State of Maine
Department of Education

Gifted and Talented Education Program
Renewal Application 2017-18

The Program Renewal Application shall be submitted annually by school administrative units (SAUs) that have an approved Initial Application.

All final applications and accompanying approval/non-approval letters and budgets will be posted on the Maine Department of Education's gifted and talented website.

DUE by: September 30, 2017

RETURN BY EMAIL TO:
mailto:GT.DOE@maine.gov

School administrative unit name: Biddeford School Department

Name and title of person responsible for gifted and talented program:
Christopher Indorf

Phone number: 282-8280

Email address: cindorf@biddefordschools.me

CERTIFICATION:

The statements made herein are correct to the best of my knowledge and belief.

JEREMY RAY
Superintendent Name (printed)

Superintendent Signature

Date of Initial submission to Maine DOE: 1/2/18, 9/19/17

Date of 1st Revision to Maine DOE: _____ Superintendent Initials

Date of 2nd Revision to Maine DOE: _____ Superintendent Initials

Date of 3rd Revision to Maine DOE: _____ Superintendent Initials

FOR INFORMATION CONTACT: GT.DOE@maine.gov

Reviewed By: _____

Maine DOE Approval: _____

Date of Approval: 1/29/18

Program Renewal Application

To maintain program approval status, a school administrative unit (SAU) must annually report any information that represents **Change** (i.e. an ***alteration***, ***addition***, *or* ***deletion***) to any program category (Maine DOE Chapter 104.14, 1-9) **from the reported and approved Initial Application** (FY2015-16 or FY2016-17).

For detailed instructions on how to complete the Program Renewal Application, please refer to the Instructions document on the Gifted and Talented website http://www.maine.gov/doe/gifted/programcomponents/forms/index.html.

1. Provide any changes to the detailed description of the SAU's philosophy for both the gifted and talented academic and arts programs.

   [X] NO CHANGE [ ] CHANGE

   Describe **CHANGE** here:
   - Academic program philosophy -

   - Arts program philosophy -

2. Provide any changes to the program abstract for both the academic and arts programs - describe the children to be served and the program(s) to be implemented in the school(s) of the unit.

   [X] NO CHANGE [ ] CHANGE

   Describe **CHANGE** here:
   - Academic program abstract -

   - Arts program abstract -

3. Provide a detailed explanation of any changes to the two goals, objectives and activities for the K-12 gifted and talented academic program and two goals, objectives and activities for the K-12 gifted and talented arts program.

   [X] NO CHANGE [ ] CHANGE

Describe CHANGE here:

- Academics program goals, objectives, activities -

- Arts program goals, objectives, activities -

4. Provide any changes to the description of the identification procedures for general intellectual ability, academic aptitude and artistic ability for each of the following program components: screening, selection and placement. Also include any changes to the description of the handling of transfer students, exit procedure, appeals procedure and appropriate notifications.

[ ] NO CHANGE [X] CHANGE

Describe CHANGE here:

- General intellectual ability identification -
  Screening End of Grade 2 is changing from administering Nonverbal COGAT to all 2nd graders to screening all 2nd graders at the end of Grade 2 using STAR data from the school year (fall to spring or spring to spring). All students scoring in the 75% or higher on STAR, and/or parent, teacher, self-recommendation will be administered the Nonverbal COGAT. Of these students, those who score 70% or higher will be administered the Verbal and Quantitative COGAT sub tests.

- Specific academic areas identification -

- Arts identification -

- Transfer students -

- Exit procedures -

- Appeals procedures -

5. Provide a description, including the name, of the staff development that takes place in order to implement the program(s).

[X] NO CHANGE [ ] CHANGE

Describe CHANGE here:

6. Provide any changes to the description of the responsibilities of the professional and auxiliary staff listed below.

A. Indicate the professional staff for the K-12 Gifted and Talented Program.

Name of Staff	690 Endorsement Yes/No	Teacher or Administrator	Grade level	Indicate Full- or Part-Time in GT
Jessica Larson	Yes	Teacher	6-12	Full-Time
Suzanne Tighe	Yes	Teacher	K-8	.8

B. Indicate the Auxiliary Staff: Educational Technician

7.

