**18. \*Who should we identify? What is the population?**

15. How can we address/incorporate creativity?

16. Criteria included in the comprehensive I.D. tool - who are we looking for?

**5. \*Valid assessment available for all – expanding beyond test scores**

1. Are we looking at the child’s needs or numbers?

2. How does an identification system based on subjective information fit with our society’s obsession with accountability and numbers?

17. Arbitrary numbers or set cutoff – don’t let an inflexible number override a reasonable decision

22. Includes input from parents and students themselves – sometimes the most telling information comes from them

**14. \*Comprehensive I.D. tools to give the most complete portrait of a student – a tool to collect info early – Kdg. - getting parents involved**

3. Can we focus on the students that truly NEED our services and not the students who are teacher pleasers and should be “rewarded”?

6. Ornery little shitheads that don’t get teacher recs but might be gifted – “It’s about ability, it’s not about anything else, “ Kevin Neal.

**12. \*Practices and procedures need to be consistent – one year to next, between buildings, across grade levels**

9. Identification is done by one person?

11. Consistency – between buildings

21.Procedures/ process – Are they based on best practice?

**4. \*Identification should be ongoing and not just at 3 times during the K-12 years?**

13. Allows for fluid movement in and out of the program as the child’s needs and interests change

**Other:**

7. Defending the process to teachers and parents

8. Core philosophical differences about what the program should be – ELP teachers, gen ed., parents, students

19. Lack of knowledge of the entire K-12 curriculum – ELP teachers need to know what everyone else is doing in the department

20. Staffing/scheduling – logistics can get in the way