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Across the country, budgets are tight. Parents and educators are pushing for inclusion of special education learners in regular classrooms and we are in one of our phases of vociferously decrying special services for gifted learners as antidemocratic. Thus, we are back to asking a question that is anything but new: Can the learning needs of gifted students be effectively addressed in the regular classroom?

On one hand, both experience and research suggest that few adaptations are made for advanced learners in regular classrooms (Archambault, et al., 1993; Westberg, et al., 1993), and that regular classrooms are generally less effective in enhancing achievement of gifted learners than are special schools, special classes, and pull-out services (e.g. Moon, Tomlinson, & Callahan, in press; Kulik & Kulik, 1987; Delcourt, et al., 1994). Such indicators suggest that adequately challenging gifted learners in heterogeneous, regular classrooms may be more delusion than dream.

On the other hand, the question of whether the needs of gifted learners can be met in the regular classroom really has only one acceptable answer: As long as regular classrooms are the mainstay of public education, the needs of gifted learners must be met in those classrooms. It is the case for most gifted learners that the vast majority of their schooling takes place in such settings. If their needs are inadequately addressed in those settings, then gifted learners are packed off to public schools with the adults in their lives accepting the fact that public schools will, at best, serve them well only a tiny portion of the time.

An argument for regular classroom instruction that is appropriately responsive to advanced students’ learning needs is not an argument to do away with other service options - rather it is an assertion that those

(See TOMLINSON, pg.10)
Is TAGT for Inclusion?

"Is TAGT for inclusion?" A concerned parent asked me this question at a recent meeting. She had read TAGT's 1997 legislative position statement and assumed that we were. The answer is that TAGT is neither for or against inclusion, but rather for effective programming for gifted children and youth. The facts about inclusion are these:

1. Inclusion is simply an administrative arrangement. Children of various abilities and interests are together in a common learning environment or classroom. What happens in that classroom will vary from teacher to teacher and from school to school.

2. At the elementary and, often, middle school levels, we know that most gifted learners spend the majority of their day in the regular classroom or in inclusive settings. Some may be clustered together in the regular classroom to form small interest or instructional groups while others may be pulled out of the regular classroom for one or more periods each day or, more often, less.

3. From the research we know that 84% of the activities in third and fourth grade regular classrooms are the same for all students (Westberg, Archambault, Jr., Dobyms, & Salvin, 1993). The general education curriculum does not provide for the previous mastery of content and skills, and therefore lacks challenge. Acceleration within the regular classroom often means more work instead of different work.

4. Teachers frequently do not have the strategies to adapt for a wide range of differences in the regular classroom setting. For the most part, pre-service teachers attend only one or two class sessions about gifted and talented children in their entire undergraduate program. The focus tends to be on methods for teaching various subject areas to the entire classroom, not differentiation or individualization.

(See JOHNSEN, page 4)
THE TAGT IN-DEPTH PROBE: EXPLORING

MOTIVATIONS BEHIND BEHAVIORS

Last spring TAGT commissioned an In-Depth Probe survey (IDP) as an initiative to develop new insights into the basic causes of the biases and prejudices that have plagued educational programs for gifted and talented learners since their inception.

The past several decades have seen a succession of serious efforts to improve public education for the gifted and talented. Some of these efforts have succeeded, but in general, services for gifted and talented students have been and remain the step-children of the public education system.

For reasons that have never been fully explored, there is broad resistance to the idea of providing special educational programs for children of high intellectual or creative potential - in sharp contrast to the caring attitude toward those represented in programs for other special populations of students. Except for a small percentage who have access to a few good programs, gifted and talented children are among our most underprivileged minorities.

This is regrettable in human terms, for those who withdraw into themselves, underachieve, rebel against the system, or drop out as they become frustrated in their desire to learn. The loss is even more regrettable in terms of our society, for when we lose these children, we lose tomorrow’s potential leaders and innovators.

Why does this prejudice exist? As a nation we have always approved and rewarded individuals who exhibit exceptional strength, courage, or agility in a wide range of activities. Why then do we not accept those who exhibit exceptional intelligence and talent?

TAGT’s IDP provided an opportunity to explore these and other questions relating to gifted education through a survey of individuals from five different groups who have a role in developing or supporting education for gifted and talented students. The survey sample included -

- Parents
  - of a gifted and talented child
  - whose children have not been identified for the program
- Teachers
  - who teach in a gifted and talented program
  - who are not involved in such a program
- Superintendents
- Principals
- CEOs of large corporations, or the executive responsible for educational grants

The TAGT leadership believes the results of the IDP research will enable the organization to concentrate attention on patterns of response which will:

- illuminate the nature of the biases and prejudices against education for gifted and talented students
- provide insights to strengthen TAGT public education and information programs, and
- enable TAGT to make recommendations to strengthen public education policy, practices, and programs for the gifted and talented.

At the conclusion of the IDP, a TAGT task force was established to examine data from the survey. In September, the task force submitted the following set of recommendations to the Executive Board for incorporating into the association’s Long Range and Strategic Planning process.

TAGT IDP Survey Recommendations

- Mount a broad-based/continuing information campaign aimed at parents, students, administrators, employers, and the general public. The goals will be to publicize the state definition, to show differences in terms of performance, and to emphasize the importance of services to gifted students.

(See McLendon, on page 25)
5. Grouping which provides different curricula for students with different aptitudes has a significantly positive effect on achievement. In fact, talented students from accelerated classes outperform nonaccelerated of the same age and ability by almost one full year on standardized achievement tests (Kulik & Kulik, 1984).

Given these facts, TAGT’s developed a legislative position statement which reads, “...Teachers selected to facilitate the education of g/t students in inclusionary settings must have an interest in this special population and a willingness to adapt instruction to meet individual differences. The inclusion teacher must be trained in the areas defined in state law and must receive support from a specialist endorsed in gifted education who will assist in making the following classroom modifications: flexible pacing, acceleration, independent study and research, mentoring, enrichment, and differentiation of curriculum that involves more depth and complexity in content, process, and product. TAGT believes strongly that gifted students must have opportunities to interact with other gifted students outside the general education classroom on a daily basis” (TAGT, 1996).

If regular education classroom teachers are able to make modifications for gifted learners, then the gifted learner will benefit from a full day of programming that meets their specific interests and abilities. In these cases, inclusion will work as long as gifted learners can interact daily with one another during planned periods of time. However, if regular education classroom teachers don’t make modifications, then inclusionary settings are really not a viable option. Unfortunately, in these cases, the gifted learner is often provided services for only a limited amount of time during the day or week. In all situations, collaboration between regular education teachers and teachers who specialize in gifted education is essential to the design of a full day of effective programming for the gifted learner.

Professional development is the key to this successful programming for gifted students wherever they may find themselves—in or outside the regular classroom. This training must include not only teachers but also administrators, boards of education, counselors, psychologists, and other specialists who either make decisions or interact with gifted students.

The question is, what kind of professional development should be provided? For the past three years, Baylor University and Texas A&M directed a Javits grant from the U. S. Office of Education that focused on training teachers to work with gifted students in the regular classroom. Our grant addressed four major questions: What should be included in the training curriculum? Who should be trained and when? How might the grant support the teachers in making changes in their classroom? What effect do these changes have on the students?

After reviewing the literature we decided to design the curriculum around four areas of learner differences: content, rate, preference, and environment. A classroom that has the greatest ability to adapt to a wide range of differences would (a) match the curriculum to a student’s interests and abilities (i.e., content), (b) provide the time needed to learn the content (i.e., rate), (c) provide choices to the student in learning the content (i.e., preference), and (d) organize the classroom so that students could learn independently or in small groups, inside or outside the classroom (i.e., environment). We then developed units that correlated to each of these areas. (These units are described on pages 18-20 in this issue of Tempo.) The training itself simulated an individualized classroom in which teachers were able to select the units that related to the area(s) that they wanted to change.

Because we knew how important the principal and the community were in supporting teachers and providing resources to help the change process, these groups were trained first. We added a mentor teacher to this support team who could organize meetings with the other six teachers, who could network with other schools who were involved in the project, and who would be on-call to assist teachers in reaching their change goals. Along with the grant staff, this local support team provided the necessary infrastructure to encourage and sustain the often-times fragile nature of transformations that were occurring in individual classrooms.

Reviewing the substantial number of changes that occurred across schools and within individual classrooms (e.g. 162 of 165 teachers made changes), we have made some preliminary observations about the forces that influence teachers’ decisions in changing their instructional practices. First, teachers were able to select the change goals that they wanted to achieve. Some were very small (e.g., adding a center that provided more choices) while others were transformational (e.g., allowing students to accelerate into higher grade level materials). Second, when the teachers participated in the training, they personally
experienced the effects of a classroom that adapted to their differences. This experience provided the early vision and the initiative to begin. As one teacher explained, “I finally have the hangar that I needed to put my dress together.” Third, the teachers received follow-up and developed a support network at their campus, from the grant staff, and from other schools. The mentor met with the project teachers on a regular basis and identified or developed resources that might be needed. Schools visited other schools and shared ideas at weekend retreats. The principal was a key player, supporting either directly or indirectly the number and kinds of changes that were made in the school.

Our initial analyses of data reveal that classroom changes in rate (e.g., allowing students to progress at their own pace) and in content (e.g., interdisciplinary curriculum) relate to increased student achievement scores in reading and in math. Conversations with gifted children in grant classrooms revealed their appreciation of individualization (Davalos, 1996). Scott, one of the students, wrote a paper about schools in the twenty-first century: “They are doing different projects for different subjects at different times so they can have fun while they learn... They are allowed to go on to any grade they are comfortable with so they can be in a class that will not bore them so they can learn at their own rate of learning... Students attend classes according to their intellectual strengths or weaknesses” (p. 81). Alison, another gifted child, “talked about enjoying projects that were ‘realistic’ in nature, such as taking the perspective of a geologist in studying caves. Her disgust about having to do worksheets in earlier grades was expressed strongly” (p. 82). However, not all classrooms were able to achieve Scott’s vision or provide more authentic types of research. With only two years of implementation, teachers experienced varying degrees of success in adapting for individual differences. These kinds of changes require focused goals, expertise, perseverance, support, and time.

At TAGT we are aware of the challenges that teachers face when moving from subject- to learner-centered curriculum. While possible, managing for learner differences is not an easy task. Schools that move toward inclusionary administrative arrangements must provide the staff development that will assist teachers in individualizing and adapting for gifted learners. Yes, Scott and Alison, you can be certain that TAGT will advocate for you and for the best education for gifted children during the upcoming legislative session.
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As I travel around the country presenting workshops on how to teach gifted students in the regular classroom, I am impressed by the variety of teaching styles represented in the audience. There are places where school reform and restructuring have taken root and where teaching and learning are totally transformed from traditional methods into state-of-the-art experiences in which students are engaged in authentic learning tasks, fully and actively engaged in constructing knowledge. There are places where more traditional teaching is effective; where students are expected to learn a prescribed curriculum in mostly teacher-directed ways. There are places where cooperative learning groups work on knowledge and comprehension activities, and places where such groups work on analyzing, evaluating and synthesizing challenging, open-ended data. There are classrooms in which student interest is incorporated into learning activities, and classrooms in which hard-working teachers strive to make prescribed curriculum as interesting as possible. There are places where experimentation and change are welcome; others in which such exercises are viewed with suspicion and resistance by some community members. And in all these places, and all these classrooms, there are gifted students trying to realize the promise of American education: for all students to learn to their highest potential and to become effective and productive citizens of the 21st century.

Many districts that support the principle of heterogeneous grouping communicate expectations that makes teachers they are to teach a “one size fits all” curriculum. Somehow a belief that has accompanied the return of all atypical learners to regular classrooms is that all students should work together as one large group as often as possible. New curriculum that place teachers in a more direct teaching role also tend to lead to expectations that class members work as one unit. Regrouping for instruction, even informally, may be perceived as incompatible with current educational ideals.

As Jim DeLisle (1995) has pointed out, all young people deserve to feel proud of who they are and to be validated that they do not need to change to be an accepted member of their classroom and student body. Theodore Sizer (1984) reminds us that students being different may be inconvenient, but it is inescapable. He tells us that adjusting to those differences is the inevitable price of productivity, high standards, and fairness to students.

Educators seem comfortable with the idea of adjusting the curriculum to help students with learning difficulties, but often are not as comfortable offering similar adjustments for their most capable students. The mistaken belief here is if the student is getting high grades, no differentiation is needed. Practices which send direct or subtle messages to kids that being the same as everyone else is the desired goal can create underachievement patterns in highly capable learners.

Differentiation Guidelines

This article describes several guidelines teachers should follow as they determine if their most capable academic learners are indeed being challenged by whatever teaching style is being utilized. The guidelines are generic; they are applicable regardless of the curriculum and teaching styles.

