

Setting Student Growth Goals Using LDC 6th Grade Gifted and Talented Scenario

STEP 1

So...how can SGG work with an itinerant gifted and talented teacher?

Mrs. Abner is an itinerant gifted and talented teacher that has identified gifted and talented students in two feeder elementary schools and the middle school of which they feed. She has the unique and beautiful opportunity to work with her students from the time they are in a primary talent pool until they enter high school. This allows for the development of a rare and lasting student-teacher relationship. Mrs. Abner is very aware of their needs, interests, abilities, and areas of weakness. She has access to formal and informal data for most of each student's school experience, which allows her to provide a differentiated instructional plan for her identified students. She has a long-lasting collaboration and consultation relationship with the teachers in her schools and access to her students' needs assessment data, especially in areas of which they are not identified as gifted to determine areas of need. This data includes KPREP, MAP, school based common assessments, gifted and talented test data, EXPLORE, and products from a variety of written and performance tasks (debates, STEM activities, problem solving activities, creativity activities, leadership activities, and higher order thinking skills).

Once TPGES was explained, it was very unclear as to how itinerant gifted and talented teachers would fit into the expectations and requirements. Would they be considered OPGES? Most districts handle gifted and talented services differently across the state of Kentucky, therefore, it was difficult to know how administrators and KDE wanted TPGES for teachers in such different circumstances. After some clarification from her evaluator, Mrs. Abner decided she would try to follow regular education TPGES expectations and procedures as closely as she could. This way she would have a support system in place with a group of regular education teachers that would provide models, feedback, and common pool of students.

What are Student Growth Goals and how can they work in unconventional instructional situations?

Mrs. Abner struggled with how to determine the student growth goals for her group of gifted students. Many questions and fears hampered the decision making for her...Which students? Which grade level? Since they are gifted and advanced academically, will they show little or no growth? Which enduring skill? They are identified in a variety of areas, so which area for SGG? Will I have time to fully develop the SGG process being itinerant? What is one area that would be a common need for all students, including g/t? That last question led to the answer that helped narrow and focus the SGG process for Mrs. Abner. Because she had spent a great deal of time in her career developing the writing process with her students, she decided that ALL students (including and maybe, especially, gifted students) need to improve written communication. Mrs. Abner also knew that writing is an area that doesn't have a "cap" for going as far as possible. Gifted students would be able to show growth, gain skill and content knowledge, and be able to communicate in writing more effectively and efficiently.

After making the decision to look more closely at her students' writing, Mrs. Abner analyzed her students' current writing data and became overwhelmed by the many grade levels she served, so she chose 6th grade only for the purposes of data collection to satisfy her TPGES requirements. She chose this grade level because of how closely she had worked with the fifth grade ELA teachers and she had a strong awareness (as well as data) of their writing abilities and experiences at that level. It was at this point that Mrs. Abner realized that she would be able to not only determine the growth of her gifted students in regard to particular areas of writing, she would also be able to measure her own effectiveness as a writing instructor for gifted students. This was her opportunity to challenge her students to write in a meaningful way, collect, analyze, and utilize data to plan instruction that would allow her students to grow in one or more areas of the writing process. Mrs. Abner had received a small amount of training with LDC, and immediately contacted Kelly Philbeck for guidance in the SGG process, using LDC as a means to complete this new and daunting task. Kelly was able to guide and advise her throughout this process, and was invaluable in Mrs. Abner learning how to complete the SGG process, fulfill the TPGES requirement, and learn how to use the best writing resource she had ever encountered.

In fact, LDC is the perfect tool for establishing baselines, monitoring student growth and measuring that growth for SGG. Next, she thought about where her students had left off in their fifth grade year with writing an argumentative piece about autonomous robots and decided that would be a good place to begin. The enduring skill she would use would be that her sixth grade gifted students would demonstrate measurable growth in their ability to write arguments to support claims in written communication. 75% of her students would meet or exceed the proficiency target on level 3 of the LDC argumentation rubric for grades 6-12.

STEP 1

How to establish the baseline?

