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SERVING PRIMARY CHILDREN

by Margaret Kress

Two years ago, when the state mandate for K-12 gifted programs was passed, most districts were forced to step back and evaluate where they were with their plans for gifted programs and determine what they needed to do to meet the mandate. One of the areas of greatest concern since that time has been the identification and serving of primary students.

A major concern is the possibility of misidentification, creating difficulty for a student two or three years after identification. While this can happen, I believe we must not allow administrative concerns to cloud our vision of what is best for children. Instead, it is important that we see this as a challenge to improve our complete services for young children.

Research has consistently indicated that early identification and the provision of special instruction for gifted students provides a better opportunity for effective development. This benefit is especially pronounced for the highly gifted, the disadvantaged gifted, and the culturally different gifted. Underachievement, displayed by first grade in extreme cases, can result from lack of identification and instruction.

Early identification is important because it alerts both school and parents that the child has special needs. Parents who are aware of their child’s special abilities can plan intelligently for appropriate, challenging educational experiences in the home. In addition, teachers can develop learning experiences geared to the child’s actual level of competence rather than ones focused on chronological age alone.

The challenge to the schools in working with primary students is to provide experiences that match the child’s skill level and the material presented. The material should be sufficiently difficult to provide a challenge, but not so difficult that the child cannot relate it to previous learning. It is important that we remember, for example, that the attention span and motor skills required in writing, will be more like those of age peers and have an impact on what must happen instructionally.

Identification of young children is difficult, but it is possible to select children with reasonable accuracy. Houston Independent School District has been identifying kindergarten children for their gifted program for 12 years with about 90% success rate. As educators it is our responsibility to look beyond the constraints and focus on what is best for our children.

By identifying children earlier, we will find that more of them will meet their potential. Many students who would have been lost before third grade can be functioning, productive members of the gifted class and school. We must use our care and creativity to assure the youngest of our students the education they deserve.

John Young, Hunter’s Creek Elementary
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tempo SPRING 1989
The legislative session ends May 30. Time for action is running out. Those of us interested in our children's educational opportunities in each school district need to become recognized advocates. Your local legislative members need to learn that funding for education is your number one priority. Without the power of your oral or written expression of concern for legislative action, additional equitable funding for education will not happen. If legislators hear from you, you are listened to! You are the voters! That is a definition of power.

TAGT Adopts Legislative Platform

The following Legislative Platform was approved by the TAGT Executive Board at its February 12th meeting. Members of the Legislature and the State Board of Education have received copies of this statement concerning g/t education's mandate. It is vitally important that the mandate be established by 1990-91:

Whereas the Texas Association for the Gifted and Talented is designed to promote and improve the education of gifted and talented persons, we stand firmly in support of H.B. 1050 mandating that all school districts in the state of Texas offer services to gifted and talented students, grades K-12, by 1990-91.

We affirm the funding formulas delineated in the 1989 State Board of Education legislative recommendations. We support the need for and the recognition of gifted and talented students as a special population in the state of Texas.

Please be aware of our appreciation for current legislation and the recognition of gifted and talented students as a special population in the state of Texas.

These needs, as well as the funding one, demand "front burner" attention. The House and the Senate need to hear you say "Get on with it. We support your efforts to provide additional funds for educational programs of excellence and high quality for our Texas youth."

Richard Brooks, third grade
St. Michael's Academy
Bryan, Texas
Although November 8-11 may seem far in the future, the 1989 Conference Committee has been hard at work to make this upcoming Texas Association for the Gifted and Talented Conference the best ever. We have taken your comments and suggestions into consideration and will be addressing issues such as overcrowding and appropriate sessions for all levels of participants. Tentative plans call for repeating selected sessions, and if numbers warrant, limiting either pre-registration or on-site registration. Further details will appear in the Summer TEMPO. Please plan to register for the conference and hotel accommodations early.

The theme, A Love of Learning, will feature two keynote speakers: Dr. Mary Meeker, whose work with the Structure of Intellect addresses all levels of students; and Dr. Lillian Katz, who is an expert in the area of primary and preschool children. Special strands will address the fine arts, secondary programs, and administrative concerns. Program selections will also cover early childhood issues as well as service to gifted students in honors and advanced placement courses. Appropriate selections will be available for beginning teachers as well as the old hands.

For those of you who love San Antonio as I do, the conference hotel, The San Antonio Marriott Rivercenter, offers a scenic view of the river and the very special shops and restaurants which line its shores. To add to your enjoyment, the Local Arrangements Committee Chairperson, Margie Irwin, has some very special surprises planned in addition to the Mexican Fiesta on Thursday night of the conference. A special administrator’s luncheon will be held on Friday, so bring your principals and central administrators.

The Conference Committee and I look forward to seeing you in San Antonio next November. What a wonderful time to be in that beautiful city!

Will the real winner of the complimentary San Antonio weekend please stand up?

If you were the lucky winner of the drawing for three nights accommodations at the San Antonio Marriott Rivercenter, awarded at the November 1988 Annual TAGT Convention, please contact our office (512-343-1886). We have more details on how to claim your complimentary reservations.

COMING ATTRACTIONS . . .

"The Child, the World, the Future"
AMERICAN MONTESSORI'S NATIONAL CONFERENCE
April 14-16, Fairmont Hotel, Dallas, Texas
Contact: Mary Moseley, (214) 348-1345

THIRD NATIONAL UNDERACHIEVEMENT INSTITUTE
August 7-11, Olympia Village, Oconomowoc, Wisconsin
Contact: Ed. Assessment Service, W6050 Apple Road, Watertown, WI 53094
(414) 261-1118

AMARILLO MONTESSORI SUMMER ACADEMY
June-July 1989
Enrichment courses for Panhandle area students. Registration through Amarillo College to be held in May. Contact: Ginger McKenzie, 3806 South Bowie, Amarillo, 79110 (806) 353-3871
In order to give you, the reader, some sense of the direction our Editorial Committee has taken in assembling this Spring issue of *tempo*, we thought it would be helpful to describe how we arrived at its theme: Gifted Education at the Preschool/Primary Level, and to orient you to particular contributions associated with that theme.

The theme itself has arisen quite naturally in response to the concerns of educators across the nation who have agreed that preparing children at the preschool level for more productive educational experiences is a critical task to be undertaken now, and to the increasing involvement of parents in the formal educational process in the schools as well as at home.