Pre-Assessment

All learning activities, including thematic, interdisciplinary units, should have pre-assessment opportunities available for students who volunteer to demonstrate prior knowledge and mastery of concepts, ideas and skills. Whatever method you have planned for assessing student progress during or at the end of a particular unit of study is the same method you can use for pre-assessment.

Whether the pre-assessment takes the form of a written test, measuring student response as the class brainstorms all they know about an upcoming topic, or performance on a designated task, teachers must realize that what has been planned as suitable for students who are learning at a level commensurate with their age cannot be equally appropriate for students who learn at levels 2-3 years beyond their chronological age. Approaches like “Mastery Learning” do not typically include a pre-assessment opportunity, causing gifted students to have to wait until the first teaching and learning steps are complete before they can indicate their level of mastery.
The pre-assessment is one step in what is called “compacting,” which means finding ways for gifted students to spend less time with the curriculum designed for age peers. Many sources exist to help you practice compacting painlessly and effectively (Reis, Burns, and Renzulli, 1992; Starko, 1986; Winebrenner, 1992). When you compact, you also plan differentiated activities for gifted students to work on instead of that part of the regular curriculum they have already mastered. When compacting and differentiation opportunities are regularly present, your most capable learners can enjoy the wonderful experience of learning new content as well as learning how to learn.

Planning

Plan differentiation options during the same time you are designing the learning activities for all students. I truly believe when you're prepared, you're not scared! Many teachers resist the notion of compacting and differentiation because they fear it will just create a lot more work for themselves.

Whether you plan regularly with other teachers such as during team planning time, or create most of your learning activities yourself, you will find the prospect of some kids needing differentiation much less terrifying if the differentiated activities are ready before you begin your teaching of the new content.

Even if no students qualify for compacting and differentiation at the beginning of the unit, you will observe some students who “finish early” by demonstrating mastery of concepts ahead of others and who would welcome being able to move on to other activities. Such activities should not be designated “extra credit” since they should replace activities students have demonstrated they do not need to do.

If you are concerned that no students will become eligible for compacting, remember that the activities you’ve planned could be used as culminating activities or to provide some variety the next time you teach the same content. Resources to help you plan differentiated activities include materials by Beecher (1995), Fogarty (1991), Kaplan (1986), and Winebrenner (1992).

I’ve recently developed a format (Figures 1 and 2) that many teachers find helpful in planning the differentiated tasks. Regardless of one’s “teaching style,” the method appears to be flexible enough to be used comfortably.

Products

Gifted students often “get hooked” on certain topics, and become very frustrated when arbitrary time constraints force them to move on to other topics before they are ready. Therefore, you are encouraged to provide adequate time both for the careful selection of a topic that is likely to keep a student interested, and for adequate time to work on the related project. The Log (Figure 2) may also be used for students to keep track of their daily progress on their project.

Avoid requiring written products, since writing slows down the fluent thinking of some students. Always offer a menu of ways in which information may be shared, such as those found in the Tic-Tac-Toe Menu (Figure 1).

Personal Research

Allow students to work on topics in which they are passionately interested during school time, whether or not they are actually connected to the designated curriculum. Many gifted students conduct research and create projects during the time they spend at home, and might be willing to spend time at school working on these ideas. It’s perfectly “legal” for them to do this, since they will have demonstrated that they have attained mastery of some of the grade-level curriculum, thus being able to “perform” well on state or local assessments. Try not to become overly involved in evaluating these projects, since that might cause the student to decide to return the project to home to only work on it there. If students do not have such a project in process, or are unwilling to work on it at school, help them identify a topic in which they are interested and work on it during the time they do not have to work on the “regular curriculum.”

Work Groups

It’s important to allow kids who qualify for differentiation to work together on the differentiated tasks. When groups are formed of students working on similar differentiated tasks, such grouping seems natural to other students in the class. For high self esteem to accompany learning experiences, students must be able to “be themselves.” Very few students would really choose to work alone, separated from other students. Allowing students to work together on similar activities allows them to continue to feel like they “belong” even if their work is differentiated.
Standard: The learner will be able to identify and describe the parts of designated types of cells.

Pre-Assessment:
If the learner can:
• Sketch and identify parts of a designated type of cell
• Demonstrate how a living thing is made of cells
• Draw and describe a cell membrane
• Compare and contrast two types of cells
• Sketch cell division as it appears under a microscope

THE LEARNER CAN SPEND REGULAR CLASS TIME WORKING ON SELECTED OPTIONS FROM THE FOLLOWING MENU. The Learner will keep a record of the work that is done each day on the log that is provided.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESEARCH</th>
<th>CREATE A VISUAL</th>
<th>INVESTIGATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a disease that comes from out-of-control cell division.</td>
<td>to illustrate the principles involved in heredity.</td>
<td>how gene therapy is helping to fight disease.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HYPOTHESIZE</td>
<td>READ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>how such division could be brought under control.</td>
<td>about possible abuse of scientific ability to control heredity.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INVESTIGATE</th>
<th>STUDENT'S CHOICE</th>
<th>STUDY</th>
<th>RESEARCH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>another topic with the word “cell” included: cellular phones, cellulite, prison cells, etc.</td>
<td>STUDENT'S CHOICE</td>
<td>a related field: cytology, histology, biochemistry, etc.</td>
<td>STUDY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STUDY</td>
<td>RESEARCH</td>
<td>TEACH</td>
<td>STUDY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cell division and find a way to illustrate or demonstrate it for other students.</td>
<td>several cases of multiple births and relate how cells produce this phenomena.</td>
<td>a mini-lesson about it to the class.</td>
<td>STUDY</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1. Tic-Tac-Toe Menu
Cell Structure Example

Evaluation

All students deserve to know what criteria will be used in evaluating their work. Students with perfectionistic tendencies are especially grateful for such guidelines. The Product Guides that have been developed by John Samara are especially helpful for this step.

When students are able to demonstrate previous mastery of a unit of work, they should earn mastery credit for that unit at the time of the pre-assessment. When students are working on differentiated tasks that replace the “regular work”, they should be able to earn equivalent credit for the differentiated work.

Be certain that evaluation guidelines are worked out ahead of the time the students begin the actual work. If your students earn letter grades, the alternate work guidelines should be constructed so that A’s or B’s can be earned. If your students’ work is evaluated in ways that do not lead to letter grades, find ways for them to earn equal credit for their differentiated work.

Conclusion

All students have a right to learn challenging material every day they are in school. In order to provide challenging learning opportunities for students whose learning abilities exceed those expected of students their age, compacting and differentiation opportunities must be planned simultaneously with regular curriculum planning and offered routinely to students who need them.
Students keep track of their daily progress on their extension projects by using this log:

**LOG OF DAILY PROGRESS ON EXTENSION PROJECT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>PROJECT TOPIC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DATE</td>
<td>ACTIVITY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLANNED</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

© Winebrenner

---

**Figure 2.**

Example of Daily Log
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settings in which gifted students invest most of their school years cannot function with the assumption that "somebody down the hall" takes care of the learning needs of these atypical youngsters. Thus, if it appears visionary to push for teaching gifted learners (as well as other academically diverse learners) appropriately in the regular classroom, I would argue that it is an imperative vision. Public schools cannot thrive unless they belong enthusiastically to all students who enter them and gifted learners cannot thrive unless developing their talent is a full-time proposition.

What is a Differentiated Classroom?

"Differentiated instruction" is a current term for what many excellent teachers have known for decades in this country. Students are not all alike. They differ in readiness, interest, and learning profile, even when similar in chronological age. Shoot-to-the-middle teaching ignores essential learning needs of significant numbers of struggling and advanced learners. To challenge the full range of learners appropriately requires that a teacher modify or "differentiate" instruction in response to the varying needs of varying students in a given classroom.

A "differentiated" classroom is one in which a teacher provides a variety of avenues to content (what is taught), process (activities through which students come to understand what is taught), and products (how a student shows and extends what he or she has learned) in response to the readiness levels, interests, and learning profiles of the full range of academic diversity in the classroom (Tomlinson, 1995a).

For gifted learners, an appropriately differentiated classroom will provide materials, activities, projects or products, homework, and assessments that are complex enough, abstract enough, open-ended enough, and multifaceted enough to cause gifted students to stretch in knowledge, thinking, and production. These classrooms provide consistent expectations for gifted students to work with fuzzy problems, make great mental leaps, and grow in ability to exercise independence (Tomlinson, in press).

Characteristics of a Differentiated Classroom?

Among characteristics of a classroom likely to be responsive to the needs of gifted (and other academically diverse students) are the following:

- Teacher sensitivity to the varying needs of learners
- On-going assessment of student progress and modification of instruction based on assessment data
- Multiple learning options at a given time on many occasions
- Variable pacing
- Respectful (interesting, important) tasks for all learners
- Use of flexible grouping (balancing like-readiness grouping, mixed-readiness grouping, grouping by interest, random grouping, whole class instruction, and individual/independent work)
- Teacher use of a variety of instructional strategies (learning contracts, compacting, group investigation, complex instruction, interest centers, learning centers, tiered lessons, tiered products, graduated rubrics) that invite varying students to learn in a variety of ways
- Varied modes of assessment likely to give students maximum opportunity to demonstrate knowledge, understanding, and skill; and
- Grading based, at least in significant measure, on student growth rather than in comparison to one another or to an absolute scale (Tomlinson, 1995a).

These sorts of classrooms are likely to be positive for gifted learners because they accept who these learners are, reflect an awareness of the specific achievement level of the learner at any given time, and provide learning opportunities that match the child's own achievement level and interests. In addition, these classrooms allow a gifted student to work at an accelerated pace, or slow down when appropriate for in-depth study. The teachers in these classrooms ensure that tasks of gifted learners don't "stick out," appearing to be abnormal. They provide a range of learning modes, ensure opportunity to work with a full range of students - including peers with similar readiness level and similar interests - and help gifted students strive for authentic personal excellence rather than allowing them to crouch under ceilings of expectation that are too low for their learning capacities.

What Supports Development of Effectively Differentiated Classrooms?

All schools and teachers differ. There is no one-size-fits-all formula for meeting the needs of aca-
demicly diverse populations in regular classroom
any more than there is a one-size-fits-all approach to

teaching gifted learners. It is important to under-
stand that teachers have special preferences,
strengths, and weaknesses as individuals, just as
their individual students do. Nonetheless, there are
several factors likely to promote effectively differen-
tiated instruction in regular classrooms (Tomlinson,
1995b; Scruggs & Mastropieri, 1996).

A rationale for providing differentiated in-
struction

Most classrooms employ single-size instruction. Thus, moving toward differentiated instruction
requires considerable change on the part of teachers. Changing habits or patterns of teaching in busy and
pressure-laden classrooms is difficult and stressful.

Teachers who are helped to understand specific
benefits to students and to themselves of differenti-
ated instruction may be more willing to risk the
change than those who are not assisted in developing
a solid rationale for change, or those who are man-
dated to change rather than assisted in doing so.

Teacher training and support in learning to
derdifferentiate instruction

Teachers may need help in shifting their role
from “teller” to facilitator, learning to manage multi-
group, multi-task classrooms, learning to plan
appropriately responsive lessons, dealing with issues
like fairness and grading, developing skill and
comfort with a range of instructional strategies that
facilitate differentiation, relating other school
initiatives to principles and practices of differentia-
tion, and so on. Not only does such learning require
long-term, in-depth direct staff development, but it
also calls for on-going conversation with colleagues,
and in-classroom coaching for transfer of principles
into active and appropriate classroom practice. One-
shot staff development sessions, lack of sustained
focus on the topic, and exhortation without attach-
ment to the classroom will greatly decrease the odds
of developing a staff skilled and comfortable with
providing appropriate instruction for gifted (or other
academically diverse) learners in the regular class-
room.

Assistance in establishing appropriate goals
and timelines

When introduced to principles of differentiated
regular classrooms, it is easy for teachers with high
self-expectations to feel a sense of urgency in modify-
ing their classroom practices to address diverse
learner needs. Attempting to do too much too fast
leads to frustration and exhaustion, if not failure.

These teachers need instructional leaders who
courage them to pace themselves in the change
process - to set and achieve manageable goals. Other
teachers may find it difficult to begin making class-
room modifications. An “I already do that,” or “next
year will be easier” stance calls for instructional
leaders who prompt teachers to take first steps,
monitor their progress in doing so, and acknowledge
progress when it is made. Like good teachers, effec-
tive instructional leaders create environments that
balance high expectations, safety, and support. They
do this in response to the differing readiness levels,
interests, and learning profiles of their learners,
who, in this case, are teachers.

Personnel support in the form of specialists

Use of gifted education, special education, and
compensatory resource teachers working as a team
with classroom teachers provides multiple minds and
many pairs of hands to develop and facilitate appro-
priately responsive regular classroom instruction.