To establish a baseline for her 19 gifted sixth grade students, Mrs. Abner collaborated with the sixth grade ELA teacher to determine an LDC teaching task to serve as a common baseline assessment. The gifted students were given the task as a cold read/cold write as a part of their regular language arts class as way to determine their level of performance of writing skills. The LDC Argumentation Rubric for Grades 6-12 was used to determine two areas of which her students needed to show growth. Those areas were reading/research and development, which is supported by the enduring skill of writing arguments to support claims. Students have to be able to read and evaluate arguments and claims in text and present information and develop paragraphs that demonstrate content understanding that help them support a point of view in an argumentative writing.

Teaching Task: A5:

After reading the articles “Be Afraid: Very Afraid” and “Scared Silly”, write an essay in which you compare fears and phobias and argue if fear is healthy or unhealthy for an individual. Support your position with evidence from the texts.

Baseline Data using LDC Teaching Task (Cold Read/Cold Write)

	Not Yet	Approaches Expectations	Meets Expectations	Advanced
Focus		32%	63%	5%
Controlling Idea	11%	32%	37%	10%
Reading/Research	16%	47%	37%	
Development	11%	52%	32%	5%
Organization		32%	57%	11%
Conventions	5%	37%	47%	11%
Content Understanding	11%	52%	26%	11%

***Content Understanding will also be monitored in support of reading/research and development based on the individual student’s area of G/T identification.**

What enduring skill will guide the SGG?

Realizing the need to fulfill TPGES requirements and provide a focus and framework for instruction, Mrs. Abner made the connections between enduring skills, anchor writing standards and grade level standards.

<u>Enduring Skills</u>	<u>Anchor Standards</u>	<u>Grade Level Standards</u>
<p>Write arguments to support claims</p> <p>Use evidence to support claims in arguments.</p> <p>Use clear reasons and relevant evidence to support claims</p> <p>Build on knowledge of a subject through reading/research using credible sources</p>	<p>CCSS.ELA-LITERACY.CCRA.W.1 Write arguments to support claims in an analysis of substantive topics or texts, using valid reasoning and relevant and sufficient evidence.</p> <p>CCSS.ELA-LITERACY.CCRA.W.2 Write informative/explanatory texts to examine and convey complex ideas and information clearly and accurately through the effective selection, organization, and analysis of content.</p> <p>CCSS.ELA-LITERACY.CCRA.R.1 Read closely to determine what the text says explicitly and to make logical inferences from it; cite specific textual evidence when writing or speaking to support conclusions drawn from the text.</p>	<p>W.6.1 Write arguments to support claims with clear reasons and relevant evidence.</p> <p>W.6.1.a. Introduce claim(s), and organize the reasons and evidence clearly.</p> <p>W.6.1.b. Support claim(s) with clear reasons and relevant evidence, using credible sources and demonstrating an understanding of the topic or text.</p> <p>W.6.4 Produce clear and coherent writing in which the development, organization, and style are appropriate to task, purpose, and audience.</p>