Secondly, as noted in the Compton TEA summary of state approved gifted/talented programs (Winter issue, p.15), 86% of school districts had yet to implement g/t programming at the kindergarten level to meet the 1990-91 mandate. Since the grade level most often served has been grade four, we have much to do to bridge this early primary gap and one way to do this is to publicize programs that are accomplishing the task well.

Thirdly, it is spring and what better time to appreciate new life than by focusing on the wonders of young children and contributing to the national focus on the Week of the Young Child, April 2-8.

At the February TAGT Executive Board meeting, our TEA Director of Gifted/Talented Education, Ann Shaw, forcefully reminded us that gifted/talented education is at a crossroads. We must proceed thoughtfully if we are to consolidate the gains we have made through such legislative supports as the mandate, and we must document carefully the contributions gifted education makes to excellence in our schools if we are to continue to receive support for gifted youth. Ann affirmed four critical questions that we must continue to address: Who is the gifted child? What is gifted education? What is a program that effectively meets the needs of gifted children? What can be done by parents to address the needs of their gifted children? We are reminded that this task must be undertaken by schools and parents acting in complementary rather than adversarial fashion.

Translating these questions into our theme, our Editorial Committee believed that we must then provide direction for:

1) **Identification**: how do we find the young child whose needs must be met through differentiated curriculum (Johnsen, p.13);
2) **Programming**: what type of instruction will serve the needs of these gifted children (Black, p 9 ; Scott p. 12 ; Kress, p.2) as well as address their social and emotional needs, i.e., the whole child (Robinson, p. 8 );
3) **Administration**: what are the logistics of establishing an integrated and effective program at this age level (Seney, p.12 ; Clarke and Hargrove, p. 14-15); and
4) **Parenting**: what are parents' most effective roles in complementing the teacher/school contribution to educating their gifted children ( Lewis, p. 16 ; Mckee, p. 11 ; Moreno, p. 10 ; Robinson, p. 8 ). We hope you will find the articles informative, idea-enhancing, and helpful as you continue your efforts for the gifted children you encounter, foster, and discover!

---

**Food for Thought...**

The earlier gifted children are identified and provided with appropriate programming, the better their chances of fully actualizing their potential (Karnes, Shwedel, & Kemp, 1985).

Shaw and McCuen (1960) report that they were able to identify underachievers as early as grade one.

By the time the gifted underachiever has reached the middle elementary grades, his underachievement is a genuine life style, and major educational readjustments or counseling over an extended period of time are often needed to change it (Gallagher, 1975).

---

**TAGT SPONSORED RESEARCH:**

$2,000 Fellowship Grant to be Awarded

Those of you with research interests and skills and who have an open summer may be interested in the call for proposals TAGT has recently put forth to conduct an initial inquiry on the question: Where and how does gifted education fit in the research on effective schools? The intent of this study will be to examine and analyze the accumulated literature on effective schools, and to generate the questions that need to be addressed in studies on the specific short and long-range effects of gifted education. A grant of $2,000 will be awarded for this study to be completed during the 1989 summer months and reported on at the Fall Conference.

Controversy over some of the findings and interpretation of the effective Schools Research (such as described in the article on ability grouping on page 15) has brought about policy decisions that may not be in the best interests of the youth who should be served through gifted education programming. We in gifted education must respond with sound theory and factual data to demonstrate that appropriate gifted education is making a major contribution to excellence and effectiveness in our schools.

Proposal submission deadline is May 1, with award notice by May 10. The RFP has been sent to all graduate programs in education in Texas but guidelines may be obtained by a call to the TAGT offices: (512) 343-1886.
Since its inception in 1976, Oak Forest Elementary has exemplified the goals of the Houston ISD Vanguard Program: to provide educational experiences and service appropriate to the needs of gifted and talented students.

Under Ann Edwards, Oak Forest’s current principal, the school continues to offer a differentiated curriculum designed to challenge high-ability learners beginning in Kindergarten. Subject area specialists and cross-graded grouping, along with a number of other instructional provisions unique to the Vanguard program, combine to gently nurture students to their maximum potential.

Above: Parents are participating partners at Oak Forest. Here a father brings in live birds for the children to observe, compare and enjoy.

Concern for traffic safety takes a new turn as kindergarten students construct and drive their own dream cars. Sidewalks adjacent to the school were transformed into streets, intersections and “no passing lanes” to give children a taste of real life traffic conditions. In a program designed by two Oak Forest teachers, Rosalind Roberson and Cheryl Stevens, children brainstormed about traffic problems, learned defensive driving techniques and graduated with a “Texas Tot” driving license. Learning to wait their turn in traffic and working together towards accomplishing goals were lessons that transferred easily to the children’s everyday lives.

Solving real life problems, Texas tots tie-up traffic.
Seasonal celebrations like Halloween, Christmas, or spring planting become the occasion for creative interdisciplinary activities at Oak Forest.

To experience the real meaning of the holiday season, kindergartners celebrate the “spirit of kindness” (below, left). Thoughtful acts the children perform at school or home are recopied on to paper ornaments and used to decorate the “Kindness Tree.”

Another class project involved a visit to a nearby nursing home. The children prepared by first talking about growing older, making decorations for the patients, learning holiday songs to perform and taking cookies to share.

Above, left: Making costumes for the Halloween carnival calls not only for ingenuity but some genuine "problem-solving skills!"

Below: Teachers, students, and volunteers dig in on the cylinder gardening project.
MATCHING THE SOCIAL AND EMOTIONAL NEEDS OF GIFTED YOUNG CHILDREN IN A COMPREHENSIVE CURRICULUM

by Nancy Robinson, Ph.D., University of Washington Center for the Study of Capable Youth

Starting bright children off on the road to academic self-fulfillment is a special privilege of teachers in the early grades in partnership with families. For children who are exceptionally able in areas that are valued in school, it is of course of high priority that we adjust the academic curriculum so that it provides an “optimal match” — just that degree of challenge that develops mature thinking skills, spurs children on with confidence and a sense of adventure, and prevents boredom and its deadly consequences.

In addition, though, there are other areas that need our attention if bright children are to blossom. We need to help them build a passion for learning, a zest for challenge, and a sense of commitment. We need to help them build high standards for their own performance (the “good kind” of perfectionism that is flexible and reasonable and yields joy and strength when goals are attained). We need to free them to take intellectual risks and to value novel solutions. We need to help them tolerate feeling “different” without damage to their self-esteem, to value differences in others, and to appreciate situations in which others do better than they.

Bright children do not come in identical packages, of course. They include early readers and average readers, natural athletes and “klutzes,” those adept with pencil and scissors and those who struggle with them, and so on. In social and emotional behavior, too, they differ widely — the shy and the fearless, the stoics and those who cry too readily, the subtle negotiators and the frontal attackers, children who seem old for their age and those who seem young.

