

Lindenwood University

Digital Commons@Lindenwood University

Theses

Theses & Dissertations

1983

The Need for and the Value of a Gifted Education Program in the DeSoto, Missouri School District

Norma J. Hoelzel

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.lindenwood.edu/theses>



Part of the Education Commons

THE NEED FOR AND THE VALUE OF
A GIFTED EDUCATION PROGRAM IN THE
DE SOTO, MISSOURI SCHOOL DISTRICT

Norma J. Hoelzel, B.A.

A Digest Presented to the Faculty of the Graduate
School of the Lindenwood Colleges in Partial
Fulfillment of the Requirements for the
Degree of Master of Art

1983



THE NEED FOR AND THE VALUE OF
A GIFTED EDUCATION PROGRAM IN THE
DE SOTO, MISSOURI SCHOOL DISTRICT

The substance of this project is a discussion of the need for and the value of a gifted education program in the schools of De Soto, Missouri. As a teacher in the elementary schools of this district for eight years, I have seen the need for such a program time and again, as I watch the gifted children who pass through my classroom struggle for acceptance and identity among his or her peers. I have tried to establish this evident need based on the very uncertain scores of our achievement tests, which at this time, is the only basis I have for my study.

Chapter two establishes criteria and procedures for identifying gifted students. The Department of Education's Marland report was used, along with the guidelines set forth by the state of Missouri, and some suggestions offered by Roger Taylor.

Chapter three sets forth the basic components of a gifted program, based on the Missouri state guidelines, as well as a comparison of programs nationwide and some alternatives for such programs.

The last chapter of my project is a step-by-step procedure for establishing a gifted program in a sequential manner.

COMMITTEE IN CHARGE OF GRADUATION:

THE NEED FOR AND THE VALUE OF
A GIFTED EDUCATION PROGRAM IN THE
DE SOTO, MISSOURI SCHOOL DISTRICT

Assistant Professor Nancy Pollock

Dr. John Freeman, Assistant
Superintendent of Schools,
De Soto, Missouri

Norma J. Hoelzel, B.A.

A Culminating Project Presented to the Faculty of the Graduate
School of the Lindenwood Colleges in Partial
Fulfillment of the Requirements for the
Degree of Master of Art

1983

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 2 COMMITTEE IN CHARGE OF CANDIDACY: Page Number

1.	IDENTIFICATION: THE ROAD FOR AND THE VALUE OF A DISTED ASSOCIATE Assistant Professor Rebecca Glenn, Chairperson and Advisor	1
	The Value of the DISTED Individ-	
	Assistant Professor Nancy Polette	2
2.	ESTABLISHING CRITERIA AND PROCED-	
	Dr. John Freeman, Assistant Superintendent of Schools, De Soto, Missouri	11
	Marland Report	12
	Honour Guidelines	13
	Procedures for Identification Roger Taylor	14
	Missouri State-assisted Program For DISTED Students	16
	Summary	21
3.	BASIC COMPONENTS OF A DISTED PROGRAM: No. State Guidelines	25
	Possible Goals for our Local District	27
	A Comparison of Programs Nationwide	30
	Alternatives and Comparisons of Programs	35
4.	ESTABLISHING A DISTED PROGRAM: A Step-by-step Procedure	38
	Commitments	40
	Requesting Planning	41
	Conclusion	47

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>Chapter</u>	<u>Page Number</u>
1. INTRODUCTION: THE NEED FOR AND THE VALUE OF A GIFTED EDUCATION PROGRAM IN THE DE SOTO, MISSOURI SCHOOL DISTRICT.	1
The Value of the Gifted Individual to Society.	6
2. ESTABLISHING CRITERIA AND PROCEDURES FOR IDENTIFYING GIFTED STUDENTS.	11
Criteria for Identification: Marland Report.	12
Missouri Guidelines	13
Procedures for Identification: Roger Taylor.	14
Missouri State-Assisted Program for Gifted Students	16
Summary	21
3. BASIC COMPONENTS OF A GIFTED PROGRAM: Mo. State Guidelines	25
Possible Goals for our Local District.	27
A Comparison of Programs Nationwide.	30
Alternatives and Comparisons of Programs	35
4. ESTABLISHING A GIFTED PROGRAM: A Step-by-Step Procedure.	39
Commitments	40
Sequential Planning	41
Conclusion.	48

LIST OF TABLES

<u>Table Number and Title</u>	<u>Page Number</u>
1 DeSoto Stanford Achievement Tests, Fifth Grade, Grade Equivalents on Composite Score.	2
2 Stanford Achievement Tests, Fifth Grade, De Soto District #73, Vineland School, Based on Composite Score.	3
3 State of Missouri - Gifted Education Programs.	4
4 Identification Procedures for Gifted Children; Resource Room Programs.	19
5 Methods of Identifying the Gifted	23
6 Gifted Program Comparison Chart	31
7 A Comparison of Delivery Systems for Gifted Programs	35
8 Planning Sequence Checklist	42

maximum stimulation and challenge to the intellectually advanced pupil. Now CHAPTER 1

the school district is failing to offer quality education to the majority of its school population.

THE NEED FOR AND THE VALUE OF
A GIFTED EDUCATION PROGRAM IN THE
DE SOTO, MISSOURI SCHOOL DISTRICT

If one can believe the results of the Stanford Achievement Test administered by our school district in the spring, it is not being successful with most of the school population. For example, the composite score on these tests given the seventh grade of

Should the De Soto School District develop a comprehensive plan for educating the gifted children in our district? Is there any value in or even the need for such a program? Does the district actually have students who qualify for such a program, and who are now being short-changed in the development of their full intellectual potential?

Most experienced teachers of elementary students in the Vineland School of this district could probably answer all of the above questions with a resounding "YES", after having witnessed student after student who has completed the elementary grades unfulfilled and unchallenged to their maximum potential, simply because no gifted remedial education has been available for elementary students. Furthermore, the teacher/student ratio, as well as the wide ability range per class has been such as to effectively inhibit even the most talented teacher from sufficiently providing the

data for gifted programs, and one can see that over the past

maximum stimulation and challenge to the intellectually advanced pupil. However, this is not to assume that the school district is failing to offer quality education to the majority of its school population.

If one can believe the results of the annual Stanford Achievement Test administered by our school each spring, it is evident that it is being successful with most of the school population. For example, the composite score on these tests given the seventh month of the fifth grade showed a mean grade equivalent varying from six to twelve months ahead of the national norm. (See Table 1.)

Table 1

Stanford Achievement Tests, Fifth Grade
Grade Equivalents on Composite Score

Year	National Norm	De Soto Scores	Difference (in months)
1980	5.9	6.5	+ 6.0
1981	5.9	6.5	+ 6.0
1982	5.8	6.8	+12.0
1983	5.8	6.7	+ 9.0

Do these averages include a significant number of students who might be classified as gifted? Based on the Missouri state guidelines that students ranking in the ninety-fifth percentile on achievement tests are candidates for gifted programs, one can see that over the past

four years an average of seven students per year ranked in the top five percent. (See Table 2.)

Table 2

Stanford Achievement Tests, Fifth Grade,
De Soto District #73, Vineland School,
Based on Composite Score

Year	No. of Fifth Graders Taking Test	No. at or Above 95%ile	% of Total Fifth Grade
1980	111	6	5
1981	121	9	7
1982	135	8	6
1983	108	6	5

The figures in Table 2 indicate that a significant number of De Soto, Vineland Elementary students can most likely be possible candidates for identification as gifted. Not only does there seem to be justification for establishing classes for this segment of the elementary school population, but also for appointing a full-time teacher for such classes.

