14 | 16.7% |
| Health/needs based | 1 | 1.2% |
| Cluster grouping | 6 | 7.1% |
| Unknown (teacher unavailable to ask) | 5 | 6.0% |
| Unknown (data not available through CDL) | 0 | 0.0% |

END of PART 7

GO to NEXT PAGE

**PART 8: SURVEY RESULTS – CONTENTS, PROCEDURE, RESULTS SUMMARY, RESULTS by GROUPS**

Contents

TEXT BEGINS on NEXT PAGE

Survey Procedure

The ODE conducted the surveys online using the Survey Monkey application. Emailed invitations provided respondents links to their online survey. Respondents completed their surveys and the ODE recorded the results during January through April 2020.

The District's Communications Department emailed survey invitations to 150 District administrators through the District's Admin Connect listserv. Communications also emailed surveys to 3,650 District teachers.

The District provided an email listserv of parents of TAG identified students. However, some reported they did not all receive District emails regarding TAG. In response, the ODE used its Microsoft Outlook application to create an email listserv by school and send TAG parents their survey invitations. At the time there were 7,495 identified TAG in the District. A parent of more than one TAG identified student might have received multiple survey invitations.

Numbers of responses to survey prompts vary. Some prompts instruct respondents to "mark all that apply."

Readers doing their own calculations will find total percentages add up to more than 100% in some tables. That is due to rounding when Excel calculations reported more decimal places than fit a table.

Results Summary

Below are bulleted summaries of results from the ODE' surveys of administrators, teachers, and parents of TAG-identified students. Numbers of respondents varied depending on the group surveyed and on the instructions for a specific prompt. The survey gave respondents opportunities to make volunteered comments. Survey result details begin at page XX.

The summary categories below correspond to allegations in Appellant's Exhibit 1 complaint to the District and  appeal to the ODE submitted on the ODE's online form. They relate to the cited ORS and OAR that define the scope of and authority for this investigation. They also align with the guiding question in the ODE's Exhibit 10 acceptance of this appeal: Is Portland Public Schools in compliance with Oregon standards of instruction that apply to talented and gifted (TAG) students?

*District Staff's Experience, Grade Levels Represented*

Administrator Survey Results
- 90.7% or respondents represented schools serving grades K-8.
- 33% were employed by the District for 1 to 5 years; 31% for 6 to 15 years; and 36% for 16 or more years.
- 34% were a principal or other administrator for 1 to 5 years; 55% for 6 to 15 years; and 11% for 16 or more years.
- 75% were at their current school or office for 1 to 5 years; 25% were there for 6 to 15 years; none were at their current position for more than 15 years.

Teacher Survey Results
- 82.83% majority represented schools serving grades K-8.

- 62.3% reported 6 to 20 years of teaching experience; 14.9% reported 5 or fewer years of experience; 22.8% reported 21 or more years of experience.
- 52% held teaching positions at the District for between 2 and 10 years; 42.7% had been with the district for 11 years or more; 5.3% had been a District teacher for 1 year or less.
- 64% had been at their then current assignment for 2 to 10 years; 22.1% had been at their assignment 11 years or more; 13.9% had been at their assignment for 1 year or less.

Parents-Grades Represented

A 79% majority of responses represented parents of students in grades K-8.

<u>Identification of Academically Talented and Intellectually Gifted Students (OAR 581-022-2325)</u>

*Administrator Survey Results*
- 76.6% of respondents reported they had received training on research-based best practices in identifying TAG students.
- 85.9% reported they had received training on TAG students' profiles and characteristics.
- 81% reported they had provided their staff training on those profiles and characteristics.
- 63.5% reported they had received training in meeting the social and emotional needs of gifted students.
- 54.7% reported they had provided staff that training.
- An average of 73% of respondents reported having 1-5 TAG-identified students per class in each category: intellectually gifted, academically talented in reading, academically talented in mathematics, and potential to perform. An average of 13% reported having none. Significantly fewer reported 6 or more such students per class.
- An average of 78% reported having 1-5 TAG-nominated students per class in any category. An average of 11% reported having none. Significantly fewer reported 6 or more such students per class.
- Responses from the survey comments section.
  - Of 14 comments submitted, 4 ask for guidance, training, professional development, or support for identifying and instructing TAG identified students.

*Teacher Survey Results*
- 88.6% of respondents were classroom teachers, not teachers on other assignments or in other roles.
- 66.1% reported they had TAG-identified students in their classrooms 6 or more years.
- An average of 70% reported having 1-5 TAG-identified students per class in any category. An average of 20% reported having none. Significantly fewer reported 6 or more identified students per class.
- An average of 60% reported having 1-5 TAG-nominated students per class in any category. An average of 36% reported having none. Significantly fewer reported 6 or more such students per class.
- 38% reported receiving training in the identification of gifted students.
- Theme(s) from teachers' 233 comments. See Exhibit 30 for all comments.
  - Concerns about the District's TAG identification process, such as over-identification, dependence on parental advocacy, needs for clarity and better understanding about the process, that identification is the only TAG program, identifications of struggling but gifted students.

- Concerns about equity in the District's TAG identification process, such as under-identifications of students of color, including in schools that primarily serve those students.
- Lack of clarity about whether TAG policies apply to kindergarten students and staff.

*Parent Survey Results*
- 54% or respondents agreed or strongly agreed their student was assessed for TAG identification in a variety of ways (e.g. testing, work samples, parent and teacher checklists/feedback); 25% disagreed or strongly disagreed; and 21% neither agreed nor disagreed.
- 51% agreed or strongly agreed they understood how their student is identified (e.g. Academically Talented Reading, Academically Talented Math, Intellectually Gifted, or Potential to Perform) and the available programs and services; 44% disagreed or strongly disagreed; and 15% neither agreed nor disagreed.
- Theme from parents' 683 comments: TAG identification is inadequate or does not lead to services. See Exhibit 31 for all comments.

Programs and Services for Talented and Gifted Students  (OAR 581-022-2500)

*Administrator Survey Results*
- 85.9% of 64 respondents reported they had received training on TAG students' profiles and characteristics.
- 81% reported they had provided their staff training on those profiles and characteristics.
- 63.5% reported they had received training in meeting the social and emotional needs of gifted students.
- 54.7% reported they had provided staff that training.
- 48.4 % reported they had received training in meeting the social and emotional needs of underachieving gifted students.
- 37.5% reported they had provided staff that training.
- 57.1% reported having special programs or services that teachers provide for gifted students.
- Respondents reported receiving and providing trainings in a variety of talented and gifted instructional strategies. Those receiving highest response rates include flexible grouping, differentiated instruction, and high level questioning strategies. Some, such as compacting curriculum and Socratic method, show significant differences in trainings received versus provided. Student agency ranked lowest.
- Most respondents rated themselves having intermediate or higher expertise in each listed talented and gifted instructional strategy. Highest rated strategies include flexible grouping, high level questioning, differentiated instruction, and formative assessment as a process.
- 70.3% reported teachers review and adjust TAG instructional plans as needed; 34.4% responded teachers do that yearly.
- 65.1% reported they review and monitor TAG instructional plans; 34.9% reported they do not.
- Of those reporting they do not review TAG instructional plans, 54% reported the TAG coordinator, facilitator or specialist individually monitors the plans. Other responses indicated another administrator or a TAG coordinator working with teachers or others monitor TAG plans.
- 61.3% expected teachers to document rate and level instruction in their gradebooks; 33.9% reported using other methods such as electronic files, parent conferences, TAG planning forms and lesson plans.
- Responses from the survey comments section.
  - Of 14 total comments, 4 ask for guidance, training, professional development, or support for identifying and instructing TAG identified students.

*Teacher Survey Results*

- 88.6% of respondents were classroom teachers, not teachers on other assignments or in other roles.
- Most taught either in self-contained elementary classrooms or in general education subjects such as English-language arts, world languages, mathematics, health education, science or social science.
- The most reported information sources used to assess TAG students' rates and levels of learning were samples of student work, daily observations, formative assessments, students' demonstrations and presentations, and students' input and self-assessment. The least used were statewide assessment results and progress reports from other sources. These are examples of other sources.
  - MAP tests.
  - Portfolios or student demonstrations.
  - Parent input.
  - Collaborations with other teachers.
  - Informal assessments of conversations with teachers.
- 70% or more reported they were familiar with differentiated instruction, high level questioning, flexible grouping, individualized instruction, formative assessment, identification of gifted students, and use of extensions; 58% or less were familiar with compacting curriculum, Socratic method, student agency and Webb's Depth of Knowledge.
- 92.2% reported they had received training in differentiated instruction. The next highest ranked strategies were high level questioning (74.5%); formative assessment (63.8%); flexible grouping (61.5%); and individualized instruction (57%). The remaining strategies ranked between 38% for identification of gifted students and 17.5% for student agency.
- Majorities (>50%) rated themselves intermediate or higher in each listed TAG instructional strategy except for compacting curriculum, Socratic method, student agency, and Webb's Depth of Knowledge. Highest rated were differentiated instruction, formative assessment, individualized instruction, flexible grouping, and high level questioning. Lowest rated were Depth of Knowledge, student agency, compacting curriculum, and Socratic method. Acceleration rated nearly evenly split between higher and lower ranges of expertise.
- Most teachers reported using their grade books or a student file to document instruction provided to TAG-identified students' rates and levels. These are examples of other comments.
  - No records kept or not keeping track (multiple similar).
  - Did not know that was required or was not asked to keep records (multiple similar).
  - Don't have or never have had TAG students (multiple similar).
  - Records are kept in Synergy or some other system (multiple similar).
  - "As the [redacted] teacher and the TAG facilitator I'm not sure where anyone would want this information. I make note in my plans if a change/modification is needed for a student."
  - "If a kid is doing well on a [redacted], I give them a harder [challenge]. The fact that the kid can [do] it is my documentation."
  - "It's in my brain."
- 75% respondents reported they did not write TAG instructional plans.
- 55% reported they did not review a student's previous TAG instructional plan prior to writing or adjusting a current TAG instructional plan.
- 86% reported parents do not often request a written instructional plan.
- 51% reported they did not make course recommendations for TAG students.
- Most often reported ways used to meet TAG students' academic needs were these in rank order.
  - In the regular classroom by the classroom teacher.
  - In the regular classroom in small cluster groups which include other highly able students.

- In the regular classroom with occasional assistance from staff familiar with the particular topic of instruction.
- In acceleration in areas of strength.
- Least often ways used to meet TAG students' academic needs were these.
  - In a resource room, where children work in small groups or independently.
  - In a full-time classroom where all the children are identified as gifted or highly capable.
  - In a pull-out program once or twice a week.
  - In college or community college classes or in honors, or Advance Placement, or International Baccalaureate, or college dual credit classes. (That is probably because most respondents taught in grades K-8.)
- 82% conferenced with TAG students regarding their learning in a meeting, by phone, or through email as needed. Fewer reported they conferenced with students weekly (17.8%), at the beginning of the year (14.2%), or quarterly (11.9%). Monthly, twice a year and end of the year conferences occurred at significantly lower rates.
- Theme(s) from teachers' 233 comments. See Exhibit 30 for all comments.
  - Concerns about the District's TAG services, such as many TAG students do not know they are TAG. Lack of supports or challenging learning opportunities. Identification is the TAG program, or ACCESS is the TAG program.
  - Needs for professional development or training in meeting TAG students' needs, including training in applying curriculum and in differentiation and other TAG instructional strategies.
  - Needs for materials, time, other resources, such time in large classes to interact with students at multiple performance levels or with special needs, TAG-appropriate core curricula, "ready to go" lessons.
  - Concerns or questions about the roles of TAG coordinators or facilitators. Needs for clarity about their role and function. Needs for suggestions or PD from coordinators/facilitators.

*Parent Survey Results*
- 29% of respondents agreed or strongly agreed their students' academic and/or intellectual needs are being met; 46% disagreed or strongly disagreed; 25% neither agreed nor disagreed.
- 27% agreed or strongly agreed their students' academic and/or intellectual needs are met daily through classroom instruction; 45% disagreed or strongly disagreed; 28% neither agreed nor disagreed.
- When asked how students' academic needs are met at school, of 12 choices, "In the regular classroom by their classroom teachers" earned a 66.7% response rate. "Other" earned 29%. All other options received a response of 12.5% of less.
- 18.7% agreed or strongly agreed they knew what learning evidence and information the teacher uses about their student to plan for rate and level of instruction; 63.8% disagreed or strongly disagreed; 17.5% neither agreed nor disagreed.
- 11% agreed or strongly agreed the classroom teacher uses their child's TAG plan to meet the student's rate and level of learning on a consistent basis; 59% disagreed or strongly disagreed; and 30% neither agreed nor disagreed.
- 22% agreed or strongly agreed if they address concerns specific to TAG services/classroom instruction (e.g. differentiation, acceleration, rate and level instructional practices, etc.) with their student's teacher, the teacher explains how the student's academic and/or intellectual needs are being met in the classroom; 29% disagreed or strongly disagreed; and 49% neither agreed nor disagreed.
- Themes from parents' 363 comments about other ways their students' academic needs are met at school.

- o Students needs are not met.
- o Needs are only met at the ACCESS program, not at other schools.
- o Specific classes alone do not provide TAG services (e.g. AP, IB, AVID).
- o Other ways needs are met include pull-out programs, individual teachers, parent or other volunteers, schooling at home or online, parent-created curricula, self-study, or in some individual classes (e.g. performing arts, bilingual classes, IB, AP, computer, mathematics).
- Themes from parents' 683 general comments. See Exhibit 31 for all comments.
  - o My student is bored. A few commented their student is not bored.
  - o TAG instruction, programs or services for TAG identified students are not provided or are underdeveloped or unclear.
  - o To some parents, OMSI events are the TAG program.
  - o Dissatisfaction with TAG facilitator or coordinator services. Examples:
    - ▪ We were not informed by TAG coordinator when the tests would be or what they would entail - for instance, we declined the verbal test because she didn't read yet and no one told us it was not a reading test.
    - ▪ Her classroom teacher does not know what to do to challenge her per her teacher's own words. There is no help from the TAG coordinator or any other source for the teacher.
    - ▪ When I have reached out to our school's TAG coordinator, I have either received no response or been dismissed.
  - o Most, but not all, comments about ACCESS Academy are positive.
    - ▪ Example positives: Our child was very depressed before going to ACCESS. The system is broken - thank goodness for ACCESS.
    - ▪ Example criticisms: I got a letter that he identified in an additional TAG area and may be eligible for ACCESS academy. BUT HE'S IN HIGH SCHOOL NOW! (Emphasis in original.) I feel like my child has been adequately tag identified however meeting his social and academic needs is still challenging even at ACCESS because he struggles to participate. He says he's challenged about 50% of the time.
  - o Concerns about equity in the TAG program. Examples:
    - ▪ It feels like all TAG resources have been funneled to Access Academy, and if you can't get your kid there, you get nothing.
    - ▪ There does not appear to be a standard infrastructure across elementary schools for TAG services/programs, which I view as an inequitable failure.
    - ▪ I find it maddening that PPS has provided hardly any support for TAG students. Whenever I raise this issue, I am told that the bar must be lowered for reasons of equity.
  - o Some parents identify lack of funding, resources or supports as causes for the lack of TAG services.
  - o Some parents commented that the TAG program is beneficial or helpful. Examples:
    - ▪ The most significant benefit from my child being identified as TAG was that he stopped getting into quite as much trouble for being distracted in class.
    - ▪ The couple of district-sponsored TAG parent nights (where a speaker has come in to present and do Q&A's) have been valuable.
    - ▪ I am in the minority of families whose students are being served well. I can't thank the administration and staff of [redacted] for helping to support my son in single subject acceleration.
    - ▪ Hopefully the TAG box being ticked will be useful in high school.
  - o Some parents provided personal stories. Most express frustrations, a few describe success.

<u>Rights of Parents of TAG Students (OAR 581-022-2330)</u>

*Administrator Survey Results*

No survey prompts were directly related to the rights of parents of TAG students or to communications with those parents.

There are no comments in the administrators' survey comments section related to rights of parents.

*Teacher Survey Results*
- 86% of respondents reported parents do not often request a written instructional plan.
- 84.2% conferenced with parents of TAG students regarding students' learning in a meeting, by phone, or through email as needed; 32.7%, reported they conferenced at the beginning of the year. Weekly, monthly, quarterly, twice a year, and end of the year conferences with TAG parents occurred at significantly lower rates.
- A search found too few teacher comments related to rights of parents to identify themes. One example, "It's fine to meet and talk with parents to come up with a plan, but there needs to be documentation by the district."