Yet, how many of us, both educators and parents, tend to regard these individual differences as outside our teaching sphere, maintaining that bright children are “first of all five (or six, or seven...) year olds,” however bright they may be. Even worse, we assume that there is nothing to be done about social maturity, that it is an inevitable expression of an immutable timeclock set at conception, and that therefore accelerative options which place a child in the company of older classmates are unnatural and potentially dangerous.

Such a position is not necessarily accurate. There are many children who come to school without the social skills they need, but as ready to learn those as they are to learn traditional academic content. They may even be able to express surprising social insights but have had so little guided experience that they cannot practice what they preach. What is called for here, I think, is just the same kind of careful observational assessment and prescriptive teaching that works in reading and arithmetic. One bright little boy was alienating both friends and teacher, for example, by shouting “I don’t like you,” when crossed; at home, his parents understood what he meant, but a teacher’s tactful suggestion to say, more mildly, “I don’t like it much when you (mess up my books, spill my milk, etc.)” worked wonders.

Bright children who plan highly complex play activities are often frustrated and disorganized by the inability of their classmates to respond in kind; they need to learn ways to restructure roles to make them more attractive and feasible for their playmates. One four-year old was disappointed, for example, when his friend failed to arrive at 3:30 p.m. after nap, as he had asked in a note, but the friend could neither read nor tell time! In a similar vein, many bright young children have attained a concept of friendship as a caring, stable relationship while their agemates are still content to play with whoever happens by; they may feel lonely and see themselves as lacking friends even though they appear popular to teachers and other children.

In self-help and socialization skills, it is surprising to discover that even bright children are not usually particularly advanced. (Such skills include, for example, doing household chores and going about the neighborhood with friends.) Young children from neglecting families, in contrast, are often far more advanced for their age; they require these skills for survival. Yet independence is one of the hallmarks of the high achiever, and perhaps we should adjust our expectations upward. One precocious 2 1/2 year old of my acquaintance could put away the family’s groceries and laundry and could even fry an egg, skills she had acquired with the loving tutelage of her mother, who was confined to a wheel chair.
For children whose intellectual maturity exceeds their years, high priority needs to be given, then, by families and teachers to preparing them to survive in the company of older children whose mental ability, wit, and interests are a good fit with theirs. Achieving an optimal intellectual match often means flexible placement — some of it, at least, with older classmates. Many gifted children do spontaneously select older friends (and, sometimes, younger ones who appreciate their leadership and attention), and older children are often excellent social teachers. But we cannot count on this process to happen all by itself. Families and teachers must team up to complement and extend one another's efforts in these significant spheres. The task is not an easy one, but our children deserve no less.

Dr. Nancy Robinson is currently the Director of the Center for the Study of Capable Youth, University of Washington, Seattle. Dr. Robinson gave a keynote address on the above topic for the recent Second Annual Conference for Early Childhood Educators sponsored by Texas A&M University's Institute for the Gifted and Talented and Region VI Education Service Center.

"Touch the Walls ... Feel the Warmth"
A Short, Short Story of W.H. Brandon School, Mini-Magnet for Primary and Elementary Gifted and Talented Children

by Karen Black, Gifted Programs Administrator, Lufkin ISD

The first time I stepped inside the doors of Brandon School, I knew that there was something distinctly different about it. The sounds, sights, and smells were similar to those found in most elementary schools, but s-o-m-e-t-h-i-n-g was different. Was it the animals in their habitats, lining the corridors, carrying on the mundane tasks of living and caring for their young? Was it the strains of “The Nutcracker Suite" coming from Mrs. Allen’s second grade classroom, or the smell of an oriental meal being prepared and served by Mrs. Steed’s first grade class? Perhaps it was the exhibition space busily being filled with wonderful, fantastical creations from Marsha Rose’s science students as they prepared for the opening of the "Invention Convention.”

As the new G/T Coordinator for LUSD, I inherited Brandon School in the spring of 1988. What a windfall! Here was a veritable treasure of innovative teaching strategies, progressive enthusiasm, optimistic attitudes, and a nurturing, loving bond among staff members, administration, and children.

Brandon School is a mini-magnet, housing Lufkin’s gifted and talented children in grades 1-6 in a self-contained setting, with about half of its enrollment of 500 composed of regular students. The theory of “radiation of excellence” is alive and well here, with all children sharing in the educational advantages reaped from a school philosophy based upon the rationales of gifted and talented education.

As a g/t coordinator, I can test and screen children, work with teachers, write curriculum, or speak to community groups, but the key elements in successful primary gifted programming are:

1) campus administrators who are dynamic, committed, self-assured, and pro-gifted education
2) teachers who are trained in the nature and needs of young gifted children and who truly love teaching children, and
3) community interest and commitment.

W.H. Brandon School is getting close to what many of us perceive an “ideal” school to be. One explanation for this was expressed well by one of its teachers when she said: “We love children at Brandon. There is so much love, you can touch the walls and feel the warmth...”

Karen Steed’s first grade class at their "pajama party"
Parents as Teachers . . .

SUZUKI PARENTING
by Beth Moreno, Managing Editor, tempo

It's been two and a half years now since Hector and I first sat down at the piano together. He was just four then and "kiddie piano" was the farthest thing from my mind; as everyone knows, the right time to start children on piano is about age 7, after they have learned to read, are comfortable with a left to right orientation on the page and display some rudimentary concentration. But despite the conventional wisdom, a number of things led me to the keyboard with him several years before most children are properly introduced; it has been an experience for both of us.

Katie, his sister, was eight years old and playing quite well that year. Taking a back seat to his sister, however, wasn't in Hector's nature; he was intensively competitive with her, putting in his two cent's worth in another octave every time she sat down to practice. After numerous attempts to shoo him away with that classic parental reproach "you're not old enough," it came to me that what I needed to do was channel his competitiveness, not deny it. Obviously, we were looking at more piano lessons, but where to start? It seemed many music educators agree, the most appropriate approach to music for very young children is a technique based on ear training rather than note reading. There are just too many symbols on a page of even simple piano music not to befuddle young children; they become so distracted deciphering note values and barlines that they seldom hear what they are playing. My own experience reinforced that observation; I had taken lessons more years than I care to remember at a very correct musical conservatory, with the upshot being that I could crunch an impressive number of notes but my reliance on the printed music was absolute. Memorization didn't come easily and ear training exercises sent me into a cold sweat. One thing I was sure I wanted for my children was more confidence in their "musical ear."

