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Correlation ≠ Causation
problem is universal
IS THERE A GIFTED GAP?

GIFTED EDUCATION IN HIGH-POVERTY SCHOOLS

BY CHRISTOPHER B. YALUMA AND ADAM TYNER

FOREWORD BY CHESTER E. FINN, JR. AND AMBER M. NORTHERN
5-7 years ago
Data Collected by NCRGE in Phase 1

- 133 Variables for 293 State District Gifted Plans
- 362,254 Current 10\textsuperscript{th}-Grade Students’ Math and Reading Achievement in Grades 3, 4, and 5
- 2 Comprehensive Literature Reviews
- 202 Interview Transcripts
- 2419 School Survey Responses (53\% [45-68\%] Response - 80\% Title 1)
- 332 District Survey Responses (78\%-90\% Response)
Data & your State
States are concerned about under-identification.

- Gifted services are not equally distributed across schools within districts.
- Underserved populations are not being identified at the same rates as non-underserved students even after controlling for student achievement.
- Very few districts reassess students.
- Very few districts offer programs to identify and recruit potentially gifted students.
- Extensive use of cognitive tests to identify students.
- Third grade achievement is directly related to identification gaps.
- Practices such as universal screening and nonverbal tests do not appear to be panaceas.
- Universal screening with modification shows promise at reducing under-identification.
- Majority of schools use pull-out classes for gifted instruction.
- Greater focus on critical thinking and creative thinking than Reading/Language Arts and Mathematics.
- Gifted programs seldom focus on core curriculum such as math and reading.
- Gifted students start ahead in reading and mathematics achievement but don’t grow any faster than other groups.
- Teacher autonomy positively influences academic achievement.
- EL reclassification is linked to gifted identification.
- Talent scouts are effective in finding gifted English learners; don’t wait for EL students to surface.
- High level of agreement between district and teacher reports of practice and curriculum.
80% of states that responded to the 2015 State of the States survey indicated underrepresentation is an important or very important issue in gifted education in their state.
- States are concerned about under-identification.
- **Gifted services are not equally distributed across schools within districts.**
  - Underserved populations are not being identified at the same rates as non-underserved students even after controlling for student achievement.
- Very few districts reassess students.
- Very few districts offer programs to identify and recruit potentially gifted students.
- Extensive use of cognitive tests to identify students.
- Third grade achievement is directly related to identification gaps.
- Practices such as universal screening and nonverbal tests do not appear to be panaceas.
- Universal screening with modification shows promise at reducing under-identification.
- Majority of schools use pull-out classes for gifted instruction.
- Greater focus on critical thinking and creative thinking than Reading/Language Arts and Mathematics.
- Gifted programs seldom focus on core curriculum such as math and reading.
- Gifted students start ahead in reading and mathematics achievement but don’t grow any faster than other groups.
- Teacher autonomy positively influences academic achievement.
- EL reclassification is linked to gifted identification.
- Talent scouts are effective in finding gifted English learners; don’t wait for EL students to surface.
- High level of agreement between district and teacher reports of practice and curriculum.

*Take home message...*
What is the relationship between the % of free and reduced lunch students in a school and the % of students identified as gifted?

-0.31 - 0.56 - 0.64

This research from the National Center for Research on Gifted Education (NCRGE – http://ncrge.uconn.edu) was funded by the Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education PR/Award # R305C140018
• **Percentage of Gifted Students**: 29% of the variance is between districts; 71% is between schools (within district)

• **Percentage of Free and Reduced Price Lunch Students**: 21% of the variance is between districts; 79% is between schools (within district)

• **Percentage of Underserved Students**: 48% of the variance is between districts; 72% is between schools (within district)

• **Average Reading**: 23% of the variance is between districts; 77% is between schools (within district)