Appendix: Argumentation Rubric for Grades 6–12 Teaching Tasks

Scoring Elements	Not Yet		Approaches Expectations		Meets Expectations		Advanced	
	1	1.5	2	2.5	3	3.5	4	
Focus	Attempts to address prompt but lacks focus or is off task. D: Attempts to address additional demands but lacks focus or is off task.		Addresses prompt appropriately and establishes a position but focus is uneven. D: Addresses additional demands superficially.		Addresses prompt appropriately and maintains a clear, steady focus. Provides a generally convincing position. D: Addresses additional demands sufficiently		Addresses all aspects of prompt appropriately with a consistently strong focus and convincing position. D: Addresses additional demands with thoroughness and makes a connection to claim.	
Controlling Idea	Attempts to establish a claim but lacks a clear purpose.		Establishes a claim.		Establishes a credible claim.		Establishes and maintains a substantive and credible claim or proposal.	
Reading/ Research	Attempts to reference reading materials to develop response but lacks connections or relevance to the purpose of the prompt.	16%	Presents information from reading materials relevant to the purpose of the prompt with minor lapses in accuracy or completeness.	47%	Accurately presents details from reading materials relevant to the purpose of the prompt to develop argument or claim.	37%	Accurately and effectively presents important details from reading materials to develop argument or claim.	
Development	Attempts to provide details in response to the prompt but lacks sufficient development or relevance to the purpose of the prompt.	10%	Presents appropriate details to support and develop the focus, controlling idea, or claim, with minor lapses in the reasoning, examples, or explanations.	55%	Presents appropriate and sufficient details to support and develop the focus, controlling idea, or claim.	30%	Presents thorough and detailed information to effectively support and develop the focus, controlling idea, or claim.	5%
Organization	Attempts to organize ideas but lacks control of structure.		Uses an appropriate organizational structure for development of reasoning and logic, with minor lapses in structure and/or coherence.		Maintains an appropriate organizational structure to address specific requirements of the prompt. Structure reveals the reasoning and logic of the argument.		Maintains an organizational structure that intentionally and effectively enhances the presentation of information as required by the specific prompt. Structure enhances development of the reasoning and logic of the argument.	
Conventions	Attempts to demonstrate standard English conventions but lacks cohesion and control of grammar, usage, mechanics, language and tone. Sources are used without citation.		Demonstrates an uneven command of standard English conventions and cohesion. Uses language and tone with some inaccurate, inappropriate, or uneven features. Inconsistently cites sources.		Demonstrates a command of standard English conventions and cohesion with few errors. Response includes language and tone appropriate to the audience, purpose, and specific requirements of the prompt. Cites sources using appropriate format with only minor errors.		Demonstrates and maintains a well-developed command of standard English conventions and cohesion with few errors. Response includes language and tone consistently appropriate to the audience, purpose, and specific requirements of the prompt. Consistently cites sources using appropriate format.	
Content Understanding	Attempts to include disciplinary content in argument but understanding of content is weak; content is irrelevant, inappropriate, or inaccurate.		Briefly notes disciplinary content relevant to the prompt; shows basic or uneven understanding of content; minor errors in explanation.		Accurately presents disciplinary content relevant to the prompt with sufficient explanations that demonstrate understanding.		Integrates relevant and accurate disciplinary content with thorough explanations that demonstrate in-depth understanding.	

How to write the Student Growth Goal?

Mrs. Abner collaborated with sixth grade ELA teachers to determine her student growth goal, because she was concerned about her itinerancy not allowing her enough time with the students to complete all of the modules and tasks to provide the opportunity for her students to achieve the levels of growth she thought they could achieve. Therefore, she would consult and collaborate with the regular education ELA teachers to make sure the instruction and learning opportunities were made available to them even on the days she was at other schools. After much discussion, she was able to write a defensible SGG for her gifted sixth grade students to her evaluator.

What was Mrs. Abner's Student Growth Goal?

During the 2014-2015 school year, my sixth grade gifted students will improve their ability to write arguments with clear reasons and relevant evidence. Each student will improve by one performance level in the reading/research and development areas of the LDC argumentation writing rubric and 75% of the students will score at the level 3 (meets expectations/proficiency) on that rubric.

How to design instruction for the areas Reading /Research and Development for Student Growth Goals?

Mrs. Abner thought about how best to develop instruction to help her students attain the goal. She planned to use the many resources available on the Literacy Design Collaborative website for many of the formative mini-tasks. Reading/research and development formative mini-tasks will be monitored both in the regular classroom with ELA teachers and in the g/t classroom. Mrs. Abner and the ELA teachers would focus on specific LDC modules for argumentation writing. These areas of growth and enduring skills would also be monitored within an instructional ladder that extends beyond the module. For gifted students, this would include instant and formal debates, research, class discussions, STEM activities, extended responses, on demand writings and presentations, and Socratic seminars.

How to add rigor for gifted students?

By nature, gifted students often achieve and expect to achieve high levels of performance on any academic measurement. They are often competitive and set high standards for themselves; therefore, they will not happily accept performing at level 2 on a writing rubric, which is good in that they will do what is necessary to score at level 3 or 4. It can be quite the opposite if they become frustrated (which is a characteristic of a gifted middle school student), and refuse to try or focus on everything else. They need and expect challenge, but most had rather “do” something than write about it. With all this in mind, Mrs. Abner thought about the importance of making the instruction meaningful by choosing tasks on the instructional ladder that allow for their areas of giftedness, interests, and abilities. Writing topics and tasks would reflect these areas, and engage the students by having them incorporate writing into lessons and activities that they enjoy and reflect their areas of identification. An area of particular interest to Mrs. Abner for argumentative writing is the content understanding. She felt this would be a great way to allow the students to work within their areas of giftedness by adding demands to that element of content understanding on the argumentation rubric that would allow students to demonstrate their knowledge of specific content and provide rigor at the same time.