These teams should not be ones of ownership (that
is, the gifted education specialist only working with
students identified as gifted, the special education
resource teacher only working with identified special
education students, or the regular classroom teacher
focusing on the “typical” students), but rather a team
of educators with a common goal of developing
alternative ways of challenging a diverse group of
learners in whom all of the adults have a stake.
Library/media specialists and computer/technology
specialists can also play potentially powerful roles as
team members in establishing differentiated class-
rooms.

Time for learning and planning

Teachers cannot reasonably be expected to
develop new ways of thinking about classrooms, new
approaches to curriculum and instruction, and new
management and reporting routines without time for
thinking, planning, collaborating, and evaluating
progress. Said another way, asking teachers to
reconceive their teaching without providing release
time to do so is equivalent to asking someone to
sketch the design for a skyscraper while juggling
chain saws.

Diversified materials

Teachers who have only one textbook for all
students in a given subject, who are limited in access
to supplementary print and computer resources, or
who have little chance to tap into volunteer and
community resources are far more constrained in
providing instruction matched to students’ readiness
levels, interests and learning profiles than are
teachers supported in gaining access to varied
materials and resources. This statement is not the
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equivalent of a mandate for big spending. In fact, many teachers allowed to earmark existing funds in new ways and those supported in gaining access to volunteers would likely be far more creative in adapting instruction for diverse learners than they are able to be with predetermined lots of prescribed materials.

**Supportive policies**

Teachers are often pulled in multiple directions by mandates, initiatives, and policies that are diametrically opposed. It is difficult to expect a teacher to create responsive regular classrooms when the policy message is clear that the worth of the teacher and her students will be judged by a single, standardized test. It is futile to hope for appropriately advanced learning for gifted students when test-driven curricula are rooted in fact or skills level goals.

It is foolish to hope a teacher will become more sensitive to the needs of students when that teacher is expected to follow a rigid curriculum guide in a relatively lockstep fashion. It is largely pointless to push for differentiated regular classrooms while simultaneously increasing rather than decreasing class sizes. And differentiated instruction is made more difficult by school schedules that carve time into small blocks that cannot be restructured as needed by the regular classroom teacher.

**Why Work for Differentiated Regular Classes?**

If creating regular classrooms that are appropriately responsive to gifted (and other academically diverse learners) is so difficult, we might logically ask, "Why bother? Why not just scramble for that hour a week or maybe even hour a day when advanced learners' needs are addressed outside the regular classroom?"

When Christopher was five, he could add and subtract multi-digit numbers with ease. He could tell time without pause. He could make change with precision. It was May before his kindergarten teacher introduced the notion that numbers are read from left to right on the page. In first grade, Christopher was hungry to read real books, but he spent the year "learning" vowels, consonants, and how to make words. In second grade, he wanted to know about black holes. His teacher gave him a book on the subject, but it left Christopher with many unanswered questions, so he asked for other books. His teacher told him there were none.

In third grade, his standardized math scores in the spring were so high, that his teacher suggested he might enjoy going to fourth grade math class for the last month of school - but noted that even if he could do the fourth grade math, he'd have to repeat it next year. There were no provisions for acceleration, in or out of grade level.

A strong pull-out program may well generate moments of mental energy in Christopher's otherwise inert school experience. For that reason, it is valuable. It is not, however, an acceptable substitute for four years - each 180 days long, each day six or seven hours in duration.

Christopher is real. So is the problem. Many things that are important are difficult to come by. Well differentiated classrooms are relatively scarce - and inestimably valuable - and unquestionably worth the effort to support and expand.
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Within regular classroom settings, teachers can challenge gifted and talented children, meet the needs of students with special abilities and interests, and improve the quality of education for all children. They accomplish this by using differentiated or modified curriculum and individualized approaches to teaching. In these classes children have the opportunity to raise their level of thinking and creativity. This is not an easy task, but it has proven to be necessary in many schools.

The process of differentiating or modifying the curriculum is multidimensional. When this responsibility is given to the regular classroom teacher, the differentiated curriculum needs to be qualitatively different than the regular curriculum and not merely more work for the student. Three aspects of the regular curriculum that can be modified are: a) the content of the material, b) the method of presentation, and c) the nature of the learning environment (Maker 1982).

The students in my regular primary classrooms in the past five years, have experienced a variety of modifications in the content and presentation of material, and in the learning environment. Students' abilities and interests drive the need for modifications in the curriculum each year. Several methods of differentiation and individualization have evolved from my on-going search for new ideas and materials, and have been made possible due to the support and collaboration from teachers and administrators.

In addition to the traditional pull-out program for the gifted and talented students, the need for grouping gifted students for additional learning experiences with their gifted peers has proven necessary. As stated by VanTassel-Baska (1992), “Grouping of the gifted should be viewed as a fundamental approach to serving them appropriately rather than merely as an organizational arrangement.” Gifted students benefit from and can be challenged by experiences with other students who possess advanced abilities, similar interests and higher levels of thinking and creative productivity.

In one school setting the identified gifted and talented students from each first grade classroom met with one teacher, once a week. During this time the students were involved in enrichment activities which required higher order thinking skills, the development of independent research skills, and a more in-depth study of certain themes or topics from the regular curriculum. While the teacher’s other students were distributed among the other classes for tutoring and enrichment activities, the gifted and talented students were provided opportunities to work together in a small group setting with attention focused on their special needs and interests. The students developed logical and deductive thinking skills through mathematical problem-solving activities. They set up and conducted experiments, providing hands-on experience in discovery learning and scientific methods of exploration. Literature studies provided a springboard for activities involving higher-level thinking strategies and creative expression. For example, after reading a book, the students analyzed how a character in the story might have a different point of view and might tell the story differently. Then they created and acted out the new version of the story. Such activities stemmed from literature used in the regular curriculum as well as more advanced reading materials.

Additionally, the gifted students' individual interests and abilities were addressed through the assignment of independent research projects in which they learned skills and methods for researching a topic of their choice. After becoming an “expert” on a topic, a student created a product to assist in their presentation of what they had learned. Products may have included a poster with a summary of information and illustrations, a student-authored booklet, a slide or video presentation, a graph of data, maps, an art project, dramatization, or any other creative idea selected by the student. A video tape of the presentation could be included in the student’s portfolio.

Through teacher collaboration and support, such a grouping can produce successful learning experiences for the gifted students. Each teacher in the grade level may take the responsibility for teaching the gifted group on a rotating basis, bringing more ideas and variety to the development of activities. However, our projects were often on-going and
required extended periods of time for completion. Therefore, the responsibility of challenging the gifted students may need to remain with one teacher. As emphasized by VanTassel-Baska (1992), “Gifted learners should have the opportunity to interact with others at their instructional level in all relevant core areas of learning in the school curriculum.” This type of small group setting and time allotment allowed the gifted students to work in a variety of subject areas with other gifted students, in an accepting and challenging environment.

While gifted and talented students are included in the regular classroom setting, however, they are still in need of a more challenging curriculum. Individual challenges and opportunities for creative expression and productivity are provided through higher-level challenges in thinking, open-ended questioning techniques and individualized homework assignments. In addition to these modifications, students are given many choices about what and how they learn, making the curriculum more dynamic in nature.

In order to create opportunities for higher-level thinking, Bloom’s Taxonomy of thinking skills is taught, involving the students in activities which utilize each type of thinking strategy. The vocabulary of Bloom’s Taxonomy (knowledge, comprehension, application, analysis, synthesis and evaluation) is displayed in the room, taught to the students and referred to often. The students learn to identify each level of thinking in the learning activities throughout the integrated curriculum.

Questioning techniques also help provide a more challenging and motivating environment. Open-ended questioning encourages more creativity and higher levels of thinking. Through awareness and fine tuning of questioning techniques, the teacher can individualize the challenges in learning by tapping into a student’s special abilities and interests. Additionally, encouraging students to ask questions promotes the development of more complex thinking strategies. My students become accustomed to being responsible for developing questions. For example, when they collect and compile data to construct a graph, they create questions to correlate to the information on the graph. The importance of developing questioning skill is stressed by Johnson (1990) when she states that, “One of the greatest bridges in preparation for the squiggles in life is differentiated questioning skills. It is an important learning tool that stimulates high-level thinking and strengthens self concept.”

Individualizing homework assignments has provided a means by which gifted students can experience more challenging extensions to their learning. By purchasing, creating and utilizing materials which promote problem solving and deductive reasoning strategies, the more advanced students are presented with challenges better geared toward their ability level, through their homework assignments. In addition, the students who need remedial work or additional practice are also given more appropriate homework assignments. Providing choices in projects that are assigned can also help differentiate according to interest and ability level. For instance, a home project assignment may include a list of activities from which to choose that involve an increasing degree of difficulty or higher levels of thinking. Also, students are encouraged, and provided with resources, to perform independent study in their own interest areas. Matching homework assignments more closely to abilities and interests provides more meaningful and motivating learning experiences for the individual student.

Within the core subject areas of the regular curriculum, gifted students are presented a variety of modifications and choices. Enrichment activities are integrated into the regular curriculum providing experience in hands-on, problem-solving activities which promote student thinking beyond the basic skills required of most math and science programs. Centers and board games are used to challenge mathematically gifted students in application and acquisition of problem-solving skills. Computer programs can also provide a format for students to experience individualized challenges in math. Logic puzzles integrated into the various themes or topics of the regular curriculum, challenge students in deductive thinking processes. They learn to analyze clues and use a grid to record their conclusions. Also, they become involved in applying their knowledge of certain topics, or researching new topics in order to use the information in creating their own logic puzzles.

Acceleration to the next grade level for math may also prove necessary for students who are mathematically advanced. Scheduling for a student or students to leave the regular classroom and enter a classroom at the next grade level can be difficult. However, when a teacher is willing to work with gifted students, it can be a successful experience. One of my gifted first grade students who attended a second grade math class, was not only exposed to the second grade math curriculum, but also experienced individualized challenges created for his special
abilities. This individualization of the upper grade content is essential as Schiever and Maker (1991) explain, "Acceleration as a service-delivery model fails to provide a differentiated curriculum for gifted learners. Students receive instruction...designed for average students who are older than the gifted student, but the curriculum is not changed to match the needs of the gifted." In this instance, the second grade teacher was willing to customize and differentiate the math curriculum according to the accelerated student’s special ability.

Gifted students who demonstrate interest and advanced ability in reading should be provided a variety of choices in reading material as well as opportunity to read at a challenging level. Providing literature in the classroom at higher levels such as chapter books, science and math related literature, and biographies, enables gifted students to explore topics according to their interests. Sets of books are used in my classroom for all students to read literature related to the unit themes or topics being explored. This exposes children to a variety of genre and reading levels. Additionally, time for choosing and reading books is provided in the classroom daily.

My students are also involved in daily writing activities including the creation of their own books. This allows students to express themselves creatively at their individual ability levels. The children are taught writing processes and editing skills, and produce individual books as well as class books. Again, providing choices and an open-ended format aids in the individualization of the curriculum according to student ability and interest.

Incorporating activities into the regular curriculum which provide for higher levels of thinking and are designed according to the needs, interests and abilities of individual students, is an on-going challenge for the regular classroom teacher. However, the endeavor of redesigning the regular curriculum and modifying teaching methods in order to address the needs of the gifted students, has proven to be a beneficial one for all students. By creating an atmosphere where students take ownership for their thinking and learning, are challenged at and beyond their individual ability levels, and are encouraged to express themselves creatively, all students are being provided a more enriched learning experience.
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REVISED: TEACHING GIFTED IN THE REGULAR CLASSROOM

**Student Created Learning Centers: A Tool for Self-Directed Learning**

Jeanie Goertz
University of Texas-Pan American

Providing educational services for the gifted in the regular classroom is difficult, so teachers are now looking for useful tools that address educational opportunities for gifted students in such a setting. Teachers who participate in the curriculum course for the gifted at the University of Texas Pan-American find that a learning center is just such a tool. Each teacher guides gifted students in creating their own learning centers about topics that interest them. The traditional learning center is usually either prepackaged with activity cards and worksheets or is teacher-created when students complete prescribed content-based activities. Through the learning center approach small groups of gifted students create centers based on topics that they want to study. Students who did not find a common interest with others in their class create a center independently. The centers focus on content of interest to the students. Some student selected topics include hurricanes, whales, mythology, genetic engineering, and world conflicts. In the process of creating the centers the teachers serve as facilitators for the students' exploration and investigation.

E. Paul Torrance (1967) recommends that gifted students be given the opportunity to learn what they want to learn instead of what they have to learn. Teachers observe that students given the opportunity to select a topic to study become excited and “fall in love” with their topics. These topics go beyond the level of interests and become “passions.” They become enthralled with their content areas and spend hours, days, weeks, and possibly years pursuing knowledge in these areas. “True motivation comes when we nurture learners to pursue what they love. As adults, we are free to do this on an on-going basis, but as children, and youth, ‘passion learning’ usually takes place out of the school environment instead of the regular classroom” (Goertz & Betts, 1994, p.8).