• **Average Math**: 24% of the variance is between districts; 76% is between schools (within district)
Gifted services are not equally distributed across schools within districts and poverty appears to be a key factor.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Number of Schools</th>
<th>Number of Schools with No Gifted Students in Our Cohort</th>
<th>Number of Schools with No Free and Reduced Lunch Gifted Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State 1</td>
<td>1,177</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State 2</td>
<td>573</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State 3</td>
<td>1,495</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- States are concerned about under-identification.
- Gifted services are not equally distributed across schools within districts.
- **Underserved populations are not being identified at the same rates as non-underserved students even after controlling for student achievement.**
- Very few districts reassess students.
- Very few districts offer programs to identify and recruit potentially gifted students.
- Extensive use of cognitive tests to identify students.
- Third grade achievement is directly related to identification gaps.
- Practices such as universal screening and nonverbal tests do not appear to be panaceas.
- Universal screening with modification shows promise at reducing under-identification.
- Majority of schools use pull-out classes for gifted instruction.
- Greater focus on critical thinking and creative thinking than Reading/Language Arts and Mathematics.
- Gifted programs seldom focus on core curriculum such as math and reading.
- Gifted students start ahead in reading and mathematics achievement but don’t grow any faster than other groups.
- Teacher autonomy positively influences academic achievement.
- EL reclassification is linked to gifted identification.
- Talent scouts are effective in finding gifted English learners; don’t wait for EL students to surface.
- High level of agreement between district and teacher reports of practice and curriculum.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relative Risk Ratio</th>
<th>State 1</th>
<th>State 2</th>
<th>State 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood of identification for FRPL students</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood of identification for African Americans</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood of identification for Hispanics</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood of identification for ELs</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood of identification for Whites</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>1.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood of identification for Asians</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>2.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood of identification for students NOT FRL, Afr. Am., Hispanic, or Native American</td>
<td>6.12</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>3.42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Probability of identification as gifted for reference students and students who are EL, Free and Reduced Lunch, and Underserved after controlling for Reading and Math scores and school SES and school percentage of gifted students.
Possible reasons...
1. No gifted program is some schools with high numbers of underserved students
2. High academic achievement isn’t enough
3. Hurdle approach with multiple criteria
4. Students are not being nominated
5. Students and parents are choosing not to participate
- States are concerned about under-identification.
- Gifted services are not equally distributed across schools within districts.
- Underserved populations are not being identified at the same rates as non-underserved students even after controlling for student achievement.

**Very few districts reassess students.**
- Extensive use of cognitive tests to identify students.
- Third grade achievement is directly related to identification gaps.
- Very few districts offer programs to identify and recruit potentially gifted students.
- Practices such as universal screening and nonverbal tests do not appear to be panaceas.
- Universal screening with modification shows promise at reducing under-identification.
- Majority of schools use pull-out classes for gifted instruction.
- Greater focus on critical thinking and creative thinking than Reading/Language Arts and Mathematics.
- Gifted programs seldom focus on core curriculum such as math and reading.
- Gifted students start ahead in reading and mathematics achievement but don’t grow any faster than other groups.
- Teacher autonomy positively influences academic achievement.
- EL reclassification is linked to gifted identification.
- Talent scouts are effective in finding gifted English learners; don’t wait for EL students to surface.
- High level of agreement between district and teacher reports of practice and curriculum.
We also found that districts frequently do not reassess identified students once they are identified. Only slightly more than half of the districts reassess non identified students at regular intervals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>State 1</th>
<th>State 2</th>
<th>State 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-identified students are reassessed at regular intervals</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-identified students are reassessed upon request</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identified students are reassessed at regular intervals</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identified students are reassessed upon request</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Identification

Grade First identify in...

• Kindergarten - .9%
• 1st – 2.8%
• 2nd – 27.8%
• 3rd – 53.6%
• 4th – 12.0%
• 5th – 1.6%
• None of the above – 1.3%

Identified in what...