Name of Staff	Role	690 Endorsement Yes/No	Grade level	Name and position of supervisor	Indicate Full- or Part-Time in GT

(a.) Indicate any changes to your Approved Initial application self- evaluation process.

Describe CHANGE here:

(b.) Provide a detailed description of the results/effectiveness of the annual program self-evaluation. *(Note: A summation statement on the effectiveness/success of the district's GT program in the academics as well as the arts will suffice.)*

3-5 English/Language Arts Evaluation Narrative: Verbal and/or Nonverbal COGAT scores and Reading/Writing Standardized test scores are used to identify GT ELA students. 8 students were identified as GT ELA for grades 3, 4, and 5 for the 2016-17 school year. Of those students, 4 or 50% of those students exceeded grade level expectations on fall to spring standardized test scores and exceeded expectations in the GT and regular classrooms. 4 students or 50% met grade level expectations on fall to spring standardized test scores and met expectations in the GT and regular classrooms. Collectively, this data indicates that the programming of ELA classes is effective.

3-5 English/Language Arts & Social Studies Evaluation Narrative: Since we use Verbal and/or Nonverbal COGAT scores and Reading/Writing Standardized test scores to identify Social Studies GT students and our programming to meet these identified students' needs includes an interdisciplinary approach to instruction, the evaluation of these two subject areas are done together. 13 students were identified as GT ELA/Social Studies for grades 3, 4, and 5 for the 2016-17 school year. Of those students, 6 or 46% of exceeded grade level expectations on fall to spring standardized test scores and exceeded expectations in the GT and regular classrooms. 7 or 54% of those students met grade level expectations on fall to spring standardized test scores and met expectations in the GT and regular classrooms. Collectively, this data indicates that the programming of ELA/SS interdisciplinary classes is effective.

3-5 Mathematics Evaluation Narrative: Quantitative and/or Nonverbal COGAT scores and Mathematics Standardized test scores are used to identify Science GT students. 6 students were identified as GT Math for grades 3, 4, and 5 for the 2016-17 school year. Of those students, 4 or 66% exceeded grade level expectations on fall to spring standardized test scores and exceeded expectations in the GT and regular classrooms. 2 or 33% of those students met grade level expectations on fall to spring standardized test scores and met expectations in the GT and regular classrooms. Collectively, this data indicates that the programming of Math classes is effective.

3-5 Mathematics & Science Evaluation Narrative: Since we use Quantitative and/or Nonverbal COGAT scores and Mathematics Standardized test scores to identify Science GT students and our programming to meet these identified students' needs includes an interdisciplinary approach to instruction, the evaluation of these two subject areas are done together. 8 students were identified as GT Math/Science for grades 3, 4, and 5 for the 2016-17 school year. Of those students, 5 or 63% exceeded grade level expectations on fall to spring standardized test scores and exceeded expectations in the GT and regular classrooms. 3 or 27% of those students met grade level expectations on fall to spring standardized test scores and met expectations in the GT and regular classrooms. Collectively, this data indicates that the programming of interdisciplinary classes is effective.

6-8 English/Language Arts & Social Studies Evaluation Narrative: Since we use Verbal and/or Nonverbal COGAT scores and Reading/Writing Standardized test scores to identify Social Studies GT students and our programming to meet these identified students' needs includes an interdisciplinary approach to instruction, the evaluation of these two subject areas are done together for those who were identified in both ELA and Social Studies, and therefore, took part in the Integrated Studies GT class (pull-out) or the STEM Integrated Humanities class (push-in). There were a total of 14 students in grades 6 through 8 that were identified in both ELA and Social Studies. Of these students, 8 students or 57% exceeded expectations in GT and regular classrooms and on standardized testing spring to spring or fall to spring. 29%, 4 students, met expectations in GT and regular classrooms and on standardized testing spring to spring or fall to spring. The remaining two students, 14% of identified students, did not meet expectations in the GT and/or regular classrooms nor on standardized tests spring to spring, fall to fall. Collectively, this data indicates that the programming of the Reading/Social Studies interdisciplinary classes is effective.