*Parent Survey Results*

- 3% of respondents agreed or strongly agreed they were frequently or often given the opportunity to discuss and develop their student's TAG plan with the teacher; 6% reported that happened regularly; 55% majority reported that happened never or not at all; and 36% reported that happened sometimes.
- 9.9% agreed or strongly agreed they were frequently or often informed about their student's progress, 21.8% reported that happened regularly; 39.3% reported that happened sometimes; and 29% reported that happened never or not at all.
- 24.3% agreed or strongly agreed the student and parent have adequate opportunities to suggest ways to meet their student's needs; 47.1% disagreed or strongly disagreed; and 28.6% neither agreed nor disagreed.
- 31.4% agreed or strongly agreed they could easily arrange to discuss TAG concerns with their student's teacher, principal, building representative, or District administrator; 32.5% disagreed or strongly disagreed; 36.2% neither agreed nor disagreed.
- 22% agreed or strongly agreed if they address concerns specific to TAG services/classroom instruction (e.g. differentiation, acceleration, rate and level instructional practices, etc.) with their student's teacher, the teacher explains how the student's academic and/or intellectual needs are being met in the classroom; 29% disagreed or strongly disagreed; and 49% neither agreed nor disagreed.
- 18.1% agreed or strongly agreed they had been informed about their rights to file a complaint with the district and how to file a formal complaint; 58.7% majority disagreed or strongly disagreed; and 23.2% neither agreed nor disagreed.
- 33% agreed or strongly agreed they were aware of their rights to withdraw students from the District's TAG services and programs; 37% disagreed or strongly disagreed;30% neither agreed nor disagreed.
- Themes from all parents' comments.
  - There are few if any staff/parent communications.
  - Communications about TAG need improvements.
  - Opportunities for parents to provide input about or discuss services for their TAG students are either inadequate or do not lead to TAG services.

END of SURVEY RESULTS SUMMARY

ADMINISTRATOR SURVEY RESULTS BEGIN on NEXT PAGE

SURVEY RESULTS: Administrators

Source: Data are from Survey Monkey results unless noted.

Grade Levels Represented

A 90.7% majority represented schools serving grades K-8. That is consistent with information on the District's Website showing most of its schools serve grades K-8.

| Administrator Survey Responses by Grade Level and Other Assignments | | |
|---|---|---|
| By Grade Ranges | Total Responses | % of Responses |
| K-5th | 28 | 43.8% |
| K-8th | 30 | 46.9% |
| 9th-12th | 5 | 7.8% |
| Other | 1 | 1.6% |
| Totals | 64 | 100% |

Administrators' Years Employed by the District

A 64% majority were employed by the District for 1 to 15 years; 36% were employed sixteen or more years.

| Administrator Survey Responses: Years Employed by PPS | | |
|---|---|---|
| Years | Responses | % of All |
| 0 to 1 | 8 | 13% |
| 2 to 5 | 13 | 20% |
| 6 to 10 | 5 | 8% |
| 11 to 15 | 15 | 23% |
| 16 to 20 | 8 | 13% |
| 21 to 25 | 7 | 11% |
| 26 to 30 | 6 | 9% |
| 31 or More | 2 | 3% |
| Totals | 64 | 100% |

SURVEY RESULTS: Administrators (Cont.)

Administrators' Years at District and at Current Assignment

An 89% majority held administrative positions at the District for between 1 and 15 years. Only 11% had been a District administrator for 16 to 25 years. None had been a District administrator for more than 25 years.

A 75% majority had been at their then current assignment for 5 years or less, and 30% had been at their assignment 1 year or less. Only 25% had been at their assignment for 6 to 15 years. None had been at their assignment more than 15 years.

| Administrator Survey Responses: Years as PPS Principal or Admin. | | | Administrator Survey Responses: Years at Current School or Office | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Years | Responses | % of All | Years | Responses | % of All |
| 0 to 1 | 4 | 6% | 0 to 1 | 19 | 30% |
| 2 to 5 | 18 | 28% | 2 to 5 | 29 | 45% |
| 6 to 10 | 19 | 30% | 6 to 10 | 11 | 17% |
| 11 to 15 | 16 | 25% | 11 to 15 | 5 | 8% |
| 16 to 20 | 4 | 6% | 16 to 20 | 0 | 0% |
| 21 to 25 | 3 | 5% | 21 to 25 | 0 | 0% |
| 26 to 30 | 0 | 0% | 26 to 30 | 0 | 0% |
| 31 or More | 0 | 0% | 31 or More | 0 | 0% |
| Totals | 64 | 100% | Totals | 64 | 100% |

TAG Identification Trainings Received by Administrators

A 76.6% majority reported they had received training on research-based best practices in identifying TAG students.

| Administrators' Responses to Survey Question | | |
|---|---|---|
| Have you received training on research-based best practices in talented and gifted identification? | | |
| Choice | Responses | % of Total |
| Yes | 49 | 76.6% |
| No | 15 | 23.4% |
| Total | 64 | 100% |

GO to NEXT PAGE

SURVEY RESULTS: Administrators (Cont.)

TAG Profiles and Characteristics Trainings Received and Provided by Administrators

An 85.9% majority reported they had received training on TAG students' profiles and characteristics. A similar 81% responded they had provided their staff training on those profiles and characteristics.

| Administrators' Responses to Survey Question | | | Administrators' Responses to Survey Question | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Have you received training on talented and gifted profiles and characteristics? | | | Have you provided training to your staff regarding talented and gifted profiles and characteristics? | | |
| Choice | Responses | % of Total | Choice | Responses | % of Total |
| Yes | 55 | 85.9% | Yes | 51 | 81.0% |
| No | 9 | 14.1% | No | 12 | 19.0% |
| Total | 64 | 100% | Total | 63 | 100% |

TAG Social/Emotional Needs Trainings Received and Provided by Administrators

A 63.5% majority reported they had received training in meeting the social and emotional needs of gifted students; 54.7% reported they had provided staff that training.

| Administrators' Responses to Survey Question | | | Administrators' Responses to Survey Question | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Have you received training on how to meet the social and emotional needs of gifted students? | | | Have you provided training to your staff on how to meet the social and emotional needs of gifted students? | | |
| Choice | Responses | % of Total | Choice | Responses | % of Total |
| Yes | 40 | 63.5% | Yes | 35 | 54.7% |
| No | 23 | 36.5% | No | 29 | 45.3% |
| Total | 63 | 100% | Total | 64 | 100% |

GO to NEXT PAGE

SURVEY RESULTS: Administrators (Cont.)

<u>Underachieving Gifted Students Trainings Received and Provided by Administrators</u>

A 48.4 % minority reported they had received training in meeting the social and emotional needs of underachieving gifted students; 37.5% reported they had provided staff that training.

| Administrators' Responses to Survey Question | | | Administrators' Responses to Survey Question | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Have you received training in meeting the needs of underachieving gifted students? | | | Have you provided training to your staff in meeting the needs of underachieving gifted students? | | |
| Choice | Responses | % of Total | Choice | Responses | % of Total |
| Yes | 31 | 48.4% | Yes | 24 | 37.5% |
| No | 33 | 51.6% | No | 40 | 62.5% |
| Total | 64 | 100% | Total | 64 | 100% |

<u>Numbers of TAG-Identified Students in Administrators' Buildings</u>

An average of 73% reported having 1-5 TAG-identified students per class in each category. Averages of 10% reported 6-10 such students per class; 0.8% reported 11-15; 2.9% reported more than 15; and 13% reported none per class.

| I currently have this number of TAG-identified students in my building. | 0 Per Class on Av. | 1-5 Per Class on Av. | 6-10 Per Class on Av. | 11-15 Per Class on Average | >15 Per Class on Av. | Totals |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Intellectually Gifted | | | | | | |
| Responses | 11 | 45 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 61 |
| Percent of Total Responses | 18.0% | 73.8% | 6.6% | 0.0% | 1.6% | 100% |
| Academically Talented-Reading | | | | | | |
| Responses | 8 | 43 | 6 | 1 | 3 | 61 |
| Percent of Total Responses | 13.1% | 70.5% | 9.8% | 1.6% | 4.9% | 100% |
| Academically Talented-Math | | | | | | |
| Responses | 7 | 45 | 7 | 1 | 1 | 61 |
| Percent of Total Responses | 11.5% | 73.8% | 11.5% | 1.6% | 1.6% | 100% |
| Potential to Perform | | | | | | |
| Responses | 5 | 43 | 7 | 0 | 2 | 57 |
| Percent of Total Responses | 8.8% | 75.4% | 12.3% | 0.0% | 3.5% | 100% |

SURVEY RESULTS: Administrators (Cont.)

Numbers of TAG-Nominated Students in Administrators' Buildings

An average of 78% reported 1-5 TAG-nominated students per class in any category. Averages of 8.2% reported 6-10 such students per class; 2.7% reported 11-15; 0.5% reported more than 15; and 11% reported none.

| I currently have this number of TAG-nominated students in my building. | 0 Per Class on Av. | 1-5 Per Class on Av. | 6-10 Per Class on Av. | 11-15 Per Class on Av. | >15 Per Class on Av. | Totals |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Intellectually Gifted | | | | | | |
| Responses | 7 | 44 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 56 |
| Percent of Total Responses | 12.5% | 78.6% | 7.1% | 1.8% | 0.0% | 100% |
| Academically Talented-Reading | | | | | | |
| Responses | 6 | 44 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 56 |
| Percent of Total Responses | 10.7% | 78.6% | 5.4% | 3.6% | 1.8% | 100% |
| Academically Talented-Math | | | | | | |
| Responses | 4 | 45 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 56 |
| Percent of Total Responses | 7.1% | 80.4% | 8.9% | 3.6% | 0.0% | 100% |
| Potential to Perform | | | | | | |
| Responses | 7 | 38 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 52 |
| Percent of Total Responses | 13.5% | 73.1% | 11.5% | 1.9% | 0.0% | 100% |

Did Their Schools Have Special Programs or Services for Gifted Students?

A 57.1% majority reported having those programs or services in their schools.

| Responses to Survey Question | | |
|---|---|---|
| Does your school have special programs and services that you and your teachers provide for your gifted students? See descriptions. | | |
| Choice | Responses | % of Total |
| Yes | 36 | 57.1% |
| No | 27 | 42.9% |
| Total | 63 | 100% |

GO to NEXT PAGE

SURVEY RESULTS: Administrators (Cont.)

TAG Instructional Strategies Trainings Received and Provided by Administrators

Respondents reported receiving and providing trainings in a variety of strategies. Those receiving highest response rates include flexible grouping, differentiated instruction, and high level questioning strategies. Some, such as compacting curriculum and Socratic method, show administrators received more trainings than they provided. Socratic method and student agency ranked lowest in trainings received and given.

| Have you received training in talented and gifted instructional strategies (mark all that apply)? 63 Responded. | | |
|---|---|---|
| **Instructional Strategy** | **Responses** | **% of 63 Responded** |
| Acceleration | 42 | 66.7% |
| Flexible Grouping | 60 | 95.2% |
| High Level Questioning Strategies | 55 | 87.3% |
| Compacting Curriculum | 37 | 58.7% |
| Differentiated Instruction | 59 | 93.7% |
| Identification of Gifted Students | 49 | 77.8% |
| Socratic Method | 35 | 55.6% |
| Individualized Instruction | 41 | 65.1% |
| Formative Assessment as a Process | 52 | 82.5% |
| Student Agency | 22 | 34.9% |
| Webb's Depth of Knowledge | 39 | 61.9% |
| Extensions | 40 | 63.5% |

| Have you provided training to your staff regarding common talented and gifted instructional strategies (mark all that apply)? 62 Responded. | | |
|---|---|---|
| **Instructional Strategy** | **Responses** | **% of 62 Responded** |
| Acceleration | 36 | 58.1% |
| Flexible Grouping | 50 | 80.6% |
| High Level Questioning Strategies | 51 | 82.3% |
| Compacting Curriculum | 24 | 38.7% |
| Differentiated Instruction | 53 | 85.5% |
| Identification of Gifted Students | 42 | 67.7% |
| Socratic Method | 17 | 27.4% |
| Individualized Instruction | 32 | 51.6% |
| Formative Assessment as a Process | 40 | 64.5% |
| Student Agency | 17 | 27.4% |
| Webb's Depth of Knowledge | 30 | 48.4% |
| Extensions | 25 | 40.3% |

SURVEY RESULTS: Administrators (Cont.)

Self-Reported Levels of Instructional Strategy Expertise

Most respondents rated themselves intermediate or higher in every strategy. Highest rated strategies include Flexible Grouping, High Level Questioning, Differentiated Instruction, and Formative Assessment as a Process.

| Administrators' Responses: I rate my level of expertise in the following strategies as 5-Expert; 3-Intermediate; 1-Novice; 0-Unsure. 64 responded. | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Strategies | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 | Totals |
| **Acceleration** | | | | | | | |
| Responses | 2 | 12 | 37 | 8 | 4 | 1 | 64 |
| Percent of Total Responses | 3.1% | 18.8% | 57.8% | 12.5% | 6.3% | 1.6% | 100% |
| **Flexible Grouping** | | | | | | | |
| Responses | 5 | 38 | 17 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 64 |
| Percent of Total Responses | 7.8% | 59.4% | 26.6% | 4.7% | 1.6% | 0.0% | 100% |
| **High Level Questioning Strategies** | | | | | | | |
| Responses | 8 | 35 | 17 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 64 |
| Percent of Total Responses | 12.5% | 54.7% | 26.6% | 6.3% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 100% |
| **Compacting Curriculum** | | | | | | | |
| Responses | 2 | 14 | 26 | 12 | 9 | 1 | 64 |
| Percent of Total Responses | 3.1% | 21.9% | 40.6% | 18.8% | 14.1% | 1.6% | 100% |
| **Differentiated Instruction** | | | | | | | |
| Responses | 9 | 38 | 14 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 64 |
| Percent of Total Responses | 14.1% | 59.4% | 21.9% | 1.6% | 1.6% | 1.6% | 100% |
| **Identification of Gifted Students** | | | | | | | |
| Responses | 3 | 25 | 26 | 8 | 1 | 1 | 64 |
| Percent of Total Responses | 4.7% | 39.1% | 40.6% | 12.5% | 1.6% | 1.6% | 100% |
| **Socratic Method** | | | | | | | |
| Responses | 6 | 10 | 28 | 9 | 11 | 0 | 64 |
| Percent of Total Responses | 9.4% | 15.6% | 43.8% | 14.1% | 17.2% | 0.0% | 100% |
| **Individualized Instruction** | | | | | | | |
| Responses | 5 | 28 | 24 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 64 |
| Percent of Total Responses | 7.8% | 43.8% | 37.5% | 9.4% | 1.6% | 0.0% | 100% |
| **Formative Assessment as a Process** | | | | | | | |
| Responses | 13 | 32 | 15 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 64 |
| Percent of Total Responses | 20.3% | 50.0% | 23.4% | 3.1% | 3.1% | 0.0% | 100% |
| **Student Agency** | | | | | | | |
| Responses | 4 | 21 | 22 | 9 | 6 | 2 | 64 |
| Percent of Total Responses | 6.3% | 32.8% | 34.4% | 14.1% | 9.4% | 3.1% | 100% |
| **Webb's Depth of Knowledge** | | | | | | | |
| Responses | 6 | 18 | 23 | 9 | 8 | 0 | 64 |
| Percent of Total Responses | 9.4% | 28.1% | 35.9% | 14.1% | 12.5% | 0.0% | 100% |
| **Extensions** | | | | | | | |
| Responses | 4 | 21 | 24 | 9 | 5 | 1 | 64 |
| Percent of Total Responses | 6.3% | 32.8% | 37.5% | 14.1% | 7.8% | 1.6% | 100% |

SURVEY RESULTS: Administrators (Cont.)

How Administrators Expect Teachers to Document Rate and Level Instruction for TAG Students

A 61.3% majority expected teachers to document rate and level instruction in their gradebooks; 33.9% reported using other methods such as electronic files, parent conferences, TAG planning forms and lesson plans. Some commented "I'm not sure;" there was no "explicit expectation to the staff" that year; documentation was not required "[u]nless creating a TAG plan for a student;" "I am not aware of a required process;" and "I don't think this has been clearly communicated from the district."

| Administrators' Responses: 62 responded. I expect that teachers document instruction is provided to the TAG-identified students' rates and levels (mark all that apply). | | |
|---|---|---|
| Response Choices | Responses | % of 62 Responded |
| In the teachers' gradebooks. | 38 | 61.3% |
| In a student's permanent file. | 13 | 21.0% |
| In a school-level TAG file. | 17 | 27.4% |
| In a district TAG file. | 7 | 11.3% |
| Other (Please Specify) | 21 | 33.9% |

| Other Specified |
|---|
| Each year teachers sign and return the documents that show what area students are identified TAG in. These go in a binder. When TAG letters are shared and signed by parents at conference they are uploaded to a child's file. |
| I'm not sure. |
| Synergy. |
| Communications with parents. |
| TAG Planning Form - given to parents in the fall and spring. |
| Lesson plans and is discussed during PLC meetings |
| Teacher's lesson plans and student assessment file. |
| BSA data folders. |
| We provide a list of TAG-eligible students to all teachers. |
| Unless creating TAG plan for a student, I do not require documentation |
| PLC data conversations, weekly notes to principal, and grade level lesson plans. |
| Lesson plans. |
| This has not been an explicit expectation to the staff this year. |
| I am not aware of a required process for documentation that instruction is provided to TAG identified students' rates and levels. |
| Individual student TAG plan. |
| Our teachers meet with our school TAG Coordinator to discuss. |
| I don't think this has been clearly communicated from the district standpoint on what expectations are. |
| Document in their lesson plans. |
| PLC. |

SURVEY RESULTS: Administrators (Cont.)