The major premise of Suzuki educators is that parents are teachers.

Although Suzuki piano demands a very special kind of teacher (in our case, Angelica Lopez, a UT graduate and a really superb conventional teacher as well), its success really depends on parent involvement. We are not talking about just baking cookies for the annual recital. We're talking about work, some of the hardest, yet most rewarding work I have ever done as a parent. The major premise of Suzuki educators is that parents are teachers. Notes, fingering, and rhythm are all the responsibility of the parent and child in the home. The parent observes at every lesson and in the following week does as much as he/she can to realize the modest, but very precise goals set by the teacher. And every day the child listens to a taped version of the music he will soon be playing.

Every Suzuki practice session begins with a bow from both the parent and child as a way of signaling their readiness to be either the best teacher possible or the best pupil. That in itself is therapeutic. As a parent I always felt myself washed clean, starting fresh each day with my child, no matter what the mood of the previous practice session had been. Kids like it too—in a society largely purged of ritual, the ceremonial bow is an exotic novelty. So the lesson begins with respect, and if I had to single out the most distinctive value of the Suzuki method, it is the respect it shows the child—respect for his abilities to learn at a young age and not at some arbitrary starting point convenient for adults; respect for his physical limitations—that his ear and his hand might coordinate better at this age than his eye and his hand; respect for the quality of the music we ask him to learn—Bach and Mozart not "The March of the Middle C's."

Make everything you touch beautiful. . .

The actual method sounds deceptively simple. The child has been listening to tapes of the music he will be playing. Phrase by phrase, hands separately and then together, he simply "copy cats" what he has heard. He reconstructs it by ear without intellectually "knowing" the formal time values, note names or other conventions of musical notation. (He'll learn those later.) Kids love to imitate and they are enthusiastic about matching sounds.

What I discovered about myself in the process were a few of my own misplaced enthusiasms. It really was difficult not to move in for the correctional "kill" every time Hector's ears and hands gropped for the right combinations. The urge to do it for him was sometimes overwhelming. Some Suzuki instructors, they say, can actually conduct a lesson without speaking. They demonstrate on a second piano the musical effect the pupil should be trying to achieve. I have a long way to go before turning mute in my children's presence, but I have learned at least to wait before editorializing, even if it means clapping my hands over my mouth. A discrete pointer once in a while by Mom or Dad is okay, but no wholesale "do it this way." The joy of watching a child literally discover the music, search it out with his fingers, is a special privilege. As you see his muscles learn the appropriate intervals and his ear recognize the right pitches, both of you share in the breakthrough.

There is frustration, of course; all disciplines have their dry spots. But it is the extra musical values a child learns in Suzuki which prepare him for a richer, more productive life, I'd like to focus on. First, there is the virtue of simple consistency. If you do anything every day—from dribbling a basketball to quadratic equations—you get better. This may seem obvious to adults but
for children who so frequently see magical powers instantly bestowed or withdrawn from characters on the video screen, it may come as a surprise. Secondly, subdivide a task and it gets easier. Does that passage sound too complicated? Take it apart, note by note if necessary; there is no dishonor in simplifying a problem, not in your music lesson or in your life. Third, trust your ear and by extension, trust yourself. Ears remember and muscles, too, even if sometimes they’re balky. You can do it.

And along the way, don’t forget to make everything you touch beautiful. Grip the key; shape the phrase; place the chord. Remember, you are the best pupil you can possibly be. It’s hard to imagine a simple piano lesson teaching a child any more.

This is the first in a series of articles about parenting written by our membership. We invite your contributions on a theme or experience you feel is relevant to other parents. For details about submission, please see the inside back cover.

BOOK REVIEW

Bringing out the Best: A Resource Guide for Parents of Young Gifted Children
By Jacquelyn Saunders with Pamela Espeland
Free Spirit Publishing, Minneapolis, Minnesota, $12.95

Packed with practical suggestions for understanding, developing and living with giftedness, Bringing out the Best addresses all the common questions parents and educators ask about the young gifted child.

The authors write in simple, practical language on such topics as:

- What it means to be gifted
- How you can affect your child’s brain development
- How to select appropriate toys
- What to look for in a preschool
- How to avoid parent burnout
- How to help your child “belong”

Dozens of activities designed to develop specific aptitudes are described in detail. Illustrations of precocious preschool behavior are followed by lists of helpful materials (and their sources), as well as suggested readings.

Bringing out the Best is an invaluable resource for parents, teachers, and administrators.

Order from: Presents for the Promising
P.O. Box 134
Sewell, New Jersey 08080

Reviewed by:
Martha McKee
Coordinator, Gifted Education
Fort Worth ISD

Parenting Program “Invests in the Beginning”

Parents as Teachers, a highly successful parenting project developed in Missouri, has been introduced on a pilot basis in three Texas school districts—Fort Worth, Garland, and Allen. Designed to teach new parents about their child’s first three years of life, the program relies on social workers and educators trained to teach parents about the physical, social, emotional, and intellectual development of their children. Its immediate goal is to reduce the chances of child abuse and at the same time, pull together new parents in a peer-support network. It is quite likely, as well, to uncover gifted potential in many children whose environment might never have permitted the full development of their abilities without additional help.

The program has been endorsed by many agencies, including the Hogg Foundation for Mental Health, which cites the importance of “investing in the beginning” of a child’s development. Funding for the demonstration programs comes from several sources, including the Department of Human Services and the Texas Education Agency. The State Board of Education has asked the Texas Legislature to appropriate $8 million in part to develop more PAT programs statewide.

Chong-Kal Fu, Hunter’s Creek, Spring Branch ISD
An Administrator's Viewpoint . . .

MEETING THE MANDATE
by Bob Seney, Gifted and Talented Program Coordinator, Spring Branch ISD

We must reject "panic" planning and the tendency to look only at the ways others are "doing it."

As a recently appointed coordinator of gifted and talented programs with the task of "meeting the mandate," I nearly fell into the problem-solving trap about which we warn our gt students: I started to seek solutions before I had adequately defined the problem! (Oh, Holy Parents, forgive!) After catching myself, I took a deep breath and began a plan of action. Since we had grades 3-9 in place and 10-12 on the drawing board, my immediate concern was researching and implementing the program. The first job was to task analyze the process of designing our K-12 gifted program.

What needs might we best serve? I quickly realized that my research must first focus on defining the needs of early childhood gifted learners. After drawing as complete a picture as possible of these needs, we can better identify the needs we can realistically meet, given the makeup and resources of our district. These needs must, then, be central to all that we do.