• Global – 41%
• Reading/LA – 69.1%
• Mathematics – 66.6%
• Other – 44.2%
- States are concerned about under-identification.
- Gifted services are not equally distributed across schools within districts.
- Underserved populations are not being identified at the same rates as non-underserved students even after controlling for student achievement.
- Very few districts reassess students.

**Extensive use of cognitive tests to identify students.**
- Third grade achievement is directly related to identification gaps.
- Very few districts offer programs to identify and recruit potentially gifted students.
- Practices such as universal screening and nonverbal tests do not appear to be panaceas.
- Universal screening with modification shows promise at reducing under-identification.
- Majority of schools use pull-out classes for gifted instruction.
- Greater focus on critical thinking and creative thinking than Reading/Language Arts and Mathematics.
- Gifted programs seldom focus on core curriculum such as math and reading.
- Gifted students start ahead in reading and mathematics achievement but don’t grow any faster than other groups.
- Teacher autonomy positively influences academic achievement.
- EL reclassification is linked to gifted identification.
- Talent scouts are effective in finding gifted English learners; don’t wait for EL students to surface.
- High level of agreement between district and teacher reports of practice and curriculum.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tools for Identification</th>
<th>State 1</th>
<th>State 2</th>
<th>State 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parents can nominate</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers can nominate</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use cognitive tests</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use non-verbal tests</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use creativity tests</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision process for identification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee of teachers and administrators decide</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use a matrix to decide</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use cut scores to decide</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- States are concerned about under-identification.
- Gifted services are not equally distributed across schools within districts.
- Underserved populations are not being identified at the same rates as non-underserved students even after controlling for student achievement.
- Very few districts reassess students.
- Extensive use of cognitive tests to identify students.

**Third grade achievement is directly related to identification gaps.**

- Very few districts offer programs to identify and recruit potentially gifted students.
- Practices such as universal screening and nonverbal tests do not appear to be panaceas.
- Universal screening with modification shows promise at reducing under-identification.
- Majority of schools use pull-out classes for gifted instruction.
- Greater focus on critical thinking and creative thinking than Reading/Language Arts and Mathematics.
- Gifted programs seldom focus on core curriculum such as math and reading.
- Gifted students start ahead in reading and mathematics achievement but don’t grow any faster than other groups.
- Teacher autonomy positively influences academic achievement.
- EL reclassification is linked to gifted identification.
- Talent scouts are effective in finding gifted English learners; don’t wait for EL students to surface.
- High level of agreement between district and teacher reports of practice and curriculum.
### Amount 3rd Grade Academic Achievement
**Accounts for Under Identification Gaps**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>State 1</th>
<th>State 2</th>
<th>State 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>FRPL (compared to non-FRPL)</strong></td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EL (compared to non-EL)</strong></td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Black (compared to White)</strong></td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hispanic (compared to White)</strong></td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
States are concerned about under-identification.

Gifted services are not equally distributed across schools within districts.

Underserved populations are not being identified at the same rates as non-underserved students even after controlling for student achievement.

Very few districts reassess students.

Extensive use of cognitive tests to identify students.

Third grade achievement is directly related to identification gaps.

Very few districts offer programs to identify and recruit potentially gifted students.

Practices such as universal screening and nonverbal tests do not appear to be panaceas.

Universal screening with modification shows promise at reducing under-identification.

 Majority of schools use pull-out classes for gifted instruction.

Greater focus on critical thinking and creative thinking than Reading/Language Arts and Mathematics.

Gifted programs seldom focus on core curriculum such as math and reading.

Gifted students start ahead in reading and mathematics achievement but don’t grow any faster than other groups.

Teacher autonomy positively influences academic achievement.

EL reclassification is linked to gifted identification.

Talent scouts are effective in finding gifted English learners; don’t wait for EL students to surface.

High level of agreement between district and teacher reports of practice and curriculum.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Structure of Identification</th>
<th>State 1</th>
<th>State 2</th>
<th>State 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Universal identification</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modify identification for underrepresented groups</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program to identify underrepresented groups</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
States are concerned about under-identification.