When looking at Table 3, one can see that the number of schools statewide offering gifted programs increased from 58 in 1980 to 109 districts in 1984. Furthermore, it is evident that a large majority of these districts provide full-time instructors for their programs. Five of those districts are found in Jefferson County. One can further note the significant increase in the number of students and total amount of dollars spent over this time period.¹

Table 3
STATE OF MISSOURI -- GIFTED EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Year	No. of districts in gifted programs	Total Amount of Dollars Spent	No. of students in programs	No. of teachers in programs		Grade Span of Programs
				Full-time	Part-time	
1980	58	\$1,560,463.00	8,546	not available		K-12
1981	68	\$2,017,492.00	8,757	320 (full-time & part-time)		K-12
1982	79	\$2,591,692.00	10,078	228	37	K-12
1983	90	\$3,020,372.00	10,666	232	45	K-12
1984	109	(information not yet available)				

Number of districts with gifted programs in Jefferson County? 5* (1983-84)

*Festus R-VI; Jefferson Co. R-VII; Fox C-12; Crystal City 47; Hillsboro R-III.

Source: Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education

But must we be concerned with such a small percentage of students in our society? If we realize that education is not only for the majority, but for each individual in that majority, we must recognize their rights as individuals and our responsibility to provide the maximum opportunity for every student in our system. Our obligation to our nation and to our society require at least this much.

Milton Gold states, "In a democracy, objectives in education of the gifted have to revolve around the belief that in serving the individual we serve society."² Historically, the major purpose of American education has been to meet each child's individual needs. Then should this not apply as much to the intellectually gifted, as to those we already serve in established programs for the learning disabled, emotionally and physically handicapped, slow learners, and speech impaired to name only a few? Dare we neglect any longer one of the most important and precious natural resources in our world today?

E. Paul Torrance reminds us that "a gifted child is potentially an awesomely powerful force. He can advance civilization or destroy it. The creative energies of gifted children need to be activated and guided early, or else they can be lost...or prove dangerous. Thus, it is important that the classroom teacher ask, "What kind of person do I want the gifted children I teach to become?"³

That is the question that must be explored as we see these gifted individuals pass through our system unchallenged to their fullest potential. But are they really of value to our society? Let's examine this point more thoroughly.

The Value of the Gifted
Individual to Society

In our modern age of accelerated and intensive progress in the highly scientific and technological fields, we are finding that the conditions of life today demand "not only high intellectual ability in the traditional fields of learning, but also giftedness in all fields of human aspiration, the social as well as the technological, the artistic as well as the economic".⁴

In 1925, Lewis Terman in his Genetic Studies of Genius stated:

It should go without saying that a nation's resources of intellectual talent are among the most precious it will ever have. The origin of genius, the natural laws of its development, and the environmental influences by which it may be affected for good or ill, are scientific problems of almost unequalled importance for human welfare.⁵

James S. Gallagher further emphasizes this point in his book entitled Teaching the Gifted Child when he quotes Arnold Toynbee as follows:

The Creator has withheld from Man the shark's teeth, the bird's wings, the elephant's trunk, and the hound's or

horse's racing feet. The creative power planted in a minority of mankind has to do duty for all the marvelous physical assets that are built into every specimen of Man's nonhuman fellow creatures. If society fails to make the most of this one human asset, or if, worse still, it perversely sets itself to stifle it, Man is throwing away his birthright of being the lord of creation and is condemning himself to be, instead, the least effective species on the face of this planet.^o

These authors, then, are pointing out that gifted children in our schools today are key members of the future generation of creators, producers and leaders in our society.

There is certainly reason to believe that the encouragement of gifted studies results in achievement in many areas for students so qualifying, based on the results of studies showing the value of differentiated programs for gifted students throughout our country.

James J. Gallagher in his Research Summary on Gifted Child Education cites a New York City study utilizing a special class program of 200 students, grades one through eight. Comparison was made with a control group of 200 students enrolled in the regular program. Students were "closely matched on IQ, age, sex, and socioeconomic status to eliminate the possibility of these factors biasing the results. The special class program has a special curriculum, and in

addition, had special resource teachers of language, science, speech, fine arts, etc.

The entire group of children was given achievement and personality tests in February of one year and again in June of that same year. The two groups were compared on the amount of growth made during the elapsed period of time. The results indicated that the group in the special class program was significantly superior at every grade level and in every subject matter. The control group gained only a little over two months in achievement in the four months of elapsed time."⁷

A study made by the American Association for Gifted entitled, "The Gifted Child" reveals information gathered by Dr. William P. Schwartz of the "progress made by two groups of bright children: one group taught in special classes, the other group in regular classes. The experimental group was selected from an elementary school having special classes for the gifted. The control group was chosen from two elementary schools which were carrying on an activity program from two elementary schools following a traditional program, and from two junior high schools.

The two groups, experimental and control, were equated on the following bases: grade, intelligence quotient, chronological age, sex, and socio-economic

background. At the end of a four-months' interval, the gifted group excelled consistently in all grades. This group was also superior to the control group in personality traits.⁸

This same study also gives the example of Professor Leta Stetter Hollingsworth and her work with the gifted at Public School 165 in New York City. Beginning with two original classes, the numbers have now grown to include over a thousand students now receiving an individualized program of education, geared to the needs of the gifted.

Results of her work have shown that in addition to the high academic achievement students normally gain in a gifted program usually these students "are superior in physique and physical stamina, are more pleasing in appearance than the average, are more stable emotionally, and have a low rate of juvenile misbehavior or delinquency."⁹

Another example the American study gives is the result obtained from a class for gifted studied by Marion V. Brown. In this instance, pupils stayed in the same type class situation with the same teacher "the last two years of elementary school. They were chosen on the basis of intelligence tests, school records, and teachers' recommendations. Their academic attainment was also superior. Not only had the pupils made

rapid progress, but they had enjoyed many desirable social experiences.....Moreover, these pupils read widely and participated frequently in clubs and other extracurricular activities." These are just a few of the many examples available substantiating the fact that specialized education for the gifted is most certainly worthwhile, and certainly of great benefit to the society in which they live.

A passage quoted by Milton J. Gold from the Rockefeller Special Studies Project on America at Mid-Century, succinctly sums up our American democratic values and the importance of each individual:

Every democracy must encourage high individual performance. If it does not, it closes itself off from the mainsprings of its dynamism and talent and imagination and the traditional democratic invitation to the individual to realize his fullest potentialities becomes meaningless.¹⁰

Can we then ignore the needs of this small percentage of our school population any longer? If a program could be established, how could identification of the gifted take place? Some criteria and procedures have been established by experts in the field of gifted education and are discussed in the following chapter.

CHAPTER 2

ESTABLISHING CRITERIA AND PROCEDURES FOR IDENTIFYING GIFTED STUDENTS

Introduction

1972, Prudent identification of the gifted is an absolute necessity in establishment of gifted programs. If ability of students developed simply from rich environmental exposure, identification of high potential would not be necessary. However, it has been found that this is just not the case. We realize and respect the right of all men being equal, but we cannot overlook the fact that all men may also be very different. If we fail to properly identify the potential in our young people at an early age, we are guilty of denying them their rightful opportunity to the ultimate in education. Milton J. Gold, in his book Education of the Intellectually Gifted, sums up this thought with a quote from the 1958 Rockefeller report, The Pursuit of Excellence:

....we must not make the mistake of adopting a narrow or constricting view of excellence. Our conception of excellence must enhance many kinds of achievement at many levels..... it is possible for us to cultivate the ideal of excellence while retaining the moral values of equality. 11

to the aptitudes of other children in the school to the extent that he needs and can profit from specially planned educational services beyond those normally provided by the standard school program. 11.