How Often Teachers Review and Adjust TAG Instructional Plans

A 70.3% majority reported teachers review and adjust TAG instructional plans as needed; 34.4% responded teachers do that yearly. One "other" response reports "PPS teachers are not required to create TAG instructional plans."

| Administrators' responses: 64 responded. How often do your teachers review and adjust TAG instructional plans (mark all that apply). | | |
|---|---|---|
| **Response Choices** | **Responses** | **% of 64 Responded** |
| Quarterly | 6 | 9.4% |
| Yearly | 22 | 34.4% |
| As Needed | 45 | 70.3% |
| Other (Please Specify) | 5 | 7.8% |
| | | |
| Other Specified | | |
| 2 times per year and as needed. | | |
| Parent request. | | |
| PPS teachers are not required to create TAG instructional plans. | | |

Did Administrators Review and Monitor TAG Instructional Plans?

A 65.1% majority reported they review and monitor TAG instructional plans; 34.9% reported they do not.

| Administrators' Responses: 63 responded. I review and monitor TAG instructional plans. 63 Responded. | | |
|---|---|---|
| Response Choices | Responses | % of 63 Responded |
| Yes | 41 | 65.1% |
| No | 22 | 34.9% |
| Totals | 63 | 100% |

SURVEY RESULTS: Administrators (Cont.)

If No to the Prompt Above, Who Monitors TAG Instructional Plans?

A 54% majority reported the TAG coordinator, facilitator or specialist individually monitors TAG instructional plans. Other responses indicated another administrator or a TAG coordinator working with teachers or others monitor TAG plans.

| Administrators' Responses: There are a total of 26 responses. If you selected "No," who monitors TAG instructional plans? |
| --- |
| Fourteen (14) responded the school's TAG Coordinator, facilitator or specialist individually monitors TAG instructional plans. |
| TAG Coordinator and VP. |
| We have a TAG facilitator who monitors the plan, as well. We work in tandem. |
| Also my TAG Coordinator. |
| Teacher and TAG Coordinator. If there is an issue then I become involved. |
| My AP and TAG coordinator. |
| To the extent that I monitor all instructional plans. |
| Look at grade level data and lesson planning for enrichment and reteaching. |
| Tag facilitator and/or teacher. |
| Also the TAG Coordinator. |
| My Assistant Principal. |
| TAG Coordinator and teachers. |
| I also ask my TAG Coordinator to do this. |

How Teachers Learn About Oregon Statutes and Rules Regarding Gifted Education

A 67.2% majority reported teachers learn about the statutes and rules through professional development opportunities.

| Administrators' Responses: 64 responded. How do teachers learn about the statutes and administrative rules regarding gifted education? | | |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Response Choices | Responses | % of 64 Responded |
| Copies are provided. | 11 | 17.2% |
| A professional development opportunity is provided. | 43 | 67.2% |
| Safe schools trainng at the beginning of the school year. | 3 | 4.7% |
| I do not inform staff of the gifted education statues and rules. | 1 | 1.6% |
| Other (please specify) | 6 | 9.4% |

SURVEY RESULTS: Administrators (Cont.)

Administrators' Other Comments

These are administrators' verbatim other comments. Three ask for guidance, training, professional development, or support for identifying and instructing TAG identified students. Six responded they had no comment. Three are not readable because the text is scrambled.

| Is there anything you would like to add that this survey does not ask about? |
|---|
| **Administrators' Volunteered Comments** |
| The IB program is an equity driver for HU students and an inquiry based model that provides student agency and many avenue for teachers to differentiate instruction. It would be great if PPS could expand IB to more schools and implement aligned PYP, MYP and DP programs. |
| Thank you for this opportunity to share what we do at [redacted]. PBL/EL are excellent teaching practices to serve TAG students who can extend and engage in higher level learning. |
| I am looking for a book of projects appropriate for . . . TAG and by grade bands. I would like to see our gifted students more engaged in projects. Additionally, we would like more guidance on identifying TAG students. |
| Administrators and teachers need more training on how to meet the needs of TAG students. |
| We need more professional development and support for teachers to meaningfully support TAG learners in our district. |
| With our very diverse population and the number of languages spoken we feel it is vital to have continual ability to identify students. |
| There are six "No" or "No, thanks" responses. |
| There are three scrambled and unreadable entries.. |
| There are no comments about the survey. |

END of ADMINISTRATORS' SURVEY RESULTS

TEACHERS' SURVEY RESULTS BEGIN on NEXT PAGE

SURVEY RESULTS: Teachers

Grade Levels and Years of Teaching Experience Represented

Given the survey results, assume some teachers taught multiple grade levels. An 82.83% majority represented schools serving grades K-8. That is consistent with information on the District's Website showing most of its schools serve grades K-8. That is also consistent with the fact that this investigation did not include District alternative programs serving students with special needs.

A 62.3% majority reported 6 to 20 years of teaching experience. A 14.9% minority reported 5 or fewer years of experience, and 22.8% reported 21 or more years of experience.

| Teacher Survey Responses by Grade Levels Taught (N=635 teachers) Some apparently taught multiple grade levels.) | | | Teacher Survey Responses: Years of Teaching Experience (N=645) | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Years | Responses | % of N |
| | | | 0 to 1 | 16 | 2.5% |
| Grade Range | Responses | % of N Responded | 2 to 5 | 80 | 12.4% |
| | | | 6 to 10 | 151 | 23.4% |
| | | | 11 to 15 | 122 | 18.9% |
| K-2nd | 185 | 29.13% | 16 to 20 | 129 | 20.0% |
| K-5th | 197 | 31.02% | 21 to 25 | 70 | 10.9% |
| 6th-8th | 144 | 22.68% | 26 to 30 | 42 | 6.5% |
| 9th-12th | 179 | 28.19% | 31 or More | 35 | 5.4% |
| Total | 705 | NA | Totals | 645 | 100% |

Years Teachers Were at the District and at their Current Assignment

A 52% majority held teaching positions at the District for between 2 and 10 years. Only 5.3% had been a District teacher for 1 year or less; 42.7% had been with the district for 11 years or more.

A 64% majority had been at their then current assignment for 2 to 10 years; 22.1% had been at their assignment 11 years or more. Only 13.9% had been at their assignment for 1 year or less.

| Teacher Survey Responses: Years Employed by PPS (N=643) | | | Teacher Survey Responses: Years at Current Location (N=640) | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Years | Responses | % of N | Years | Responses | % of N |
| 0 to 1 | 34 | 5.3% | 0 to 1 | 89 | 13.9% |
| 2 to 5 | 178 | 27.7% | 2 to 5 | 253 | 39.5% |
| 6 to 10 | 156 | 24.3% | 6 to 10 | 157 | 24.5% |
| 11 to 15 | 85 | 13.2% | 11 to 15 | 57 | 8.9% |
| 16 to 20 | 95 | 14.8% | 16 to 20 | 51 | 8.0% |
| 21 to 25 | 49 | 7.6% | 21 to 25 | 20 | 3.1% |
| 26 to 30 | 26 | 4.0% | 26 to 30 | 8 | 1.3% |
| 31 or More | 20 | 3.1% | 31 or More | 5 | 0.8% |
| Totals | 643 | 100.0% | Totals | 640 | 100% |

SURVEY RESULTS: Teachers (Cont.)

Subjects Taught

Responses indicate most teachers taught either in self-contained elementary classrooms or in general education subjects such as English-language arts, world languages, mathematics, health education, science or social science.

| Teacher Survey Responses: Subjects Taught (Assumes Multiple Subjects Taught) (N=639) | | |
|---|---|---|
| Subject | Responses | % of N |
| Electives/Specials | 51 | 8% |
| English Language Ars | 184 | 29% |
| English Language Development | 35 | 5% |
| Health/Reproductive Education | 81 | 13% |
| Mathematics | 176 | 28% |
| Physical Education | 10 | 2% |
| Science | 145 | 23% |
| Self-Contained Elementary | 204 | 32% |
| Social Science | 161 | 25% |
| Special Education | 47 | 7% |
| World Languages | 43 | 7% |
| Other | 71 | 11% |
| "Other" descriptions are omitted to ensure privacy. | | |

Teachers' Roles at Their Schools

An 88.6% majority of respondents were classroom teachers.

| Teacher Survey Responses: What is your role at the school? (N=640) | | |
|---|---|---|
| Subject | Responses | % of N |
| Classroom Teacher | 567 | 88.6% |
| TOSA | 5 | 0.8% |
| Counselor | 5 | 0.8% |
| Other | 63 | 9.8% |
| Totals | 640 | 100% |
| "Other" descriptions are omitted to ensure respondents' privacy. | | |

GO to NEXT PAGE

SURVEY RESULTS: Teachers (Cont.)

Numbers of Years Teachers Had TAG-Identified Students in Their Classrooms

A 66.1% majority reported they had TAG-identified students in their classrooms 6 or more years.

| Teacher Survey Responses: Numbers of years you have had TAG-identified students in your classroom(s). (N=629) | | |
|---|---|---|
| Years | Responses | % of N |
| 1 to 2 | 114 | 18.1% |
| 3 to 5 | 99 | 15.7% |
| 6 or More | 416 | 66.1% |
| Totals | 629 | 100% |

Numbers of TAG-Identified Students Teachers Had in Their Classrooms

Numbers of responses varied depending on the TAG identification category. An average of 70% reported 1-5 TAG-identified students per class in any category. Averages of 7.6% reported having 6-10 such students; 1.4% reported 11-15; 1.3% reported more than 15; and 19.6% reported having none.

| I currently have this number of TAG-identified students in my class(es). | 0 Per Class on Av. | 1-5 Per Class on Av. | 6-10 Per Class on Av. | 11-15 Per Class on Av. | >15 Per Class on Av. | Totals |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Intellectually Gifted | | | | | | |
| Responses | 92 | 408 | 43 | 9 | 8 | 560 |
| Percent of Total Responses | 16.4% | 72.9% | 7.7% | 1.6% | 1.4% | 100% |
| Academically Talented-Reading | | | | | | |
| Responses | 89 | 380 | 53 | 7 | 6 | 535 |
| Percent of Total Responses | 16.6% | 71.0% | 9.9% | 1.3% | 1.1% | 100% |
| Academically Talented-Math | | | | | | |
| Responses | 105 | 369 | 34 | 9 | 10 | 527 |
| Percent of Total Responses | 19.9% | 70.0% | 6.5% | 1.7% | 1.9% | 100% |
| Potential to Perform | | | | | | |
| Responses | 117 | 306 | 28 | 4 | 4 | 459 |
| Percent of Total Responses | 25.5% | 66.7% | 6.1% | 0.9% | 0.9% | 100% |

GO to NEXT PAGE

SURVEY RESULTS: Teachers (Cont.)

Numbers of TAG-Nominated Students Teachers Had in Their Classrooms

Numbers of responses varied depending on the TAG nomination category. An average of 60% reported 1-5 TAG-nominated students per class in any category. Averages of 3.45% reported 6-10 such students; 0.3% reported 11-15; 0.6% reported more than 15; and 36% reported having none.

| I currently have this number of TAG-nominated students in my class(es). | 0 Per Class on Av. | 1-5 Per Class on Av. | 6-10 Per Class on Av. | 11-15 Per Class on Av. | >15 Per Class on Av. | Totals |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Intellectually Gifted | | | | | | |
| Responses | 99 | 174 | 11 | 1 | 1 | 286 |
| Percent of Total Responses | 34.6% | 60.8% | 3.8% | 0.3% | 0.3% | 100% |
| Academically Talented-Reading | | | | | | |
| Responses | 88 | 175 | 9 | 1 | 1 | 274 |
| Percent of Total Responses | 32.1% | 63.9% | 3.3% | 0.4% | 0.4% | 100% |
| Academically Talented-Math | | | | | | |
| Responses | 101 | 168 | 8 | 0 | 1 | 278 |
| Percent of Total Responses | 36.3% | 60.4% | 2.9% | 0.0% | 0.4% | 100% |
| Potential to Perform | | | | | | |
| Responses | 96 | 132 | 9 | 0 | 3 | 240 |
| Percent of Total Responses | 40.0% | 55.0% | 3.8% | 0.0% | 1.3% | 100% |

GO to NEXT PAGE

SURVEY RESULTS: Teachers (Cont.)

Information Teachers Used to Determine a Student's Assessed Level and Rate of Learning

Responses indicate the most used information sources were samples of student work, daily observations, formative assessments, students' demonstrations and presentations, and students' input and self-assessment. The least used sources were statewide assessment results, online learning applications, and progress reports from other sources.

| Teacher Survey Responses: As a classroom teacher, I use the following information to determine a student's assessed level and rate of learning (mark all that apply). (N=661) | | |
|---|---|---|
| **Information Sources** | **Total Responses** | **% of N** |
| Information from previous teacher(s) | 369 | 58.5% |
| Student input and self-assessment | 432 | 68.5% |
| Student and/or parent surveys | 329 | 52.1% |
| Student demonstrations & presentations | 454 | 71.9% |
| Oregon State Assessments (OSAT) | 184 | 29.2% |
| Daily observational data | 538 | 85.3% |
| Chapter/unit tests | 350 | 55.5% |
| Student reading logs/writing journals | 310 | 49.1% |
| Formative Assessment as a process | 515 | 81.6% |
| Pre-assessments | 377 | 59.7% |
| Samples of student work | 550 | 87.2% |
| Exit tickets | 303 | 48.0% |
| Online learning app progress reports | 167 | 26.5% |
| Other (please specify) | 68 | 10.8% |

Exhibit 29 lists teachers' descriptions of other sources used to determine students' rates and levels of learning. Those excerpts suggest information that will help the District plan any future actions.

> None of this happened this school year.

> I don't believe in the identification part of this program. It is inequitable and does not serve our larger community or the students who are identified. I have conversations with colleagues and facilitate assessment in order to inform differentiated instruction and extensions.

> I do not have the time or support to formally assess the level of my TAG students in any meaningful way. There are no funds to support it, it is often based on tests students took in elementary school and in many cases does not mean students are still TAG by high school. Nor do I have the time, funding, or inclination to develop TAG specific curriculum over and above the extensions and opportunities that I offer to all of my students.

SURVEY RESULTS: Teachers (Cont.)

Instructional Strategies Teachers were Familiar With

Responses indicate 70% or more of responding teachers were familiar with differentiated instruction, high level questioning, flexible grouping, individualized instruction, formative assessment, identification of gifted students, and use of extensions. Fewer (58% or less) were familiar with compacting curriculum, Socratic method, student agency and Webb's Depth of Knowledge.

| Teacher Survey Responses: I am familiar with the following (mark all that apply). (N-634) | | |
|---|---|---|
| **Instructional Strategy** | **Total Responses** | **% of N** |
| Acceleration | 454 | 71.6% |
| Flexible Grouping | 585 | 92.3% |
| High Level Questioning Strategies | 586 | 92.4% |
| Compacting Curriculum | 365 | 57.6% |
| Differentiated Instruction | 624 | 98.4% |
| Identification of Gifted Students | 477 | 75.2% |
| Socratic Method | 356 | 56.2% |
| Individualized Instruction | 557 | 87.9% |
| Formative Assessment as a Process | 517 | 81.5% |
| Student Agency | 288 | 45.4% |
| Webb's Depth of Knowledge | 273 | 43.1% |
| Extensions | 447 | 70.5% |

SURVEY RESULTS: Teachers (Cont.)

Instructional Strategies Teachers were Trained In

Survey results indicate 92.2% of teachers who responded had received training in differentiated instruction. The next highest ranked strategies were high level questioning (74.5%); formative assessment (63.8%); flexible grouping (61.5%); and individualized instruction (57%). The remaining strategies ranked between 38% for identification of gifted students and 17.5% for student agency.

| Teacher Survey Responses: I have training in the following (mark all that apply). (N=577) | | |
|---|---|---|
| **Instructional Strategy** | **Total Responses** | **% of N Respondents** |
| Acceleration | 168 | 29.1% |
| Flexible Grouping | 355 | 61.5% |
| High Level Questioning Strategies | 430 | 74.5% |
| Compacting Curriculum | 156 | 27.0% |
| Differentiated Instruction | 532 | 92.2% |
| Identification of Gifted Students | 219 | 38.0% |
| Socratic Method | 213 | 36.9% |
| Individualized Instruction | 329 | 57.0% |
| Formative Assessment as a Process | 368 | 63.8% |
| Student Agency | 101 | 17.5% |
| Webb's Depth of Knowledge | 163 | 28.2% |
| Extensions | 185 | 32.1% |

GO to NEXT PAGE

SURVEY RESULTS: Teachers (Cont.)