Teachers report that these learning centers are exciting ways to promote independent thought and action in the regular classroom. The gifted students utilize the center as a creative base to organize information on a topic of interest as well as a display for completed activities. The steps in developing the center require the students to: (1) define a topic of interest, (2) write questions about the topic, (3) design activity cards, (4) gather materials and people resources to complete the activity cards, (5) complete the activity cards, (6) share completed projects with an appropriate audiences, and (7) assess and evaluate the completed projects. These steps lead the students through the process of researching a real problem or topic. As an investigator of a topic or problem, the student is both a consumer and a producer of knowledge. This Type III enrichment, according to Renzulli (1977), is appropriate mainly for gifted students. A student-designed center is one method to communicate results in a professional manner when it is prepared for an authentic audience. The completed center is a display of products that students create from their activity cards. For example, a mythology center created by third grade GT students includes a video of interviews of mythological characters they portrayed, business cards for Greek god/goddesses and directions on how to create a business card, pictures of Greek architecture, card packet of information about myths, and handmade musical instruments.

**How To's**

How do the students develop skills to work independently, make choices, complete activities, record progress, and work individually or in small groups? We found that most children who attend traditional classrooms, who are told precisely what to do experienced difficulty with the transition to a flexible, self-disciplined learning center. To facilitate the selection of a topic teachers guide students in the beginning to create a learning center. The teachers and students cooperatively assess interests to define a topic, establish goals, and plan learning activities to determine the final presentation.

**Defining A Topic**

To begin, each student chooses a topic of interest or “passion.” This is a monumental task for students who have many interests. It is difficult for them to converge on the selection of a single topic. To facilitate the selection of the topics the teachers offered several brainstorming strategies. One such strategy is taking ten 3x5 notecards, writing one topic on each card and arranging the cards in rank order according to intensity or degree of interest.
Questions to Guide the Investigation

After the topics are selected, the students generate questions on what they want to know about the topic. Students write several questions about their topics. Emphasis is placed on developing who, what, when, where, why, and how questions, rather than yes/no questions. For example, Cheryl, Scott, and Bert, third grade GT students, chose mythology as their topic. Some questions about their topic are: (1) Who are some of the Greek characters and what do their names mean? (2) What if the minotaur or pan actually lived today? (3) If Greek gods/goddesses carried business cards, what would they say?

Collecting Data

With questions in mind, the students collect data about their topics. Teachers encourage students to find the information in a variety of sources. Students list people who may have information on the topic, such as specialists in the area of interest, a teacher, a neighbor, relative or friend. They use the phone book to jot down addresses and phone numbers of the individuals. In addition to people, students list places where they might find information. For example, still using the mythology as the topic, the student might explore a museum that has a section on Greek history or visit the public library.

Designing Activity Cards

The next step was the creation of activity cards. Each student completes this task by selecting a verb and a product from the lists the teachers provide. The first list of words (verb list) suggests what could be done; the second list (product list) suggests items to produce. Some samples of activity cards by Cheryl, Scott, and Bert about mythology are: (1) Create a script and video tape interviews with mythological characters. (2) Research the meaning of the roles of the Greek gods/goddesses and create business cards for each character. After the activity cards are planned the students gather all the information available and complete the activities.

Presentation Design

To bring closure to the project, the students decide which authentic audience to present their project. Cheryl, Scott, and Bert present the activities they completed on Greek Mythology in a mini-seminar format to the their third grade classes. Most students select another class to share their presentation with, but other students present to a special interest group, and some opt to share their work at a special event in the school. Students who are confident and secure with their presentation may select civic organizations or other special interest groups in the community to make their presentations.

Advantages of the Center

The teachers report several advantages of using the learning center as a tool to meet the needs of the gifted in their classroom. First, the learning center allows the students to do their own thinking. They explore, questions, experiment and formulate their own plans of learning. This open-ended learning situation encourages the gifted to engage in topics of intrinsic interest. Second, although regular classroom teachers often use independent study as a way to extend programming for the gifted, the learning center goes one step further. It emphasizes the processes of higher level thinking, productive thinking, inquiry and creative problem solving. This approach personalizes learning so the gifted child moves at his own pace and can explore individually selected topics. The teachers observe that the learning center approach certainly promotes independent thought and action in classrooms. It was a viable approach to meeting the needs of the gifted in the regular classroom by providing a more flexible learning environment which is adaptable to the gifted child's learning style. The child moves from the role of student to the role of learner. Finally, the learning center approach relates to present world conditions. As norms for social and interpersonal relations change, so must the learning environment for the gifted child change. A rigid authoritarian system which would have children line up, sit quietly for long periods, work on the same assignment, and keep their ideas to themselves does not prepare GT students to function in the fast moving, open society. Gifted students who are making choices and decision in their education develop social and intellectual skills (independence, responsibility, creativity, resourcefulness) that are necessary for today's world.
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THE GIFTED STUDENT IN THE REGULAR CLASSROOM: A SURVEY

Janet Ray
Palo, TX

This issue of Tempo is focused on the needs of the gifted learner in the regular classroom. However, there is a need that must be established before any method, process, or technique can be successful. Are our colleagues convinced of the need to modify the regular curriculum for gifted learners? This study assesses beliefs of classroom teachers in areas critical to successful modification of the curriculum. Beliefs about education are inevitably reflected in classroom practices, so this survey examines those, also. In addition, parents of gifted students were asked to respond concerning the regular classroom experiences of their child.

Despite wonderfully planned and implemented enrichment programs for the gifted, most high ability learners in Texas spend the majority of their school days in heterogeneous classrooms. Most elementary gifted students are served in pull-out programs, which do not focus on the core curriculum. Many of our brightest are simply "marking time" in the classroom where the best way to succeed is to do just as the teacher asks; nothing more (Reis, Burns, and Renzulli, 1992).

Heterogeneous ability classrooms and inclusionary practices place the high ability child in an environment where repetition and a moderate pace are the norm. Consequently, there is a serious mismatch between the abilities of the child and the work he/she is expected to do. This mismatch results in wasted time in the best case, and frustration and underachievement in the worst case.

Clearly, our high-ability students face a daily curriculum that moves too slowly and repeats too much. Learning occurs when students are presented with challenging content, not when they are repetitively exposed to concepts and skills they have already mastered or can master with little effort (Westberg, 1995).

The 1993 "Classroom Practices Survey" (Archambault, Westburg, Brown, Hallmark, Zhang, and Emmons, 1993) reveals the typical experience of the gifted child in everyday classroom life. In the regular classroom, gifted students are given no more opportunity than average ability students to work outside the classroom, use enrichment centers, pursue self-selected, independent studies, or work in special interest groups. Gifted students have no more opportunities than average students to work in mixed-grade groups, work on accelerated materials, or to receive concentrated instruction in critical thinking skills.

Teacher Survey

In the spring of 1996, a survey was completed by 242 Texas elementary and middle school teachers to determine what Texas teachers think about teaching advanced learners in the regular classroom and how they translate those attitudes into practice. The teachers came from 15 schools (11 public, 4 private) in seven cities. In addition, parents of gifted students in those schools were surveyed and asked to reflect upon their child's regular classroom experience.

Teachers were first asked if they agreed or disagreed with this statement: "Students must participate in all learning activities in order to achieve mastery of a learning objective." Forty-one percent of the teachers believed that students must participate in all learning activities in order to achieve mastery of a learning objective. This is significant because Reis, et. al. (1992) discovered that teachers who equate participation in learning activities with mastery of a learning objective will probably have a difficult time streamlining curriculum.

Why might such a significant percentage believe that students must participate in all activities in order to master an objective? There are several possibilities:

- The teacher is not making a distinction between an objective and an activity.
- The teacher is using activities to measure the extent of learning.
- The teacher lacks background knowledge in learning styles of high ability students.
- The teacher utilizes several modalities in activities and wants to make sure she "hits" everyone.
Teachers were also asked if they agreed or disagreed with this statement: "Above average ability students have mastered 50% of the learning objectives for the year before formal instruction begins." Half (50%) of the teachers agreed, while 30% did not agree. Nineteen percent were not sure. Almost half (49%) of the teachers did not recognize that high ability students bring a great deal of knowledge and skills into the classroom. This has important implications for the high ability child:

- High ability students spend a large percentage of their class time in drill and practice that they do not need.
- High ability students become accustomed to everything "being easy" and never learn to take a risk.
- The high ability student with attention difficulties may become frustrated and underachieve.

Teachers were then given the following scenario: "You decide to pretest your students on the upcoming chapter/unit by giving the entire class the end-of-chapter/unit test in the text. Four students score between 85-90%." Teachers were given seven options for those four students and asked to check all that applied.

63% chose peer tutoring.

48% of the teachers would assign additional, more difficult activities from the text.

34% of the teachers said that they would teach the content as planned to the whole class.

45% would allow independent research on a related topic until time for the next unit.

12% of the teachers said that they would provide material from the next grade level's text.

18% of the teachers said that they would never pretest.

The most common option (63%) chosen by the teachers was allowing the four students to tutor peers needing extra help. When a teacher uses peer tutoring as an option, it is important to first ask these questions:

- What is the high ability student learning?
- What is the best use of the high ability student's time?
- Is the high ability student frustrated or impatient with slower students?

Another popular option (48%) was assigning extra activities from the text. Teachers who choose to assign additional activities from the text should be cautious. The extensions should provide opportunities for complex, high level thinking, and not be just "more and harder" of the regular content.

Interestingly, one-third of the teachers expected the students who had shown mastery of the content to participate with the whole class. Most of these teachers would also use the four students as peer tutors and would assign additional work from the text.

Parent Survey

Parents were asked how often their high ability child expressed feelings indicating that he/she either already knew what was being covered in school or that the material was too easy or boring.

- In math: 47% reported "often/very often" 13% reported "never"
- In reading: 53% reported "often/very often" 18% reported "never"
- In science: 32% reported "often/very often" 27% reported "never"
- In social studies: 40% reported "often/very often" 27% reported "never"

Parents were then asked to quantify how much of the grade level work their child already knew when school began the previous fall.

- Math: Fifty-five percent believed that their children already knew 50-100% of the grade level material.
- Reading: Sixty-eight percent believed that their children already knew 50-100% of the grade level material.
- Science: Forty-two percent believed that their children already knew 50-100% of the grade level material.
- Social Studies: Thirty-nine percent believed that their children already knew 50-100% of the grade level material.
Teaching Gifted in the Regular Classroom

Last, parents were asked to choose options for their child if he/she demonstrated mastery of content area.

- 17% would have their child taught the content along with the whole class.
- 42% would have their child given additional practice in the same content.
- 58% would have their child tutor peers.
- 63% want their child to use class time for independent exploration of a related topic.
- 48% would have their child work on material from the next grade level.

Discussion

Compare the options chosen by teachers for students who show mastery with the options desired by parents. Enlightening is the discrepancy between the percentage of teachers who teach the content to the whole class (34%) and the percentage of parents (17%) who desire this. Are we then surprised by the large number of parents who report hearing feelings of frustration and boredom from their children?

There was a large difference between the percentage of parents who would choose independent study and acceleration for their child and the percentage of teachers who would offer them.

Although the percentages of teachers and parents who would choose peer tutoring as an option were comparable, it is interesting that only 3% of parents would choose this as the only option. Many parents commented on the stress induced in their gifted child by peer tutoring. Once again, peer tutoring should be used with caution as a means of "enriching" the gifted student.

How can gifted specialists, administrators, classroom teachers and all those with a passion for the education of gifted learners use the information derived from these surveys?

- Establish the need for modifying the content and pace of the regular curriculum for the gifted learner before training and implementation of special programs. Remember, what a teacher thinks about teaching determines what is done.
- Use the questions asked in the survey as a "starting point" for inservice education of the regular classroom teachers.
- Survey your own teachers and determine which options are used most with gifted learners, and which options need to be developed.

Above all, let us use this data to strengthen the classroom experience of high ability learners and make school a purposeful place for them.
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PRODUCT DIFFERENTIATION: A CATALYST TO EXCELLENCE

Bertie Kilgore
Hardin-Simmons University

Products are important outcomes by which students communicate their analysis of existing information and their synthesis of new ideas or concepts. Student products involve a variety of processes and formats to match the audience and the content. However, in product differentiation, a primary consideration must be the ability and strengths of the learner.