6-8 Social Studies Evaluation Narrative: There was one student at the middle school level who was identified in Social Studies only. This student did not meet expectations in the regular and GT classrooms, nor on standardized tests. This student was moving at the end of the school year, thus became disengaged from her studies.

6-8 Mathematics & Science Evaluation Narrative: Since we use Quantitative and/or Nonverbal COGAT scores and Mathematics Standardized test scores to identify Science GT students and our programming to meet these identified students' needs includes an interdisciplinary approach to instruction, and therefore, took part in the Integrated Science GT class (pull-out) or the STEM Science class (push-in), the evaluation of these two subject areas are done together for those who were identified in both Science and Math. 18 students were identified as GT Math/Science for grades 6, 7 and 8 for the 2016-17 school year. Of those students, 8 or 44.5% of those students exceeded grade level expectations on spring to spring or fall to spring standardized test scores and exceeded expectations in the GT and/or regular classrooms. 8 or 44.5% of those students met grade level expectations on spring to spring or fall to spring standardized test scores and met expectations in the GT and regular classrooms. The remaining two students, 11%, did not meet expectations on spring to spring standardized test scores nor in GT and/or regular classrooms. Collectively, this data indicates that the programming of interdisciplinary science and math classes is effective.

9-12 Mathematics & Science Evaluation Narrative:
Since we use Quantitative and/or Nonverbal COGAT scores and/or Mathematics Standardized test scores to identify Science GT students, the evaluation of these two subject areas are done together for those who were identified in both Math and Science. 16 students at the high school level were identified in both Math and Science for the 2016/2017 school year. Of those students, 10 or 62.5%, exceeded honors, AP, and/or CP grade level and standardized test expectations from fall to spring. 31%, 5 students, met honors, AP and/or CP grade level and standardized test expectations from fall to spring, while 1 student did not meet grade level nor standardized test expectations in math and science. Collectively, this data indicates that the high school level programming of science and mathematics has improved and, therefore, is effective.

9-12 Mathematics Evaluation Narrative:
3 Students were identified in Math only. One of these students transferred to a different school district in the middle of the school year. The other two students met honors/AP level and standardized test expectations from fall to spring.

9-12 Science Evaluation Narrative:
2 students were identified in Science only. Both of these students (100%) exceeded honors/AP level expectations from fall to spring.

9-12 English/Language Arts & Social Studies Evaluation Narrative:
Since we use Verbal and/or Nonverbal COGAT scores and/or Reading/Writing Standardized test scores to identify Social Studies GT students, the evaluation of these two subject areas are done together for those who were identified in both ELA and Social Studies. 18 Students were identified as such for the 2016/2017 school year, 83% (15 students) having exceeded honors, AP, and/or CP grade level and standardized test expectations from fall to spring. The remaining 3 students, 17%, met honors, AP, and/or CP grade level and standardized test expectations from fall to spring. Collectively, this data indicates that the high school programming of English and Social Science CP, Honors, and AP classes is effective.

9-12 English/Language Arts Evaluation Narrative:
At the high school level, 10 students were identified in English/Language Arts only. 6 of these students, or 60%, exceeded honors, AP, and/or CP grade level and standardized test expectations from fall to spring. The remaining 4 students/40% met honors, AP, and/or CP grade level and standardized test expectations from fall to spring. Collectively, this data indicates that the high school programming of English CP, Honors, and AP classes is effective.

3-5 Visual and Performing Arts Evaluation Narrative: There were 24 students identified GT in Visual and Performing Arts in grades 3,4, and 5 for the 2016/2017 school year. Of those students, 18 or 75% exceeded expectations in the GT and regular classrooms based on classroom observations, concerts and/or show pieces, and work samples and/or performances, and 6 or 25% met grade level expectations based on classroom observations, concerts and/or show pieces, and work samples and/or performances. Collectively, this data indicates that the elementary level VPA programming is effective.