Criteria for IdentificationMarland Report

What criteria need be established in order to determine the capabilities of high performance? In 1972, S. P. Marland, the Commissioner of Education during the Nixon Administration, was asked by the president to investigate and determine the need for gifted education in our nation. In the resulting study, the Commission determined that potential ability of achievement in any of the following areas singly, or in combination, would be shown:

1. General intellectual ability
2. Specific academic aptitude
3. Creative or productive thinking
4. Leadership abilities
5. Physical and performing arts
6. Psychomotor abilities¹²

A brief explanation of each of these six talent areas of gifted follows:

GENERAL INTELLECTUAL ABILITY: The child possessing general intellectual ability is consistently superior to that of other children in the school to the extent that he needs and can profit from specially planned educational services beyond those normally provided by the standard school program.

SPECIFIC ACADEMIC APTITUDE: The child possessing a specific academic aptitude is that child who has an aptitude in a specific subject area that is consistently superior to the aptitudes of other children in the school to the extent that he needs and can profit from specially planned educational services beyond those normally provided by the standard school program.

CREATIVE THINKING: The creative thinking child who consistently engages in divergent thinking that results in unconventional responses to conventional tasks to the extent that he needs and can profit from specially planned educational services beyond those normally provided by the standard school program.

LEADERSHIP ABILITY: The child possessing leadership ability is that child who not only assumes leadership roles, but also is accepted by others as a leader to the extent that he needs and can profit from specially planned educational services beyond those normally provided by the standard school program.

VISUAL AND PERFORMING ARTS ABILITY: The child possessing visual and performing arts ability is that child who, by his consistently outstanding aesthetic production in graphic arts, sculpture, music or dance, needs and can profit from specially planned educational services beyond those normally provided by the standard school program.

PSYCHOMOTOR ABILITY: The child possessing psychomotor ability is that child who consistently displays mechanical skills or athletic ability so superior to that of other children in the school that he needs and can profit from specially planned educational services beyond those normally provided by the standard program.

The Marland Commission further established that a minimum of three to five percent of the school population would probably meet the above criteria.

Missouri Guidelines

Following the Marland report, in 1975 the state of Missouri established the following identification criteria as.....

Those abilities found singly or in combination in any of the following areas: leadership ability, a specific academic aptitude, visual and performing arts, and general intellectual ability or productive thinking.....

.....the total number of gifted students to be served may not exceed five percent of the enrollment for the target grade span in the schools screened for the academic program....

.....the total number of gifted students to be served in the fine arts area may not exceed two percent of the enrollment for the target grade in the schools screened for the fine arts program.¹³

Procedures for Identification: Roger Taylor

Having established criteria for identification, it is important to establish procedures for carrying through such identification of students.

Roger Taylor in his book The Gifted and the Talented gives us a listing of suggestions for possible identification procedures in the six areas:

INTELLECTUAL

Teacher recommendations
Intelligence Test Scores
Cumulative Records
Achievement Test Scores
Parent Inventory
Student Interest Inventory

ACADEMIC

Teacher recommendations
Cumulative Records
Achievement Test Scores
Parent Inventory
Student Interest Inventory
Special Achievements in Academic Area

Worksheet on Specific Academic Areas
Intelligence Test Scores

LEADERSHIP

Teacher Recommendations
Sociometric Tests
Cumulative Records
Parent Inventory
Student Interest Inventory
Anecdotal Reports

CREATIVE THINKING

Teacher Recommendations
Cumulative Records
Parent Inventory
Student Interest Inventory
Situational Tasks Creativity Test
Peer Identification
Short form of Torrance's Creativity Test
Anecdotal Reports

VISUAL AND PERFORMING ARTS

Teacher Recommendations - classroom and
special teachers
Parent Inventory
Student Interest and Value Inventory
Peer Identification

PSYCHOMOTOR

Teacher Recommendation-classroom and
special teacher
Peer Identification
Parent Inventory ¹⁴

Roger Taylor's list of possible procedures could conveniently be used in conjunction with the specific Student Selection Criteria set forth in the Missouri State Guidelines for gifted students. A detailed copy of the Screening and Evaluation Instruments and Procedures is included in the following section:

Following screening and referral, schools shall use at least three of the following four selection criteria to evaluate and select students

MISSOURI STATE-ASSISTED PROGRAM

FOR GIFTED STUDENTS

Section II - Student Selection Criteria (Screening and Evaluation Instruments and Procedures)

GUIDELINES:

The student identification process should consist of at least the following two stages: (A) screening and referral and (B) individual evaluation and selection. (See Appendix A for a flow chart on the gifted student identification process.)

A. Screening and Referral

During the screening stage, all available data on students indicating outstanding abilities are considered, and students whose abilities warrant further evaluation are identified. The school should establish group intelligence cut-off test scores of 125 and above (or 120 and above, or 115 and above) depending on the number in the school population which the district wants to include in individual assessments (Part B). The typical superior student group (115 to 125 I.Q. on group tests) may include a few gifted students who would be eliminated by an I.Q. cut-off of 125. However, most gifted students will score above 130 on individual I.Q. tests. Referrals of students (with an I.Q. above the cut-off) for individual evaluation frequently are made by the regular classroom teacher but may also be made by others familiar with the abilities and performance of the student. Referrals should be made for the purpose of gathering further information about students who exhibit outstanding abilities, not just for those who qualify with an I.Q. above the cut-off but also for those who could be more adequately tested with special instruments designed for individual use. It is suggested that at least 10% of the district population be referred for individual evaluation.

B. Individual Evaluation and Selection

Following screening and referral, schools shall use at least three of the following four selection criteria to evaluate and select students

for the gifted program. The school may determine which ones would be most appropriate for the academic or fine arts program area(s) addressed, the grade levels to be served, and the background of students in the district. The Department will furnish, upon request, names of tests and scales in each of the four categories listed below. It is expected that the use of tests and scales will differ within districts as well as between districts.

1. General Mental Ability

Scores on an individual intelligence test at or above the 95th percentile. Although they are more time consuming, individually administered intelligence tests provide more accurate indicators for final placement purposes than do group tests. However, as an alternate, two scores from group intelligence tests, both at or above the 95th percentile, may be used in lieu of the individual intelligence test score. It is important to note that 5% of the total population is at or above the 95th percentile, and further evaluations are needed to identify the gifted students in this select group. Districts with more than 5% above the 95th percentile will need to establish a cut-off percentile of 96 or 97 to identify gifted students for the state-assisted program.

2. Academic Ability

Scores on standardized achievement tests at or above the 95th percentile. The scores shall be in the subject area(s) or in the subtest area(s) most related to the design of the gifted program. (Most districts will need to establish a cut-off percentile of 96 or 97 to identify gifted students for the state-assisted program.)

3. Creativity, Reasoning and Problem-Solving Ability

Results of valid tests or other assessments indicating outstanding ability in one of the following areas: (1) creative and productive thinking, (2) advanced insight, (3) outstanding imagination, (4) innovative or creative reasoning ability, (5) advanced

perception of cause and effect relationships, (6) problem solving, or (7) abstract concepts. These areas of ability must be related to the design of the gifted program.

4. Performance

Nomination, supported by documented evidence of outstanding performance, by persons from two or more of the following groups (teachers, other school personnel, external professionals who are experts in the program area, peers, and parents) and whose evaluations are recognized by school officials. Outstanding performance in a general academic area, a fine arts area, or another area related to the design of the gifted program shall be used as a basis for nomination.¹⁵

Identification Procedures Comparison

As a comparison for Missouri guidelines, Table 4 shows a survey of twenty-four schools nationwide which indicates the most frequently used screening and measurement devices. (See Table 4)¹⁶ A study of this table shows that various achievement and intelligence tests were employed in all districts, as well as performance nomination by teachers, parents, peers, administrators, counselors or the student. However, tests of creativity were used in only one-third of the districts. In addition to those criteria, about one-third of the districts also employed the Renzulli/Hartman Behavioral Rating Scales for identification purposes. These schools use a Resource Room-Pull-Out Program, which is what the Missouri guidelines specify. No reliable conclusions can be drawn as to the most popular testing tool, as so many are not revealed.