Optional Demands:

- **D1** Be sure to acknowledge competing views. (Use with Argumentation tasks.)
- **D6** Include _____ (bibliography, citations, references, endnotes).
- **D7** Include _____ (charts, tables, illustrations, and/or stylistic devices) to help convey your message to your readers.

What Formative Assessment Resources would be used?

LDC's CoreTools Mini-Task Library at www ldc.org (Once on the site, create a free CoreTools account. Search the mini-task library for exemplary mini-tasks to instruct students to provide appropriate and relevant details to support their arguments/claims).

LDC's Template Collection 3.0:

To monitor students' progress in attaining the goal, Mrs. Abner and the ELA collaborating teachers decided to use the LDC Big Task Bank template tasks to design formative assessments to improve students' development of their writing. She and the regular ELA teachers used these formative pieces within their LDC modules and throughout the year in daily classroom instruction. (http://ldc.org/sites/default/files/LDC_Secondary_Big_Bank_062514_0.pdf)

After researching _____ (informational texts) on _____ (content), write _____ (and essay or substitute) in which you argue _____ (content). Support your position with evidence from your research.

After researching _____ (informational texts) on _____ (content), write _____ (an essay or substitute) in which you compare _____ (content). Support your position with evidence from your research.

STEPS 3 & 4

How would she monitor Student Growth Goals?

Mrs. Abner used the Argumentation Rubric for Grade 6-12 Teaching Tasks to determine students' performance and growth. As a part of her gifted and talented service delivery for collaboration and consultation, she worked closely with the ELA teachers in her middle school, and shared information and monitoring. It was agreed to record quantitative and qualitative data as numerically as possible, using common rubrics as often as possible...especially for all writing tasks. She kept anecdotal records (see example) of each of the 19 students and their levels of performance on modules, tasks, products, and other activities from the instructional ladder. Later, she realized there was a more convenient data monitoring sheets (include data monitoring sheets for teachers and students) that would have been easier and much more efficient to use.

Example of anecdotal record of student monitoring (Re-typed and name removed):

Student A

Student A completed the baseline task (Fear/Phobia Argumentative Essay) Sept. 14, 2014. Surprisingly, scored mostly in the 2 level...but organization is only 1. (Focus, Controlling Idea, Reading/Research, Development, Content Understanding all 2's...Organization low 1, high 2...Conventions low 3) No sources cited, no demonstration of content understanding to g/t level, some lapses.

9-22-2014 Does a really good job (Proficient on rubric) for instant debate...seems to be able to argue better verbally than in writing...need to see ELA teacher about any writing she has done with her.

9-28-2014 Discussed possible use of CER, Article Analysis and other reading mini-tasks with Mrs. S (ELA teacher) and she feels Student A could perform much better than she does...with writing anyway...but I told her reading is likely the key to her improving writing based on several formatives...doesn't seem to always understand prompt or article in terms of how to use it in written response...teacher says she doesn't see the giftedness...I reminded her that her gifted area was math.

10-1-2014 Student A did a wonderful job with designing a probability math game. The written directions for the game and written reflection of the activity were higher levels of writing on both rubrics ...much better than her argumentative pieces. Find mini-tasks to help...??? Show results to ELA teacher and discuss how to use her love of math to help with reading and writing tasks...something she loves or has strong interest to help her read with better understanding and use formative assessments to see if improved argumentative writing takes place

Student B

Student B completed the baseline task (Fear/Phobia Argumentative Essay) Sept.14, 2014. His were the highest scoring levels in entire group...(Focus 4, Controlling Idea 4, Reading/Research 3 but still strongest in class, Development 3 also still best one, Organization and Conventions 4, Content Understanding was a 3 but this is an area where he could have done even more than he realizes...although he had an admirable attempt. Easy to see why his gifted identification is ELA. Need to add demands to modules for rigor.

11-15-2014 Mrs. H says Student B had highest score for extended response in her class(gave me copy of rubric), and social studies teacher said he won essay contest for district for Veteran's Day contest...asks for more challenge for him...I referred her to some links for g/t sites for writing and social studies

12-1-2014 From argumentation rubric (included with anecdotal record)for "Virtual Reality Therapy Cures Fears and Phobias", Student B isn't citing sources with correctness or accurate punctuation...also, quotations aren't accurate in terms of conventions...mini lessons either with me or in writer's workshop in ELA class

What are some examples of mini-tasks used for the gifted sixth grade students?