6 – 10 Visual and Performing Arts Evaluation Narrative:
There were 22 students identified in Visual and Performing Arts in grades 6, 7, and 8 for the 2016/2017 school year. Of those students, 11, 50%, exceeded expectations; 2 students, 9%, met expectations; and 9, 41%, did not meet expectations in the regular and/or GT classrooms based on observations, concerts and/or show pieces, and work samples and/or performances. The high volume of students not meeting expectations is due largely to the fact that students who have talents and interests in both the visual and performing arts must choose between the two due to scheduling. As a result, some students did not participate in the music and/or art programming and therefore, growth could not be evaluated by the classroom teachers. This is an ongoing struggle for middle school scheduling and something that is addressed year to year.

9-12 Visual and Performing Arts Evaluation Narrative:

There were 28 students identified GT in Visual and Performing arts in grades 9, 10, 11, and 12 for the 2016/2017 school year. 17 students, 61%, exceeded expectations; 7 students, 25%, met expectations; and 4 students, 14%, did not meet expectations in the CP and advanced courses and/or clubs based on observations, concerts and/or show pieces, and work samples and/or performances. Of those who did not meet expectations, 50% (2 students) did not participate in any course or club offerings last year to be evaluated, and the other two, 50%, displayed a lack of effort and performances/pieces were not of the caliber required of GT criteria. Overall, students are continuing in the music and arts programming offered at the high school and performing well.

3 – 5 GT Programming Survey Narrative:

GT identified students in grades 3, 4, and 5 were asked 2 questions regarding their GT programming experiences for the 2016/2017 school year. 26 students completed the survey, below are the questions and results.

Question 1: Did you feel challenged in your GT classes this year?

Results: Yes = 85%; Sometimes = 11%; No = 4%

Question 2: If you are identified as GT academic for the 2017/2018 school year, will you participate?

Results: Yes = 96%; No = 0%; Not sure = 4%

Conclusion – The majority of students surveyed feel challenged with the academic GT programming at the elementary level and will continue in the program if identified again next year.

6-8 GT Programming Survey Narrative:

GT identified students in grades 6, 7, and 8 were asked 4 questions regarding their GT programming experiences for the 2016/2017 school year, including suggestions for the future. 25 students completed the survey, below are the questions and results.

Question 1: Did you feel challenged in your GT classes this year?

Results: Yes, always = 80%; Sometimes = 20% No = 0%

Question 2: If you are identified as GT academic for the 2017/2018 school year, will you participate?

Results: Yes = 72%; Depends on the schedule = 28%

Question 3: Because scheduling GT classes and meetings can be difficult at the middle school, what is your suggestion for scheduling GT in the future that would be most successful for everyone?

Results: Morning before school or Afterschool 60%
Make it a Club = 20%
Lunch Time = 20%
Other = 0%

Question 4: Would you participate in GT classes if they were offered as a Unified Art?

Results: Yes = 48%; No = 40%; Maybe, depends on which UA I would have to give up = 12%

Conclusion – Scheduling at the middle school continues to be a challenge and will remain an ongoing goal for the GT team.

9-12 GT Programming Survey Narrative:

GT identified students in grades 9, 10 & 11 were asked 4 questions regarding their GT programming experiences for the 2016/2017 school year, including suggestions for the future. 20 students completed the survey, below are the questions and results.

Question 1: Did you feel challenged in your Honors, AP, and/or Independent Study class(es)?
Results: Yes, always = 70%; Most of the Time= 15%; Some of the Time = 10%; Only AP classes = 5%
Question 2: Do you wish GT classes and/or check-ins would continue into High School?
Results: Yes = 65%; Maybe just check-ins = 25%; Depends on my schedule = 10%
Question 3: If GT classes were offered as an elective, do you think you would take the class?
Results: Yes = 50%; Depends on my schedule = 40%; No = 10%
Question 4: If there were GT check-ins, you would attend them if they were offered (when)?
Results: Lunch = 80%; Before or after School = 10%; if it was a club = 10%
Conclusion – The majority of GT students feel challenged in their honors, AP and independent study courses. The majority also wishes the GT programming continued on into high school in some capacity. This is a discussion the GT team and high school administration should have.

(c.) Include how program effectiveness was determined.

Program effectiveness was determined by analysis of student data fall to spring and/or spring to spring that includes STAR and/or PSAT/SAT testing, teacher evaluations, and student surveys.