16
 TABLE 4

IDENTIFICATION PROCEDURES FOR GIFTED CHILDREN

Resource Room Programs

SCHOOL		METHODS USED			
District City	Performance by Nomination	I.Q. Test	Group Intelligence Test	Creative Tests	Other
Glendale, AZ.	T, S, PA, PE,	x	x	x	
Littleton, CO.	T, S, PA, PE,		x		
South Windsor, CT.	T, S, PA	ITBS	CAT	x	Renz.
Wheaton, IL.	T, S, PA	Otis Lennon	Metropolitan		Renz.
Bettendorf, IA.	PA, T	S.O.I.			Renz.
Cedar Falls IA.	T, S, PA, PE	x	x	x	
Fort Madison IA.	T, S, PA	WISC-R	ITBS	TORRANCE	
W. Des Moines, IA.	T, S, PA, PE	x	x		
Olathe, KS.	T, S, PA	x	x	x	
Lake Charles, LA.	T, PA, PE	x	x	x	
Hallowell, ME.	T, S, AD	x	x		
Oxford, MA.	T, Ad, C	130+	95%ile		Renz.
Benton Harbor, MI.	T, C, AD, PA, S	x	x		
Minneapolis MN.	T	135+	95%ile		Renz.
St. Louis Park, MN.	T	x	x	x	

TABLE 4, continued

Enfield, NH	T, S	CTBS	x	Renz.
Irvington, NJ	T, PE, PA, S, C	x		
Millville, NJ		WISC-R	Stan- ford	
Northport, NY	T, PE		x	Torrance
Oceanside, NY	T, AD, PE, PA	x	x	
Putnam Valley, NY	T, PA, S	SLOSSON	x	Torrance Renz.
Cincinnati, OH.	T, S, PA, AD	x	SAT	
Paris, TX	T	x	Otis- Lennon	Renz.
Webster, TX	T	x	CAT.	Renz.

A brief explanation of some of the tests mentioned follows for informational purposes:

Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children-Revised, (WISC-R), Slosson, Otis-Lennon, Metropolitan, SAT, CAT, are all screening tools to measure intellectual abilities and general achievement.

Torrance Test of Creative Thinking: Observation of child's behavior and analyses of what they produce in order to identify creativity. For example; ability to express emotion, to improvise, role play, enjoyment of visual arts, creative movement, and music are a few.

J.S.Renzulli/R.K.Hartman: test to identify behavioral characteristics of superior students. Four categories in particular: learning, motivational, creativity and leadership characteristics.

S.O.I.: J.P. Guilford's Structure of the Intellect Model; presents a scheme and elements for either developing or presenting learning experiences; relates content to product and operations.

Of course, there are advantages and disadvantages in depending on the use of these identification procedures. Table 5, a listing of these advantages and disadvantages is utilized and made available along with Missouri literature, and makes us very aware that screening and identification cannot be taken lightly. (See Table 5 following summary).¹⁷

Summary

Identification of the gifted and the procedures used in identification are still being experimented with and questioned by educational experts in our country. However, the current pattern appears to be one which does not rely exclusively on any one approach, but to use combinations of them (i.e. performance nomination, I.Q. and achievement testing). Although there is a growing use of the new creativity and Renzulli/Hartman behavioral rating scales, Table 4 reveals that nearly 60% of the districts surveyed neglect this area of identification. This may indicate that the majority of students admitted to these programs are defined as "those children who are doing well in school, much better than their companions".¹⁸ The weakness evident in this approach lies in the fact that "many children who have a high aptitude for reasoning and conceptualization are not performing well in school.

Such a definition would then rule them out. Albert Einstein, Thomas Edison, and Winston Churchill would constitute three classic cases that would not be labeled 'gifted'¹⁹ by this type of identification.

We can see that the procedures used in identifying gifted children must be carefully analyzed with the realization that flexibility to change and possible adjustment to differences in definition must be made when the identification process is carried out if it is going to encompass those easily recognized and those not so easily recognized.

The Missouri State Manual and Guidelines for State-Assisted Programs for Gifted Students reinforces this need for careful identification:

It is important to note that differentiated educational programs for gifted students are not designed for the typical superior student (115-125 I.Q.) who is frequently an excellent scholar, can earn 'A' grades, and achieve academic honors. Gifted programs are reserved for the upper 2-3 percent of students who are as far from the superior student in potential as the superior is from the average student. The task is to identify this small percentage of students with truly outstanding potential and to provide educational opportunities which will challenge and develop fully their abilities.²⁰

TABLE 5¹⁷METHODS OF IDENTIFYING THE GIFTED

Method	Advantage	Disadvantage
TEACHER NOMINATION	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> *Provides opportunity to observe learning behaviors *Experiences familiarity in denoting characteristics of the gifted *Gives opportunity for comparison in developmental stages *Gains support from classroom teacher because of involvement 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> *Misses unmotivated, under-achievers *Misses minorities, disadvantaged, handicapped, learning disabled *Misses those with behavioral or emotional problems *May be least accurate according to research
INDIVIDUAL INTELLIGENCE TEST	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> *Identifies verbal involvement ability accurately *Samples a broader range of abilities *Controls testing conditions *Interprets potential performance 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> *Administering test is costly *Permits possibility of cultural bias *Needs trained personnel
GROUP INTELLIGENCE TEST	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> *Acts as a screening device *Identifies 50% of gifted students 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> *Existing learning problems may interfere with performance *Penalizes poor readers *Gives a ceiling too low to measure high ability *Lacks identification of underachievers
CREATIVITY TESTS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> *Assesses problem solving skills *Measures divergent production ability *Reflects wider range of abilities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> *Based strongly upon verbal skills *Establishing valid information not possible yet

TABLE 5, cont'.

PARENT NOMINATION	*Maintains close contact with child *Assesses with a greater degree of information	*Underplays and over- estimates child's accomplishments
PEER AND SELF NOMINATION	*"Takes one to know one."	*Conceals their abilities to avoid rejection *Being aware of self is lacking in young children
PROFESSIONAL BEHAVIORIAL RATING SCALES	*Identifies creative behaviors in those lacking verbal ability *Reflects personality characteristics of gifted *Indicates curiosity, openness, and inventiveness *Assesses the degree of task commitment	*Insuring uniformity of comparison is not possible
NOMINATION BY EXPERTS/MENTORS	*Makes comparison to others with similar interests	*Limited by infrequent contact with children

CHAPTER 3

BASIC COMPONENTS OF A GIFTED PROGRAM

Missouri State Guidelines

In order to establish a successful program for our gifted students, we must carefully examine and set forth some worthwhile goals for guidance.

Referring ~~once~~ again to the Missouri State Guidelines, we note some goals:

In accordance with the definition of giftedness which is set forth in the law (H.B.474) the state-approved programs for the gifted will be in the general academic areas and/or in the fine arts. It is recognized that gifted students are capable of outstanding performance in one or more academic areas and may also display outstanding ability in one or more of the fine arts. It is further recognized that outstanding intellectual, creative thinking, and reasoning abilities contribute singly and in various combinations to such performance. Consequently, school districts will need to assess a variety of student abilities and to design appropriate programs which will challenge and develop these abilities.

