|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **DETERMINING APPROPRIATE ID CRITERIA, A SELF-STUDY, Bertie Kingore, 2000**  **GUIDING QUESTIONS, FORM 217, OSPI 2014, OSPI**  **NAGC Master Program Checklist for IDENTIFICATION** | **YES** | **NO** | **?** |
| 1. | Do your ID instruments and strategies include multiple criteria that measure students’ abilities in each area of the giftedness relevant to the district’s definition and services? In other words, do the assessments used reflect a variety of academic, cognitive, and creative strengths? |  |  |  |
| 2. | Are the ID instruments and strategies appropriate for the specific needs and characteristics of the ages (K-12) and demographics of your district? |  |  |  |
| 3. | Do your district’s notification, nomination, screening, assessment, and selection processes target all demographics of the district’s enrollment? Is information made available to the community in a variety of ways and languages in order to maximize  outreach throughout the community? |  |  |  |
| 4. | Does the identification process (tools utilized, eligibility criteria, selection system) align to the purpose/vision of the program and the highly capable student definition? |  |  |  |
| 5. | Does the ID process produce information that is useful in planning instruction and curriculum for the student? |  |  |  |
| 6. | Does the ID process occur early enough to maximize for students the benefits that may be obtained from special programs? |  |  |  |
| 7. | Does the ID process delineate and provide reoccurring opportunities to screen students not  yet identified? |  |  |  |
| 8. | Does the district uses a norm-referenced measure of achievement and aptitude with adequate ceilings to assess achievement above grade level in each of the areas for which program services are offered? |  |  |  |
| 9. | Are the standardized tests reliable and valid for your multi-ethic population and for students likely to perform at levels far beyond those expected for their age group? Has your district considered the Standard Error of Measure, avoiding combining non-standard scores, avoid averaging scores? |  |  |  |
|  | **FROM:**   * **DETERMINING APPROPRIATE ID CRITERIA, A SELF-STUDY, Bertie Kingore, 2000** * **GUIDING QUESTIONS, FORM 217, OSPI** * **NAGC Master Program Checklist for IDENTIFICATION** | **YES** | **NO** | **?** |
| 10. | Are the ID instruments and materials available in each of the languages represented by the diverse ethnic groups in the district where the student is not fluent in English? |  |  |  |
| 11. | Does the ID system consider qualitative information from a variety of people most familiar with the students’ needs, abilities, and behaviors? |  |  |  |
| 12. | Does your ID system endeavor to balance any limitations of one criterion with the strengths of another criterion? |  |  |  |
| 13. | Can a student quality for the program despite a low score on one criterion if performance is appropriately strong on other criteria? |  |  |  |
| 14. | Can the ID process realistically be accomplished with the time, staff, and funds available? What training or changes are needed? |  |  |  |
| 15. | Are members of the ID committee trained in the nature and needs of gifted students? |  |  |  |
| 16. | Is everyone on the ID committee prepared to review accumulated data and interpret specific student needs before final decisions are reached? |  |  |  |
| 17. | Have you created and clearly communicated to parents and community your procedures for appeal, exit, and re-entry? |  |  |  |
| 18. | Does the exit procedure include a period of intervention no less than one grading period to determine of student can be successful in the program with support? |  |  |  |
| 19. | Does your district periodically review your ID process to determine its effectiveness in identifying students representing your district’s demographic? |  |  |  |
| 20. | How effective is your district’s ID process in identifying your district’s “most highly capable”? WAC 075 |  |  |  |