8. Provide a justification/description of the items included in the proposed budget in number 9.

To cover teacher salaries, programming supplies, book and material costs including independent studies at the high school level as needed, field trip entrance fee/student tuition and busing costs, contracted services, professional development for GT teachers, and fees and dues in order to implement the activities and programs described in the program abstracts, the costs to be incurred total **$153,622.53 for the 2017/2018 school year.**

Field trips to places in Massachusetts such as museums, The Freedom Trail, as well as in Maine such as Challenger Space Center, Wells Reserve, The Telling Room and other educational events/activities offered at other locations that require student tuition and transportation are taken during the school day with only identified students in the educational unit of study area for the trip's purpose. Examples: Humanities students identified in ELA and Social Studies will participate in field trips that have a history-based itinerary, and/or educationally based performances. Students identified in the areas of Math and/or Science will participate in trips to the Museum of Science, MIT and technology based trips, and to Challenger Space Center and Wells Reserve. Students who are identified in ELA will participate in field trips to destinations such as the Telling Room for writing residencies and workshops taught by their staff and performances based on classic literature books, stories and poems. Students who are identified in VPA areas would participate in travels to museums of the arts, and performances for music and/or theater.

9. For those school units requesting approval of *allowable program costs* for State subsidy, please complete the following budget information. Amounts budgeted for the SAUs Gifted and Talented Program must be reported in the NEO (New Educational Onotology) financial system as part of the Annual Budget Reporting.

NOTE: To be approved as an allowable cost for the current school year, all personnel listed below must be appropriately certified/endorsed by the application deadline of September 30.

Professional Staff Costs

Professional Staff Name	Elementary (salary with benefits)	Secondary (salary with benefits)
Jessica Larson	34,547.57	34,547.57
Suzanne Tighe	62,763.84	
Subtotal	97,311.41	34,547.57

Auxiliary Staff Costs

Auxiliary Staff Name	Elementary (salary with benefits)	Secondary (salary with benefits)
Subtotal		

Independent Contractor Costs

Independent Contractor Name	Area of expertise	Elementary (contract amount)	Secondary (contract amount)
Josh King	Instrumental Musician		$300
Subtotal		$0	$300

Please list individual product names and costs associated with the district's Gifted and Talented Program.

A. Educational Materials and Supplies:

Elementary: Name of Material/Supply	Cost	Secondary: Name of Material/Supply	Cost
BreakoutEdu Kit – Start-up materials needed for problem solving, critical thinking based projects/culminating activity ($125 for each grade 3 through 8 BPS, BIS & BMS)	$750	Books for Book Awards (Honors Convocation Ceremony for Juniors & Seniors)	$100
Houghton Mifflin COGAT testing materials Grade 2/Level 7 Update to Form 7 (for GT ID selection BPS)	$550	Independent Study Materials for Melody Michaud (General Academic identified, Science of Exercise Independent study year-long)	$200
Alexander Hamilton by Ron Chernow for ELA/SS integrated studies informational text (paperback) $16 each (BMS)	$190		
Prufrock Press - To develop critical language skills: Challenging Common Core Language Arts Lessons Series 3-5 $119.85 (BIS & BPS); To develop problem soving: Challenging Common Core Math Lessons Series 3 & 4 $79.90 (BIS & BPS); Advanced Common Core Math Exploration Series: Fractions and Rations, Proportions and Similarities (2-book set) $59.90 (BIS); To develop creativity, problem solving and collaborative learning: Hands-on Engineering $21.95 (BPS & BIS);	$311.60		
Books a Million - To support lessons of overcoming adversity:	$355.70		