By law and tradition, Missouri school districts are expected to provide programs of instruction suitable for the full range of student ability, from handicapped and disadvantaged learners through those who are academically advanced.....To ensure that a gifted program does not supplant the regular program offered or expected in a school district for academically advanced students, all state-assisted gifted programs must meet the following criteria:

1. The state-assisted gifted program must consist of curricular offerings which do not replace those offered previously for academically advanced (superior) students in the school district's instructional program and which are qualitatively different from those normally expected for superior students;
2. The state-assisted gifted program shall be designed to teach content and processes which differ from regular and advanced offerings of the school district (content, methods, and objectives must be different from and beyond those offered advanced students in the regular curriculum); and
3. The state-assisted gifted program must represent an actual increase in district expenditures for instructional staff and for special materials. For example, the state-assisted gifted program shall:
 - (a) Require additional teacher assignments for the instructional time for which special state aid for the gifted program is requested; and
 - (b) Increase the school's cost beyond the cost of the regular instructional program. (This is the basic reason for requesting matching (50%) state aid.)

Any decrease in the staff employed in the school's regular instructional program (as measured by the teacher-pupil ratio) must be attributable to factors other than the state-assisted gifted program. It is the school district's responsibility to provide such an explanation.
4. Class or group sizes within the gifted program should not exceed 15 nor be less than 5, with an average of 10 students per class, for each instructional position and program component.

Possible Goals for our Local District

For a state-assisted program, it is clear that we must organize a program which does not replace those previously offered, and one which differs in content, methods and objectives. Additional instructors must be added to the staff, and class or group sizes must be limited. Further recognition is made of the need for a program which contributes toward the development of a student's critical thinking and reasoning abilities, as well as one which meets the needs of those having outstanding intellectual ability. Such a program might be geared to those particular skills and talents listed below:

1. The ability to associate and inter-relate concepts
2. The ability to evaluate facts and arguments critically
3. The ability to create new ideas and originate new lines of thought
4. The ability to reason through complex problems
5. The ability to understand other situations, other times and other people; to be less bound by one's own peculiar environmental surroundings. ²¹

If we are to accept these as reasonable goals to strive for, then we must choose with care the content of any particular program, the method of presentation of such program, and the change in learning environment

which will be necessary to fulfill such goals. James J. Gallagher presents some interesting ideas for these areas which I feel are worthy of consideration:

1. The content of the material presented to the students can be changed. Since the gifted child has demonstrated manifest ability to handle a complexity of ideas far beyond his chronological age, it is natural to assume that schools sensitive to this problem will make a genuine effort to modify the content reaching these students to stress the greater complexity and higher levels of abstraction that they can comprehend.
2. The method of presentation of material to the students can be changed. Since the process of thinking or the style in which a youngster approaches difficult problems appears important, a significant amount of attention has been given not only to what the teacher presents but how she tries to present it. The goals of the teacher of gifted students should go beyond the mere absorption of knowledge to help the child develop a learning style that will serve him or her in good stead in later studies and in later life.
3. The third major avenue of change would be to modify the nature of the learning environment itself. This means either moving the youngster to a different setting or changing the nature of the setting in which he receives his instruction. Such devices as acceleration to the next-highest grade level, or the use of open classrooms, resource rooms, after-school clubs, or special classes--all represent decisions to change the nature of the learning environment.²²

Specifically we must decide whether the program will not only meet state requirements, but will:

1. Concentrate on one grade level or all grade levels.
2. Individualize to facilitate each learner's uniqueness in development of originality, responsibility and initiative.

3. Provide a learning environment which actually will emphasize fully each of the following criteria:
 - a. general intellectual ability
 - b. specific academic abilities of synthesizing, analyzing and evaluation skills
 - c. creative thinking and problem-solving and skills of inquiry
 - d. visual and performing arts abilities
 - e. psychomotor abilities
 - f. leadership training
4. Allow for flexibility in programming to meet the special needs, interests and talents of students in the initial program, as well as for the future,
5. Provide for experiences which will promote understanding of self and others,
6. Initiate opportunities for career exploration,
7. Provide access to special learning activities beyond regularly prescribed curriculum, and
8. Provide for teachers who are:
 - a. skillful in developing independent learning activities
 - b. flexible to change
 - c. accepting of individual differences in students
 - d. capable of originality of idea, who show curiosity, and are willing to organize programs suitable to the G/T child
 - e. has the desire to work with this type of students, and is willing to accept the challenge

These are some of the first goals to consider when investigating and determining what type of program is needed for our particular district in order to achieve maximum results. Examining and observing other district programs would be helpful in this aim.

A Comparison of
Programs Nationwide

The National Association for Gifted Children published a book, Successful Programs for the Gifted and Talented, which was edited by Joyce Juntune. I have compiled a breakdown (see Table 6²³ of some of the already established programs in our nation which make use of the resource room, pull-out type program, (which of course, is required by Missouri guidelines), from the information this book offers.

A brief explanation of some of the terminology used in Table 6 follows:

THINKING: results when there is persistent effort to examine the evidence which supports any belief, solution, or conclusion which is suggested for acceptance, together with the implication and further conclusions of the evidence.²⁴

CRITICAL THINKING: defining a problem, developing a tentative answer, testing this tentative answer, developing and applying a conclusion.

CREATIVE THINKING: wondering why not, what if, just suppose, recalling past experiences, gathering facts and answers, observing the unusual and formulating original interpretations.

PROBLEM-SOLVING: defining problem, working with it, drawing a conclusion and carrying out a conclusion.

ANALYSIS: analyzing elements, relationships, and systematic arrangements.

SYNTHESIS: productive thinking; producing communication; a plan or set of operations; formulating hypotheses; reconstructing in a new pattern and producing a product that did not exist before.

23
TABLE 6

GIFTED PROGRAM COMPARISON CHART

Name of School	Grade Level Served	Hours in program (weekly)	Years Program in Operation	BASIC COMPONENTS			Evaluation Results
				Content Areas Offered	Process Emphasis (Thinking)	Resource Persons Involved	
Glendale, AZ	1-8	--	7	Ind. study (student choice) Teacher-directed	Production Critical Creative Behaviorial	-----	Students developed awareness. Teacher/parent input.
Littleton, CO	3-6	2-3 for 6 wk. block	----	Verbal/tech. curriculum activities beyond classrm.	Productive	Parents/ Mentors/ teacher/ Comm.res.	Annual subjective/ Positive.
South Windsor, CN.	4-6	2 aft.	7	Differentiated Curric.	Inquiry; investigation; Research; logic; Problem-solving; Creative; (Bloom Taylor, Williams; Renzulli, Calvin	-----	on-going; Prog.mod. Increased comm.involvement.
Wheaton, IL.	k-12	----	1	Divergent think.skill activities	Bloom Tax. thinking skills	community	In-process

31.

Lettsendorf, IA.	3-8	1-2	4	Ind.stdy. Grp.act.	Bloom Tax. Divergent Product dev.	Comm. resources	Recognized as model program in Iowa
Bedar Falls, IA.	k-6	1/2 day	---	Ind.& grp. activities	Interaction w/self-others; Dev. unique- ness	Mentors Resource people	Successful
St. Madison, IA.	2-6	--	4	Student Interests	Decision- making; Renzulli Triad	-----	Positive comm. support;no adverse affect on ach.scores
Des Moines, IA.	k-8	1/2 day twice	5	Academic curric.	Renz.Tri. Critical Creative	Mentors, Parents, Comm.	Positive
Blatne, KN.	k-12	1-3	3	Ind.stdy. Affective; Creative	Creative	Mentors, Parents; Comm.	Very positive
Snake Chas. LA.	k-12	---	7	2 curric. guidelines based on stud.interest	Awareness	-----	Students snowed sig. gain
Allowell, ME.	k-6	---	---	Academic, cultural enrich.	Creative Mechanical	Mentors Parents Comm.	Student/ teacher per- ception imp.