How Teachers Rated Their Levels of Expertise in Instructional Strategies

Majorities (>50%) rated themselves intermediate or higher in each strategy except for compacting curriculum, Socratic method, student agency, and Webb's Depth of Knowledge. Highest rated were differentiated instruction, formative assessment, individualized instruction, flexible grouping, and high level questioning. Lowest rated were Depth of Knowledge, student agency, compacting curriculum, and Socratic method. Acceleration rated nearly evenly split between higher and lower ranges of expertise.

| Teachers' Survey Responses: I rate my level of expertise in the following strategies as 5-Expert; 3-Intermediate; 1-Novice; 0-Unsure. | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Strategies | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 | Totals |
| **Acceleration** | | | | | | | |
| Responses | 26 | 88 | 222 | 74 | 107 | 91 | 608 |
| Percent of Total Responses | 4.3% | 14.5% | 36.5% | 12.2% | 17.6% | 15.0% | 100% |
| **Flexible Grouping** | | | | | | | |
| Responses | 85 | 228 | 216 | 45 | 26 | 24 | 624 |
| Percent of Total Responses | 13.6% | 36.5% | 34.6% | 7.2% | 4.2% | 3.8% | 100% |
| **High Level Questioning Strategies** | | | | | | | |
| Responses | 87 | 246 | 214 | 41 | 19 | 20 | 627 |
| Percent of Total Responses | 13.9% | 39.2% | 34.1% | 6.5% | 3.0% | 3.2% | 100.0% |
| **Compacting Curriculum** | | | | | | | |
| Responses | 26 | 97 | 164 | 93 | 129 | 103 | 612 |
| Percent of Total Responses | 4.2% | 15.8% | 26.8% | 15.2% | 21.1% | 16.8% | 100% |
| **Differentiated Instruction** | | | | | | | |
| Responses | 120 | 307 | 156 | 22 | 8 | 15 | 628 |
| Percent of Total Responses | 19.1% | 48.9% | 24.8% | 3.5% | 1.3% | 2.4% | 100% |
| **Identification of Gifted Students** | | | | | | | |
| Responses | 49 | 179 | 204 | 84 | 61 | 46 | 623 |
| Percent of Total Responses | 7.9% | 28.7% | 32.7% | 13.5% | 9.8% | 7.4% | 100% |
| **Socratic Method** | | | | | | | |
| Responses | 21 | 93 | 141 | 83 | 151 | 124 | 613 |
| Percent of Total Responses | 3.4% | 15.2% | 23.0% | 13.5% | 24.6% | 20.2% | 100% |
| **Individualized Instruction** | | | | | | | |
| Responses | 111 | 219 | 189 | 55 | 21 | 22 | 617 |
| Percent of Total Responses | 18.0% | 35.5% | 30.6% | 8.9% | 3.4% | 3.6% | 100% |
| **Formative Assessment as a Process** | | | | | | | |
| Responses | 89 | 236 | 183 | 53 | 28 | 33 | 622 |
| Percent of Total Responses | 14.3% | 37.9% | 29.4% | 8.5% | 4.5% | 5.3% | 100% |
| **Student Agency** | | | | | | | |
| Responses | 27 | 102 | 138 | 70 | 96 | 172 | 605 |
| Percent of Total Responses | 4.5% | 16.9% | 22.8% | 11.6% | 15.9% | 28.4% | 100% |
| **Webb's Depth of Knowledge** | | | | | | | |
| Responses | 19 | 80 | 128 | 62 | 130 | 181 | 600 |
| Percent of Total Responses | 3.2% | 13.3% | 21.3% | 10.3% | 21.7% | 30.2% | 100% |
| **Extensions** | | | | | | | |
| Responses | 50 | 169 | 165 | 74 | 72 | 86 | 616 |
| Percent of Total Responses | 8.1% | 27.4% | 26.8% | 12.0% | 11.7% | 14.0% | 0% |

SURVEY RESULTS: Teachers (Cont.)

How Teachers Documented Instruction was Provided to TAG-Identified Students' Rates and Levels

Most teachers reported using their grade books or a student file to document instruction provided to TAG-identified students' rates and levels.

| Teacher Survey Responses: I document that instruction is provided to the TAG-identified students' rates and levels (mark all that apply). (N=592) | | |
|---|---|---|
| Response Choices | Total Responses | % of N Respondents |
| In my grade book. | 335 | 56.6% |
| In a student file. | 259 | 43.8% |
| In a school-level TAG file. | 154 | 26.0% |
| In a district level TAG file. | 37 | 6.3% |
| Other (please specify) | 126 | 21.3% |

These are sample volunteered comments from the teacher survey results. A review of all comments might help inform the District's planning going forward.

Thirteen responses: no records kept.

Six responses: Did not know this is required or have not been asked or trained to keep records. Example: "I've never been asked to do this. I don't have a formal documentation system for instructing TAG students' rates and levels of learning."

How do you document if a student is identified as TAG but does not take advantage of high level differentiated activities, acceleration, extensions, or revision opportunities?

If a kid is doing well on a [redacted], I give them a harder [challenge]. The fact that the kid can [do] it is my documentation.

Twelve responses: not sure how to reply or NA without explanation.

I don't know how to document it other than writing that I provided it.

It's in my brain.

I don't have TAG students. Ever. Because TAG sucks at identifying [specific] students.

GO to NEXT PAGE

SURVEY RESULTS: Teachers (Cont.)

Teachers' Reviews of a Student's Previous TAG Instruction Plan Prior to Writing or Adjusting a Current Plan

A 55.1% majority reported they did not review a student's previous TAG instructional plan prior to writing or adjusting a current TAG instructional plan.

| Teachers' Responses: I review a student's previous TAG Instructional Plan prior to writing or adjusting a current TAG Instructional Plan. (N=602) | | |
|---|---|---|
| Choice | Responses | % of N |
| Yes | 270 | 44.9% |
| No | 332 | 55.1% |
| Total | 602 | 100% |

Did Teachers Write TAG Instructional Plans?

A 75% majority of respondents reported they did not write TAG instructional plans.

| Teachers' Responses: I write TAG Instructional Plans. (N=617) | | |
|---|---|---|
| Choice | Responses | % of N |
| Yes | 152 | 24.6% |
| No | 465 | 75.4% |
| Total | 617 | 100% |

Did Students' Parents Request a Written TAG Instructional Plan?

An 86% majority reported parents do not often request a written instructional plan.

| Teachers' Responses: My students' parents often do not request to have a written TAG Instructional Plan. (N=603) | | |
|---|---|---|
| Choice | Responses | % of N |
| Yes | 521 | 86.4% |
| No | 82 | 13.6% |
| Total | 603 | 100% |

GO to NEXT PAGE

SURVEY RESULTS: Teachers (Cont.)

Most and Least Often Used Ways to Meet the Academic Needs of Gifted Students

This survey prompt gave responding teachers a list of ways to meet the academic needs of gifted students and asked them to rate the top three ways used at their schools. The rating scale ranged from 1 to 9, with 1 being the rating for most often used. The prompt included an NA choice. Numbers of respondents varied among the choices.

For the purposes of this section, the ways most often used are determined by their 1 ratings. The next most often used are determined by their combined ratings from 1-4. The least often used are determined by their NA ratings.

Most Often Used Way to Meet Academic Needs of Gifted Students
> In the regular classroom by the classroom teacher. Received a 1 rating from 72.7% of respondents. Only 15.5% or fewer of respondents gave any other choice a 1 rating.

Next Most Often Used Ways to Meet Academic Needs of Gifted Students
- In the regular classroom in small cluster groups which include other highly able students. Received a combined 1-4 rating of 85.9%.
- In the regular classroom with occasional assistance from staff familiar with the particular topic of instruction. Received a combined 1-4 rating of 55.8%. Also received a 40.6% NA rating.
- In acceleration in areas of strength. Received a combined 1-4 rating of 48.2%. Also received a 40.3% NA rating.

Least Used Ways to Meet Academic Needs of Gifted Students
- In a resource room, where children work in small groups or independently. NA rating of 77.8%.
- In a full-time classroom where all the children are identified as gifted or highly capable. NA rating of 75.3%.
- In a pull-out program once or twice a week. NA rating of 72.6%.
- In college or community college classes. NA rating of 71.2%. That is probably because those classes are available only to students in upper grades.
- In honors, or Advance Placement, or International Baccalaureate, or college dual credit classes. NA rating of 53.4%. Also received a combined 1-4 rating of 36%. Those results are probably because honors and similar classes are available only to students in upper grades.

SURVEY RESULTS: Teachers (Cont.)

<u>Ways Teachers Used to Meet the Academic Needs of Gifted Students: Prompt and Response Details</u>
This table is the source of the results discussed above.

**Teachers' responses: There are many ways to meet the academic needs of gifted students. Please choose the top three used by you/your school from the list below. Mark the most often used as 1, with a 2 or 3 for the next most common practices used. Mark all others as NA.**

| In the regular classroom by the classroom teacher. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | NA | SUM |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 426 | 79 | 40 | 8 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 31 | 586 |
| | 72.7% | 13.5% | 6.8% | 1.4% | 0.0% | 0.2% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.2% | 5.3% | 100% |

| In the regular classroom with occasional assistance from staff familiar with the particular topic of instruction. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | NA | SUM |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 10 | 84 | 113 | 18 | 8 | 4 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 164 | 404 |
| | 2.5% | 20.8% | 28.0% | 4.5% | 2.0% | 1.0% | 0.0% | 0.7% | 0.0% | 40.6% | 100% |

| In the regular classroom in small cluster groups which include other highly able students. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | NA | SUM |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 63 | 260 | 114 | 14 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 69 | 525 |
| | 12.0% | 49.5% | 21.7% | 2.7% | 0.4% | 0.4% | 0.0% | 0.0% | 0.2% | 13.1% | 100% |

| In a pull-out program once or twice a week. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | NA | SUM |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 3 | 10 | 28 | 28 | 16 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 247 | 340 |
| | 0.9% | 2.9% | 8.2% | 8.2% | 4.7% | 0.6% | 0.6% | 0.9% | 0.3% | 72.6% | 100% |

| In a full-time classroom where all the children are identified as gifted or highly capable. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | NA | SUM |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 9 | 12 | 8 | 3 | 24 | 23 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 256 | 340 |
| | 2.6% | 3.5% | 2.4% | 0.9% | 7.1% | 6.8% | 1.2% | 0.3% | 0.0% | 75.3% | 100% |

| In a resource room, where children work In small groups or independently. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | NA | SUM |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 0 | 2 | 9 | 3 | 11 | 27 | 17 | 2 | 2 | 256 | 329 |
| | 0.0% | 0.6% | 2.7% | 0.9% | 3.3% | 8.2% | 5.2% | 0.6% | 0.6% | 77.8% | 100% |

| In Honors, or Advanced Placement, or International Baccalaureate; or college dual-credit classes. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | NA | SUM |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 62 | 45 | 30 | 6 | 2 | 1 | 31 | 6 | 2 | 212 | 397 |
| | 15.6% | 11.3% | 7.6% | 1.5% | 0.5% | 0.3% | 7.8% | 1.5% | 0.5% | 53.4% | 100% |

| In College or Community College classes. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | NA | SUM |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 3 | 15 | 19 | 3 | 5 | 6 | 2 | 36 | 10 | 245 | 344 |
| | 0.9% | 4.4% | 5.5% | 0.9% | 1.5% | 1.7% | 0.6% | 10.5% | 2.9% | 71.2% | 100% |

| In Acceleration in areas of strength. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | NA | SUM |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 15 | 60 | 119 | 13 | 6 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 33 | 173 | 429 |
| | 3.5% | 14.0% | 27.7% | 3.0% | 1.4% | 0.7% | 0.7% | 0.9% | 7.7% | 40.3% | 100% |

SURVEY RESULTS: Teachers (Cont.)

Did Teachers Make Course Recommendations for TAG Students?

A 51% majority of respondents reported they did not make course recommendations for TAG students.

| Teachers' Responses: I make course recommendations for TAG students. (N=609) | | |
|---|---|---|
| Choice | Responses | % of Total |
| Yes | 296 | 48.6% |
| No | 313 | 51.4% |
| Total | 609 | 100% |

How Often Teachers Conferenced with Parents of TAG Students by Meeting, Phone, or Email Regarding Students' Learning

An 84.2% majority reported they conferenced with parents of TAG students regarding students' learning in a meeting, by phone or through email as needed. Fewer, 32.7%, reported they conferenced at the beginning of the year. Weekly, monthly, quarterly, twice a year, and end of the year conferences with TAG parents occurred at significantly lower rates.

| Teachers' responses: I conference with parents (meeting or by phone or email) of TAG students regarding their learning (mark all that apply). (N=609) | | |
|---|---|---|
| Response Choices | Total Responses | % of 609 Respondents |
| Weekly. | 16 | 2.6% |
| Monthly. | 32 | 5.3% |
| Quarterly. | 109 | 17.9% |
| Twice a year. | 60 | 9.9% |
| At the beginning of the year. | 199 | 32.7% |
| At the end of the year. | 42 | 6.9% |
| As needed. | 513 | 84.2% |

GO to NEXT PAGE

SURVEY RESULTS: Teachers (Cont.)

How Often Teachers Conferenced with TAG Students by Meeting, Phone, or Email Regarding Their Learning

A majority 82% of responding teachers conferenced with TAG students regarding their learning in a meeting, by phone or through email as needed. Fewer reported they conferenced with students weekly (17.8%), at the beginning of the year (14.2%), or quarterly (11.9%). Monthly, twice a year and end of the year conferences occurred at significantly lower rates.

| Teachers' responses: I conference with TAG students (meeting or by phone or email) regarding their learning (mark all that apply). (N=607) | | |
|---|---|---|
| Response Choices | Total Responses | % of 609 Respondents |
| Weekly. | 108 | 17.8% |
| Monthly. | 50 | 8.2% |
| Quarterly. | 72 | 11.9% |
| Twice a year. | 21 | 3.5% |
| At the beginning of the year. | 86 | 14.2% |
| At the end of the year. | 37 | 6.1% |
| As needed. | 498 | 82.0% |

Teachers' Other Comments (With Redactions)

The survey included this open-ended prompt: Is there anything you would like to tell me that I did not ask in this survey?

Teachers submitted 233 comments. Below are themes from their responses and verbatim example comments. Exhibit 30 lists all verbatim comments, redacted to protect the privacy of individuals, schools or specific subject areas. Not included here are any responses directed at issues that are under the District's local control and are beyond the scope of this investigation (e.g. funding or staffing).

| THEME | TEACHERS' EXAMPLE COMMENTS |
|---|---|
| Needs for professional development or training in meeting TAG students' needs. | *We teachers would like more training for methods to use with TAG students other than just assigning them harder projects and more extra credit work.<br>*The district does not train us to work with [TAG] students.<br>*We don't receive much training in how to best meet the needs of TAG students. Most of what I do is an inverse of what I do for ELD students and SpEd by differentiating instruction.<br>*After more than [redacted] years in PPS I still don't feel confident in my ability to differentiate for TAG students. I have never received any quality or useful professional development in this area.<br>*Instructional practices are not a big, school-wide focus at [redacted]. PD in differentiation strategies would be helpful for many staff. |

| THEME | TEACHERS' EXAMPLE COMMENTS |
|-------|---------------------------|
| Needs for professional development or training in meeting TAG students' needs. (Cont.) | *[T]here needs to be thoughtful planning on adapting the current elementary classroom, so teachers don't add more to their plate, but rather change their approach in planning, instruction, and flexible grouping.<br>*I would love to have more training on how to differentiate for Kinder students that come already "reading" at a 2nd-4th grade level.<br>*I would like more training on planning independent projects and also developing higher order thinking lessons/projects.<br>*There is nothing going on with TAG in this district other than identification.<br>*PPS has not provided me with training directly on TAG students or the teaching techniques listed in this survey.<br>*Classroom teachers are floundering in the area of TAG and working with gifted students. We have been given no resources or training.<br>*Especially as a new teacher with no additional help. I would love to do so much more for my students but with given resources (time, money, help, educational tools, etc.) other diverse needs of my students, and large class sizes, I do not know how to implement all of the amazing strategies I have learned. |
| Needs for materials, time, other resources. | *With such large class sizes it becomes increasingly difficult to tailor to the needs of students.<br>*Teachers are expected to do the extra work of creating a separate curriculum that caters to the needs of these students.<br>*The curriculum offered at our school in the core subjects of reading, writing, and math do not provide any type of differentiation for learners. It all falls on the shoulders of classroom teachers with little training or help.<br>*We simply do not have time when we can barely tackle SPED, ESL and our extremely needed work on racial justice in our schools. TAG should not and is not a priority since we have so much going on.<br>*Teachers are too overwhelmed bringing students below-grade level up to grade level while meeting the myriad of social and emotional needs within ever-increasing class sizes.<br>*I would be interested in why TAG isn't fully funded as a form of special education. The district does not train us to work with students, it does not support the program with money, it has one special school, and it does not continue to support programs like IB that would benefit TAG kids.<br>*All TAG instruction is created and implemented by the classroom teacher, which can be overwhelming when considering the number of emergent/strategic students and the amount of time/resources dedicated to them.<br>*[W]e do need much more PD and structural support to give TAG students a truly appropriate education.<br>*There is no TAG program that I'm aware of. There's a system to identify students, but that seems to be the end of it. The rest is differentiation.<br>*At the elementary level, teachers need more "ready to go" lesson plans and/or question stems that are already imbedded into the curriculum we have, not just philosophical ideas for teachers to research. |