A Self-Assessment of Product Differentiation

Take 5 minutes and complete the following task to discover your integration of product differentiation. For 2 minutes, list as many different kinds of products, appropriate to your curriculum and grade level, which students could produce to show they have learned some topic or content. Next, fold a paper into four boxes and write one modality in each box: visual, oral/auditory, written, and kinesthetic. Finally, spend 3 minutes reorganizing your product list by modalities. It is important that you recopy your products and list each under its modality in order to learn the most from this experience. The modality for each product is dictated by what the student primarily has to do to produce the product. Consider which products truly use multiple modalities. For those well versed in multiple intelligences, a product list might also be reorganized according to which of the intelligences each product incorporates.

Analyzing Your Product List

What can you learn by analyzing your product list? Most educators are less balanced than we intend in our product offerings to students. Many of us inadvertently teach using products most related to OUR strengths and passions.

Our product challenge is to strive for a balance in modalities and intelligences in order to reach more students more of the time and to increase the variety in the types of products students have opportunities to produce. A balanced offering of products also validates the significance of all modalities and intelligences and encourages students to demonstrate their best ways to learn. Students are more successful in learning tasks that incorporate their modality and intelligence strengths.

Continue adding to your list over time and create a checklist to help you more quickly insure production differentiation as you plan learning experiences. An example from a product checklist follows (Figure 1). It lists products in alphabetical order for quick reference. Each product is coded to the modalities and intelligences the student primarily has to use to produce and present the product. Many products may, in addition, be adapted to mathematical, naturalist, or musical intelligences by incorporating specific content in the task. For example, a book or booklet engages naturalistic intelligence when a student writes a booklet explaining to others how to complete an outdoor science experiment involving one species of birds.

Most products incorporate interpersonal intelligences when completed by a group of students; products encourage more intrapersonal intelligence when completed by an individual. Hence, on this checklist, both interpersonal intelligence and intrapersonal intelligence are marked for any product that could be done equally well by either a group or an individual. Most learning experiences can be designed by a teacher so either a group or an individual can produce the product. The key difference is whether students are assigned to work together (interpersonal) or given the option to work alone (intrapersonal). As often as is appropriate, a teacher may begin a task assignment by stating to the class, “By yourself or with one or two other people...” Thus students are given the choice occasionally to work alone or with others. As one wise gifted student observed, “You can’t work with others all of the time without compromising what you could really do.”

Incorporating a Product List in Differentiation of Curriculum and Instruction

Use a checklist as a tool to help establish product selection options for students (Kilgore, 1996). These options encourage the variety of forms recommended by the National Association for Gifted Children’s position statement on differentiation of curriculum and instruction (NAGC, 1993). Product options greatly enhance student autonomy and elevate the
results of an independent study from just research paper formats.

A product checklist provides these options for teachers or students:

1. **Product-student match.** When the teacher has a checklist of products categorized by modalities and multiple intelligences, the teacher can more accurately prescribe a specific product appropriate to any student's strengths and needs.

2. **Product choice.** The teacher may use the checklist to provide product options for a student by prescribing multiple products from which a student can select, all of which are appropriate to the learning task and the student. Product selection options allow each student some choice in how to demonstrate learning. The power of choice actually increases some students' motivation to excel.

3. **Individualized product selection.** To maximize student autonomy, however, use the checklist (Kingore, 1996) to provide each student with a personalized product list. To prepare the student's list, the teacher or the student highlights the checklist columns which match the student's pattern of strengths and then lists all or some of the products in those columns for a student's personalized list. This option allows open-ended product selection for any learning experience as each student has a list of appropriate products to choose from to demonstrate learning. The teacher's assignment to the student then becomes, "Here is the content. Which product might you select from your list to allow you to best demonstrate content that is in-depth, complex, and advanced?" With this option, a student can use a personalized product list as needed all year. In a regular classroom, these product lists help advanced and gifted students proceed independently with projects and self-directed study when preassessment shows that they have already mastered the core curriculum.

Product differentiation becomes a catalyst to excellence when it motivates students to incorporate content depth and complexity at a level commensurate with their abilities. A product checklist becomes a catalyst to excellence when it enables teachers to incorporated appropriate and varied products that encourage student autonomy.
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Adapting the Elementary Classroom for Gifted Students

Susan Johnsen, Patricia Haensly, Gail Ryser, Randy Ford, Virginia Christian, Ruth Davalos, Glenda Griffin, Jan Purdy, and Mary Witte
The Mustard Seed Project

Most gifted elementary students spend most of their time in the regular classroom. Therefore, a federal Javits grant, the Mustard Seed Project (MSP), was developed to educate teachers in methods that they might use in adapting instruction for students with varying talents and abilities. The MSP encouraged teachers of gifted children to continue their resource and pull-out programs. At the same time, SMP showed teachers how to mentor and collaborate with the regular education teachers in providing a more comprehensive program to meet the needs of each individual gifted child.

Since the fall of 1994, 165 teachers have participated in the training activities. Most, 162, used the training they received and made significant changes in the ways they organized and taught gifted children in their classrooms. The MSP discovered three factors that contributed to these teachers transferring their training to their classrooms. First, the teachers experienced the effects of training activities that adapted to their preferences and interests. Second, the set their own goals for changes in their classrooms. The topics of these goals included curriculum compacting, interdisciplinary curriculum, authentic assessment, learning centers, and others. Third, and most important, we provided teachers follow-up support at their local campus. This support came from the project staff plus principals, mentor teachers, other participating teachers, and community members in their schools. In addition, we established a computer network for inter-district collaboration and electronic curriculum dissemination. Preliminary data suggested that changes in classroom practices, particularly in providing for learner differences in rate, related to improved achievement scores.

The Mustard Seed classrooms continue to be an innovative mix of successful, research-based methods for adapting instruction for students of varying abilities. For example, a project classroom might include learning centers, flexible groupings of students for specialized instruction, independent and small group study, and individualized student planning. Teachers use individual, small group, and whole group instruction based upon student interests and needs. The cornerstone of such classrooms is flexibility. Even after the formal project training and support was over, these teachers have a wide array of strategies available to them for meeting each student’s needs.

Because causing change requires strong support, administrators, community members, and mentor teachers also participated in the staff development activities along with the regular classroom teachers. Each year of participation in the project, these important support individuals came to the training activities first. Then they could provide the resources and follow-up necessary to help the teacher participants reach their goals. Next, the mentor teacher returned with a set of six volunteer classroom teachers from her district to participate in the training activities. During the three-to-five-day training sessions participants systematically simulated several classroom practices. All participants became aware of learner differences and the possible negative effects of a rigidly-sequenced curriculum, of common activities, of forced grouping patterns, and of fixed time allotments on gifted children. The simulations provided opportunities for participants to experience and gain a new perspective on adaptive practices. These practices included interest-based topics, preference or activity choices, flexible groups, and varied time for tasks. What is more important, the lessons not only provided the cognitive training, but showed the participants through a first-hand experience that modifying instruction for gifted students in the regular classroom was indeed possible! Participants selected personal implementation goals, and chose among nine specific training units.

Unit 1: Adapting for Learner Differences

This unit described four general areas of individual differences: content, rate, preference, and environment. The participants first examined classroom models to detect the degree to which they
provide for individual differences. Next, the teachers read case studies of gifted students and described the kind of classrooms that might be adaptive for each. Finally, the participants established individual classroom goals by examining questions related to each learner difference area. At this point, the teachers choose to do those units of interest to them in their situations.

Unit 2: Organizing the Content for Learner Differences

We subdivided this unit into three separate parts. Based upon current classroom practices, the teacher selected one of these parts. One module was useful if a teacher's subject matter was organized around a textbook. A second module was available for teachers who organized their curriculum around concepts, skills, or strategies. A final module was used when curriculum was organized around interdisciplinary concepts. In each case, the teacher learned about pretesting, compacting, learning contracts, designing activities that varied response modes and formats, and designing learning areas inside and outside of the classroom. Within the interdisciplinary unit, the teacher had the option of using topics, literature, broad-based themes, issues or problems as a starting point for designing the unit.

Unit 3: Assessment

We also subdivided this unit into two separate modules. One module focused on designing assessment procedures that measured concepts and strategies. In the second, teachers learned how to develop dimensions, scales, and standards for evaluating performance or products. These were often used with portfolios.

Unit 4: Managing the Learning Environment

This unit was subdivided into four modules. Each module focused on how the teacher might organize the learning environment to adapt for individual differences. In “Room Arrangement,” we showed teachers how to develop interest and learning centers. In “Materials,” we showed teachers how to manage material for independent learning. In “Scheduling,” we showed teachers how to develop teacher and student schedules that identify activities and times for sharing, conferences, direct instruction, and assessment. In “Record Keeping,” we showed teachers how to develop teacher and student records for monitoring progress.

Unit 5: Instructional Strategies

We subdivided this unit into three separate modules. The first identified possible frameworks for asking questions including Bloom’s Cognitive Taxonomy, Richard Paul’s Critical Thinking, Torrance’s areas of Creative Thinking, and Krathwohl’s Affective Taxonomy. The second described the steps involved in the independent study process from the selection of a topic, issue, or problem to the presentation of the product. The third described the steps in the creative problem solving process from identifying the “mess” to carrying out the solution.

Unit 6: Teacher as Facilitator and Steps in Developing an Accelerated Program

One portion of this unit showed teachers how to design lessons using “authentic” methods. We introduced the teachers to ways of conducting individual conferences, progress evaluations, monitoring progress, and resource management. The second module identified the characteristics of a management system and took the teachers through ten steps necessary for establishing an accelerated program in the classroom.

Unit 7: Mentoring, Peer Coaching, and Collaboration

This unit was particularly critical for the mentors who learned about the specific functions, roles, and conditions for developing successful mentor relationships and how to communicate in productive ways. In the peer coaching component, non-judgmental response and reflective practice were shown as observational strategies. The collaboration unit focused on ways to involve different groups in goal-setting, negotiation, and action-oriented activities.

Unit 8: Systems, Community, and Technical Support

We designed these three units to help the support team back at each school. Participants learned to develop effective support systems including strategies for empowering teachers, methods for promoting school and community ownership of changes, and strategies for problem solving. In addition, we explained specific communication systems that link schools technologically.
Unit 9: Change

This unit focused on eight important lessons described in Michael Fullan's book, the Forces of Change.

Summary

The units and modules within Project Mustard Seed are very effective in facilitating substantial classroom change. Gifted students in classrooms with participants show significant achievement gains. Due to the nature of the training, teachers report their readiness to do the strategies. Beginning this school year (1996-1997), the Mustard Seed training units are available to school districts. For more information regarding this distribution and the research results, contact Susan Johnsen or Randy Ford, Center for Learning Abilities and Talent Development, at Baylor University, (817) 755-3112.

MCLENDON, from page 3

- Encourage new research on improved methods of assessment, curriculum, instruction, and program evaluation. Encourage longitudinal research that would identify effective practices that relate to long-term student achievement in these areas. Disseminate this information in TAGT publications, conference, and regional service centers.

- Challenge schools to offer a broader, more flexible array of services that match each gifted students' interests and strengths.

- Develop a resource guide for school districts and communities that provide an overview of an array of services and prototypes for gifted programs. Include both practices that are effective and not effective in serving gifted children.

- Provide quality professional development opportunities for all teachers and other school personnel to improve services to gifted children.

- Work with local communities and/or school districts to develop special classes for parents to help them understand the characteristics of gifted children the educational services they need.

- Work with schools, communities, and the legislature to fund education at the level necessary for quality programs and services.

- The term “gifted and talented” must be specifically defined. This includes:
  - individuals who are gifted and talented and how this shows up for them in terms of their abilities in some areas but perhaps not all areas.
  - programs for gifted and talented and the absolute need for these programs. This would include the diversity of programs within the state as well as how they are different in primary, middle and high school.

  Within this recommendation is the question of whether persons or programs should be called “gifted and talented.” Some persons perceive the term as part of the problem -- the label has become as much of a negative as a positive. Two specific suggestions were made:

  - the use of “performance” in a title that indicates a level of ability to clearly show why a student is included and another is not. Performance is easier to explain than the current methods to select students for the program.

  - rather than using words like “gifted and talented” which describe an individual, use word that only describes the program. For example, an “honors” program describes the program, not the students.

  The use of the terms “gifted and talented” should be thoroughly discussed before any programming proceeds to determine whether they should be kept or changed.

  To receive an executive summary of the IDP report, contact the TAGT office at 512/ 499-8248, or by e-mail: cj@tenet.edu.
1996 Laura Allard Grants for Excellence Award Recipients

Region 10
Ms. Inalee Sell, Duncanville High School, Duncanville ISD
Title of Project: International Studies Internship Program

The International Studies Internship Program is an extension of the Duncanville Independent School District International Studies Program which began in the fall of 1995. The program was developed to provide students a broad cross-cultural educational experience to prepare them to function successfully in a global society and economy. The International Studies Internship Program will match student interests to the company, agency, or institution providing the experience. An essential aspect of the internship is to locate community internship placements through which the students will be able to use their foreign language skills. The TAGT Laura Allard Grants for Excellence funds will be used to purchase materials needed to recruit and recognize community participants and to share the International Studies Program with the Duncanville community and beyond.