Oxford, MA.	4-7	1/2 day twice	5	Curric.ext. Ind.study	Renzulli Triad	Parent Comm.	Goals met Students challenged
Denton Harbor MI.	3-6	Mon- Thur.	---	Grp.dynamics Ind. project Mini-course	Creative; Logic; values; persuasion; prob.solv.	Comm. Res. people	On-going
Minneapolis, MN.	k-12	Indiv.	4	Ind.stdy. Field trips; Discuss.grp.	Decision- making	Comm.	Most Successful
Enfield, NH.	4-6	1/2 day	4	Ind.stdy. & Grp.research	Prob.-solv.	Comm.; tutors Para-prof.	----
Irvington, NJ.	k-6	Indiv.	5	Res.; investg; individualized	Renz.; explor; prob-solv.; creative	-----	Extremely Positive
Northport, NY.	k-12	***	1	Ind.study small grp.	Renz/Wms/ Bloom/Torr. Reasoning; prob-solv; creative; logic.	Mentor; Comm; par.	-----
Cincinnati, OH	5-6	---	2	Enrich. for Reading; Academic enr.	Reasoning; prob-solv; creative; logic.	-----	Very positive
Paris, TX.	4-7	1 day	5	Ind.study; Small group; One lg.grp. activities	Creative; forecasting; reasoning; planning; Decision- making.	Tutors	Sig.gains in stud. perf.

EVALUATION: making judgments based on external or internal criteria.

BLOOM'S TAXONOMY: grouped learning experience in an heirarchy from the lowest to the highest mental processes: knowledge, comprehension, application, analysis, synthesis, evaluation.

WILLIAM'S STRATEGY: a three-dimensional model for implementing cognitive-affective behavior in the classroom.

TORRANCE CREATIVE SCREENING: screens levels of creative abilities; emphasizes fluency, flexibility and originality.

RENZULLI: organized a program for gifted and enrichment which incorporates the teacher/curriculum/student in an ongoing process of study and enrichment.

As we study and analyze Table 6, we can see similar characteristics in many of the program components which are viewed as valuable to quality gifted programming.

For example:

1. Development of skills of inquiry.
2. Development of higher levels of thinking skills, as well as creative and productive thinking skills.
3. Independent activities offering freedom of choice, with community involvement.
4. Research and problem-solving skills.
5. Individualization of program for development of responsibility, awareness and the uniqueness of the individual.
6. Varied activities and differentiated curriculum.
7. Early entry into programs, as early as kindergarten in many districts.
8. Evaluation.

Resource room programs seem very successful, but there are alternatives which will be discussed in the

Alternatives and Comparisons
of Programs

Even though Missouri State Guidelines require a resource room, pull-out type program, it behooves us to at least consider alternative types of programs available. In Table 7, we see a comparison of the advantages of a resource room program as opposed to other available delivery systems.

Table 7.

A Comparison of Delivery Systems
for Gifted Programs

Type of Delivery System	Advantages
1. Regular classroom setting-regular teacher	1. Scheduling undisturbed 2. Adequate time to complete program activities 3. Avoids labeling somewhat 4. Continuous contact with regular teacher 5. No transportation costs
2. Regular classroom setting; regular teacher and educational resource teacher	1. Scheduling undisturbed 2. Adequate time to complete program activities 3. Avoids labeling somewhat 4. Continuous contact with regular teacher 5. No transportation costs 6. Program can be planned, coordinated, evaluated 7. Utilizes specially trained person in gifted education with matching state aid dollars

-
3. Resource room before/after school-Resource Room Teacher
1. Scheduling undisturbed
 3. Avoids labeling somewhat
 6. Program can be planned, coordinated, evaluated
 7. Utilizes specially trained person in gifted education with matching state aid dollars
 8. Gifted child has a peer group of similar children
 9. Gifted children can conduct small group projects and activities
 10. Program does not compete with regular program schedule
-

4. Resource Room during school-Resource Room Teacher.
6. Program can be planned, coordinated, evaluated
 7. Utilizes specially trained person in gifted education with matching state aid dollars
 8. Gifted child has a peer group of similar children
 9. Gifted children can conduct small group projects and activities
 11. Program does not compete with extra-curricular activities and transportation schedules
-

NOTE: This is the most common pattern in Missouri, due to some disadvantages encountered in the first three patterns

5. Special Class period-special class teacher
- 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11 as seen above. (Note: This pattern is most often found in the secondary school.)
-

6. Special all-day class; special class teachers	Includes 1 through 11, except for item 3, and 5. (Note: this pattern is not recommended, except for the upper one percent of students.)
--	---

7. Special school	All of the above items, 1-11 are advantages of this program.
-------------------	--

(Note: A special school for the gifted does not exist in Missouri, except for one or two private schools.)

(Note: The above table of information was obtained from a packet of material issued by the Missouri Department of Elementary & Secondary Education, Gifted Education Division.)

We have considered the identification of and procedures for identifying the gifted, program goals based on a resource room concept, and alternatives programs available to establish a quality program. However, there are other important basic program components to be considered in the development of such a program:

1. A philosophy stated by the district, objectives and needs of district
2. Is program student oriented?
3. Physical facilities and necessary transportation to implement programs
4. Special funding
5. Staffing and in-service training for entire staff
6. Community support and resources available; parental role
7. Administrative and professional staff support and involvement

8. Evaluation methods and procedures

Organizing and implementing a quality educational program for the gifted requires sufficient time for organizing and developing necessary resources for maximum implementation. "Any school district wishing to pay more than mere lip service to the national promise of providing all students with opportunity to experience quality, optimum education should study closely the admonition of noted historian Arnold Toynbee, as voiced in an article entitled, 'Is America Neglecting Her Creative Talents?':

To give a fair chance to potential creativity is a matter of life and death for any society. This is all important because the outstanding creative ability of a fairly small percentage of the population is mankind's ultimate capital asset.

Recognizing that responsibility as obligation, such a school district will provide an instructional program with special dimension for the intellectually gifted and creatively talented student, for fostering educational excellence for all certainly recognizes the right of gifted children, too, to reach their potential. Not to do so would not only break faith with America's youth, but also negate the enlightened self-interest of the nation itself." ²⁵

CHAPTER 4

ESTABLISHING A GIFTED PROGRAM

A Step-by-Step Procedure

The establishment of a gifted education program requires careful planning and organization, commitment, attention to design and thoughtful implementation with honest evaluation. In addition, there must be enthusiastic support from all personnel involved.

These are essential factors in program development. A step-by-step process for the actualization of these factors is presented below, based on the particular needs of our local school district.

In setting forth this step-by-step procedure, several leading authorities have been researched; those most prominent in the field of the gifted student. They include Dr. Roger Taylor, nationally known consultant for gifted programs, who wrote The Gifted and the Talented, Corinne P. Clendening and Ruth Ann Davies, who wrote Creating Programs for the Gifted, and Sandra Kaplan, who wrote Providing Programs for the Gifted and Talented. Their ideas and sequences of organization are adapted especially for our particular district.

Commitments

Roger Taylor sees the following commitments as vital in the development of a complete and quality program:

1. The school district must recognize that (a) gifted students are present in the school district and (b) these gifted students have special needs which are not being met by the existing educational program.
2. Selection of a Program Committee including all components of the school district; all support personnel must be aware of (a) the scope and sequence of the program and (b) the district's commitment to gifted education.
3. Teachers are simultaneously trained to not only identify but also implement programs designed to meet the identified needs of gifted students.
4. All teachers within the school district should be aware of the district's gifted program regardless of their involvement and/or commitment.
5. The school board believes in and is committed to providing support for programs to meet the special needs of gifted students. This should be in the form of a board resolution.
6. Appropriate personnel within the school district are willing to commit time and effort for pre-planning, implementation, and follow-through efforts to meet the special needs of gifted students.
7. The administration is willing to support both short and long-range goals for the proposed gifted program.
8. All personnel, including administrators, involved in developing a state funded gifted program must recognize that: (1) the program is categorical by nature, (2) the program must be directed toward a small percentage of the school population,

and (3) finally, that the program must be in compliance with the Administrative Manual and Guidelines: State Assisted Program for Gifted Students.