Which types of giftedness do these needs represent? Once we have defined the specific needs which we will attempt to meet in our program, we can better determine the type of giftedness we are seeking to serve. The touchstone during this process will be the district's current philosophy about gifted education, but it may well be that an additional approach must be designed that will "tessellate" with the existing philosophy.

Which program model will best serve these needs? The next step will be to design a program model. An approach to curriculum, administrative organization, and desired outcomes will be considered as they best relate to the targeted needs which we have chosen to serve.

Who will teach these gifted children? The fourth step will be the consideration of staffing needs, selection, and training. The selected staff will be included in the planning stage as early as possible.

How will we identify the children? It is only now that we should move to the fifth step in the process: designing the identification program. With the identification program, we will seek to be inclusive, not exclusive, and the results of the identification procedure will lead us directly to programming for individual students. We will identify to match what we have designed and planned.

The purpose of delineating a plan in this way is to provide a cohesive, formative development which is proactive and not reactive. First concerns of "How do we identify?", "What type of program do we develop?" and "What will be our curriculum?" give way to a more realistic development plan. Our goal is to develop a K-2 gifted program that holds together well yet sets the stage for these children to progress as well-prepared students to meet the challenges and opportunities in the remainder of our school district's K-12 gifted program.

I have shared this procedure of development in order to suggest a plan of action to aid those who also find themselves with the need to meet the 1990-91 mandate. I am convinced that the identification of the needs of the gifted learner that a program will serve is the priority task in planning a successful program for the early childhood gifted learner. We must reject "panic" planning and the tendency to look only at the ways others are "doing it." We must plan to meet the specific needs and priorities of our own particular setting.

Gifted Education at the Preschool and Primary Level: Modifying the Strategies

by Eleanor Meyer Scott
K-3 Teacher, Gifted and Talented
Clear Creek ISD

The gifted child is a child for whom the regular grade learning programs are not challenging enough to hold the child's attention. By virtue of the child's ability to learn at a faster pace, to handle abstract concepts and to master a high level of content presented at an earlier age, many regular classroom teaching strategies are inappropriate. Because of these basic learning characteristics, an advanced curriculum and many stimulating services must be provided for the preschool and primary level gifted learner.

In modifying the teaching strategies for the student in the regular classroom, teachers should offer them the opportunity to answer questions dealing with higher cognitive levels within the content area. Classroom teachers can incorporate creative problem solving techniques such as brainstorming or attribute listing into daily lesson plans.

Classroom learning centers also invite self-directed exploration based on special learning skills, creative problem solving, divergent thinking, logic, information gathering, information sharing, and critical thinking. A "research in action" corner or special area in the classroom can be set up where materials on new topics being investigated are located. A problem-solving section could be in place. Students would be encouraged to help each other on the projects and cooperate in the efforts in the preschool and primary level.

Many teachers are already meeting the needs of the gifted child. Others must become skilled at tapping the potential. The challenge is there, and the rewards and benefits are unlimited.
Along with the majority of states, Texas requires that more than one criteria be used in the identification process for gifted and talented children (O'Connell, 1985). This requirement is often based on the rationale that giftedness has many dimensions and facets that are difficult to measure with any one single method or instrument. Most Texas school districts do use multiple data. However, one set of problems arises during the final selection phase when these multiple data are summarized and evaluated by the selection committee. These problems may relate to the comparison of scores that are not similar, the arbitrary division of percentile ranks into equal intervals, the treatment of a score as if it were "real," and the focus on a cut-off number for limiting entry into a gifted program. To avoid some of these problems, I would like to suggest the following criteria to use in the development and evaluation of a final selection form:

Criterion 1: The scores are comparable. For example, the 95th percentile is comparable to a standard score of 124 (with a mean and standard deviation of 100 and 15 respectively), the 99th to 133, and so on. Charts comparing various test scores may be found in many test manuals or from a test publisher.

Criterion 2. Error in the tests are considered when reporting scores. Every test contains a certain amount of error (i.e., the standard error). Depending upon the reliability of the instrument, the size of this error will vary across grade levels, across subtests, and between different tests. For example, with the same instrument, a student may obtain different scores over time. This variation in performance may in part be attributed to the error in the test itself. Therefore, when reporting scores, you should consider that a student's "real score" lies somewhere within a range of scores. Again, test manuals and/or test publishers will be able to tell you the amount of error found in specific tests.

Criterion 3. It does not weight one instrument or one source of information. The "weighting" of instruments is accomplished in many ways. One way is the assigning of extra points to certain tests. For example, an intelligence test might earn 10 points whereas a teacher nomination might earn only 5 points. Another way is to have a single source of information such as the teacher provide the majority of the subjective information (i.e., grades, checklists, product scores). In this case, the teacher's perception is weighted. Another way is to use several subtests as well as a composite score from the same instrument. This single instrument is therefore triple weighted. Check your summary form to make sure that unintentional weighting is not occurring.

Criterion 4. It shows the student's best performance. The best estimate of a student's "potential" is his/her best performance. The selection committee should be able to examine these differences in performance in determining whether or not a child might benefit from a gifted program.

Criterion 5. It describes the student as well as reporting numbers. While numbers are helpful in comparing certain kinds of data, not all information about the student can be described numerically. Therefore, space should be provided for anecdotal information or clinical observations such as how the student goes about acquiring new information and his/her reasoning strategies. This subjective information may be especially useful when attempting to match instructional strategies to student characteristics.

Professionals in gifted education in the State of Texas are moving into a new era of mandated program planning, development, and implementation. We must ensure that all phases of our identification process are both defensible and comprehensive. I hope that you will find these five criteria useful in developing and evaluating forms used in the selection process.


Art work: "An environment," Ramsey Noah, third grade, St. Michael's Academy, Bryan, Texas
THE EFFECTS OF GROUPING ON GIFTED STUDENTS

by Barbara Clark, Ed.D.
California State University, Los Angeles
Author of Growing Up Gifted

The practice of grouping in any form does not solve poor teaching or inappropriate curriculum, but without grouping we can limit good teaching and the delivery of appropriate curriculum.