| THEME | TEACHERS' EXAMPLE COMMENTS |
|---|---|
| | *Our meager TAG funding goes mostly to after school opportunities. Volunteers provide some additional TAG experiences in some classrooms.<br>*If the district is tired of being sued, then it makes sense to me that they would build structures that teachers could follow that would extend, compact, accelerate, etc. the curriculum that is expected. |
| Lack of clarity about whether TAG policies apply to kindergarten. | *There was no option to choose 0 identified TAG students, but I teach kindergarten.<br>*Some questions were tricky to answer as a Kindergarten teacher (14-16) because there was not an "not applicable" choice.<br>*I teach kindergarten and never have any identified children in the beginning of the year.<br>*TAG identification at the kindergarten level is something I struggle to understand the value of. Kindergarten should primarily be about social and emotional learning experiences.<br>*Some kids get tested while in Kindergarten but I still haven't had a student test as TAG while they are in my classroom.<br>*Several of the questions that I answered "no" were not applicable because I teach kindergarten. |
| Concerns about the District's TAG identification process. | *I wish we would move TAG identification in Kindergarten to the Spring. (No explanation provided.)<br>*There is an over-identification of TAG students and an inflated sense of extensions needed to meet their needs. Exceptionally gifted students needing significant extensions are rare, yet at [redacted] we average 20-30 per cohort.<br>*TAG identification is faulty at [redacted] thanks to skewed parental input; many students that should be TAG have parents that don't care about TAG identification, and many students that marginally qualify as TAG are identified due to parent determination.<br>*[T]he process to become TAG identified is often dependent on parents.<br>*Although I know it is possible to be struggling and gifted, I've never had anyone who made it through the identification process.<br>*TAG identification at the kindergarten level is something I struggle to understand the value of. Kindergarten should primarily be about social and emotional learning experiences.<br>*I'd love clarification on why TAG Identification is important and what expectations are for supporting these identified students.<br>*There is nothing going on with TAG in this district other than identification.<br>*I don't feel students should be identified as TAG until at least 3rd grade. Just because a student might enter kindergarten or first grade reading, does not mean they are TAG.<br>*Our students did get tested this year but I never heard about the outcomes of the test.<br>*TAG students are identified early and should be required to meet yearly requirements to keep going.<br>*Staff at this school . . . did not understand that any staff member can nominate a student. |

| | *This year no one came to test my 3 nominated students. Did the process change? *The timelines of notifications and the process has changed almost each year. *The only response I can give is that the district didn't tell us and that I don't know. |
|---|---|
| Concerns about equity in the District's TAG identification process. | *The TAG identification process is discriminatory. I'm at the point where I don't want to identify anyone because the criteria and testing are not for all kids. *The process for nominations, the steps for qualifications, all of it should be analyzed with an equity lens to make sure that students of color are represented in a school's TAG population because they currently are not at my school. *[I]t's difficult not to see TAG as a way of rewarding white middle/upper SES students and families for their social and cultural capital, while assimilating and separating out BIPOC students. TAG has a lot of equity issues inherent in it and I don't see very much work to address these issues. *I have several students of color in my language arts classroom whose reading levels are grades ahead of their white, TAG-identified peers, who have not been identified as TAG even by the 8th grade. [S]everal of these students of color have also been consistently scoring highly on language tests for years, indicating that this discrepancy in TAG identification is not even academic. *The TAG program as a whole is decidedly tilted toward white, English speaking students and is extremely inequitable in this regard. *Once in my [redacted] years working at [redacted] a student tested TAG on an assessment because it was offered in Spanish. The TAG assessment is not offered in the other languages my students speak. *We need to address how we are serving black students, Latinx and native students as well as other BIPOC students. As they disproportionately represent and not served well by our TAG program. *I do not see the needs of TAG identified students being met in the classroom. I see an egregious under representation of Black, Indigenous, students of color, and bilingual/multilingual students identified as TAG. *I think there is a lack of equity in the fact that some schools (ESPECIALLY that primarily serve students of color) are TAG exempt. (Emphasis in original.) |
| Concerns about the teachers' or District's ability to deliver TAG services. | *I have heard of no services that the TAG programs would offer students. *The same TAG opportunities need to be available for students who are TAG. This means across the city. *There are not any extra services provided to TAG students. Many students do not even know they are considered TAG! *I do not feel there are opportunities for kids to be challenged unless they have an exceptional teacher. *I do not feel our TAG students are well-supported and have heard the same from parents. |

| | |
|---|---|
| | *The district needs to do a better job providing learning opportunities for TAG students rather than it just falling on the classroom teacher to figure out.<br>*How teachers work to support their TAG students is almost entirely up to the teacher, unless there are parent complaints, in which case there might be some intervention by administration.<br>*We have NO opportunities at our school for TAG students and we have a high number of TAG kids [at redacted].<br>*If, as a district, we are serious about serving our gifted students, we need to be more than just a department.<br>*Every good teacher should differentiate & teach at every child's level - high or low. I don't think TAG does anyone any favors.<br>*PPS "does not have a TAG program" besides ACCESS. |
| Concerns or questions about the roles of TAG coordinators or facilitators. | *Our TAG coordinator writes TAG education plan for all students in writing at the beginning of each school year. (No further explanation.)<br>*Our tag coordinator is a [redacted] grade teacher herself so, her ability to help modify is a big ask.<br>*We have a TAG coordinator but I am not sure what they do.<br>*I would be delighted if the TAG coordinator, or who's in charge, would add suggestions . . . for teachers to get ideas to guide TAG students in all curricular areas.<br>*At [redacted], our facilitator and admin have been interested in running additional trainings about instructional practices etc. for TAG students. We simply do not have time when we can barely tackle SPED, ESL and our extremely needed work on racial justice in our schools.<br>*[W]e have had a TAG coordinator come to a staff meeting listing the things educators need to do, but never modeled nor gave resources for implementation, adjusting curriculum.<br>*[T]he TAG "coordinator" teacher at our school who does not provide PD or resources to work with TAG students. |
| Comments, concerns about the teacher survey. | *WHY ARE RACIALLY, CULTURALLY AND LINGUISTICALLY DIVERSE STUDENTS NOT MENTIONED? IF ODE IS PROVIDING GUIDANCE TO SCHOOL DISTRICTS IN REGARDS TO HOW TAG IS DELIVERED TO STUDENTS, THEN YOU HAVE THE RESPONSIBILITY TO BE INCLUSIVE AND YOU ARE NOT. (All caps in original.)<br>*It is very concerning to me that this survey does not even touch upon the equity issues with the current TAG system.<br>*As is too often the case, so much of the language in this survey doesn't apply to the realities of kindergarten.<br>*This survey had some confusing questions. Questions asking YES or NO probably needed the response TRUE or FALSE; AGREE or DISAGREE (caps in original).<br>*This survey did not take into consideration specialists which might make their answers less satisfactory.<br>*You didn't explain what the purpose of this survey was or what you intend to do with the information.<br>*Some staff will be (and were) worried it might be for evaluation purposes if you do not state anonynimity is assured (or told it would not be). |

| | *Nowhere in this survey do you ask us, as teachers, what we need so that we can best support our TAG students.<br>*It was very hard to answer this survey as a [subject redacted] teacher because these questions assume a TAG kid is doing well in your class and needs extensions.<br>*I did not answer some of the questions in the survey because it did not apply to my role as instructional coach in the building.<br>*Not all of us work with TAG students, so an "N/A" option should have been available. |
| --- | --- |

END of TEACHERS' SURVEY RESULTS

PARENTS' SURVEY RESULTS BEGIN on NEXT PAGE

SURVEY RESULTS: Parents of TAG-Identified Students

Grade Levels Represented

A 79% majority of responses represented parents of students in grades K-8.

| Parent Survey Responders by Ranges | | |
|---|---|---|
| Grade Ranges | Total Responses | % of All Responses |
| K-5th | 538 | 44% |
| 6th-8th | 434 | 35% |
| 9th-12th | 256 | 21% |
| Totals | 1228 | 100% |

Responses to Individual Survey Prompts-Listed by Topic

TAG Identification-Assessments Used

A 54% majority agreed or strongly agreed the District assessed their students for TAG identification in a variety of ways (e.g. testing, work samples, parent and teacher checklists/feedback). Of the remainder, 25% disagreed or strongly disagreed, and 21% neither agreed nor disagreed.

| Survey Prompt | Strongly Agree | Agree | Neither | Disagree | Strongly Disagree | Total Responses |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| My student was assessed for TAG identification in a variety of ways (e.g. testing, work samples, parent and teacher checklists/feedback). | 162 | 507 | 255 | 206 | 98 | 1228 |
| | 13% | 41% | 21% | 17% | 8% | 100% |

TAG Identification-Understandings of the Process

A 44% plurality disagreed or strongly disagreed they understood their students' TAG identifications (e.g. Academically Talented Reading, Academically Talented Math, Intellectually Gifted, or Potential to Perform) and the available programs and services. A 41% share agreed or strongly agreed they understood their students' identification and services, and 15% neither agreed nor disagreed.

| Survey Prompt | Strongly Agree | Agree | Neither | Disagree | Strongly Disagree | Total Responses |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| I understand how my student is identified (e.g. Academically Talented Reading, Academically Talented Math, Intellectually Gifted, or Potential to Perform) and the available programs and services. | 144 | 479 | 190 | 279 | 136 | 1228 |
| | 12% | 39% | 15% | 23% | 11% | 100% |
| | Space Intentionally Blank | | | | | |

SURVEY RESULTS: Parents of TAG-Identified Students (Cont.)

Responses to Individual Survey Prompts-Listed by Topic (Cont.)

Evidence the Teacher Uses to Plan Rate and Level Instruction

An 18.7% minority agreed or strongly agreed they knew what learning evidence and information the teacher uses about their student to plan for rate and level of instruction. A 63.8% majority disagreed or strongly disagreed, and 17.5% neither agreed nor disagreed.

| Survey Prompt | Strongly Agree | Agree | Neither | Disagree | Strongly Disagree | Total Responses |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| I know what learning evidence and information the teacher uses about my student to plan for rate and level of instruction. | 36 | 194 | 215 | 427 | 356 | 1228 |
| | 2.9% | 15.8% | 17.5% | 34.8% | 29.0% | 100% |

Opportunity to Discuss Student's TAG Plan with Teacher

A 3% minority agreed or strongly agreed they were frequently or often given the opportunity to discuss and develop their student's TAG plan with the teacher, and 6% reported that happened regularly. A 55% majority reported that happened never or not at all, and 36% reported that happened sometimes.

| Survey Prompt | Frequently | Often | Regularly | Sometimes | Never/Not At All | Total Responses |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| I was given the opportunity to discuss and develop my student's TAG plan with the teacher. | 10 | 28 | 74 | 438 | 678 | 1228 |
| | 1% | 2% | 6% | 36% | 55% | 100% |

Informed About Student's Progress

A 9.9% minority agreed or strongly agreed they were frequently or often informed about their student's progress, and 21.8% reported that happened regularly. A 39.3% plurality reported that happened sometimes, and 29% reported that happened never or not at all.

| Survey Prompt | Frequently | Often | Regularly | Sometimes | Never/Not At All | Total Responses |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| I am informed of my student's progress. | 54 | 67 | 268 | 482 | 357 | 1228 |
| | 4.4% | 5.5% | 21.8% | 39.3% | 29% | 100% |

SURVEY RESULTS: Parents of TAG-Identified Students (Cont.)

Responses to Individual Survey Prompts-Listed by Topic (Cont.)

Adequate Opportunities to Suggest Ways to Meet Student's Needs

A 24.3% minority agreed or strongly agreed the student and parent have adequate opportunities to suggest ways to meet their student's needs. A 47.1% plurality disagreed or strongly disagreed, and 28.6% neither agreed nor disagreed.

| Survey Prompt | Strongly Agree | Agree | Neither | Disagree | Strongly Disagree | Total Responses |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| My student and I have adequate opportunities to suggest ways to meet my student's needs | 59 | 240 | 351 | 314 | 264 | 1228 |
| | 4.8% | 19.5% | 28.6% | 25.6% | 21.5% | 100% |

Can Easily Arrange to Discuss TAG Concerns with Teacher or Administrator

A 31.4% minority agreed or strongly agreed they could easily arrange to discuss TAG concerns with their student's teacher, principal, building representative, or District administrator, and 32.5% disagreed or strongly disagreed. A plurality of 36.2% neither agreed nor disagreed.

| Survey Prompt | Strongly Agree | Agree | Neither | Disagree | Strongly Disagree | Total Responses |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| I can easily arrange to discuss TAG concerns with my student's teacher, principal, building representative, or District administrator. | 78 | 307 | 445 | 215 | 185 | 1230 |
| | 6.4% | 25.0% | 36.1% | 17.5% | 15% | 100% |

Teacher Uses the TAG Plan to Meet the Child's Rate and Level of Learning

An 11% minority agreed or strongly agreed their child's TAG plan is being utilized by the classroom teacher to meet my student's rate and level of learning on a consistent basis. A 59% majority disagreed or strongly disagreed, and 30% neither agreed nor disagreed.

| Survey Prompt | Strongly Agree | Agree | Neither | Disagree | Strongly Disagree | Total Responses |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| My child's TAG plan is being utilized by the classroom teacher to meet my student's rate and level of learning on a consistent basis. | 26 | 105 | 370 | 294 | 433 | 1228 |
| | 2% | 9% | 30% | 24% | 35% | 100% |

SURVEY RESULTS: Parents of TAG-Identified Students (Cont.)

Responses to Individual Survey Prompts-Listed by Topic (Cont.)

The Teacher Responds to Parents' Concerns Specific to TAG Services or Instruction

A 22% minority agreed or strongly agreed if they address concerns specific to TAG services/classroom instruction (e.g. differentiation, acceleration, rate and level instructional practices, etc.) with their student's teacher, the teacher explains how the student's academic and/or intellectual needs are being met in the classroom. A total of 29% disagreed or strongly disagreed. A plurality of 49% neither agreed nor disagreed.

| Survey Prompt | Strongly Agree | Agree | Neither | Disagree | Strongly Disagree | Total Responses |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| If I address concerns specific to TAG services/classroom instruction (e.g. differentiation, acceleration, rate and level instructional practices, etc.) with my student's teacher, the teacher explains how my student's academic and/or intellectual needs are being met in the classroom. | 48 | 227 | 602 | 182 | 169 | 1228 |
| | 4% | 18% | 49% | 15% | 14% | 100% |
| | Space Intentionally Blank | | | | | |

Information about Parents' Rights to File a Complaint and the Complaint Process

An 18.1% minority agreed or strongly agreed they had been informed about their rights to file a complaint with the district and how to file a formal complaint. A 58.7% majority disagreed or strongly disagreed, and 23.2% neither agreed nor disagreed.

| Survey Prompt | Strongly Agree | Agree | Neither | Disagree | Strongly Disagree | Total Responses |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| I have been informed about my rights to file a complaint with the district and how to file a formal complaint with the district. | 31 | 191 | 285 | 355 | 366 | 1228 |
| | 2.5% | 15.6% | 23.2% | 28.9% | 29.8% | 100% |
| | Space Intentionally Blank | | | | | |

GO to NEXT PAGE

Awareness of Rights to Withdraw Students from TAG Services and Programs

A 33% minority agreed or strongly agreed they were aware of their rights to withdraw students from the District's TAG services and programs. A 37% plurality disagreed or strongly disagreed: 30% neither agreed nor disagreed.

| Survey Prompt | Strongly Agree | Agree | Neither | Disagree | Strongly Disagree | Total Responses |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| I am aware of my rights to withdraw my student from TAG services and programs in Portland Public Schools. | 63 | 348 | 370 | 256 | 191 | 1228 |
| | 5% | 28% | 30% | 21% | 16% | 100% |

SURVEY RESULTS: Parents of TAG-Identified Students (Cont.)

Responses to Individual Survey Prompts-Listed by Topic (Cont.)

The Student's Academic and/or Intellectual Needs are Met

A 29% minority agreed or strongly agreed their students' academic and/or intellectual needs are being met. A plurality of 46% disagreed or strongly disagreed, and 25% neither agreed nor disagreed.

| Survey Prompt | Strongly Agree | Agree | Neither | Disagree | Strongly Disagree | Total Responses |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| My student's academic and/or intellectual needs are being met. | 55 | 309 | 301 | 334 | 229 | 1228 |
| | 4% | 25% | 25% | 27% | 19% | 100% |

The Student's Academic and/or Intellectual Needs are Met Daily through Classroom Instruction

A 27% minority agreed or strongly agreed their students' academic and/or intellectual needs are met daily through classroom instruction. A plurality of 45% disagreed or strongly disagreed, and 28% neither agreed nor disagreed.

| Survey Prompt | Strongly Agree | Agree | Neither | Disagree | Strongly Disagree | Total Responses |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| My student's academic and/intellectual needs are met daily though classroom instruction. | 47 | 288 | 342 | 340 | 211 | 1228 |
| | 4% | 23% | 28% | 28% | 17% | 100% |

How Students' Academic Needs are Met at School

When asked how students' academic needs are met at school, of these choices, "In the regular classroom by their classroom teachers" earned a 66.7% response rate. "Other" earned 29%. The other comments are below.

| Please indicate below how your student's academic needs are met at school. Check all that apply. 1228 parents responded. | Total | % of 1228 |
|---|---|---|
| In the regular classroom by their classroom teachers. | 819 | 66.7% |
| In the regular classroom with occasional assistance from staff familiar with TAG populations. | 43 | 3.5% |
| In the regular classroom in TAG cluster groups. | 54 | 4.4% |
| In a pull-out program once or twice a week. | 56 | 4.6% |
| In a full-time classroom where all students are identified as gifted or highly able. | 87 | 7.1% |
| In a resource room, where students work independently or in small groups. | 16 | 1.3% |
| In Honors, Advanced Placement, International Baccalaureate, or college dual credit classes. | 145 | 11.8% |
| In college or community college classes. | 11 | 0.9% |
| Through online programs/college level courses. | 32 | 2.6% |
| Acceleration in areas of strength (subject acceleration (e.g. advancing to the next grade level or course level in a certain subject area). | 153 | 12.5% |
| Acceleration (whole grade (e.g. grade skipping). | 19 | 1.5% |
| Other (Please Describe) | 363 | 29.6% |

Parents' Comments: Other Ways Students' Academic Needs are Met at School (With Redactions)

The parent survey included this open-ended prompt: Please indicate how your student's academic needs are met at school.

