Centers for Enriched Instruction

SELECTION COMMITTEE 2018
Goal of Choice
To effectively and efficiently meet the instructional needs of all highly able learners by identifying a myriad of ways to ensure that they are receiving instruction to meet their needs.

Purpose of Program
Although many students would benefit from a selective magnet program experience, the intent of the program is to serve students who lack an academic cohort in their home school.
Ground Rules

- Respect the experiences, expertise and perspective that each member of the committee brings to the table.
- Respect other’s opinions, even when they differ.
- Each committee member has the right to be heard.
- The group will arrive at the recommendations after everyone has been heard.
- The group agrees that it is okay to disagree.
- When there is disagreement, each committee member has the right to express his/her thoughts openly without judgment.
- Sometimes we will not reach consensus.
- Side bars will be limited to Round 2 paired discussions only.
- The group's decisions will focus on the best interests of the child.
Factors for Consideration

- The process for selection is race-neutral, name and school blind. Profiles will denote gender.
- Committees will see if a student receives services in:
  - Special Education
  - Section 504 Plan
  - ESOL
  - FARMS

The committee is charged with ensuring that “otherwise qualified” students are not discriminated against on the basis of disability.
## Review Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Process Step</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Round 1 A: Individual Review</td>
<td>Review academic performance and student voice</td>
<td>Limited Substantial Definitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Round 1B: Individual Review</td>
<td>Review CogAT score and reevaluate rating</td>
<td>Limited Substantial Definitive Exceptional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Round 2: Paired Review</td>
<td>Compare, discuss, and determine if you can come to consensus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Round 3: Group Review for Consensus</td>
<td>Only if needed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Round 4: Program Recommendation Decision</td>
<td>Led by OSA</td>
<td>Recommended Wait Pool Not Recommended</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Academic Performance

• Report Card Grades
• Instructional Reading Level
  • How are they performing in relation to the grade level target for the marking period?
• Access to Enrichment
  • Is the student receiving access to enrichment in mathematics?

See handout for descriptors
Outside Assessment

• Cognitive Abilities Test (CogAT)
  • Composite Score
    • Verbal Reasoning
    • Nonverbal Reasoning
    • Quantitative Reasoning
  • Percentile Rank

See handout for information
Weighing Conflicting Data

The review is a holistic review of the needs of the student.

Multiple criteria is used to select a student.
  • Don’t allow a single data point prevent you from recommending a student.

Sometimes there is conflicting data.
  • High reading level/lower grades
  • Lower scores/strong grades
  • Spikey profiles
  • Performance over time
Selection Interface Tool

Enter in your Username and Password:

Username and password may be your first name as your user name and your last name followed by 123 as your password.
Selection Interface Tool: Ratings

After each rating, you will be able to see a summary of your progress as you complete the students on your list:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Your activity log:</th>
<th>Individual</th>
<th>Individual</th>
<th>Partner</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Helen Roberts</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matsunaga Pseudo ID 11001</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matsunaga Pseudo ID 11078</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>