... At the present time those of us who are attempting to provide quality education for our students, and especially educational experiences appropriate for gifted students, find ourselves increasingly limited by a... trend. That trend encourages the use of only heterogeneous grouping in all classrooms. This situation has been brought about by sincere concerns that some children are not receiving quality educational experiences and are being penalized by the practices of the educational system. There is no denying that the system as it is now organized fails to serve all students equally well. Students who enter the schooling process without the skills that will allow them to operate as successful learners, those who have little support from home, those whose families are part of the culture of poverty, those who have limited language ability in either their native language or in the dominant language of the classroom, and those who are significantly ahead of the designated grade level curriculum will find learning in the current schooling system difficult. Many will fall further and further behind and others who began ahead will find no way to realize the extent of their abilities. A simplistic notion has been advanced to account for the failure of these children. The practice of grouping in classrooms is held to be responsible. From books, such as the treatise by Oakes (1985), from task forces, such as the one that produced the Literature Project, to "new " methods suggested for the classroom, such as Cooperative Learning (Johnson & Johnson, 1987), come the cry to do away with ability or needs grouping.

It is interesting that in all of the furor there is no mention of age grouping, which is the most inappropriate of any form of grouping. Long ago it was discovered that age was not related to learning; however, schools continue to organize classrooms and learning experiences using age as the criterion for grouping. Other forms of grouping have been used by educators to try to alleviate the problems caused by age grouping. Those who would do away with all these modifications have not suggested any reorganization that would discontinue age-grouped classes.

There can be no doubt that there have been abuses in the practice of grouping. Grouping students from test scores recorded in their files without any observation of the students or their specific needs is an abuse. Tracking learners into all advanced classes without consideration for just where their talents need advancement is an abuse. Keeping students rigidly in three groups for the entire year and sometimes year after year is an abuse. Using grouping without assessment of ability, interest, or pace of learning is an abuse. No one denies grouping practices, as is true of all practices in education, can be abused.

The answer is not to discontinue the benefits of grouping but to reveal the abuse and suggest better grouping practices, more alternatives to help students succeed.

As we consider the problem with which we are faced, one solution becomes clear... As the largest organized group of advocates for quality education, especially as it affects our most able learners, (we) must share information on alternatives with those who see the narrow solution now being proposed as the "best" solution... .

The Effects of Grouping on Gifted Students

There have been many reviews of the literature on the effects of grouping on learning and self-concept. Among the most recent are Kulik and Kulik (1982), Slavin (1987), and Passow (1988). Of those reviews only Passow investigates grouping as it affects the gifted student. Both the Kuliks and Slavin use disclaimers at the beginning of their reviews stating that studies of special classes for the gifted and for low achievers will be excluded as they are, says Slavin, "... fundamentally different from comprehensive ability grouping plans" (p.297). While some of the critics of ability grouping have cited the Kuliks and Slavin reviews to show that gifted students should not be grouped, it is interesting to note this exclusion in their work.

Simpson and Martinson (1961) showed that regardless of the form that the grouping took, whether in a pull-out program or in a special class, achievement gains were positively correlated with the time the gifted student spent in special grouping. Current data gathering has focused on "mainstreaming," or heterogeneously grouping students with those of differing ability. Those who have used such practices for a period of several years have the following criticism of this practice (Evans, 1985). Using heterogeneous grouping resulted in:

* more difficulty for less-achieving students, as there was more pressure from the pacing and higher thought processes of brighter students.
* less-achieving students exhibiting more difficult behavior.
* management problems of teachers increasing.
* putting children back into failure situations that special grouping had remediated.

Cushenberry and Howell (1974) criticize the use of gifted students as teachers' aides, demonstrators, tutors, or record keepers, roles that seem to result from relying solely on heterogeneous grouping. While other students may benefit from the extra help, the gifted students are deprived from developing their abilities and interests. The researchers, therefore, consider such an arrangement a violation of gifted students' rights to
appropriate education and to healthy social interactions with classmates. It seems from these reports that the special needs of neither high nor low students were met by doing away with ability grouping.

Quite different results have been reported with students, the gifted included, in classes appropriately grouped (McDermott, 1977; Moos cited in Contenta, 1988; Walburg & Anderson, 1972):

* more learning took place.
* lack of cliquishness and friction among students.
* students were less apathetic about classroom experiences.
* more trusting relationships were established which allowed students to spend their time and energy in learning rather than in disruptive behaviors.
* interest in subject areas increased.

Advocates of heterogeneous grouping as the "best" practice seem to indicate that homogeneous grouping creates inequality in ability. Such an assumption ignores the fact that inequality in ability is well in place prior to school attendance. It is, at least in part, the result of inequality in the social system, especially the economic system, for there is no greater inhibitor to human development, physical and intellectual, than the culture of poverty. We have seen that the gifted students with their heightened sensitivity to their environment are all too often vulnerable to underachievement and maladjustment if they are not allowed appropriate educational experiences. Without alternative grouping practices these experiences cannot be provided. Grouping must be based on the PURPOSE of the teacher and the NEED of the student.

This article appeared in the February 1989 edition of Intercom, the newsletter of the California Association for the Gifted and was reprinted with their permission.

GUIDELINES FOR GROUPING

by Kathy Hargrove, Director of Academic Development, Plano ISD

Consider the following guidelines in establishing grouping arrangements for students:

1. Assign students to an instructional group based on instructional needs at a given point in time. (The Reading Teacher, February, 1989) The key is flexibility. All too often, groups are static. This tendency to "track" students—once a "bluebird," always a "bluebird"—is a justifiable criticism of poor grouping practices. Don't assume that a group formed for a specific instructional need will automatically share a future instructional need. Use diagnostic/prescriptive strategies to group and regroup.

2. Strive for a balance in grouping practices. All students need experiences with peer groups, both agemates and intellectual peers. Research indicates that rigid homogeneous grouping has lowered achievement and social development for students in low and intermediate groups. Gifted students, too, suffer in their social development if they never have opportunities to interact with their agemates.

Advocates of heterogeneous grouping cite several reasons that it improves the achievement of children in the lower levels:

* teacher expectations are higher
* students receive peer approval
* gifted and talented students serve as models for less able youth

These same reasons can be cited for grouping gifted students. When they are grouped and offered a differentiated curriculum, teacher expectations for them are higher. They receive needed approval from their peers. Schunk (1987) reports that "observing similar others succeed at a task can raise observers' self-efficacy and motivate them to try the task themselves, because they . . . believe that if others can succeed, they can as well." Grouping gifted students provides them with worthy models to challenge them to excellence.

Further, Feldhusen (1989) reports that his research suggests that children of average or lower ability have the opportunity to "blossom" when gifted students are removed to special classes. Research indicates that both "between-class" and "within-class" grouping of gifted and talented students results in benefits for these learners. (Kulik and C. Kulik, 1987; Slavin, 1986).