STEPS 3 & 4

Note...many mini-tasks and instructional strategies were differentiated for the gifted students through flexible grouping (small to whole class), independent study, and various levels of challenge (by adding demands in some cases or pulling activities from higher grade levels). Some were in regular ELA class and some in the gifted/talented class.

Mini-Tasks Used to Support/Monitor Student Growth Throughout the Year:

CER (Claims Reasons Evidence) Grades: 6-12 Discipline: Science

In complete sentences, write a scientific claim that is backed up by evidence and supported by scientific reasoning.

Debate (participation and graphic organizer) Grades: 6 – 12 Discipline: Any

Complete the graphic organizer by (1) Describing on side of an arguable viewpoint, (2) Stating three reasons that would convince someone that your viewpoint is valid, (3) Writing 3 facts or examples to support each of your main reasons, and (4) Concluding your argument by summarizing the most important details of the argument. Finally, participate in the class debate by orally explaining your viewpoint.

Instant Debate Grades: 5-12 Discipline: Any

The class will be divided into teams (randomly chosen and assigned). Each team will be asked to either defend the premise of a piece text or refute it. Each team must create an opening statement-make a verbal argument and offer rebuttal.

Controlling Idea/Evidence/Counterclaim (based on "Believing and Doubting") Grades: 6 – 12 Discipline: Social Studies

Choose a topic and write a controversial statement about that topic. (Examples: War Never Solves Anything; Character Determines Fate; Women are Smarter Than Men; the US is Too Dependent on Oil, etc.) 1) Believing: write everything you can in SUPPORT of this statement Begin with "I believe this statement is true, because . . ." 2) Doubting: Write everything you can think of OPPOSING this statement Begin with "I doubt this statement is true, because. . ." 3) Deciding:

Transitions Grades: 5-12 Discipline: Any

As you develop your essay, consider the following questions to guide your thinking: Are you paragraphs glued together with the appropriate transitions? Do they communicate to the reader the relationship between the ideas?

Focused Text Marking Grades: 6-12 Discipline: Any

Read an article and make tracks in your reading. Place an exclamation point after anything that is new learning, a question mark after anything that is confusing to you, and a check mark after anything that makes sense to you or helps you make a connection to your understanding.

Understanding Citation Systems Grades: 6-12 Discipline: Any

Analyze the citation systems representing three major fields of study to determine how each system represents the values of the fields that use it.

Below is a one page data monitoring sheet which Mrs. Abner plans to use to monitor student growth.

Name		<u>Baseline Assessment</u>				<u>Module 1</u>				<u>Module 2</u>				<u>Module 3</u>				<u>Summative Assessment</u>			
		September				October				November/December				February/March				April			
		Score				Score				Score				Score				Score			
		1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Student A	RR																				
	D																				
Student B	RR																				
	D																				
Student C	RR																				
	D																				
Student D	RR																				
	D																				
Student E	RR																				
	D																				
Student F	RR																				
	D																				
Student G	RR																				
	D																				
Student H	RR																				
	D																				
Student I	RR																				
	D																				
Student J	RR																				
	D																				
Student K	RR																				
	D																				
Student L	RR																				
	D																				
Student M	RR																				
	D																				

Mrs. Abner's Reflection:

What are my thoughts and reflections from first use of LDC to determine SGG?

This was the most unsettling and scary experience of my 26 year career in education. I have never not known what to do or not have someone to provide answers. I have never been so miserable and stressed. No one knew what to do with gifted teachers...not principals nor administrators, even KDE didn't think we fit in the OPGES with librarians and other professionals. I was terrified that my evaluation would be tied to something I didn't even understand. We were given a great deal of misinformation with good intentions...no one seemed to have answers...and I asked everyone I knew to ask. We couldn't even figure out enduring skills from standards at first. Finally, Kelly Philbeck was able to provide an answer to one of the many questions swirling around me. Her answer was another question...which was, "Why not use LDC?" When she explained how it could work, I was empowered to answer all my questions, one at a time. I got a great deal of it wrong on this first attempt, but I do believe my gifted students grew beyond what I wrote in my SGG (I was scared not to be conservative) in the areas of designated growth. I learned far more than they did, and have continued to ask reflective questions so I can continue to improve, so both my students and I can demonstrate measurable growth.