Parents submitted 363 comments, including duplicates. Below are themes from their responses with verbatim example comments. Redacted to protect privacy are names of individuals, schools or specific subject areas. Not included are any responses directed at issues that are under the District's local control and are beyond the scope of this investigation (e.g. funding or staffing). Exhibit 31 provides all verbatim comments with redactions.

| THEME | PARENTS' EXAMPLE COMMENTS-NEEDS MET at SCHOOL |
|---|---|
| Needs are not being met in the District's schools. | *Nope (or) None (or) Not Met (or) Nothing (or) Nothing is being done (or) Not sure (or) No idea (or) They aren't. (There are multiple same or similar comments.)<br>*This survey raises many questions that we didn't know we should have about the TAG program.<br>*My student was in a regular classroom, but . . . needs were not met.<br>*THEY ARE NOT BEING MET (all caps in original). That probably should have been the first selection.<br>*None, except classroom work packets he completes without peers (at grade level or TAG). |

| | |
|---|---|
| | *His needs are not met. He has never been offered differentiated curriculum/instruction other than being given extra worksheets and a math workbook. He gets an all As and is bored senseless, and has been since 3rd grade.<br>*PPS does not provide TAG services to kids whose parents do not have the time or resources to advocate for their kids!<br>*I am shocked to see many of these options as I they have not been available to my daughter.<br>*To the best of my knowledge, the TAG program was talked up in elementary school when my daughter was first "TAGGED," however, since, the program has no visibility or impact on her instruction. (Emphasis in original.)<br>*Not being met by PPS never has been, even at ACCESS.<br>*There is no TAG program (or) I don't think there is a TAG program (or) No services provided. (There are multiple similar comments.)<br>*Not once in [the student's] time in general education has he had staff familiar with TAG populations, TAG cluster groups, pull out programs, resource room, or online classes.<br>*Her needs were not met. She no longer attends.<br>*We have withdrawn our gifted child from PPS because it was unable to meet her at her rate and level (multiple similar comments about withdrawing student from PPS).<br>*My son took this class (AP) because he wanted to get into this field. The teacher . . . left in the middle of the school year. Her replacement didn't understand the content of the class and so the class was dropped with no explanation to the students or parents. My son didn't get the credit of the class and lost any hope of continuing in this field. |
| Needs were met only at ACCESS, not in other schools or programs. | *The ONLY place my student's unique needs were met was at ACCESS.<br>*Only after moving to ACCESS. Otherwise academic needs were not being met.<br>*[The student's] needs we're not met until ACCESS where (s)he received further whole grade advancements( and became a happy kid.<br>*At ACCESS Academy where all students are TAG identified. [*T]hese are all standard for students at ACCESS.<br>*Access. That was extremely helpful to [the student] going into high school.<br>*Attendance at ACCESS. Prior to this, I tried several times to get single subject acceleration at [redacted] School and was rebuffed because of logistics.<br>*ACCESS or ACCESS Academy (multiple responses).<br>*In the only resource PPS offers for highly gifted students : Access.<br>*We are told the only options are single subject acceleration or Access Academy. Adjusting rate of instruction is not an option. |
| Ways students' needs are met. | *Getting pulled out of the class once a week for 6 weeks.<br>*[A]fter school TAG program with librarian (or) after school option (multiple similar comments).<br>*Compact math was the only resource he has been able to access.<br>*[C]lassroom work packets he completes without peers (at grade level or TAG). *We have worked with the teacher to create a special |

| | |
|---|---|
| | program with a variety of modalities, including independent worktime with another student, small group work, and extended studies.<br>*With councilor approval, we paid for and enrolled my student in an ORVED class, and my student has been given permission to do work for the extra online class in the regular classroom.<br>*In specific courses (e.g. computer, mathematics, performing arts, bilingual class, IB, AP, self-study) (multiple similar responses).<br>*I created curriculum for my daughter to be done as independent learning during the school day. After a few days of going to the library to do this learning, she was told she had to stay in the classroom because a "certified teacher was not present in the library." We . . . decided to pull her out of . . . classes in the middle of the day and have her bike home to do her independent learning before returning for her final two classes.<br>*One time per week my daughter meets with a parent volunteer for math. No other accommodations have been made.<br>*At home (or) home schooling (or) Extra work we provide (or) supports parents provide outside of school (or) non-PPS program (multiple similar comments).<br>*I supplement at home as do most of the [redacted] parents since we don't really have a TAG program.<br>*An individual teacher, counselor, advisor of tutor (multiple similar comments). |
| Other ways needs are being met. (Cont.) | *This is driven by my child.<br>*Was sent to library with another kids to choose books above level in class.<br>*My student MIGHT be clustered with other TAG students (emphasis in original).<br>*Online Programs . . . initiated by parents (or) paid for by parents (multiple similar comments).<br>*Extra-curricular or after school programs or clubs (multiple similar comments).<br>*By parent volunteers.<br>*With supplemental worksheets. Maybe?.<br>*We are resorting to external tutoring and considering leaving PPS<br>*By taking her out of PPS. |

| | |
|---|---|
| Specific classes, programs or assignments alone do not provide TAG services. | *Compacted Math is not TAG specific.<br>*IB is NOT TAG. AP is not TAG (emphasis in original). Until it actually has a TAG program, PPS is just creating problems by bothering to identify students as TAG. It is insulting that the question is even being asked that parents may give PPS credit for meeting my child's TAG needs "in college classes".<br>*AP Programs are NOT TAG programs, and that is all she gets, besides AVID, which is an elective (emphasis in original).<br>*AP classes are less easy/boring than the regular classes so that's something.  But, other than the ONE child picked to take a class at Reed, there is ZERO support from PPS for taking college classes (emphases in original).<br>*AP classes are not TAG when general prerequisites are required in order to get into them.<br>*Requiring that [students] work in a hallway or giving them MORE work instead of more CHALLENGING (emphases in original) work makes them bored and uninterested, until finally, as happened with my child, they loathe school and underachieve because "why bother?" |
| There are few if any staff/parent communications. | *I'd like to have more clear communication as to why she was tested and how it's being used in the classroom.<br>*There has been no communication regarding my son's TAG status.<br>*No teachers have communicated to us regarding specialized curriculum.<br>*I'm [not] aware of these opportunities outside the regular classroom: I have not seen them offered. If they have been offered, it has [not] been communicated clearly.<br>*[N]o information provided regarding assessment post nomination.<br>*I would like information about these options at my child's school - they sound great.<br>*We've never heard of any of this (or) No information provided (multiple similar comments).<br>*Throughout my child's education with PPS, I have understood there is no TAG programming.<br>*TAG cluster groups???? this is the first that I've heard of it.  "Pull out programs"???   "Resource room??" - I've never seen one.<br>*(Also see the "no idea" or "not sure" comments in "Needs are not being met" section above.) |

The parent survey included this open-ended prompt: Other comments I would like to share.

Parents submitted 683 other comments, duplicates included. Below are themes from their responses and example comments. The comments are verbatim except for formatting deletion edits or other edits indicated by brackets. Redactions are to protect privacy are names of individuals, schools or specific subject areas. Not included are any responses directed at issues that are under the District's local control and beyond the scope of this investigation (e.g. funding or staffing).

Exhibit 31 is a verbatim copy of all comments, with redactions. The District's review of all parent comments would help inform its planning going forward.

| THEME | PARENTS' EXAMPLE OTHER COMMENTS |
|---|---|
| My student is bored. | *He would do a lot better in an accelerated science class. He's been bored in science for years. The honors opportunity is good, but it's not good enough. <br> *A chief frustration for me was that with 100 students in her class, it seemed like she could have been grouped with others and had social learning experiences rather than being the helper, being bored, or being alone. <br> *My student is newly identified as TAG but it is just widely known that this really means *nothing* for him until he gets to middle school. He is super bored & not challenged in his daily school work. <br> *I worry my son will begin acting out in class because he is so bored. <br> *I have expressed concern routinely in K, 1 and 2 that she is really bored in math with no evident improvement/effort on the part of her teacher. <br> *My son reads about 5 novels a week (plus graphic novels and other reading) , reading constantly in his spare time, and is beyond bored in language arts. <br> *He is a student who is quiet, does all his work (is bored and unchallenged) well behaved, and has slipped through the cracks every single year since kindergarten. <br> *My child was placed in grade level math and the principal refuses to move him. He's bored out of his mind. Total waste of time and frankly detrimental. <br> *[M]y concerns are that so many other creative and talented students get bored with "doing school" and are not challenged. <br> *My daughter is bored in school. She dislikes school and says she never learns anything. <br> *My child is bored and not challenged in reading, writing or math. It seems the only way PPS would challenge her is by skipping grades, which would upset her socially. <br> *She is bored at school. We are considering our options. |
| My student is not bored. | *My kids aren't bored and acting out - they get what they need. At the same time, I'd like to know that other families who need more are getting it. <br> *[T]here were a couple years where he was bored out of his mind at school. So far, so good in 6th grade. He seems interested, engaged, and challenged. |
| TAG identification is inadequate or does not lead to services. | *[T]here were clearly students who could have been grouped together beneficially at [redacted] and were not because of lack of identification and bias against grouping by ability. <br> *Identification of TAG students, communication of available programs and implementation of TAG services should be improved at Title 1 schools. <br> *I understand that our neighborhood school has bigger things to worry about than TAG kids, but I also think that the lack of |

| | understanding about TAG may lead to lower identification in this community.<br>*[The TAG coordinator] could not even provide a single example of how TAG identification might practically manifest in a classroom.<br>*Overall, pps does not have tag services, only tag identification.<br>*TAG identification has had no apparent value-add for my student's education. I saw no relevant impact of the identification.<br>*Our experience over the past 8 years with how PPS has handled our student's math TAG identification lead to the opinion PPS's TAG program is functionally nonexistent and a disgrace. |
|---|---|
| Communications about TAG need improvements. | *Identification of TAG students, communication of available programs and implementation of TAG services should be improved at Title 1 schools.<br>*There are opportunities we have missed (with One very busy working parent and one parent at home) then the communication has failed. I think it's all sad.<br>*I would really like to see better communication options offered to parents. *More of a focus on communication with families and better follow-through when we ask for information. I have very little knowledge of how/what my child is doing on a regular bases in his classes.<br>*I didn't receive any further information about the TAG program. The only communication was that my kid could be part of the program.<br>*There has been no communication regarding my son's TAG status.<br>*PPS has no cohesive plan to provide a communication.<br>*In 8 years of having a TAG identified student in Math the only communications we received about TAG programs were boilerplate district wide emails.<br>*If she is identified as TAG after the testing, I would expect more communication with us and also follow-up in the classroom.<br>*Our child was identified early by a grade school teacher and during that time we were made aware of a few extra TAG related activities she was able to participate in.<br>*Outside of a meeting at back-to-school night and one email from the TAG coordinator, we've had no communication regarding TAG at [redacted] this year.<br>*There is almost no communication (outside of the parent teacher conference) for us to work along with him to keep her learning at her potential.<br>*Literally the only information we get about TAG is an OMSI night email three times a year.<br>*There has not been any information shared on TAG programs or support after elementary school. |
| THEME | PARENTS' EXAMPLE OTHER COMMENTS |
| Opportunities for parents to provide input about or discuss services for their TAG students are either | *There is no interest from the administration (and some staff) in forming a closer partnership with parents and community to enrich and improve student experiences in any way that would require the |

| inadequate or do not lead to TAG services. | administration to accept outside input that is not solicited by the administration.<br>*There have never been opportunities, discussions or any specialized education discussions, events etc. My 11th and 6th grade students experienced the same. Identified but nothing more.<br>*Some teachers have assembled a tag plan, discussed it with us, or related how they challenge the student. as far as we know, none of the other teachers through the year were aware they HAD tag students at all.<br>*While there have been opportunities to discuss TAG-associated learning, it doesn't seem like the school and teachers really can focus on it.<br>*Our daughter has been in TAG since second grade, and I think we've discussed the extra work she is doing to help keep her engaged all of twice during parent-teacher conferences for elementary school.<br>*After multiple inquiries and follow up with the school about TAG and what options are available, his current teacher finally discussed implementing a few additional activities in the classroom during our P/T conference.<br>*Our daughter's teacher meets with us to discuss progress, but I don't know if my daughter is being challenged.<br>*We initiated a discussion in the beginning of the school year to try to get our child's TAG needs met in school, but no satisfactory action was offered.<br>*[T]here was no differentiation for my student (or at least not enough that she felt challenged). This was true for the entire school year, despite several meetings with the teacher and discussions about differentiating rate and level.<br>*I've asked for a formal plan, an informal plan, a conversation, a reading group, something from all of them and received absolutely zero. The principal is also absolutely no help.<br>*I feel that there is no clear protocol for TAG students once identified. It seems that they are identified and then nothing.  I'm not sure what is supposed to happen--do we meet with teachers and TAG rep to discuss strategies for better meeting her needs?<br>*[W]e have never been offered pull out or resource room, and when acceleration was discussed the principal would "not allow" it due to her personal feelings about TAG students.<br>*[W]e have never been offered pull out or resource room, and when acceleration was discussed the principal would "not allow" it due to her personal feelings about TAG students.<br>*After 7th grade we again addressed the issue with school administration and requested our student be placed in the higher math class for 8th grade. This request was met with resistance and initially denied.<br>*In my interactions with the PPS's main office I found that requests for support for high achieving students has been stonewalled or was met with hostility. |
|---|---|

| | |
|---|---|
| | *We [had the] TAG director . . . talk to our TAG parent group and the admin. . . about flexible grouping, but [the administrator's] response was that it was tracking. |
| Dissatisfaction with TAG facilitator or coordinator services. | *We were not informed by TAG coordinator when the tests would be or what they would entail - for instance, we declined the verbal test because she didn't read yet and no one told us it was not a reading test.<br>*[I]n the TAG info night meeting, the TAG coordinator told all the parents it was impossible for a student to be working three grades up in language arts and they must be missing crucial skills. [That] kept many parents from accessing the education and resources their kids needed.<br>* He qualified for ACCESS, but in talking with the neighborhood school TAG coordinator we felt that she was discouraging us from applying. [She] also said in our neighborhood school our child would receive no specific plan or services to meet his rate and level of learning. It would be up to each teacher to figure out.<br>* Her classroom teacher does not know what to do to challenge her per her teacher's own words. There is no help from the TAG coordinator or any other source for the teacher.<br>*We had a meeting for TAG parents for the first time this year...it is clear the coordinator does not know what is going on. [She] could not provide a single example of how TAG identification might practically manifest in a classroom.<br>* PPS under-staffs the department at district, allows "TAG coordinator" to be an after thought assignment at the schools. My son would never have gotten into Caltech if I had entrusted him to PPS TAG services!<br>* After the first several years without any additional plan, execution, or communication assistance (already overworked teachers being designated as TAG coordinator), we received presentations from [redacted] on TAG, however with no visibility to what was actually being done with my child.<br>* Our only interaction with the TAG coordinator was to be told my son's teacher wasn't allowed to push him up into 4th grade math without additional testing and meetings, and then the school never followed up to offer us any such services.<br>* My child was identified in kindergarten and has received the bare minimum. She is pushed to reading/writing, though she is TAG in both reading and math, and her math scores were actually higher. I asked the TAG district coordinator if there's a bias against girls in math and she said no. It seems easier for teachers to differentiate for reading/writing, but I'm still not sure what's being done. In math.<br>* Outside of a meeting at back-to-school night and one email from the TAG coordinator, we've had no communication regarding TAG this year.<br>*[O]ur daughter's current middle school didn't know she was TAG identified until we happened upon the TAG COORDINATOR (capitalized in original) at parent teacher conferences at which point we were told there was a "glitch" in their system. To date, our |

| | |
|---|---|
| | daughter still doesnt have a TAG plan and I have not heard back from the TAG coordinator whom I emailed more than 3 months ago.<br>*The times we have brought up TAG with each of her 2nd-4th grade teachers (as well as the school TAG coordinator), each teacher said there are no specific TAG resources at the school and the teacher has his or her hands full trying to manage the needs of a diverse range of students.<br>*When I have reached out to our school's TAG coordinator, I have either received no response or been dismissed. |
| TAG instruction, programs or services for TAG identified students are not provided or are underdeveloped or unclear. | *There basically is no TAG program in place. Both of my children have been identified and then nothing is done. (Multiple responses say there is no TAG program, it is in name only, underdeveloped or no TAG services are provided.)<br>*As the TAG program stands at [redacted] right now, it is merely a test. There is no program, follow-up or special curriculum for TAG kids.<br>*I hear so little . . . that I'm not even positive they are still in the TAG program.<br>*It is hard to identify the TAG services my daughter is receiving . . . , so it is hard for us to think of ways to evaluate how well the TAG program works.<br>*I dont understand how PPS can say they provide TAG services.<br>*TAG services would be welcome.<br>*We had to push for a TAG plan the following year and were only given one in math and the teacher didn't seem to understand how to differentiate in language arts or that that might be beneficial despite the fact that she was identified with potential for overall.<br>*We left [redacted] because the tag plan was never implemented and my son needed much more than what he was getting in a very crowded classroom.<br>*He does have a TAG plan filed, but it isn't followed and there are no services or pull out opportunities for him.<br>*In 4 years of tag, one teacher knew what to do and performed well after I pressed for an individual tag plan. Others don't get it.<br>*I haven't heard about my student's participation in TAG program in about 1.5 years, though her teacher is aware that she has high capability. I don't recall if she has a "TAG plan," but if she does, we certainly don't review it or refer to it in any staff discussions.<br>*TAG plans essentially just mean they get a notebook with "bonus work" for when they finish early. That is not gifted education.<br>*I have never had a teacher spontaneously mention a TAG plan for either of my kids. I know they are eligible.<br>*[S]ome teachers have assembled a tag plan, discussed it with us, or related how they challenge the student. as far as we know, none of the other teachers through the year were aware they HAD tag students at all.<br>*I've filled out a survey each year, allegedly to help the teacher develop a TAG plan, but I've never seen evidence that a plan exists. |