3. Review the research on acceleration for gifted students and consider the possibilities it offers.

The most pervasive mode of grouping students in schools is by age; i.e., all students six years of age by September 1 of a given year are placed in grade 1. Yet a large body of research indicates that grouping by age alone is an administrative convenience rather than the most desirable educational practice.

4. Utilize cooperative learning methods when students are heterogeneously grouped.

In cooperative learning, students work in small heterogeneous learning groups which are rewarded on the basis of the individual learning of all group members. In such groups, everyone's effort and product can be valued. Remember, however, that for maximum learning, assignments and/or expectations of different group members must be based on their individual needs.

5. Remember the potential burden on teachers who are confronted by an impossibly wide range of student abilities. Realistically, a teacher with students at many different instructional levels usually teaches to the "average." True, sh/she can individualize instruction or set rigorous academic standards or modify downward. Individualization is far too time-consuming for most teachers. Rigorous standards result in frustration for many students. This frustration can cause behavior problems. Modifications to the "average" (or lower) cause underachievement and boredom for higher ability students and invite mischievous behavior from them (Scott, 1989).

"Campus Improvement Plans" that are part of the accreditation process require disaggregated data. Lezotte (1989) suggests that schools should disaggregate data by social class and family background as well as by other factors in order to "monitor student outcomes. . . . Schools should constantly ask whether all students are benefiting from current instructional practices and organizational patterns. Schools. . . . ought to use structuring that favors their (individual) student population."

In a society committed to educating all children, advocates for the gifted along with concerned educators and parents, must seek ways to challenge all children to the maximum. Grouping practices deserve examination, but we must not be in too big a hurry to throw out the bath water lest we throw out the baby, too!
EARLY READERS AND GIFTEDNESS
by Gail Lewis
Past Chair, Preschool/Primary Committee of the National Association for Gifted Children

QUESTION: My highly gifted five-year old has not yet begun reading. Is there something I should do?

ANSWER: Research findings clearly indicate that highly gifted children do not necessarily read early. In Terman’s (1925) study, only half read before first grade and only 20% of these before the age of five. Cassidy and Vukelich (1980) echoed Terman’s findings and, additionally, reported that the degree of giftedness of early readers is not significantly different from the degree of giftedness found in young nonreaders. Durkin (1966) had reported that the IQ’s of early readers in her two studies covered a considerable range — from 82 to 170.

In light of these findings, much of what we do for gifted preschoolers—in assessment, programming, and parenting strategies—should be examined. I worry most about the trend advocated by some popular books and in some preschool programs which aims to develop academic skills in very young children through a regular program of direct instruction. I call this “early first grade” and it begins in some homes almost as soon as children can walk, through the use of flash cards and other devices. It is most often an attempt to help the child read early, but it can lead to stress and to the child’s linking self-image to achievement. Both these outcomes can actually interfere with learning rather than assisting it.

Rather than intensive direct instruction during these early years, I advocate that parents focus on three words: allow, experience, explore. A child who has been to a museum will, when first encountering the word “painting” on the printed page, be more likely to understand that the word can represent an object hung in an exhibit or the act of applying paint to a wall. A world of experiences at an early age will more likely lead the child to an understanding of the subtleties and power of words than will flash cards. The word “allow” is equally important, however. If a child is ready to read, she or he should be allowed the opportunity, informally and—for the best results—in a warm and supportive environment. Parents who read to and with children help establish the importance of the printed page.

The five-year old who already reads at the 6th grade level needs a carefully orchestrated educational program when he or she reaches school. Putting such a child into a first-grade reader can be catastrophic. Ideally, in such cases, schools can provide pre- and post-testing to determine areas of weakness and allow the child to read at ability level.

Remember that reading is not just comprehension, but the ability to interpret and evaluate as well. Any exercises which help the child develop higher level thinking skills will aid in the use of the printed word.

Reprinted with the permission of the author from the Digest, published by the Association for Gifted and Talented Students, Northwestern State University, Natchitoches, Louisiana.

Forging a Link Between School and Home

A general session panel at the Second Annual Conference for Early Childhood Educators held at Texas A&M University focused on the necessity for collaboration between schools and parents to create and support optimally educational opportunities appropriate for gifted and talented students. The theme of the conference, held February 17-18, was Unlocking Giftedness in Young Children. Guest presenters on the panel included Laura Allard, representing TAGT; Julie Jackson Lusby, a parent from Cypress-Fairbanks ISD; Margaret Bryant, a recent Texas classroom teacher now teaching in an Akron, Ohio inner-city school; and Dr. Bill Nash, Director of TAMU’s Institute for the Gifted and Talented.

While the panel did not begin to address all the questions the conference participants generated, it became obvious that we all must work much harder at establishing better communication between school and home so that gifted students may be served more effectively.

NOMINATION PROCEDURES

Although TAGT now has a membership of over 3,500, you, the individual member, have an important voice in its governance and management through the officer nomination process.

The annually elected officers of the Association are the President-elect, First Vice-President, Second Vice-President and Secretary. Any member who has served a minimum of one year on the Executive Board, or as a member of a standing committee may be nominated for these offices. The names you submit will be considered by the nomination committee for the final ballot.

Individual members of TAGT are represented on the Executive Board by Regional Representatives who are elected for a two-year term. Representatives from even-numbered Educational Service Center Regions are elected in even-numbered years and from odd-numbered regions in odd-numbered years. Any member who resides in an odd-numbered region this year may be nominated to represent that region.

These officers, regional representatives and (non-voting) advisory members make up the Executive Board, which is the governing body of the Association. Members of the Executive Board may not serve in the same position more than two terms.

To nominate someone for a board position, determine that he/she meets the qualifications listed above; next, secure that person’s permission and finally, mail the nomination form found on page 17 to Attn: Nominating Committee, TAGT, P.O. Box 9802 #814, Austin, Texas 78766.
The Texas Association for the Gifted and Talented invites you to nominate next year's officers and regional representatives. The Association's nominating procedures are explained on the facing page of this issue of TEMPO. Nominees must be members in good standing of the Association and officers must have served on the Executive Board for at least one year. In 1989 the Association is electing representatives from odd-numbered regions only. You may nominate persons to serve as representatives in regions other than your own. Please be sure that you have the person's permission before you nominate him/her for any Board position. Thank you for assisting us in the election process.