Region 14
Ms. Mary Blassingame, Buffalo Gap Elementary School, Jim Ned CISD
Title of Project: Computer Camp for Kids

The Computer Camp for Kids (CCFK) is a second-year recipient of a TAGT Laura Allard Grants for Excellence. The CCFK project (Jim Ned CISD) will provide 8 scholarships for the Buffalo Gap Elementary School Computer Camp for gifted students, grades 2-8, and two internships for high-school gifted students to serve as counselors. The grant will also provide software and supplies for participating students. The camp curriculum will be theme-based, emphasizing “Connections” between product, process and content. The product will be a video using multimedia equipment and Hyperstudio. The process will include skills in computer graphics, digitizing, sequencing, choosing relevant graphics and music, and writing narration. The content will vary according to student. Each student will produce an autobiographical video and another video based on the student’s “passion” or a narrative.

Region 14
Ms. Peggy Maddox, Sweetwater Middle School, Sweetwater ISD
Title of Project: Philip Nolan Park

This Laura Allard Grants for Excellence supports the dream of 18 seventh-grade students that began when they were sixth graders. The idea to preserve the site of the old Philip Nolan Elementary School for educational purposes really began with these students. Their presentation to a community committee and the landscape architect set the project in motion for community fund raising. The site, to be called Philip Nolan Park, will be for the entire Sweetwater community. The overall project proposes to build playground equipment, walking paths, baseball and basketball areas. The Laura Allard Grants for Excellence will help fund gifted and talented students’ ecological garden which will be dedicated to educational activities and enjoyment.

Region 15
Ms. Marta Iza Gonzalez-Stitts, Lamar Elementary School, San Felipe Del Rio CISD
Title of Project: Kool Skool Collaborative Arts

Kool Skool Collaborative Arts is a gifted education summer school program for identified G/T students and potentially identified G/T students, to integrate biological science, local cultural arts and Spanish/English language acquisition. A year long biological study of Del Rio’s San Felipe Creek will serve as the subject matter for cultural arts product making. At the end of a month long series of workshops, a “Friends of the Creek” arts fair culminates with product exhibition, song, dance, poetry performances and fun.
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Region 19
Ms. Irma Zepeda, Surratt Elementary School, Clint ISD
Title of Project: Project Challenge

Project Challenge is a program designed to provide gifted and talented students of Surratt Elementary School with experiences that will broaden their minds while also strengthening their character. Project Challenge is set up as a pull-out program to be conducted within the school environment. Approximately 50 identified G/T students from kinder through 5th grade participate in activities that teach the history of the United States Space Program. The project includes student research of profound events in our space history. Patriotism is a theme interwoven into the curriculum. The program also involves the students participation in a Space Camp. The camp is designed with activities that parallel some of the training that astronauts undergo. The camp is designed to stretch the limits of gifted and talented students, both mentally and physically. Students that successfully complete the program earn their “wings” and are honored in a ceremony for family, school administrators, and guests. The ceremony includes a fine arts performance where G/T students and their achievements are showcased. The project will be a source of parental awareness and an important step in parental involvement in Clint Independent School District’s educational programs for the gifted and talented.

GIFTED AND TALENTED CENTER RECEIVES ENDOWMENT

A businessman who graduated from the University of Connecticut 40 years ago has committed $1.5 million to the University to endow its program in gifted and talented education. The gift from Raymond Neag, Class of ‘57, and his wife, the late Lynn Neag, will be matched by the state under the UCONN 2000 program, for a total endowment of $3 million.

The gift will establish an endowed chair and a new center on gifted education. The center will incorporate the University’s graduate programs in gifted education, outreach programs for teachers and for gifted high school students, and The National Research Center on the Gifted and Talented, based at The University of Connecticut. The National Research Center is one of the leading research programs in the nation in the field of gifted education.

The University of Connecticut’s research on gifted education has focused on seeking talented students from disadvantaged backgrounds and improving the quality of education for all students by encouraging them to pursue in depth the topics that interest them.

CORRECTION
Mary Peters was inadvertently left out of the Parent of the Year Announcements in the Fall 1996 Tempo. Mary shared the honor of being the Region 11 TAGT Parent of the year with Cheryl Clark.
Dear Colleague,

The Twentieth Annual Conference of the Texas Association for the Gifted and Talented will take place November 19-22, 1997 at the Austin Convention Center in Austin, Texas. “Giftedness: Through the Looking Glass” is the theme for this year’s conference.

Alice, while in Wonderland, once said to the Mock Turtle and the Gryphon, “I could tell you my adventures - beginning from this morning, but it’s no use going back to yesterday because I was a different person then.” Gifted education in Texas is also going to be different tomorrow then it was yesterday. This year’s conference will focus many of its sessions on how teachers and parents can meet the new Texas State Plan for the Education of Gifted/Talented Students’ challenge to offer curriculum options in all areas of giftedness.

You are cordially invited to submit a program proposal for a session presentation. On the following pages is a “Call for Proposals” that outlines the application procedures and other requirements related to session presentations. In order for your proposals to be considered, the application must be completed in full and submitted to the TAGT office by April 1, 1997. You will be notified by May 30, 1997, regarding the status of your proposal.

Your participation is important to the growth of a strong group advocating for gifted and talented programs. Only through continued support of professional development, encouragement of community involvement, and your attention to current research in your field will we be able to continue developing the promises of gifted and talented children and youth. So join us and help us all to turn our new challenges “into a sort of a mist” so that “it’ll be easy enough to get through” to the Looking-glass House and discover “such beautiful things in it.”

Sincerely,

Andi Case

Andi Case
Chair, 1997 Conference Committee
First Vice President, TAGT
# CALL FOR PROPOSALS

**Texas Association for the Gifted and Talented 20th Annual Conference**  
Giftedness: Through the Looking Glass  
November 19–22, 1997 • Austin Convention Center, Austin, Texas

Proposals must be postmarked by April 1, 1997.  
All individuals submitting proposals will be notified of status of their proposal by May 20, 1997.  
Please mail completed proposals to: TAGT 1996 Conference, 406 East 11th Street, Suite 310, Austin, Texas 78701-2617, Attention: Andi Case.

*Please type or print clearly*

## I. PRIMARY PRESENTER INFORMATION (PRESENTER SUBMITTING PROPOSAL)

| Last Name | First Name | MI | Dr. | Mr. | Mrs. | Ms. |
|-----------|------------|----|-----|-----|------|_____|
| Institution/Professional Affiliation | Position/Title | Year Round Mailing Address | City, State, ZIP | Telephone: Office | Home | Fax |

## PROFESSIONAL CREDENTIALS:

- Degree(s):  
- Certification(s):  
- Educational and Other Professional Experience:

## II. TWO PERSONS WHO CAN RECOMMEND YOU AS A PRESENTER:

1. Name:  
   Position:  
   Address:  
   Telephone: |

2. Name:  
   Position:  
   Address:  
   Telephone: |

## III. CO-PRESENTER(S) PLEASE NOTE: Communications will be sent ONLY to the primary presenter who is responsible for communicating with session co-presenters and facilitators.

1. Last Name:  
   First Name:  
   MI:  
   Position/Title:  
   Institution/Professional Affiliation:  
   Please circle correct salutation: Dr. | Mr. | Mrs. | Ms. |

2. Last Name:  
   First Name:  
   MI:  
   Position/Title:  
   Institution/Professional Affiliation:  
   Please circle correct salutation: Dr. | Mr. | Mrs. | Ms. |

Facilitators are needed for all sessions and primary presenters are requested to provide a facilitator for each of their sessions. This individual will assist with monitoring attendance, disseminating materials, and helping with other such duties. Facilitator information will be requested on the Primary Presenter Form that will accompany the letter of acceptance mailed to approved presenters.

## II. TITLE OF SESSION (As it is to appear in the program. Please be brief – maximum of 10 words)

## III. SESSION DESCRIPTION (As it will appear in the conference program. Include 2-4 objectives of the session. Be as specific as possible, as conference participants will select sessions based on session description. Title and description must match. Maximum = 50 words)
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1997 Executive Board Winners

President-Elect
Benny Hickerson

As the Principal for Euless Junior High School, HEB ISD, Dr. Hickerson is involved in administrative advocacy for gifted, supervision of G/T programs, curriculum development, teacher training, identification, and parent communications. She has a long history in TAGT, including serving on the Executive Board and Executive Committee, as Local Arrangements Chair for the 1994 Conference, and as First Vice-President and Conference Chair 1995-96. She has also served as Director for Region XI. Her G/T experience ranges from the classroom to staff development to college teaching.

Second Vice-President
Roslyn Blache

Ms. Blache serves on the Texas Commissioner's Advisory Council for the Education of Gifted Students, the San Antonio ISD Advisory Council for the Education of Gifted Students, and the Region XX Advisory Council for the Education of Gifted Students. She has presented for the National Association for Gifted Children and the Associations for Supervision & Curriculum Development. Her experience also includes G/T teacher training at San Antonio ISD.

Region II Director
Stella Garrett

Ms. Garrett is a Secondary Curriculum Specialist for the Calallen ISD and Chairman of Calallen district's G/T committee. She aided in development of the K-8 G/T programs and directed G/T curriculum planning and writing in her district.

Region IV Director
Ned C. Moss

Mr. Moss serves as the G/T Coordinator for Curriculum and Staff Development for the Houston ISD. Formerly, he served as both coordinator and teacher at Vanguard, a gifted and talented high school. In 1995, he held a position on the Local Arrangements Committee for the TAGT Annual Conference. He is a four time presenter at TAGT conferences and a TAGT member since 1983.

Region VI Director
Donna J. Corley

Ms. Corley is currently the Gifted Education Specialist for the Conroe ISD. She serves several other districts as the G/T Foundation Trainer. She has been a part of the TEA Task Force to write new state guidelines, and the Planning Committee for the Region V and VI G/T Conference. She is also an Adjunct Professor for Sam Houston State University.

Secretary/Treasurer
Karen M. Fitzgerald

Ms. Fitzgerald is currently the G/T coordinator for Spring Branch ISD. Her G/T teaching experience reaches all the way to Tennessee and Missouri, and she has experience as well as the parent of a gifted child. She has attended the Confratute at the University of Connecticut. She is a former Alumni President of Phi Mu Fraternity.
Region VIII
Pat Gilbert

Ms. Gilbert’s experience stretches beyond Paris ISD, where she is the Principal of Aikin Elementary, a school with a large gifted student population. She is a presenter and educational consultant in: Instructional Leadership, Cooperative Learning, Learning Styles, Texas Teacher Appraisal System, and Dupont Trainer. Other offices include President-elect of Lamar County Reading Council, Administrative Consultant for Paris Association for Gifted Education enrichment activities, PISD GfT task force member and TEPSA Academy II member.

Region X
Lynda Walker

For the past two years, Ms. Walker has held the coordinator post of Gifted Programs (K-12) at Plano ISD. She has 13 years experience as a Gifted/Talented teacher, and has served as an Odyssey of the Mind Regional Co-Director and State Executive Board Member.

Region XII
Krys Goree

Ms. Goree has served as Gifted and Talented Education Specialist at Education Service Center, Region XII, for four years. She is the Senior Editor of Gifted Child Today magazine, where she writes a bi-monthly column. She has coordinated district-level programs in two school districts, served as an Advisory Board Member for Project Mustard Seed Grant, and has served as G/T teacher/program coordinator in several districts in the state.

Region XIV
Kimberly Cheek

Ms. Cheek is a SOAR Teacher for K-12 in the Wylie ISD. She also has experience as a parent of a gifted child. She received her G/T training from Bertie Kilgore, Ph.D. and has 10 years of experience teaching gifted children.

Region XVI
Lisa Yauck

Ms Yauck is a teacher of G/T Social Studies at Follett ISD. She served six years as classroom teacher (three years 5th grade; three years American History, Government, and Economics) and for the past two years has served as G/T Coordinator for grades 3-6. She is active on various school committees, and is also the parent of a gifted child. In the past she has served as President of the Village Improvement Program.

Region XVIII
Jim Collett

As well as being a teacher of high school G/T, Mr. Collett is Curriculum Director for McCamey ISD. He developed the original courses/curriculum in the McCamey high school G/T program. He is G/T Director for the district, and serves on the Commissioner’s Advisory Council for G/T. He also serves as a faculty member of the Annual Interdisciplinary Problem-Solving Conference at Baylor University.