| | |
|---|---|
| | *TAG planning or accommodation is not part of BCS's curriculum or daily teaching. My child's teacher knows she is TAG from her record, but only "expects more of her" as a result. No unique instruction is available.<br>*The school has a lovely building TAG plan hanging on the wall, and it's all made up fantasy. The only thing that really happened for my kids was extra work, which I put a stop to.<br>*At his elementary school [redacted], we were told that they didn't support TAG pull-out groups or programs because it would create bad feelings and jealousy among the students who were left behind. |
| Most, but not all, comments about ACCESS Academy are positive. | *Our child was very depressed before going to ACCESS.<br>*When we moved here, we had missed the short window to apply for ACCESS and had to full grade accelerate our student upon enrollment to attempt to meet his needs. |
| Most, but not all, comments about ACCESS Academy are positive. (Cont.) | Example Positive Comments<br>*My daughter's academic needs are being met because she is at ACCESS. I doubt they could/would be met if she were attending our neighborhood middle school.<br>*Our kid was lucky enough to get into ACCESS in first grade, but so many others were not able to get in and I know their stories. Those stories are not happy. PPS needs to do a lot of work, and now.<br>*In my opinion, unless a student goes to Access Academy, TAG is a relatively meaningless designation that has no special programs or services attached to it (except occasional free visits to OMSI).<br>*Frankly TAG is totally inadequate at our school. We are considering applying to Access for her but have heard that it is almost impossible to get a spot.<br>*Since my son was placed at Access, we have been satisfied with how his academic needs are met. Before that, when he attended his neighborhood school, his learning was not made a priority.<br>*Our experience at ACCESS Academy for grades 6-8 were the only time our student's TAG needs were met.<br>* It would be misleading to give PPS a grade based on our experience at ACCESS, because in my experience the district is completely failing TAG students in the neighborhood schools.<br>*The system is broken - thank goodness for ACCESS.<br><br>Example Critical Comments<br>*I feel like my child has been adequately tag identified however meeting his social and academic needs is still challenging even at ACCESS because he struggles to participate. He says he's challenged about 50% of the time.<br>*I got a letter that he identified in an additional TAG area and may be eligible for ACCESS academy. BUT HE'S IN HIGH SCHOOL NOW! (Emphasis in original.)<br>*ACCESS is a disaster, and even then doesn't account for all TAG kids, anyway. PPS doesn't want to help parents in any way.<br>*The district has put all its TAG eggs into the ACCESS basket. |

| | |
|---|---|
| | *ACCESS is the only PPS District placement that would allow many 2e [twice exceptional] individuals to receive instruction at their rate and level of learning, yet PPS does not provide adequate Special Education resources to the program to enable 2e students to thrive there and access the accelerated curriculum. |
| Concerns about equity in the TAG program. | *It feels like all TAG resources have been funneled to Access Academy, and if you can't get your kid there, you get nothing.<br>*PPS is stuck providing excellent service to a very few students at ACCESS and NO services to the rest of the district. The system is scandalously inequitable (emphasis in original).<br>*There does not appear to be a standard infrastructure across elementary schools for TAG services/programs, which I view as an inequitable failure.<br>*PPS is all about equity right now. But in words only. Leaving TAG programming up to individual schools and teachers is the least equitable option. |
| Concerns about equity in the TAG program. (Cont.) | *PPS, for as much ado that it makes about equity, does not provide equal access to all students for things like differentiation or acceleration or extracurriculars.<br>*If PPS can't bring minority and economically disadvantaged students up without holding gifted students down, then we will end up [transferring to another local district].<br>*Offering the ability to pay extra and participate in barely available out of school programs is NOT TAG services - it is elitist, discriminatory and loudly tells our students that their needs are much less important than all other "special" groups.<br>*There are many talented children of color and girls who are clearly being overlooked.<br>*It was implied that our child's interest in learning was a symptom of our White privilege and that her raising her hand "too much" indicates a lack of tolerance for other learners.<br>*I find it maddening that PPS has provided hardly any support for TAG students. Whenever I raise this issue, I am told that the bar must be lowered for reasons of equity. |
| To some parents, OMSI events are the TAG program. | *The only TAG services I am aware of are special OMSI events or evening workshops for parents which assume a high level of privilege and flexibility of working parents.<br>*[I]t is frustrating that that TAG doesn't seem to mean much beyond a special sticker in their cumulative folder and the above-mentioned few free OMSI offers per year.<br>*TAG is a relatively meaningless designation that has no special programs or services attached to it (except occasional free visits to OMSI).<br>*I cannot think of one thing TAG related that my 7th grader has had I the last 3-4 years except the OMSI night.<br>*Other than the identification, I have no idea how TAG benefits my child. We get a yearly "come to a TAG night at OMSI" but I have no idea why we'd go.<br>*The advertisement for the one OMSI event per year is about the only time I get information from the TAG program. |

| | |
|---|---|
| | *An OMSI night and a flag on his file do not a program make.<br>*We are aware of TAG nights at OMSI and such but haven't seen any TAG enrichment as part of any regular class.<br>*I asked other parents about [TAG resources] and they scoffed at the program - the answer I got "ya they get a free night at OMSI once a year and that's it." |
| Some parents identify lack of funding, resources or supports as causes for the lack of TAG services. | *I am disappointed that my child has been identified as TAG and that my only information to-date was that no funds existed to do any programming at her school.<br>*Providing the funds for the entire district to one Access school is . . . a great disservice to the future of Portland.<br>*I want to make it abundantly clear that I don't blame the teachers-they have WAY too large a classroom size to effectively do individualized instruction, and ZERO funding from PPS or the state to support TAG programming. (Emphasis in original.)<br>*I feel my child was TAG identified but no resources are given to support anything special for these students. |
| Some parents identify lack of funding, resources or supports as causes for the lack of TAG services. (Cont. | *What TAG program?? All of my daughter's teachers since 2nd grade have basically told me that it is an unfunded, unsupported program.<br>*[T]here needs to be some sort of structure and support for teachers. They don't have time to teach TAG, grade level and struggling students in the same class at the same time.<br>*TAG services at the neighborhood school is doled out as if they are treats with very little support for teachers.<br>*I've encouraged the administrators to reach out to district to get support to teachers so they might increase their capacity around differentiation.<br>*The TAG office is understaffed to serve an entire district. |
| Some parents commented that the TAG program is beneficial or helpful. | *I feel that the social interaction my child has at school is beneficial to him. He made these connections in elementary through a weekly TAG program, and the friendships have lasted for several years now. Because he is interacting with the other TAG kids on a daily basis, his needs are met.<br>*We recognize that there are a few stimulating after-school activities available, specifically Chess club and OBOB, which have been helpful.<br>*Because he is interacting with the other TAG kids on a daily basis, his needs are met. I feel that early identification and opportunities to bond with other TAG kids is helpful for building a strong social structure.<br>*Hopefully the TAG box being ticked will be useful in high school.<br>*I would live to see each school with a TAG specialist who can do some pull out programming per grade level focusing on project-based, group hands on learning to enrich and supplement class work tbrough inquiry and creation in a setting where students are at similar levels and similarly focused and engaged. Not for the whole day, but like a special. This was my TAG experience in elem and middle school and it comprises among my most valuable and memorable learning experiences. |

| | |
|---|---|
| | *The couple of district-sponsored TAG parent nights (where a speaker has come in to present and do Q&A's) have been valuable.<br>*I am in the minority of families whose students are being served well. I can't thank the administration and staff of [redacted] for helping to support my son in single subject acceleration.<br>*I appreciate that the program exists and wish it was more effective.<br>*The most significant benefit from my child being identified as TAG was that he stopped getting into quite as much trouble for being distracted in class. |
| Example personal stories that deserve recognition. | *I repeatedly requested tag testing in 3rd, 4th and 5th grades [at redacted] elementary and was told "we know we are supposed to do tag, but we don't."<br>*I have asked teachers to adjust rate and level, but they are overwhelmed "just trying to get everyone to graduate". Some have told me "yeah, I Probably need to do more to challenge him" or "I never worry about him, He is the brightest kid in the class." My child is begging me to allow him to transfer to a more challenging school environment.<br>*[M]y son got into TAG in 9th grade. We went to one TAG meeting at the beginning of 9th grade, where the woman basically said, "We don't really do any TAG stuff at [redacted]." And we never heard about TAG again.<br>*Had we been able to afford it, we would have long ago sent our kids to a private school. As it is, our kids seek out extracurricular activities (outside of PPS) to fill their higher learning needs. |
| Example personal stories that deserve recognition. (Cont.) | *The methods of testing students for TAG are woefully inadequate. I was not told of deadlines for that this fall, had to beg to have my kindergartener tested for a grade acceleration, and was ultimately denied because they claim his reading level wasn't adequate. He never even learned the name of his test administrator. He was asked to read words, but was shy with a STRANGER WHO DIDN'T EVEN TELL HIM HER NAME, and so didn't read for her. (Emphasis in original.) He reads for others. His teacher supported his grade acceleration. His math is off the charts. But we were denied by someone who couldn't even spend enough time with him for him to know her name.<br>*In 4th grade, I had to make an issue about [the student] just even getting to be in the classroom. He was far ahead of the class, so they sent him to the photocopy room and he spent an hour a day making photo copies for the various teachers. I thought that was inappropriate.<br>*He is expected to teach the kids who need help. He does what a grown up tells him to do. As a result, he is always paired with the lowest performing kids and expected to teach them. On field trips, other kids get put in groups of 4 or 5 with a chaperone. A certain kid with an IEP really likes my son, so my son always gets put into a group only with that kid and a chaperone . He misses out on the field trip content because he is expected to keep the IEP kid [calm].<br>*[Student] attended [redacted] where there was inadequate support for a TAG child. Some teachers were outright hostile, with several telling me . . . that my request for single subject acceleration in |

| | |
|---|---|
| | math was misguided because I clearly did not "value a well rounded, global citizen."<br><br>*My son was bored to tears until this year when he was lucky enough to find a teacher who not only engages him but who places him frequently with other students who challenge him rather than constantly asking my son to work with students so he can help them.<br><br>*When I spoke with my daughter's [redacted] grade teacher about what she was going to do for her because of her TAG status, the teacher said "My job is to help all the kids in the class be leaders, not just [daughter's name]." That teacher also made . . . kids who finished the math worksheets first just sit there and do nothing while the other kids finished. Not even read a book.<br><br>*At my daughter's neighborhood school, parents helped where they could, pulling gifted students for accelerated math and language arts. We weren't teachers but the TAG kids were so bored and frustrated in mainstream classes that we did what we could.<br><br>*My son was constantly told to wait. Wait until middle school and you will be able to take accelerated classes. At middle school, he was told to wait until HS. There he would be able to take advanced classes. At high school, he was told to wait until his junior year and THEN he could take IB classes. (Emphasis in original.)<br><br>*My son always qualifies for it, and the teachers I spoke with in elementary [redacted] and middle [redacted] always said they don't really have anything different for TAG other than additional optional assignments, which to no surprise, my son didn't opt to do. |
| Comments about the survey express new awareness, frustration, and hope. | *This survey raises many questions that we didn't know we should have about the TAG program.<br><br>* We like our school community and the teachers work very hard, so we try not to criticize. But since you are asking in the form of this survey, I have been struck that so far being TAG identified hasn't amounted to much for our student.<br><br>*I'm filling out this survey twice - once for [redacted] (1st grade) and once for ACCESS @Vestal (2nd grade) because of the HUGE difference in the two programs. (Emphasis in original.)<br><br>*I wish your survey capture responses from others . . . the social emotional effects that the lack of rate/level and a lack of FRIENDS has on these kids. (Emphasis in original.)<br><br>* I don't feel TAG exists. So what is the point of this survey? TAG seems to me to be a PPS designation that had no follow through.<br><br>*This survey is super frustrating as it implies that there is actually a program when there is really not much of one at all.<br><br>*I appreciate being asked on a survey like this, but honestly, if there is no funding or support for different approaches for gifted kids, why bother with testing and designating them as TAG?<br><br>*TAG "services and programs" barely exist. I've filled out a survey each year, allegedly to help the teacher develop a TAG plan, but I've never seen evidence that a plan exists. |

| | |
|---|---|
| | *This survey is very poorly designed. I currently have 3 students in school. Two were TAG identified.  Consequently, I'm answering the survey questions from the perspective of my youngest TAG-identified student, who "graduated" from the ACCESS program 2 years ago.  I think it would be misleading to give PPS a grade based on our experience at ACCESS, because in my experience the district is completely failing TAG students in the neighborhood schools. Consequently, most of the questions are answered based on our experience with the neighborhood school [redacted] just before we left in 2012, with additional comments provided about ACCESS, which is a phenomenal program. <br> *The survey is set up for a single student. Answers are different for our high school age student. Outside of Access, we believe that Portland Public Schools is not compliant with Oregon requirements in general. <br> *Please give us the results from this survey so we, as parents can see how everyone is doing. <br> *In your email for this survey, you said that my responses are "invaluable". It's similar responses that I have given for years. I do hope that something changes, but am skeptical/doubtful. <br> * I appreciate the fact that this survey conveys some willingness to make changes and hope that you can achieve more for future students. <br> * I hope that this survey will help the TAG office to think through ways to reinvigorate TAG services across the district. <br> *I appreciate PPS is undertaking this survey. And I hope it leads to real change. |

END of PART 8

GO to NEXT PAGE

**PART 9: DISTRICT'S TAG POLICY 6.10.015-P**

Findings

The District has a TAG policy. However, it is not consistent with current TAG OAR or with the District's administrative directives. The District last amended that policy in 2002.

The District should amend its TAG policy to be consistent with current TAG OAR.

The District should consider adopting an administrative directive to strengthen and support implementation of its amended TAG policy.

The District should review and amend any TAG information to parents to ensure any citations to or quotes from TAG OAR are current, correct, and consistent with the District's TAG policy and administrative directive.

District's Current TAG Policy-When Adopted and Amended-No Administrative Directive Adopted

The District's Policies and Administrative Directives page at https://www.pps.net/policies states a policy is "A district rule or guideline, either new or revised, that has been passed by a Board vote." An administrative directive is the "procedural plan, created by the superintendent and his [sic] staff, to implement a Board policy."

The District's Exhibit 6 TAG policy is 6.10.015-P, Talented and Gifted Education. It is also at https://www.pps.net/cms/lib/OR01913224/Centricity/Domain/4814/6.10.015-P.pdf .

The District first adopted that policy March 10, 1983. It amended the policy twice, on October 26, 1995, and September 9, 2002.

A search of the District's policies and administrative directives on instruction at https://www.pps.net/Page/11918 found Policy 6.10.015-P but did not find a related administrative directive that implements the policy.

State Legislature Amended TAG ORS After 2002

The State Legislature amended these TAG-related ORS in 2011.
    343.395, Definitions.  The ORS defines these TAG-related terms: "Identification" and "Talented and Gifted Children."
    343.397, Plan of instruction for talented and gifted children.

State Board of Education Amended or Renumbered TAG OAR After 2002

Since 2002, according to their histories, the State Board of Education amended or renumbered these Division 22 TAG OARs in the years listed. The Division rules with histories are at https://secure.sos.state.or.us/oard/displayDivisionRules.action?selectedDivision=2563.
    581-022-2325, Identification of Academically Talented and Intellectually Gifted Children: 2009, 2016, 2017.
    581-022-2330, Rights of Parents of TAG Students: 2017, 2018, 2019.
    581-022-2500, Programs and Services for Talented and Gifted Students: 2009, 2011, 2017.

<u>District's Administrative Directive for Reviewing its Policies</u>

The District's processes for reviewing its policies are set out in Section VI, Review of Policies, of its Administrative Directive 1.70.021-AD, *Policy Development, Adoption, Administration and Review*. The District adopted and last amended that Directive in 2002. That Directive is at https://www.pps.net/cms/lib/OR01913224/Centricity/Domain/4814/1.70.021-AD.pdf .

Section VI begins: "The superintendent or designee shall ensure that the Board is advised, in accordance with 1.70.021-AD (III), when any existing policy needs to be repealed, revised or replaced." Conditions causing a repeal, revision or replacement include, "State or federal law has changed in such a manner as to require review or modification of existing policy." (Ibid.) Section VI also calls for regular policy reviews.