**PRESIDENT-ELECT:** Serves as chairperson for the Conference Committee that plans and implements the annual conference and as an ex-officio member of the Nominations Committee.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Nominee</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>Telephone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**FIRST VICE-PRESIDENT:** Serves as the chairperson of the Editorial and Research Committee that coordinates publications.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Nominee</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>Telephone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**SECOND VICE-PRESIDENT:** Chairs the Advocacy Committee that coordinates and assists regional representatives in membership efforts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Nominee</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>Telephone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**SECRETARY:** Chairs the Finance Committee that oversees the budget, maintains systematic records of the Association and administers grants and scholarships.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Nominee</th>
<th>District</th>
<th>Telephone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**REGIONAL REPRESENTATIVES:** Serve as voting members of the Executive Board and as members of at least one standing committee; recruit membership; report activities of their respective regions at meetings and in TEMPO; communicate to the regional membership regarding the on-going activities of the Association; assist members in the formation of local chapters.

| ESC 1 | ESC 11 |
| ESC 3 | ESC 13 |
| ESC 5 | ESC 15 |
| ESC 7 | ESC 17 |
| ESC 9 | ESC 19 |

When you have completed the nomination form, please mail it to the address below. This form may not be duplicated. All nomination forms must be received by MAY 1, 1989.

Attn: Nominating Committee
TAGT
P.O. BOX 9802 #814
Austin, Texas 78766-9802

(Please indicate your Regional ESC number . The form does not need to be signed.)
The TAGT Finance Committee is pleased to announce the recipients of the 1989 Grants for Excellence Awards given to support innovative projects designed to benefit gifted children. Formal presentation of the awards was made at the annual conference in Austin, last November, but real implementation of the projects will take place this calendar year, 1989.

**River Oaks Elementary School, Houston**

**Houston International Theater School**

In a unique "matching funds" proposal, River Oaks Elementary School in Houston was awarded money to bring the Houston International Theater School to its campus. The outreach program of the HITS professional theater school offers a six-week intensive workshop in musical theater for children in grades 3-5. In addition to the theater arts instruction, Michele Staples, principal of this Vanguard school, feels the performance experience enhances the self-confidence and sense of accomplishment enjoyed by their gifted students.

**Union Grove ISD**

**A Century of Education**

Karen Dickson, G/T Coordinator of Union Grove ISD in Gladewater, Texas, presented a student newspaper project to commemorate the 100th anniversary of their community’s public education system. A Century of Education will be the theme used to bring the communities of West Mountain, Union Grove and Mings Chapel together in a celebration of their educational history. Students will be in charge of the festivities. TAGT will be funding the ten-month rental of a copy machine and supplies to publish a school newspaper covering the celebration.

**Boerne Science and Math Booster Club**

The Boerne Science and Math Booster Club, under the leadership of Mary Kennedy and Dr. Joseph Doenges, devised a mentorship program to broaden the experiences of both gifted students and their teachers in technical areas. The program is designed to encourage scientific mentorships between parents and students, assist in field trips, and help underwrite the cost of professional development opportunities for teachers. TAGT will help pay for speakers, field trips, and conference registrations.

**Electra and Holliday ISD**

**Equal Values Workshop**

Electra and Holliday ISD will benefit from another TAGT grant in support of an Equal Values Workshop. Under the direction of Sandra Irish, G/T Coordinator for Electra, the workshop will bring together students, parents, and teachers from two rural North Texas districts as they explore the common values of gifted students. Grant monies will help defray the cost of a speaker.

**Duke University Talent Recognition Ceremony**

As in previous years, TAGT will collaborate with Duke University to sponsor the recognition ceremonies honoring bright Texas students identified by the Duke Talent Search. Over 10,000 seventh-grade Texas students registered with the Talent Search last year and nearly 2,000 qualified for state recognition by scoring as well or better on the SAT or ACT assessment as average college-bound students. Texas supplies nearly one-quarter of all Talent Search Participants in Duke’s 16-state area. It is the only state whose numbers make it necessary to hold two recognition ceremonies. TAGT’s contribution will be applied to books for awards, invitations, programs, and certificates.

**NOTE TO 1989 SCHOLARSHIP APPLICANTS:**
Due to the large number of applications this year, only winning scholarship recipients will be notified. Letters should be arriving by April 15.
CALL FOR ARTICLES...

YOUR contributions to the TEMPO are warmly invited! Please submit articles of general interest to parents and teachers for possible publication in the TEMPO.

Please use the following guidelines for articles you submit:

2. Please type and double-space articles, 50 spaces per line, 25 lines per page.
3. Include your name, position/role, region, address, and daytime telephone number.
4. Please limit articles to 250 words or less.

Articles must be received by May 15th.

The theme of the SUMMER ISSUE is: THE FUTURE OF GIFTED EDUCATION. What will gifted education look like as it absorbs the technological, environmental and demographic changes bearing down on us at the end of the century? What is the future for gifted students? What changes in the job market, career decisions, etc. will face them?

Send all submissions to TAGT, Attn: Beth Moreno, Managing Editor, P.O. Box 9802#814, Austin, Texas, 78766-9802.

The Editorial and Research Committee
Patricia Haensly, Editor
Hillrey Dufner
Beth Moreno
Bob Seney
Doris Teague
Sandra Younger

Kindergarten Art Featured

Instead of conducting a formal competition for this edition's cover, we simply asked members of the Editorial and Research Committee to collect samples of young children's art from classes in their home districts.

Bob Seney called on Donna Kittman from Hunter's Creek Elementary in Spring Branch ISD for some of her personal favorites and the results are here for everyone to enjoy: Betsy Bryant, John Young, Chong Kai Fu and John Wu, all kindergartners, are our youngest contributors.

Patricia Haensly contacted Julia Mashburn, the art teacher at St. Michael's Academy in Bryan and she submitted the work of Richard Brooks and Ramsey Noah, both third graders. They had illustrated cities and environments of the future.

For your information, this is the first run of tempo to reach 5,000 copies (yes, membership is up!) We hope our young artists and their teachers and parents take pleasure in the thought of seeing their work all over the state. Congratulations to everyone!

Art Contest Reminder!

We are inviting submissions for the cover of our Summer issue, THE FUTURE OF GIFTED EDUCATION. (See details in "Call for Articles".) The competition is open to students in grades 10-12. All entries must be received by June 1st.

Students should submit 7 x 7 originals on white paper in a black medium such as charcoal, felt-tipped pens, dark pencils, or black crayons. An identification label should be attached. If art work is to be returned, a stamped, self-addressed envelope is required.

The winner will receive five copies of tempo and a wall plaque. Sponsoring teachers will receive a $25 check for art materials. Go to it and good luck!
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