Region XX
Marcy Voss

Ms. Voss is G/T Coordinator for Kerrville ISD and a member of the Commissioner’s Advisory Council for the Education of Gifted Students. She was G/T Coordinator and G/T Teacher, La Grange ISD, 1981-1992. Ms. Voss holds a Master’s in Educational Psychology with a specialization in Gifted Education from Texas A&M University. She is a former TAGT Regional Director and a presenter at conferences, Education Service Centers, and local school districts.
APPLICATION FOR TAGT AWARENESS CERTIFICATE CREDIT

This application may be completed by anyone (e.g., educational service centers, public and private schools, universities, collaborative groups, parent organizations) offering quality professional development activities for teachers of gifted and talented students during the 1996-97 school year. You or your organization may apply for up to 45 clock-hours of credit. If approved, participants in your program will receive a TAGT certificate after the completion of 45 clock-hours that covers the five core areas and teacher competencies.*

Carefully complete each of the seven sections that are listed on this application. It is important that each of the objectives and activities relate to a teacher competency. This set of teacher competencies was highly rated by a panel of state-wide experts of teachers, service center consultants, supervisors, directors, community members, and university faculty as important for teachers at the awareness level.

After you have completed the application, send it to the TAGT Education and Training Committee, 406 East 11th Street, Suite 310, Austin, Texas 78701-2617. This committee will review your application and return it to you as soon as possible. If your application is approved, you will be able to offer professional development activities that will apply toward a TAGT Awareness Certificate.

PLEASE TYPE OR PRINT CLEARLY.

I. Title of Professional Development Activity: __________________________________________________________

II. Date(s) of Activity: __________________________________________________________

III. Attach an additional sheet that lists the objectives for each Core Area and Teacher Competency and describes the activities related to each objective.

IV. Presenter(s) (Attach a resume for each presenter): __________________________________________________

V. Indicate the number of clock-hours requested beside each core area:

_____ Nature and Needs of G/T Learners (up to 6 clock-hours)

_____ Identification and Assessment (up to 6 clock-hours)

_____ Social and Emotional Needs (up to 6 clock-hours)

_____ Creativity (up to 6 clock-hours)

_____ Differentiated Curriculum (up to 6 clock-hours)

_________ Educational Service Center Institute, Region ___ covering the five core areas (attach participant record) (up to 30 clock-hours)

_____ Other: ____________________________ (Up to 15 clock-hours)

VI. Person submitting application and address: __________________________________________________________

____________________________

* Note: This certificate is awarded by the Texas Association for the Gifted and Talented, not the Texas Education Agency. While the TAGT Awareness Certificate may count toward the state clock hours, it is not required by TEA.
TAGT AWARENESS CERTIFICATE CORE AREAS AND COMPETENCIES

These competencies and time requirements were developed by a panel of professionals in the field of gifted education. Participants included Texas teachers, administrators, state and regional consultants, university faculty, and parents.

1.0 Nature and Needs (6 clock-hours)
   1.1 Knows basic terminology, current definitions, theories, and models of giftedness.
   1.2 Identifies characteristics and their effects on academic and social settings.
   1.3 Identifies characteristics of special groups of gifted and talented students such as lower income, handicapped, black, Hispanic, and limited English proficient. Understands the implications of these groups' characteristics on programs for the gifted and talented.
   1.4 Creates an environment in which gifted and talented students feel challenged and safe to explore and express their uniqueness.

2.0 Identification and Assessment (6 clock-hours)
   2.1 Uses broad-based, multifaceted identification procedures, including varied sources of information and qualitative and quantitative measures that match specific areas of ability.
   2.2 Interprets assessment results from both qualitative and quantitative measures to other professionals and parents for their use in determining placement and in planning specific program activities for each gifted and talented student.
   2.3 Understands the characteristics of special groups of gifted and talented students such as lower income, handicapped, black, Hispanic, and limited English proficient. Understands how to provide equal access to programs for gifted and talented students.

3.0 Social and Emotional Needs (6 clock-hours)
   3.1 Identifies individuals (family members, teachers, peers, and others) and environments (school, home, and community) that influence the social and emotional development of gifted and talented students.
   3.2 Identifies how characteristics of special groups of gifted and talented students influence their social and emotional development.
   3.3 Uses strategies for nurturing the social and emotional development of gifted and talented students at home and in school.
   3.4 Understands approaches for educating and involving parents, the community, and other professionals in supporting gifted and talented children.

4.0 Creativity and Instructional Strategies (6 clock-hours)
   4.1 Understands the characteristics of gifted and talented students and the influence of these characteristics on instructional strategies used in classrooms for the gifted and talented.
   4.2 Designs lessons within and across disciplines that teach strategies for nurturing creative and critical thinking in the gifted and talented students.
   4.3 Locates and develops resources for assisting gifted and talented students in the fulfillment of their creative potential.
   4.4 Adapts the classroom to the learning differences of each gifted and talented learner including the management of large and small groups and independent learning.
   4.5 Identifies strategies from gifted education that can be used in the regular classroom.

5.0 Differentiated Curriculum (6 clock-hours)
   5.1 Applies the basic principles of a differentiated curriculum to the cognitive, affective, and physical development of each gifted and talented student.
   5.2 Demonstrates knowledge of cognitive and affective content as related to each academic discipline, to multiple disciplines, and to broad-based themes, issues, and problems.
   5.3 Develops activities to encourage original research, independent study, and problem solving that are authentic to each discipline.
   5.4 Includes meaningful products in the curriculum that engage the gifted and talented student in real life experiences and promote lifelong learning.
   5.5 Collaborates with general education professionals in the development and coordination of programs for gifted and talented students.
The Executive Board of the Texas Association for the Gifted and Talented met from 3:00 p.m. to 5:00 p.m. in the Austin Suite of the Austin Convention Center, Austin, Texas on November 20, 1996.

President Mary Seay welcomed the board and introduced Douglas Batson, GAGT Capital Campaign Drive Committee Chair, who gave a special report on the TAGT Capital Campaign Drive.

In his report, Mr. Batson informed the Board that from his research and interactions with the business community, he learned that there is a lack of understanding of the needs of gifted and talented youth. He recommended that TAGT educate the general public about the goals and objectives of the organization, as well as the needs of the special population which it serves. He also suggested that TAGT become more cognizant of the budget process of corporations and foundations. Mr. Batson said that the capital campaign will be a longer process than it was originally thought, and that probably any concrete results should not be expected until late spring.

President Mary Seay reported that she, Ann Wink, and Connie McLendon had attended the NAGC Annual Conference in Indianapolis October 31 - November 3, 1996, where Ms. Wink and Ms. McLendon had presented a session on the TAGT In Depth Probe Survey.

Dr. Seay announced that the contract for the TAGT elementary curriculum publication with Dr. James Curry and Mr. John Samara had been broken mutually by both parties and that the publication funds would be held in escrow until TAGT can produce its own elementary curriculum publication, possibly in late spring.

Dr. Seay reported that she and Ann Wink had attended the November 7-8, 1996 meeting of the State Board of Education on the State Plan for Gifted Education. She noted that the standards for the four content areas had been maintained, and the plan was approved with minor changes.

In her Executive Director’s report, Connie McLendon informed the Board that Ann Wink and Wayne Craigie had participated in the Texas School Initiative (TSI) training program last summer, in which District Effectiveness and Compliance (DEC) indicators were examined. Ms. Wink reported that “gifted” was not mentioned in the training sessions. She said that monitoring of districts occurs only once every five years, and it was important that gifted programs be included in the monitoring cycle. She said that after learning of this information, she contacted Connie McLendon and Evelyn Hiatt, Director of TEA Division of Advanced Academic Services, regarding omission of G/T. She commented that two indicators relating to gifted education had been added to the DEC publication as a consequence of TAGT’s intervention.

Ms. McLendon reported on the Gifted Education Funding Research Project for the 75th Texas Legislature and the Legislative Budget Board sponsored by the School Finance Working Group and TAGT. She reported that she had participated in the Legislative Budget Board Round Table in October, using PIEMS data which indicates that districts are spending twice what they are getting from the State on gifted education programs. She recommended that the funding weight be increased to reflect more accurately the actual program costs across the state.

Ms. McLendon also introduced a new member of the TAGT Headquarters Staff, Anne Kemerer, who has taken over the position of Coordinator of Programs and Services, formerly held by Alicia Denney.

Susan Johnsen reported that the Education and Training Committee had been receiving a number of applications for the TAGT Awareness Certificate. She recommended that the Board also consider a 12-hour certificate for administrators. Dr. Johnsen said that she believes there is not enough marketing of the TAGT Awareness Certificate. She encouraged members of the Executive Board to complete their own training workshops and to turn in their applications for training credit.

Ann Wink referred the Board to the elected members of the 1997 Executive Board. She noted that the position of Regional Director for Region III is temporarily vacant, and that Susan Johnsen will need to appoint a director for that region.
Tracy Weinberg reported that TAGT had met its proposed conference budget for the Fiscal Year 1996-97, even though registration was slow in September. He announced that the only area in which TAGT had significantly exceeded the conference budget expenditures was in transportation; this was due to the need to run shuttles to additional hotels. He said that even though TAGT had gone over budget in expenses for transportation, the overall income from the conference looked good.

Mr. Weinberg reported that five awards had been given for the 1996 Laura Allard Grants for Excellence. He recommended that the deadline for applications be changed to coincide with other deadlines for scholarships, as well as the publication of Insights. He suggested having a March deadline, so that the grants could be funded in the spring. He also suggested that TAGT award these grants twice yearly and that the number of applications be increased. He suggested limiting the number of pages of the applications in order to save time and reduce work.

Mary Seay reported on the TAGT Legislative Training Workshop, held October 29, 1996. She noted evaluations were very positive. Dr. Seay said that she felt it was a fantastic meeting and the best training she had ever received on legislative issues. She complimented Connie McLendon and Sandy Kibby for their work.

Colleen Elam referred the Board to the Advocacy Pamphlet, which had been developed in response to parents' suggestions on the TAGT parent survey. She also reviewed the program for the Parent Reception, to be held in the Texas Ballroom III of the Hyatt Regency Hotel, Austin, Texas, November 22, 1996, 7 p.m., encouraging everyone to attend.

Benny Hickerson predicted that conference registration would top 5,000. She also reported that the number of presenters for Creativity Potpourri was 73, a record number.

Michael Sayler reported the resignation of Renee Horton and that his secretary, Cristine Lammers, would be taking on more Tempo responsibilities. He also informed the Board that he would be seeking copy-editing help from the University of North Texas English Department.

Dr. Sayler announced that the Editorial Board had selected tentative themes for next year's publications. He encouraged the Board to write for Tempo and asked for more ideas for themes.

Colleen Elam reported on the In-Depth Probe Survey recommendations. She announced that the recommendations from Walsh and Payne essentially had been rejected, and that the In-Depth Probe Task Force had found Connie McLendon and Ann Wink's recommendations much more positive and usable. She said that the Task Force had organized these recommendations for presentation.

Mary Seay thanked the Board for their work during her tenure as TAGT President.

The TAGT Executive Board approved the following items:

• approval of Cyndi Boyd as the Assistant Regional Director for Region IV, Dr. Charles Chernosky as the Assistant Regional Director for Region X, and Carol Romary as the Assistant Regional Director for Region XI.
• acceptance of the Long-Range Plan Goals and Objectives
• acceptance of the In-Depth Probe Study Recommendations
• approval of extension of the Executive Director's contract.

The next TAGT Executive Board meeting is scheduled for January 31 - February 2, 1996 at the Holiday Inn South, Austin, Texas.
The National Research Center on the Gifted and Talented (NRCGT) is planning to conduct seven new research studies over the next five years. Topics include professional development activities for classroom teachers, student leadership, the use of linguistics and culture to teach and evaluate culturally diverse students, and Sternberg’s triarchic theory of intelligence.

The NRCGT works with 339 school districts in all states and territories to conduct its research and would like additional districts to join its network of Collaborative School Districts. If your district is interested in becoming a NRCGT Collaborative School District, contact The National Research Center on the Gifted and Talented, University of Connecticut, 362 Fairfield Road, U-7, Storrs, CT 06269.

The NRCGT is run under a cooperative agreement with the U.S. Department of Education by a consortium that includes the University of Connecticut, City University of New York, City College, Stanford University, and Yale University. The cooperative agreement is funded through the Jacob K. Javits Gifted and Talented Students Education Act of 1994.

The Interdisciplinary Creative Problem Solving Conference is a conference created to serve both teachers and students. Teachers attend sessions focusing on interdisciplinary curriculum and the creative problem solving process and observe master teachers implementing these strategies working with students. This year new sessions for teachers will be led by experienced professionals in the field. Session topics include: designing interdisciplinary curriculum, individualizing curriculum for all students, providing opportunities for team projects, involving students in authentic research, observing successful teaching processes, and designing simulations for gifted students.