Gifted services are not equally distributed across schools within districts.

Underserved populations are not being identified at the same rates as non-underserved students even after controlling for student achievement.

Very few districts reassess students.

Extensive use of cognitive tests to identify students.

Third grade achievement is directly related to identification gaps.

Very few districts offer programs to identify and recruit potentially gifted students.

**Practices such as universal screening and nonverbal tests do not appear to be panaceas.**

Universal screening with modification shows promise at reducing under-identification.

Majority of schools use pull-out classes for gifted instruction.

Greater focus on critical thinking and creative thinking than Reading/Language Arts and Mathematics.

Gifted programs seldom focus on core curriculum such as math and reading.

Gifted students start ahead in reading and mathematics achievement but don’t grow any faster than other groups.

Teacher autonomy positively influences academic achievement.

EL reclassification is linked to gifted identification.

Talent scouts are effective in finding gifted English learners; don’t wait for EL students to surface.

High level of agreement between district and teacher reports of practice and curriculum.
19.3% use Universal Screening. With Universal Screening, they most often use

• Group Cognitive – 77.7%
• Non-verbal – 37.5%
• Achievement – 22.3%
• Teacher Rating Scale – 11.7%
Take home message...

- States are concerned about under-identification.
- Gifted services are not equally distributed across schools within districts.
- Underserved populations are not being identified at the same rates as non-underserved students even after controlling for student achievement.
- Very few districts reassess students.
- Extensive use of cognitive tests to identify students.
- Third grade achievement is directly related to identification gaps.
- Very few districts offer programs to identify and recruit potentially gifted students.
- Practices such as universal screening and nonverbal tests do not appear to be panaceas.

**Universal screening with modification shows promise at reducing under-identification.**

- Majority of schools use pull-out classes for gifted instruction.
- Greater focus on critical thinking and creative thinking than Reading/Language Arts and Mathematics.
- Gifted programs seldom focus on core curriculum such as math and reading.
- Gifted students start ahead in reading and mathematics achievement but don’t grow any faster than other groups.
- Teacher autonomy positively influences academic achievement.
- EL reclassification is linked to gifted identification.
- Talent scouts are effective in finding gifted English learners; don’t wait for EL students to surface.
- High level of agreement between district and teacher reports of practice and curriculum.
The gap in identification rates for high achieving FRPL vs. non-FRPL almost disappears in districts that use modification policies.
46% modify the identification for underserved populations with...

- 33.9% Native Language
- 50.3% Non-Verbal Test
- 62% More Flexible Score
- 23.9% Different Weighting of Criteria
- 49.4% Different Criteria or Cutoff
- States are concerned about under-identification.
- Gifted services are not equally distributed across schools within districts.
- Underserved populations are not being identified at the same rates as non-underserved students even after controlling for student achievement.
- Very few districts reassess students.
- Extensive use of cognitive tests to identify students.
- Third grade achievement is directly related to identification gaps.
- Very few districts offer programs to identify and recruit potentially gifted students.
- Practices such as universal screening and nonverbal tests do not appear to be panaceas.
- Universal screening with modification shows promise at reducing under-identification.

**Majority of schools use pull-out classes for gifted instruction.**
- Greater focus on critical thinking and creative thinking than Reading/Language Arts and Mathematics.
- Gifted programs seldom focus on core curriculum such as math and reading.
- Gifted students start ahead in reading and mathematics achievement but don’t grow any faster than other groups.
- Teacher autonomy positively influences academic achievement.
- EL reclassification is linked to gifted identification.
- Talent scouts are effective in finding gifted English learners; don’t wait for EL students to surface.
- High level of agreement between district and teacher reports of practice and curriculum.
Grouping/Service Options

• 73.2% of schools use pullout (2.81 hs/wk)
• 53.4% of schools use cluster grouping (50% Sometimes or less)
• 45.3% of schools use homogenous grouping
• 33.1% of schools use push-in (1.87 hs/wk)

Acceleration Practices

• 29.2% of schools do not accelerate
• 34.8% of schools subject accelerate
• 26.1% of schools whole grade accelerate
States are concerned about under-identification.