Sequential Planning

Once established commitments to a program have been realized, actual planning and organization must begin. In Table 8, Sandra Kaplan offers a Planning Sequence Chart which might be utilized. (See Table 8.)

Some suggestions and recommendations for the use of such a checklist follows:

STEP 1. Establish building steering committee

1. Select one person who will be a dedicated leader.
 - a. Person should be a diplomatic leader.
 - b. Person should have the time to devote.
 - c. Person would become committee chairperson.
2. Select a committee that will be representative of all areas.
 - a. Consider all departments.
 - b. Consider all grades.
 - c. Administrators and Counselors.
 - d. Consider parents now, but not for identification process.
 - e. Limit the number to those who effectually work together.

Criteria for selection of the above personnel should ideally include: interest, commitment to gifted children and willingness to devote time and energy to the project. Administrative support in freeing committee members for meeting time during school hours would be helpful.

TABLE 8.

PLANNING SEQUENCE CHECKLIST

PHASE	STEP	TASKS	STATUS		
			Organizing	in Progress	Completed
I	1.	Establish building steering committee			
	2.	Develop staff awareness			
	3.	Evaluate current building programs			
	4.	Decide scope of initial program			
	5.	Select general program framework			
II	6.	Initial identification			
	7.	Obtain formal approval and commitment			
	8.	Select parents and students for committee			
	9.	Design specific program and implement			
III	10.	Evaluation			
	11.	Ongoing identification, modification and expansion of program			

Adapted from Kaplan, Providing Programs for the Gifted and Talented, p. 17.

STEP 2. Develop staff awareness

1. Become familiar with material and resources
2. Set up in-service:
 - a. utilizing experts in the field of gifted education; i.e. Roger Taylor; Nancy Polette, Lindenwood College; Darrel Leitz, Davenport, IA schools.
 - b. outlining to staff what other schools are doing in and outside the county.
 - c. planning for key people to attend State Convention on Gifted and Talented, and other appropriate in-service activities.

STEP 3. Evaluate current building programs for needs assessment.

1. What is already being done:
 - a. opportunities for independent study
 - b. counseling
 - c. advanced placement courses
 - d. acceleration
 - e. seminars
 - f. special activities
 - g. grouping
 - h. community resources

2. What could be expanded that works for a department already?

3. Where are the weaknesses?

STEP 4. Decide scope of initial program.

1. Will the initial program concentrate on one grade level or all grade levels?
2. Will the initial program incorporate all six talent areas of
 - a. general intellectual ability
 - b. specific academic ability
 - c. creative thinking
 - d. visual and performing arts ability
 - e. psychomotor ability
 - f. leadership ability

STEP 5. Select general program framework

1. Administrative design
 - a. Resources: space/staff/time
 - b. Categories of gifted students
 - c. Numbers to be served
 - d. Grouping
 - e. Group size
 - f. Relation to regular classroom
 - g. Multiple options, such as counseling

2. Curriculum - Differentiated
 - a. Content-based on student interest/ or interdisciplinary/acceleration
 - b. Process, rather than content emphasis on higher cognitive functions: creative and critical thinking
 - c. Product-oriented, rather than consumer oriented
 - d. Use of resources beyond the classroom
 - e. Affective objectives include opportunities for creativity, independence, self-evaluation and relations with gifted peers
 - f. Learning environment supportive and shifts responsibility from teacher to students
 - g. Student evaluation is based on individual, not comparative performance; student involvement in self-evaluation
 - h. Each student's educational plan and progress is recorded
 - i. Special counseling services

3. Staff
 - a. All staff have information and training in meeting needs of gifted
 - b. Special staff for gifted have training in individualizing according to needs, interests and learning styles
 - c. Resource persons beyond the classroom available

4. Materials/Space/Transportation
 - a. Money has been budgeted for special materials
 - b. Money has been budgeted for access to facilities/persons not within the school

5. Evaluation

- a. Get assistance from research or consultant
- b. Collect and record formative data (about process and context of program)
- c. Collect data from several sources, including students
- d. Collect data on student progress
- e. Evaluate for purpose of program improvement
- f. Make recommendations for program improvement

STEP 6. Initial identification

1. Intellectual

- a. Teacher recommendations
- b. Intelligence Test Scores
- c. Cumulative records
- d. Achievement Test Scores
- e. Peer identification

2. Academic

- a. Teacher recommendations
- b. Cumulative records
- c. Achievement test scores
- d. Special achievements in academic areas
- e. Intelligence test scores
- f. Awards (Science fair, etc.) Honors

3. Leadership

- a. Teacher recommendations
- b. Sociometric tests
- c. Cumulative records
- d. Anecdotal reports
- e. Peer identification

4. Creative thinking

- a. Teacher recommendations
- b. Cumulative records
- c. Peer identification
- d. Short form of Torrance's Creativity Test
- e. Anecdotal reports

5. Visual and performing arts

- a. Teacher recommendations - classroom and special teachers
- b. Student interest and value inventory
- c. Peer identification

- d. Previous performance
 - e. Awards, honors
6. Psychomotor
- a. Teacher recommendation - classroom and special
 - b. Peer identification
 - c. Student interest inventory
 - d. Awards, honors
7. Additional Evaluation Methods
- a. Parent-Inventory (given when the student is initially accepted in the program)
 - b. Student interest inventory (given when the student is initially accepted in the program)
 - c. Renzulli Scale for Rating Behavioral Characteristics of Superior Students

When data is gathered, the following procedure for completing the identification process is suggested:

1. Screening

Compile a list of names of those students of exceptional ability in each of the six talent areas using teacher screening checklist, peer nomination checklist and student evaluation checklist.

2. Selection

Submit names to building gifted committee where selection of those students to be included in the program will be made using other identification procedures as found in chapter two of this report.

CAUTION: Although it is tempting to include large numbers of students in a gifted program, identification should be limited to only those few students possessing truly exceptional ability in one or more of the six talent areas.

STEP 7. Obtain formal approval and commitment

A final report needs to be developed stating the results of above processes for submission to the Board of Directors, and the state, if state-aid is anticipated.

STEP 8. Select parents and students for committee

Selection could be made by a survey asking the parent/student what they see as valuable in a gifted education program. This can be done through a direct question or by giving them a list of possible aspects being considered and asking for their response to them.

STEP 9. Design specific program and implement

If each of the above steps have been carefully followed, the committees should now be ready to specify the program desired for our district. Previous efforts should enable the implementation of the program to go forth effectively at this stage.

During the implementation stage, data should be gathered at regular intervals for use in the evaluation stage which follows.

STEP 10. Evaluation

Both formative and summative evaluation are important to a gifted program, the former to correct problems as they arise, the latter to enable one to take a comprehensive look at what the program has accomplished.

Both the district's total gifted program and the child's individual program need to be evaluated.

The evaluation of the program should include a review of the effectiveness of the following:

1. Identification procedures used
2. Identification measures used
3. Materials selected
4. Sequence of activities
5. Program activities
6. Student success in program
7. Program objectives

STEP 11. Ongoing identification, modification and expansion of design.

Careful analysis should be made of identification procedures and results and progress made of those identified. This should be an ongoing process with necessary modification not only in the identification process, but program design when deemed necessary. The results of these ongoing studies will give basis for expansion or modification.

Conclusion

Is a gifted program needed in the De Soto elementary School District? Of course it is. Having established a rationale and need for such a program, having set forth identification criteria and procedures, having listed the basic components of a gifted program, as well as a step-by-step process for implementation, it would seem feasible to recommend a program for gifted beginning in kindergarten and extending through the sixth grade.