> The board shall ensure that all policies, including 1.70.020-P, are reviewed at least once every four (4) years, with at least two (2) sections reviewed annually, in order to ensure policies are current, relevant, in compliance with the law and are consistent with each other and the district-approved mission, vision, goals and strategic plan. If any discrepancies are discovered, appropriate policy proposal revisions shall be submitted for action.
>
> In addition to the regular review of policies, following adjournment of the Oregon State Legislature, a review to reconcile policies and directives with new statutory language shall be conducted.

Section VI also provides that "Periodic review by the Board for effectiveness of a policy or directive may be done upon request." (Ibid.)

The text and history of District Policy 6.10.015-P *Talented and Gifted Education* indicate the District has not reviewed or revised that policy since 2002.

<u>District Should Review and, Where Necessary, Amend its Exhibit 6 TAG Policy to Ensure Consistency with Current TAG OAR Texts and Numberings</u>

For example, Section 1 states, in part:

> Talented and gifted students means those children who require special educational programs or services, or both, beyond those normally provided by the regular school program in order to realize their contribution to self and society and who demonstrate outstanding ability or potential in one or more of the following areas:
> > (a) Intellectual ability;
> > (b) Unusual academic ability in reading or mathematics.

OAR 581-022-2325, Identification of Academically Talented and Gifted Students, sets out specific definitions and processes for identifying talented and gifted students which District Policy 6.10.015-P does not address. Those definitions and processes in the OAR include these examples.

> Intellectual ability is defined as "General intellectual ability as commonly measured by measures of intelligence and aptitude." That adds clarity to the generic term "Intellectual ability."
>
> District policies and procedures must require that the District "use research based best practices to identify students from underrepresented populations including: ethnic minorities, students with disabilities, students who are culturally and/or linguistically diverse, or economically disadvantaged." That requirement is not limited to a particular grade level or span.
>
> "No single test, measure or score shall be the sole criterion" for identifying TAG students. "A team shall make the final decisions on the identification of students" using a collection of "behavioral,

learning and performance information and include the information in all procedures for the identification of students."

"Intellectually gifted students shall score at or above the 97th percentile on a nationally standardized test of mental ability," and "Academically talented students shall score at or above the 97th percentile on a test of total reading or a test of total mathematics from a nationally standardized test battery, a nationally standardized test of reading or mathematics, or a test of total English Language Arts/Literacy or total mathematics on the Smarter Balanced Assessment." However, it also states that, even if a student fails to achieve the 97th percentile on a standardized test, "districts, by local policies and procedures, shall identify students who demonstrate the potential to perform at the 97th percentile."

"School districts may identify additional students who are talented and gifted . . . if the students demonstrate outstanding ability or potential in one or more of the following areas:
    Creative ability in using original or nontraditional methods in thinking and producing.
    Leadership ability in motivating the performance of others either in educational or non-educational settings.
    Ability in the visual or performing arts, such as dance, music or art."

The Districts review, adoptions or revisions should also be consistent with OAR 581-022-2330, Rights of Parents of TAG Students, and with OAR 581-022-2500, Programs and Services for Talented and Gifted Students.

Oregon School Boards Association (OSBA) Provides Sample Model TAG Policies

OSBA's Model Sample Policy documents (downloaded February 23, 2021) address TAG student identification, procedures for appeals of student identification and placement, TAG programs and services, and complaints regarding a TAG program. See Exhibits 32-A through E.

Those or similar model sample policies, as well as consultations with OSBA and ODE staff, could help inform the District's review of and amendments to its TAG policy and the adoption of any new TAG policies or administrative directives.

District Should Consider Adopting an Administrative Directive to Strengthen and Support Implementation of its Amended TAG Policy

A search of the District's Webpage at https://www.pps.net/Page/11918 listing policies and administrative directives related to education did not find an administrative directive supporting the District's TAG Policy 6.10.015-P. Adoption of such an administrative directive could help clarify for staff, parents, students, and the community how the District establishes and maintains effective TAG programs and services that are also in compliance with the standards in the TAG OAR.

END of PART 9

GO to NEXT PAGE

**PART 10: TAG FACILITATORS – ROLES and RESPONSIBILITIES – for the DISTRICT'S CONSIDERATION**

TAG OAR Do Not Require TAG Facilitators

TAG OAR do not require TAG facilitators. It is the District's choice to include them in the delivery of TAG programs and services. This discussion is for the District's consideration because its TAG Webpages provide instructions to parents about working with facilitators, and the TAG Building Plans reviewed indicate school administrators consistently rely on the facilitators to coordinate TAG nominations, identifications, programs, services, and staff professional development.

Anyone with concerns or suggestions regarding TAG facilitators should express them to the District.

The investigation collected this information before the COVID-19 school closures. The investigator has not researched if or how school closures affected or reopening schools will affect the facilitators' or TAG Teachers on Special Assignments' (TOSAs') assignments or duties.

Facilitators are Volunteers

The Districts TAG Program Director and others reported each TAG Facilitator is a volunteer. Some facilitators have other duties as administrators, librarians or teachers. During school visits, some TAG Facilitators substituted for absent teachers.

District's TAG Teachers on Special Assignment (TOSAs) Support the Facilitators

The District assigns TAG TOSAs by high school clusters or feeder systems. Each TOSA supports the TAG Facilitators and other staff at the schools within the cluster. Each TAG Facilitator interviewed reported the TOSA is helpful and responsive. Some TAG Facilitators sought out and relied on the TOSA's support more than others.

The investigator did not research if or how school closures affected or reopening schools will affect that TOSA support system.

Facilitators' Roles and Responsibilities

The District's TAG Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ's) at https://www.pps.net/Page/13106 provide this information.
- FAQ 33: "Who is my contact at the school regarding TAG questions and resources?" The response is "Each school has an appointed TAG facilitator who can assist teachers, students and parents."
- FAQ 31: "What resources are available for TAG families to learn about TAG?" In part the response is "The TAG facilitator or designee has a list of parent TAG resources."
- FAQ 27: "What about the schools that have historically underserved populations?" The response is that "The TAG Department actively monitors schools who [sic] have historically underserved populations and supports the TAG facilitator and the school to notify families of good candidates for TAG. Professional development is also given to facilitators to help identify students."

District's TAG Program Director reported each TAG facilitator and school received the Exhibit 34 document titled *TAG Facilitator Roles and Responsibilities 2019-2020*. It lists eighteen general responsibilities, including these. The emphasis is in the original.

- Advocate for all students.
- Attend **ALL** TAG Facilitator meetings and share information with building administrators, teachers and staff. This is your opportunity to have a voice, learn with us, and understand about processes, systems, and Board Policy/OARs.
- Be a point of contact for the school for TAG related questions, issues, and concerns.
- Provide rate and level training to staff in the fall semester at a building staff meeting.
- Communicate with community to capture nominations, especially for students that are historically underserved.
- Maintain TAG Bulletin Board
- Assist building leaders in updating and completing the Building TAG Plan.
- Collaborate with all stakeholders and solve concerns professionally and positively.
- Support instructional needs and collaborate with TAG Department by presenting information from professional development at building staff meetings.
- Meet with parents when necessary.
- Guide teachers and principals in writing the Individual TAG Plan if necessary.
- Ensure that your building teachers are aware of who their TAG identified students are in their classrooms.

The *Roles and Responsibilities* include these specific to the nominations, assessments and identifications of TAG students.

- Collect and check Nomination/ Permission forms (IDPF) for completion and accuracy. Enter important assessment information in school Google Sheet.
    > The "Google Sheet" referred to here is a shared real-time document. It allows the District to send TAG Facilitators TAG assessment scores, document assessment accommodations, identify students eligible for nomination forms and identify students with TAG potential who are in historically underrepresented groups. (Exhibit 34.)
- Support 2$^{nd}$ grade assessment window.
- Support all other assessments for nominated students. Work with the proctor and school to help coordinate QUIET space, time, and materials.
- Monitor TAG School Team (i.e., facilitator, administrator, and minimum one general ed. teacher) meetings during the beginning and final stages of nomination and identification and when school teams meet to make final decisions for identification. This may require you to set aside time to facilitate and organize.

The District Provides TAG Facilitator Trainings

The District provided these examples: Exhibits 13-AA and 13-BB, Tag facilitator meeting agendas and materials; and Exhibit 15, which includes An Educator's Guide: Gifted and Talented English Learners.

TAG Facilitators are Compensated Through Extended Time Pay

Exhibit 35, the Appendix B Extended Responsibility Schedule, prescribes TAG Facilitators' current compensation. Compensation is equal to a percentage of the Facilitator's base salary. Percentages vary depending on the grade levels served and, for schools serving grades K-8, the size of a school's population. For example, in the third year of the current Schedule, a facilitator in a K-5 school of 0-299

students receives extended compensation equal to 3.5% of the Facilitator's base salary. A Facilitator in a K-8 school of any size receives 6.5% of base salary. A Facilitator in a high school receives 7.5% of base salary.

TAG Facilitators Do Not Have Release or Preparation Time

TAG Facilitators do not have contractual release or preparation time to perform their roles and responsibilities. They might use before or after school or other time they carve out on their own. The TAG Director reported an example where two staff volunteered to share the Facilitator's roles and responsibilities, both to lighten the individual workload and to ensure quality service.

TAG Facilitators Turn Over at a High Rate

The District's TAG Director reported fifty percent of the voluntary TAG Facilitator positions turn over each year.

School Administrators Ensure Facilitators are Trained, Familiar With the Job; TAG Director Does Not

The District's TAG Department does not directly supervise TAG Facilitators. School administrators are responsible for their TAG facilitators. This statement appeared in most of ten TAG Building Plans randomly selected from the list at https://www.pps.net/Page/2598https://www.pps.net/Page/2598 . The bulleted methods are verbatim representative examples taken from among those ten TAG Building Plans.

> The administrator ensures the TAG Facilitator is trained and familiar with the requirements of the TAG Facilitator Job Description, which include mandatory attendance at TAG sponsored PD and coordinating the Nomination and Identification process in the school, in the following manner:
> - TAG Coordinator will attend mandatory PD
> - TAG Coordinator will regularly review TAG compliance calendar and implementation of building TAG PD
> - TAG Coordinator will work to actively engage in the implementation of the school's Equity Team Strategies across classrooms and throughout the school community
> - Communicating dates for training
> - Coordinating with facilitator to ensure needs for time, subs, etc. are taken care of for said obligations
> - Coordinating with facilitators to ensure there is space on the PD calendar to address TAG-specific items.
> - Check in meetings with TAG Facilitator
> - PD provided by TAG Facilitator
> - Meetings at least quarterly between the TAG Facilitator and the administrator
> - The Principal assigns the TAG Coordinator position
> - The TAG Coordinator attends school district trainings and performs duties according to the TAG Coordinator Job Description including coordinating the ID process in the school.
> - Teacher sign ins at mandatory PD sessions
> - The TAG department checks in to ensure this

## Methods for Ensuring TAG Facilitators are Trained, Familiar With the Job are Unclear

Those bulleted representative descriptions are activities or artifacts. They do not describe how the administrator determines whether a TAG facilitator is trained and familiar with the job. For example, what would the administrator expect to learn from a check-in meeting with a facilitator? How would the administrator know if the facilitator attended mandatory trainings? The administrators' roles as coach, mentor, supervisor, or evaluator of a school's TAG facilitator are not clear.

## Survey Results Indicate Mixed Reviews from Teachers and Parents

Teachers' survey comments include concerns or questions about the roles of TAG coordinators or facilitators and requests for clarity about facilitators' roles and functions. See Exhibit 30 for their comments. Parents' survey comments indicate some dissatisfaction with services provided by TAG facilitators or coordinators. See Exhibit 31 for their comments.

## Clarifying the District's TAG Facilitator Expectations, Supervision, and Supports Could Improve TAG Services

TAG Facilitators are critical to the District's delivery of school based TAG services. The fifty percent annual turnover of volunteer TAG Facilitator positions indicates an imbalance among expectations, workloads, and benefits. That turnover makes it difficult if not impossible to establish, support and maintain a consistently well-trained, effective and valued team of TAG Facilitators. Lack of a consistent monitoring and evaluation system for TAG Facilitators creates missed opportunities to identify needs for coaching, trainings or materials to improve facilitation services at a school, in a school cluster, and throughout the district.


END of PART 10

GO to NEXT PAGE

**PART 11: TAG ADVISORY COMMITTEE (TAGAC) – for the DISTRICT'S CONSIDERATION**

**Purpose and Membership**

Exhibit 33, provided by the District, is a copy of 1) the District's TAG Advisory Council (TAGAC) Website; and 2) of TAGAC the meeting minutes discussed below as of September 20, 2019.

The TAGAC Webpage is at https://www.pps.net/Page/1548. It contains the information the District copied to the ODE. It includes links to meeting minutes for some school years between 2012-2013 and 2018-2019.

TAG OAR do not mention advisory committees. Districts have the option to create and work with them.

The Website states the TAGAC "reviews all aspects of the Portland Public Schools' Talented and Gifted Programs and makes recommendations to the District with respect to TAG services in Portland Public Schools." TAGAC membership includes "parents from all quadrants of the city" and that the "council seeks parent members that represent the demographics of the students served by the district [sic]."

The Website provides the TAGAC's monthly meeting dates and location. It "states the TAGAC "organizes its work around these areas.
- Consistent identification and services for English language learner (ELL) students.
- Consistent identification and services for twice-exceptional (2E) students.
- Appropriate and consistent rate and level opportunities in all elementary schools.
- Accelerated learning opportunities in all middle and high schools.
- Predictable automatic TAG services.

Council-approved results from these committees will be included in a yearly written report of the Council's activities provided to the Program Director of Talented and Gifted Education K-12, the Superintendent and the School Board."

**Sample Meeting Minute Topics**

These sample topics from TAGAC meeting minutes provided by the District relate to TAG OAR.

- October 10, 2018.
    - Universal screening in 2nd grade administered by TOSAs and proctors. Decision to use screener was prior to the new director's hiring. Parents will get results by mail, email.
    - Opting in versus opting out of identification. It was not clear if opting out would be consistent with state TAG law. Interpretation was parents "must opt in or agree to identification."
    - The District's 2015 TAG plan and extension of time to complete rate and level PD by January 2019. PD would be by train the trainer model through TOSAs. Discussion about inviting the ODE's TAG specialist to assist. District's commitment was to "Reach as many as we can during already-scheduled staff PD opportunities. Not sure we can get other time."
    - Difficulties appearing on school board agendas "except by using public comment opportunities."

- ACCESS program's admissions process, lack of clarity regarding who reviews the application and admissions process.
- January 9, 2019.
  - Discussion of District's draft 2019 TAG plan. Concern public is not seeing TAG services happening.
  - Discussion of how District middle school staff are using MAP assessment results to move some students to higher math classes.
  - TAG mandates should be universal. Programs like IB are not part of the mandate.
  - Discussion of uses of MAP, CogAT, Naglieri, of SBAC results for identification. Ways for parents to access MAP results through the ParentVue application.
  - Update of the ACCESS program application and admission cycle.
- March 13, 2019.
  - Discussion of the TAG identification cycle. "Testing complete. Scoring is close to completion. 99th %ile eligibility letters will go out over spring break. The general TAG ID process is carried out at the building level; TAG facilitators are receiving training, with TAG ID letters sent by 5/1."
  - Discussion of the ACCESS admissions cycle, including how it does not synch with the District's TAG identification and budget cycles.
  - Communications. "The TAG listserv is now up-to-date thanks to the TAG dept's investment in removing obsolete recipients and adding current parents-resulting in over 10,500 parents on the listserv."
  - Nominations of ELL students. District's TAG department "is working with the ESL department on communication and education around TAG, leveraging training sessions that are already occurring; empowering parents and ESL teachers to nominate."
  - Supporting students with MAP. Description of MAP assessments and processes. What growth targets could mean for TAG students. Ways MAP could be used for TAG screening. Limitations on MAP based on possible workload grievances. For example, "PPS cannot dictate that teachers print out report for each student."
- April 10, 2019.
  - Discussion of upcoming OMSI night.
  - How TAGAC might work with TAG coordinators in schools.
  - Requests for data on single subject and whole grade accelerations, MAP growth data for TAG students, and TAG trainings for teachers.
  - High school science standards and "what is the path for accelerated students who, for example, already have the math exposure for more rigorous physics?"
- May 8, 2019.
  - Most agenda items relate to TAGAC business such as membership, updating bylaws, nominations and elections of officers, community outreach, and the end of year report.
  - Response to request for information from April 10th meeting. Includes comment that "Basic rate & level training was provided by facilitators to teachers at the school level. Additionally, PD at monthly facilitator meetings, offering differentiation implementation strategies and resources to take back to teachers."
  - Review of ACCESS program application process and numbers of new and returning applicants.

The TAG Director reported the District considers the TAGAC's input and that collaboration on policies and procedures takes place during and after TAGAC meetings. The Director said the TAGAC and the TAG Department have a good relationship and work well to find ways to support all students identified as

TAG and those that may not be. "We are working on ways to include more historically underrepresented students in TAG." TAGAC members were "working with the district to include more families of color on their committee. As this is an advisory committee to the district the TAG Department welcomes their input."

**TAGAC Not Mentioned in Parent or Staff Surveys**

The survey results and other evidence suggest parents and staff were unaware of the TAGAC. No survey prompts asked about its function or effectiveness. Word and phrase searches for "TAGAC," "advisory committee," "advisory," and "committee" found no TAGAC-related results in the volunteered comments sections of parent and staff surveys.

<div align="center">END of REPORT</div>