Gifted services are not equally distributed across schools within districts.

Underserved populations are not being identified at the same rates as non-underserved students even after controlling for student achievement.

Very few districts reassess students.

Extensive use of cognitive tests to identify students.

Third grade achievement is directly related to identification gaps.

Very few districts offer programs to identify and recruit potentially gifted students.

Practices such as universal screening and nonverbal tests do not appear to be panaceas.

Universal screening with modification shows promise at reducing under-identification.

Majority of schools use pull-out classes for gifted instruction.

**Greater focus on critical thinking and creative thinking than Reading/Language Arts and Mathematics.**

Gifted programs seldom focus on core curriculum such as math and reading.

Gifted students start ahead in reading and mathematics achievement but don’t grow any faster than other groups.

Teacher autonomy positively influences academic achievement.

EL reclassification is linked to gifted identification.

Talent scouts are effective in finding gifted English learners; don’t wait for EL students to surface.

High level of agreement between district and teacher reports of practice and curriculum.
Focus of Program Services

Using the slider, indicate the degree to which the gifted programming at your school focuses on the following goals and/or activities (0=Not a focus, 100=Complete focus).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skill</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Critical Thinking Skills</td>
<td>-55.31</td>
<td>85.65</td>
<td>27.08</td>
<td>18.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creativity/Creative Thinking</td>
<td>-63.73</td>
<td>88.27</td>
<td>19.44</td>
<td>20.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading/ELA: Grade Level Extension Activities</td>
<td>-66.19</td>
<td>92.31</td>
<td>15.13</td>
<td>23.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math: Grade Level Extension Activities</td>
<td>-66.96</td>
<td>92.31</td>
<td>12.50</td>
<td>25.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication Skills</td>
<td>-55.31</td>
<td>75.19</td>
<td>11.93</td>
<td>20.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology Literacy</td>
<td>-78.27</td>
<td>75.62</td>
<td>10.97</td>
<td>21.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metacognitive Skills</td>
<td>-79.00</td>
<td>76.35</td>
<td>9.14</td>
<td>20.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Skills</td>
<td>-68.27</td>
<td>75.00</td>
<td>7.96</td>
<td>21.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Motivation</td>
<td>-59.77</td>
<td>71.23</td>
<td>7.13</td>
<td>20.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Self-Confidence</td>
<td>-82.69</td>
<td>72.27</td>
<td>4.87</td>
<td>20.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Autonomy</td>
<td>-85.00</td>
<td>71.23</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>21.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrichment in non-core content areas</td>
<td>-79.04</td>
<td>96.15</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>25.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing Skills</td>
<td>-77.31</td>
<td>95.92</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>23.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-directed projects</td>
<td>-80.73</td>
<td>75.96</td>
<td>-0.30</td>
<td>22.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Skills</td>
<td>-74.50</td>
<td>76.92</td>
<td>-0.32</td>
<td>21.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social-Emotional Needs</td>
<td>-82.69</td>
<td>76.35</td>
<td>-1.51</td>
<td>23.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interdisciplinary study of big ideas</td>
<td>-86.73</td>
<td>80.54</td>
<td>-4.01</td>
<td>23.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math: Acceleration</td>
<td>-89.58</td>
<td>83.58</td>
<td>-7.63</td>
<td>29.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading/ELA: Acceleration</td>
<td>-95.19</td>
<td>75.73</td>
<td>-8.50</td>
<td>28.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities for Underserved Students</td>
<td>-84.81</td>
<td>79.65</td>
<td>-8.60</td>
<td>24.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College and Career Readiness</td>
<td>-88.46</td>
<td>72.27</td>
<td>-9.97</td>
<td>27.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culturally Responsive Curriculum</td>
<td>-82.69</td>
<td>73.85</td>
<td>-12.13</td>
<td>22.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Contests</td>
<td>-90.92</td>
<td>83.92</td>
<td>-13.35</td>
<td>26.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultivation of Cultural Identity</td>
<td>-90.00</td>
<td>69.12</td>
<td>-19.51</td>
<td>21.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Learning</td>
<td>-88.46</td>
<td>61.50</td>
<td>-20.50</td>
<td>22.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities Outside of School Day</td>
<td>-88.46</td>
<td>72.35</td>
<td>-22.94</td>
<td>24.85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Greater than average focus