Such program should utilize the regular classroom setting, incorporating cluster grouping within such setting. Assignment of such groups should be made to a self-contained class including approximately twenty other pupils in addition to the gifted cluster. Such students for this class should include intellectually gifted and highly gifted students as well as those academically talented students selected by the counselor, teachers and administrators on the basis of high group

or individual I.Q. test scores, and Stanford-Binet achievement scores. Students could be scheduled to utilize special learning centers within this environment which would include accelerated and differentiated content, stressing activities based on the higher cognitive levels of thinking, which are outside the bounds of the regular curriculum.

Extended learning activities should include field trips, use of community resources, teaching mentors and Junior Great book discussion groups to further opportunities to elaborate on the regular curriculum.

To insure that individual student needs are provided for, the program should offer some flexibility so that students can at times be allowed to schedule their own learning times to work independently, to be able to share experiences within the group, and to have individual contact with peers, teachers or mentors in order to develop interpersonal relationships.

A guide for establishing this program could be Sandra Kaplan's Handbook, entitled "Providing Programs for the Gifted and Talented", wherein she offers planning for a specialized curriculum. Such curriculum should be developed by a committee which includes at least one teacher per grade level from each elementary



school, as well as the counselors and administrators of each school. The skills of an authority in gifted education should be utilized in guiding such committee to determine goals and objectives, content and process, as well as evaluation procedures.

Teachers selected to work with the program should receive in-service training provided by the district. This could include an evening awareness meeting for both teachers, administrators and the public, to be followed by at least one week of intensive in-service workshops led by a qualified authority in gifted education. Attendance by teachers at state and national gifted conferences could further this beginning in the education of personnel. Follow-up workshops should be offered periodically by the district. Access to a qualified consultant would certainly seem worthwhile for the district to provide so that teachers may have someone to turn to for advice and consultation as needed.

Periodically, provisions for group feedback should be arranged so that teachers, administrators and counselors can reexamine the program and evaluate for improvement or change, thereby insuring that such a program for this school system would become one worthwhile of the individuals served.

FOOTNOTES

¹Bob Roach, Director of Gifted and Alternative Education, Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (Jefferson City, Mo., 1963)

²Milton J. Gold, Education of the Intellectually Gifted (Columbus: Charles E. Merrill Books, Inc., 1965) p.22.

³E. Paul Torrance, Gifted Children in the Classroom (New York: Macmillan, 1965), p.12.

⁴Robert M.W. Travers, Second Handbook on Research and Teaching, (New York: Dodd, Mead, 1970) p.97.

⁵Travers, op. cit., p. 97.

⁶James J. Gallagher, Teaching the Gifted Child (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1975), p.xiii.

⁷James J. Gallagher, Research Summary on Gifted Child Education, (Illinois: Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction, 1966), pp. 80-89.

⁸The American Association for Gifted Children, The Gifted Child, (Boston, D.C. Heath & Co. 1951) pp. 47-91

⁹AAGC, op. cit. pp. 189-190.

¹⁰Gold, op. cit., p.4.

¹¹Ibid., p.77

¹²S.P. Marland, Report on the Gifted and Talented (Washington, D.C.: The Government Printing Office, 1972), pp.1-5.

¹³Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education, Administrative Manual and Guidelines: State-Assisted Program for Gifted Students, (Jefferson City, Mo., 1982), pp. 1-5.

FOOTNOTES, continued

¹⁴Roger Taylor, The Gifted and the Talented (Englewood, CO.: Educational Consulting Associates, Inc., N.D.) p. 41

¹⁵Missouri Guidelines, op. cit., pp. 1-10

¹⁶Joyce Juntune, Successful Programs for the Gifted and Talented (Washington, D.C.: National Association for Gifted Children, 1981) pp.9-244.

¹⁷Missouri Guidelines, op.cit., pp. 3-10.

¹⁸Gallagher, op.cit., pp. 15-19

¹⁹Ibid. pp. 18-19

²⁰Missouri Guidelines, op.cit., pp. 1-10.

²¹Gallagher, op. cit., pp. 75-76.

²²Ibid., p. 72

²³Juntune, op.cit., pp. 9-240.

²⁴Gold. op. cit., pp. 185-187.

²⁵Corinne P. Clendening and Ruth Ann Davies, Creating Programs for the Gifted, (New York: R.R. Bowker Co., 1980) pp. 68-69.

Kester, Ellen S., "G.O.I.: A Qualitatively Different Program for the Gifted", G/O/I, Vol. 21, Jan./Feb., 1982.

Harland, S.F., Report on the Gifted and Talented, Washington, D.C.: The Government Printing Office, 1972.

Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education, Administrative Manual and Guidelines: State-Assisted Programs for Gifted Students, March, 1982.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- American Association for Gifted Children, The Gifted Child, Boston: D.C. Heath & Company, 1951.
- Carney, Fay, "Another Look at Triad", G/C/T, Vol. 17, March/April, 1980.
- Clendening, Corinne P. and Davies, Ruth Ann, Creating Programs for the Gifted, New York: R.R. Bowker Co., 1980.
- Coleman, Dona, "Parenting the Gifted", G/C/T, Vol. 22, March/April, 1982.
- Freehill, Maurice F., Gifted Children, New York: The Macmillan Co., 1961.
- Gallagher, James J., Teaching the Gifted Child, Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1975.
- Gold, Milton J., Education of the Intellectually Gifted, Columbus: Charles E. Merrill Books, Inc., 1965.
- Gurcsik, Bruce, "Justifying Your Program With A Diagnostic-Prescriptive Approach or S.C.I.-It Works For Us!", G/C/T, Sept./Oct., Vol. 19, 1981.
- Hall, Horton, Kershner, Savage, Readings in American Education, Chicago: Scott, Foresman & Company, 1963.
- Juntune, Joyce, Successful Programs for Gifted and Talented, Washington, D.C.: National Association for Gifted Children, 1961.
- Kaplan, Sandra N., Providing Programs for the Gifted and Talented, Reston, Va.: Council for Exceptional Children, 1975.
- Kester, Ellen S., "S.O.I.: A Qualitatively Different Program for the Gifted", G/C/T, Vol. 21, Jan./Feb., 1982.
- Marland, S.P., Report on the Gifted and Talented, Washington, D.C.: The Government Printing Office, 1972.
- Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education Administrative Manual and Guidelines: State-Assisted Programs for Gifted Students, March, 1982.

BIBLIOGRAPHY, continued

- Polette, Nancy, 3 R's For the Gifted, Littleton, Colorado: Libraries Unlimited, Inc., 1962.
- Renzulli, Joseph S., "What Makes Giftedness?", Phi Delta Kappan, 60:1:261, 1978.
- Roach, Robert, Personal Report of Number of Gifted Programs in Missouri, Department of Elementary and Secondary Education, Jefferson City, Mo.: 1963.
- Rubin, Larry, "A Search For the Unchosen Gifted and Talented", G/C/T, Vol. 19, Sept./Oct., 1981.
- Sellin, D.F. and Birch, J.W., Psychoeducational Development of Gifted and Talented Learners, Rockville: Aspen Systems Corp., 1981.
- Sisk, Dorothy, "It's a New Day For Gifted Children", G/C/T, Vol. 8, May/June, 1979.
- Taylor, Roger, The Gifted and the Talented, Englewood: Educational Consulting Associates, Inc.: N.D.
- Torrance, E. Paul, Gifted Children in the Classroom, New York: Macmillan, 1965.
- Torrance, E. Paul, "Ways Gifted Children Can Study the Future", Gifted Child Quarterly, Vol. 18, Summer, 1974.
- Travers, Robert M.W., Second Handbook on Research and Teaching, New York: Dodo, Mead, 1970.