Why didn't I use Content Understanding as an area of need for growth for my gifted students?

I felt it would be very difficult to measure their growth in this area because these students are gifted in one or more academic areas and may not be very strong in other areas. I would need to have content understanding that allowed for fairness in terms of growth. Some of my students have extensive knowledge about history, areas of science, or ELA and their demonstration of content understanding would vary based on area of identification. I thought the best way to handle this is through development, which allows the students to show content understanding within their writing. Also, I can add demands to their LDC Tasks, such as Demand #7.

Why do I not feel great about my summative assessment?

I was given an unusual assignment by one of my principals to assist with a school wide intervention, which resulted in me not being able to have all of this group of gifted students as I would expect to have or needed to have. Therefore, the summative that I used was a topic the students had become very familiar...they had debated it, researched it, designed video games around it, used it as the launchpad for several STEM tasks, etc. I had intended this to be a formative assessment to let me monitor counterclaims (demand 1), but had to use it as the summative because I had no opportunity to give them a task that had unfamiliar texts or topics we hadn't explored to such a depth.

What will I do again next year that worked well this year?

- I will continue to use LDC to determine SGG for gifted students. It is a perfect match, as one seems to be designed with the other in mind.
- I will continue to work this closely with ELA teachers on LDC tasks...it is truly a great relationship in that allows us to give gifted students comprehensive instruction that has continuity...we are able to use individual strengths to help each other and improve our weaknesses also.

What will I do differently next year?

- I will feel more secure about TPGES procedures and implications. Thanks, LDC☺!
- I will get MDC training, so I can monitor the growth of math and science identified gifted students and LDC for ELA and social studies identified gifted students.
- Use a teacher data monitoring sheet!
- Explore LDC for all its potential...there is much more to the instructional ladder and I haven't scratched the surface.
- Utilize the timeline I planned...which is to make sure each grading period (9 weeks) has two formative assessments and the summative is pre-planned as much as possible with gifted students.

Follow this plan?

- 6th grade will focus on argumentative writing that begins in 5th grade with introduction to debate.
- 7th will focus on literary writing, but differentiated based on area of identification, interest, literature selection, and ELA teacher input.
- 8th will write argumentation/explanatory but will support the social studies curriculum (historical mostly) because this class is wrecking their GPA:).

My Name: _____

Year: 2014-2015

LDC Student Growth Self-Monitoring

	Baseline Assessment	Module 1	Module 2	Module 3	Summative Assessment	+/-	<u>Comments</u>
<u>Scoring Criteria</u>		Topic:	Topic:	Topic:			
Focus							
Controlling Idea							
Reading/Research							
Development							
Organization							
Conventions							
Content Understanding							

	LDC Baseline Assessment	
<u>Scoring Criteria</u>	My Score:	Reflection on my writing: Where did I struggle? How did I improve?
Reading/Research		
Development		

**Enlarge student comment boxes for actual student use—writing space has been condensed for the purposes of this document.*

	LDC Module #1: Topic _____		
Scoring Criteria	My Score:	+/- baseline	Reflection on my writing: Where did I struggle? How did I improve?
Reading/Research			
Development			

	LDC Module #2: Topic _____		
Scoring Criteria	My Score:	+/- baseline	Reflection on my writing: Where did I struggle? How did I improve?
Reading/Research			
Development			

	LDC Module #3: Topic _____		
Scoring Criteria	My Score:	+/- baseline	Reflection on my writing: Where did I struggle? How did I improve?
Reading/Research			
Development			

--	--	--	--

**Enlarge student comment boxes for actual student use—writing space has been condensed for the purposes of this document.*

	LDC Module: Summative Topic _____		
Scoring Criteria	My Score:	+/- baseline	Reflection on my writing: Where did I struggle? How did I improve?
Focus			
Controlling Idea			
Reading/Research			
Development			
Organization			
Conventions			
Content Understanding			

**Enlarge student comment boxes for actual student use—writing space has been condensed for the purposes of this document.*