Less than average focus
o States are concerned about under-identification.
o Gifted services are not equally distributed across schools within districts.
o Underserved populations are not being identified at the same rates as non-underserved students even after controlling for student achievement.
o Very few districts reassess students.
o Extensive use of cognitive tests to identify students.
o Third grade achievement is directly related to identification gaps.
o Very few districts offer programs to identify and recruit potentially gifted students.
o Practices such as universal screening and nonverbal tests do not appear to be panaceas.
o Universal screening with modification shows promise at reducing under-identification.
o Majority of schools use pull-out classes for gifted instruction.
o Greater focus on critical thinking and creative thinking than Reading/Language Arts and Mathematics.

Gifted programs seldom focus on core curriculum such as math and reading.

o Gifted students start ahead in reading and mathematics achievement but don’t grow any faster than other groups.
o Teacher autonomy positively influences academic achievement.
o EL reclassification is linked to gifted identification.
o Talent scouts are effective in finding gifted English learners; don’t wait for EL students to surface.
o High level of agreement between district and teacher reports of practice and curriculum.
• 28.9% schools offer gifted reading/LA but 28.7% of them don’t have specific reading/LA curriculum
• 28.4% schools offer gifted mathematics but 24.2% of them don’t have specific gifted math curriculum
• 93.7% of districts do not have a designated math curriculum for gifted
• 90.2% of districts do not have a designated reading/LA curriculum for gifted
States are concerned about under-identification.

Gifted services are not equally distributed across schools within districts.

Underserved populations are not being identified at the same rates as non-underserved students even after controlling for student achievement.

Very few districts reassess students.

Extensive use of cognitive tests to identify students.

Third grade achievement is directly related to identification gaps.

Very few districts offer programs to identify and recruit potentially gifted students.

Practices such as universal screening and nonverbal tests do not appear to be panaceas.

Universal screening with modification shows promise at reducing under-identification.

Majority of schools use pull-out classes for gifted instruction.

Greater focus on critical thinking and creative thinking than Reading/Language Arts and Mathematics.

Gifted programs seldom focus on core curriculum such as math and reading.

**Gifted students start ahead in reading and mathematics achievement but don’t grow any faster than other groups.**

Teacher autonomy positively influences academic achievement.

EL reclassification is linked to gifted identification.

Talent scouts are effective in finding gifted English learners; don’t wait for EL students to surface.

High level of agreement between district and teacher reports of practice and curriculum.
Take home message...

- States are concerned about under-identification.
- Gifted services are not equally distributed across schools within districts.
- Underserved populations are not being identified at the same rates as non-underserved students even after controlling for student achievement.
- Very few districts reassess students.
- Extensive use of cognitive tests to identify students.
- Third grade achievement is directly related to identification gaps.
- Very few districts offer programs to identify and recruit potentially gifted students.
- Practices such as universal screening and nonverbal tests do not appear to be panaceas.
- Universal screening with modification shows promise at reducing under-identification.
- Majority of schools use pull-out classes for gifted instruction.
- Greater focus on critical thinking and creative thinking than Reading/Language Arts and Mathematics.
- Gifted programs seldom focus on core curriculum such as math and reading.
- Gifted students start ahead in reading and mathematics achievement but don’t grow any faster than other groups.