Gifted middle-school and secondary students work on teams (guided by experienced facilitators), competing to creatively solve a complex crisis within the 24 hour conference time. Information gathering, teamwork, planning, selling ideas are just a few of the activities that are planned. These teenagers explore exciting ideas, make new friends, solve complex problems and enjoy challenging times together. Approximately 150 students attend this conference, now in its eighth year. Students are encouraged to request the registration forms and return them as quickly as possible.

ICPS begins at 2 p.m. Friday, February 28th and ends at 4 p.m. on Saturday, March 1. Acceptance to the conference is based strictly on a first-come-first-serve basis. Application forms are available from Baylor University, P.O. Box 97301, Waco, TX 76798.

For questions about the conference or registration, please call 817/ 755-3112 or send e-mail to Susan_Johnsen@baylor.edu. We’re looking forward to seeing many of you at Baylor in February!
Sources of Funding Information for Teacher Grants

The Summer 1995 issue of Tempo contained an article on writing successful grant proposals. The article referred to places where funding information was available. The following centers have more information and serve as Centers of the Cooperative Collections in Texas. Additional information and a teacher’s guide to fellowships and awards can be accessed at http://info.doe.mass.edu/doedocs/tgfaltr.html

Abilene
Abilene Center for Nonprofit Management
Funding Information Library
500 N. Chestnut, Suite 1511
Abilene, TX 79064

Amarillo
Amarillo Area Foundation
700 First National Place
801 South Fillmore
Amarillo, TX 79101

Austin
Hogg Foundation for Mental Health
3001 Lake Austin Blvd.
Austin, TX 78704

Corpus Christi
Texas A&M University at Corpus Christi
Library, Reference Department
6300 Ocean Drive
Corpus Christi, TX 78412

Dallas
Dallas Public Library
Urban Information
1515 Young Street
Dallas, TX 75201

El Paso
El Paso Community Foundation
1616 Texas Commerce Building
El Paso, TX 79901

Fort Worth
Funding Information Center of Fort Worth
Texas Christian University Library
2800 South University Drive
Ft. Worth, TX 76129

Houston
Houston Public Library
Bibliographic Information Center
500 McKinney
Houston, TX 77002

Longview
Longview Public Library
222 West Cotton Street
Longview, TX 75601

Lubbock
Lubbock Area Foundation, Inc.
502 Texas Commerce Bank Building
Lubbock, TX 79401

San Antonio
Funding Information Center
530 McCullough, Suite 600
San Antonio, TX 78212-8270

Wichita Falls
North Texas Center for Nonprofit Management
624 Indiana, Suite 307
Wichita Falls, TX 76301
NATIONAL INVENTIVE THINKING ASSOCIATION

The National Inventive Thinking Association (NITA) is a nonprofit organization of educators, business leaders, and government representatives who believe that creative and inventive thinking can provide limitless opportunities for the Nation and its well-being.

Formed in 1989 by a group of educators meeting in Dallas, NITA's mission is to promote inventive thinking and a spirit of positive problem-solving through education and the networking of community and national resources. The organization serves as a network of inventive thinkers. It distributes information and ideas through its newsletter, networks of schools, and annual National Creative and Inventive Thinking Skills conferences and workshops.

Each year the NITA sponsors several important events:


- **National Conference.** This meeting is for teachers, students, and adults. It is held in October and includes general sessions, presentations, hands-on workshops, new ideas, sharing of ideas, exhibits, student works, etc.

- **Workshops.** In-depth workshops are offered before the national conference and at different times and locations over the United States and foreign countries. Special workshops are offered upon request by schools and businesses.

- **National Academy for Creative Exploration.** A new curriculum designed for schools and parents to use primarily in after-school, Saturday, or Summer settings. The activities focus on creativity, exploration, discovery, and innovation and invention. Grade levels addressed are three through nine.

For more information on NITA and its opportunities contact: NITA, P.O. Box 836202, Richardson, TX 75083

---

PARENT ORGANIZATION GOES ELECTRONIC

The Hurst-Eules-Bedford Association for the Gifted and Talented (HEBAGT) distributes announcements via e-mail. HEBAGT president Raymond Peters collects information from various sources including web sites, HEBAGT members, the HEBAGT board, and electronic discussion groups on gifted education. He reports that the e-mail distribution allows immediate contact when important events or announcements occur. Mr Peters can be reached at r.f.peters@ieee.org

ADVANCED PLACEMENT QUESTIONS ANSWERED

The Texas Education Agency has produced a question and answer pamphlet on Advanced Placement Courses and examinations. This flier is for parents. It answers commonly asked queries about the nature of Advanced Placement, its advantages, how AP classes work as college credit, taking courses with or without the credit exam, and much more. The flier is available in English and Spanish in lots of 25 or 50. Information about copies can be obtained from the publication Office of the Texas Education Agency at 512/463-9455 or by writing them at: Texas Education Agency, Attention Publications, P.O. Box 13817, Austin, TX 78711-3817.
The National Alliance for Excellence

National Alliance for Excellence is a national non-profit organization dedicated to recognizing and supporting the educational and career goals of outstanding high-school and college students. In an increasingly competitive global economic environment, providing these gifted leaders of tomorrow with educational opportunities commensurate with their demonstrated abilities is essential for our future as a nation and as a planet.

Excellence is more than an abstract concept; its a state of being and doing characterized by a continual commitment to accomplishment. It means applying oneself and working to one’s highest level of potential, exceeding the bounds of what one has already attained. It requires the investment and continual support of both the educational and business communities for that potential is to be realized.

With specific programs including merit scholarships, mentorships, internships, and more, the National Alliance for Excellence has already established itself as a highly respected non-governmental organization providing invaluable assistance to our future scientists, professionals, researchers, civic leaders, artists, and technological innovators. An advocacy group for gifted and talented students, the Alliance recognizes that academically talented students rarely receive scholarships since most of America's top colleges do not provide scholarships based on excellence. This catch-22 has been the catalyst for the organization's theme - "Excellence...worth striving for!"

With the cost of colleges rising toward the $30,000 mark annually, students often find themselves searching for money in order to fulfill their dreams. It is often too late in the college application process by the time students realize that all of the Ivy League colleges and most of the most prestigious liberal arts colleges offer no merit-based scholarships. Though students who excelled in high school may get admitted to college based on their academic achievements, contrary to popular belief, America's best and brightest are not being taken care of.

The Alliance conducts national competitions in four categories:

Technological Innovations - integrates problem solving with engineering, design, math and science, robotics, product design, computer assisted design, transportation systems, electronic communications, designing mechanisms, and architecture.

Academics - involves overall accomplishments in school, including grades, achievements, test scores, and honors.

Visual Arts - includes photography, fine arts, graphic design, jewelry, fashion design, and film production.

Performing Arts - encompasses dance, vocal talent, theater arts, and instrumental music.

Studies have shown that often students who are gifted in academics are also talented musicians, so it is not unusual to see students enter into several categories. Once entered in the competition, the students are judged by an Advisory Board of professionals relating to the students' field of expertise.

One of the awards for which students are competing are scholarships, which start at $1,000, and can be used toward educational costs at a school of their choice. Students are also eligible for internships with major corporations and government offices, and mentorships with experienced professionals. By giving talented students the opportunity to meet people and work in their field of interest during college, they will have a head start toward high achievement in the future. Students can also win Autodesk educational software, valued at over $4,000. This enables them to create and design with cutting edge computer technology.

The awards are presented in ceremonies with senators, congressmen, governors, heads of corporations and civic leaders. Funding for the awards comes from corporations and individuals interested in supporting the goal of bringing excellence back to American education.

This is a year-round competition with no deadline. For information, call the National Alliance at (908) 747-0028. If requesting an application, send a self-addressed stamped envelope to National Alliance for Excellence, 55 Highway 35, Suite 5, Red Bank, NJ 07701.
ACCELERATED DISTANCE LEARNING CLASSES
FOR K-12 GIFTED AND TALENTED STUDENTS

These multimedia classes are the result of a new partnership between the Investigations of Talented Students (ITS) at the University of North Texas and the Education Program for Gifted Students (EPGY) at Stanford University. Students take rigorous courses at home via CD-ROM technology. In addition to the software package, students communicate with tutors via e-mail and phone calls. Tutors are full-time EPGY instructors at Stanford. They provide instructional help and some technical assistance. Additional technical and administrative assistance is provided by ITS at North Texas. Interactive lessons and exercises, textbook assignments, personal tutorial assistance, and comprehensive assessment all help ensure that students completing a course through ITS-EPGY understand the material well. ITS provides assistance to parents and schools wanting to use these classes to demonstrate mastery of course content for subject acceleration or high-school credit.

The self-paced mathematics sequence begins with primary school mathematics (K-1) and continues through secondary school courses such as Algebra and Precalculus. Students continue in AP mathematics and can move to college-level courses such as Multivariate Calculus and Linear Algebra. In addition to mathematics, students can select from several AP and college-level physics courses. These include Mechanics, Electricity, and Magnetism; Optics; and Thermodynamics. They also offer Logic and AP Expository Writing. Numerous new courses are currently under development.

For more information contact: ITS-EPGY, P.O. Box 13857, University of North Texas, Denton, TX 76203-6857, (817) 565-4699, FAX (817) 565-2964, its-epgy@coefs.coe.unt.edu, http://www.coe.unt.edu/auxill/its/
Summer 1997

PROFILES OF THE GIFTED

One undeniable fact about gifted children and youth is their uniqueness. Although we call them all gifted, each have their own profile of gifts, strengths, and talents. The summer Tempo will portray some of these gifted individuals. Describe a gifted child or youth to our readers. He or she could be someone in your class, school, or district; it could be your own child. Help put faces to the generic description "gifted and talented." Show our readers the wonderful richness and variety that exist within the population of the gifted and talented.

The deadline for submission of articles is March 1, 1997. This allows us time to review the manuscripts submitted and to help authors polish them for publication.

Fall 1997

GIFTEDNESS: THROUGH THE LOOKING GLASS

The fall Tempo features articles related to the upcoming Conference. This theme encourages us to look to the history of gifted education in Texas and in each of our own schools. It also suggests new and exciting experiences for gifted education in the future. Tempo seeks articles related to either area. Additionally, individuals who are presenting at the conference are encouraged to submit articles related to their conference presentation.

The deadline for submission of articles is June 1, 1997. This allows us time to review the manuscripts submitted and to help authors polish them for publication.

Guidelines for Article Submissions

Tempo needs your manuscripts. We can only print what we receive. Other schools and parents should hear the about the good things you or your schools have done. We are not harsh critics, but work with all of our authors to develop and polish their manuscripts.

When submitting manuscripts:
1. Write about an upcoming issue theme (see list above).
2. Double space your manuscript and use 1 1/2 inch margins on all sides.
3. Use APA style if you know it; if not we will help you once we receive your manuscript.
4. Include a cover sheet with your name, address, daytime telephone and FAX number or E-mail address if available.
5. You do not need to send a copy on disk at the time of initial submission.

Send all submissions or requests for more information to:
Dr. Michael Sayler, TAGT Editorial Office, P. O. Box 13857, University of North Texas, Denton, TX 76203-6857.
Phone 817/565-4699, Fax 817/565-2964, sayler@unt.edu, http://www.coe.unt.edu/auxill/its

Texas Association for the Gifted and Talented

Membership Application

Member Name(s) ___________________________ Telephone: (H) ___________________________ (W) ___________________________
Mailing Address __________________________________________________________ City ___________________________ State __________ ZIP __________
School District & Campus Name/Business Affiliation ___________________________ ESC Region __________
Electronic Address (i.e., Teren, internet) if applicable ___________________________

PLEASE CHECK ONE: ○ Teacher ○ Administrator ○ Parent ○ School Board Member ○ Other ___________________________

Individual ........ $25 ( ) Family ............. $25 ( ) "Student .......... $15 ( ) * Must include verifiable campus, district, and grade.
Patron ............ $100 ( ) ** Institutional .. $100 ( ) Lifetime ........ $400 ( ) Parent Affiliate $45 ( )

** Institutional members receive all the benefits of regular membership, plus may send four representatives to all TAGT conferences at the member rate, regardless of individual membership status.

In addition to your regular Membership, you are invited to join a TAGT Division for an additional fee.
Choose either or both: GT/Coordinators ................................................................. $10 ( ) Research & Development ....................... $10 ( )

Membership Services
* Tempo quarterly journal and newsletter * Insights Annual Directory of Scholarships & Awards * TAGT Capitol Newsletter - monthly update during Legislative Session * Professional development workshops with inservice credit * General Management/Leadership Training * School Board Member Training * Parent services and information * Legislative representation & networking * Reduced registration fees for conferences and regional workshops

Return form and dues to: TAGT, Dept. R. B. #0471, P. O. Box 149187, Austin, TX 78789-0471
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