Orphan Girl Train, Refugee, List, The War I Finally Won, The Day Break Bond, Firefly Code, Children of Refuge, Sputniks Guide to Life, Restart, William Shakespeare's Star Wars Series (6 books), Cyclone, Insignificant Events, Thornhill, In Over Their Heads (BIS)			
Prufrock Press – Interdisciplinary Curriculum from William and Mary Exploring America Series (50s, 70s, & 90s) 39.95 each (BMS)	$119.85		
Booksource Classroom Library Set -10 Modern Titles ($77.15); Poetry Collection Set – 10 Titles ($74.16) (BMS)	$155.04		
PITSCO Education/Maker Space – Kits/materials for designing and testing rockets, racers, and robots (tool sets, launching equipment, basic supplies) for Math & Science Integrated Studies Units (BMS)	$261.60		
PITSCO Education/Maker Space To develop creative and critical thinking skills and collaborative learning: Hands-on Engineering Sail Car Class Pack $47.75; Sail Car Elementary Stem Activity Guide $4.95 (BPS)	$62.70		
Subtotal	**$2,756.49**	**Subtotal**	**$300**

B. Other allowable costs (i.e. field trips, student fees, membership):

Elementary: Item name	Cost	Secondary: Item name	Cost
Travel Professional Development (GT teachers K-8 for workshop travel expenses for 2 teachers)	$300	Travel non-PD (travel between buildings/districts by 9-12 GT teacher for Regional Fine Arts [RFA] program)	$100
Math Meet Transportation: 3 5-6 meets; 1 5-8 meet (see dates and times below) (BIS & BMS)	$721.99	Field Trip Transportation (Sam Rhine Genetics and/or Salem, MA see tuition below)	$150
Telling Room Field Trip Busing Costs (see Student Tuition	$350	Field Trip Transportation for RFA VPA Program	$800

below for Telling Room field trip)			
Subtotal	$1351.99	Subtotal	$1,050

C. Student Tuition (i.e. regional programs/ computer programs, college courses in identified area):

Elementary: Program name	Cost	Secondary: Program name	Cost
So. Maine Elementary Math Leagues (5-6 BIS & BMS) Registration $175 each grade (math meet dates: 12/12 9:30 – 11:45, 1/23 9:30 – 11:45, 3/6 9:30 – 11:45, 5/1 9:30 – 12:00	$350	Regional Fine Arts/RFA Tuition (VPA GT program $210 per student to pay resident artists' costs)	$2,940
So. Maine Math League (7-8 BMS) Registration $75 each grade meet 5/1 9:30 – 12:00	$150	Honors Science/Social Studies Field Trip (Sam Rhine Genetic Conference $20 per student/Salem Cry Innocent reenactment tuition)	$400
The Telling Room (Writing workshop taught at BPS by Telling Room staff for 3rd graders $300; Writing workshop taught at BIS by Telling Room staff for 4th graders $300)	$600		
Massachusetts Field Trips tuition 4-8 (Salem, Boston Museums, Musicals and Theater – North Shore Theatre/Boston Opera House, Chamber Theatre Productions Inc., etc.) (BIS & BMS)	$5,483.77		
Subtotal	$6583.77	Subtotal	$3,340

D. Staff Tuition/Professional Development:

Elementary: Course/Workshop Title	Cost	Secondary: Course/Workshop Title	Cost
NEGAT 2017 (Portland) conference (1.8 GT Teachers) and MEGAT Annual membership fee (2 teachers) all-inclusive cost for Maine residents	$450	NEGAT 2017 (Portland) conference (.2 GT Teachers) and MEA Annual Membership	$150

GT Summer Confratute UCONN – Renzulli Center for Creativity for 2 GT teachers	$3,238.12		1079.38
COGAT Online Testing Webinar (full time GT teacher) for end of 2nd grade screening (required for COGAT form 8 purchase – see section A)(BPS)	$600		
BER Best Instructional Strategies for challenging and Motivating GT students K-8) Workshop Manchester, NH (2 GT teachers @ $249 each)	$498		
Subtotal	$4,786.12	Subtotal	$1229.38

E. Totals

Subtotals from charts above	Elementary Costs:	Secondary Costs:
Professional Staff	97,311.41	34,547.57
Auxiliary Staff		
Independent Contractors		$300
A. Materials/Supplies	$2,731.16	$300
B. Other Allowable Costs	$1371.99	$1,050
C. Student Tuition	$6654.90	$3,340
D. Staff Tuition/PD	$4,786.12	$1229.38
Total	$112,855.58	40,766.95