**Teacher autonomy positively influences academic achievement.**

- EL reclassification is linked to gifted identification.
- Talent scouts are effective in finding gifted English learners; don’t wait for EL students to surface.
- High level of agreement between district and teacher reports of practice and curriculum.
Research Skills
Communication Skills
Critical Thinking
Metacognitive Skills
Reading/Language Arts Acceleration
Math Acceleration
Academic Contests
Opportunities Outside School
Leadership Skills
Cultivation of Cultural Identify
Student Autonomy
Math Gifted Extension Activities
Opportunities for Underserved
Technology Literacy
Academic Self-Confidence
Academic Motivation

Some Factors We Examined
Teacher autonomy is strongly related to gifted students’ achievement

How much autonomy do your school's teachers of the gifted have in choosing the content to deliver?

- Very Little – 4.6%
- Some – 26.8%
- A Lot – 51.9%
- Complete  15.8%

Teacher autonomy is strongly related to gifted students’ achievement.
o States are concerned about under-identification.
o Gifted services are not equally distributed across schools within districts.
o Underserved populations are not being identified at the same rates as non-underserved students even after controlling for student achievement.
o Very few districts reassess students.
o Extensive use of cognitive tests to identify students.
o Third grade achievement is directly related to identification gaps.
o Very few districts offer programs to identify and recruit potentially gifted students.
o Practices such as universal screening and nonverbal tests do not appear to be panaceas.
o Universal screening with modification shows promise at reducing under-identification.
o Majority of schools use pull-out classes for gifted instruction.
o Greater focus on critical thinking and creative thinking than Reading/Language Arts and Mathematics.
o Gifted programs seldom focus on core curriculum such as math and reading.
o Gifted students start ahead in reading and mathematics achievement but don’t grow any faster than other groups.
o Teacher autonomy positively influences academic achievement.

**EL reclassification is linked to gifted identification.**
o Talent scouts are effective in finding gifted English learners; don’t wait for EL students to surface.
o High level of agreement between district and teacher reports of practice and curriculum.
• Students are in EL for less time in schools with more gifted students.
• EL students who exit EL earlier have a greater probability of being identified as gifted, but they do not have higher slopes of achievement growth than other gifted students.
• States are concerned about under-identification.
• Gifted services are not equally distributed across schools within districts.
• Underserved populations are not being identified at the same rates as non-underserved students even after controlling for student achievement.
• Very few districts reassess students.
• Extensive use of cognitive tests to identify students.
• Third grade achievement is directly related to identification gaps.
• Very few districts offer programs to identify and recruit potentially gifted students.
• Practices such as universal screening and nonverbal tests do not appear to be panaceas.
• Universal screening with modification shows promise at reducing under-identification.
• Majority of schools use pull-out classes for gifted instruction.
• Greater focus on critical thinking and creative thinking than Reading/Language Arts and Mathematics.
• Gifted programs seldom focus on core curriculum such as math and reading.
• Gifted students start ahead in reading and mathematics achievement but don’t grow any faster than other groups.
• Teacher autonomy positively influences academic achievement.
• EL reclassification is linked to gifted identification.

• **Talent scouts are effective in finding gifted English learners; don’t wait for EL students to surface.**
• High level of agreement between district and teacher reports of practice and curriculum.
Teachers Value... Verbal Skills, Social Skills, Achievement, and Work Ethic (Peterson & Margolin, 1997)

Behavior Skills Are NOT Necessarily Related to Academic Giftedness. 24% of Items on Rating Scale Bias: Assertive, Initiating activities, Asking questions, Contributing in class (A. Brice & R. Brice, 2004)

Project U-STARS~PLUS Found Teachers Might Have Overlooked 22% Children of Color (Coleman & Shah-Coltrane, 2011)

The National Center for Research on Gifted Education (NCRGE – http://ncrge.uconn.edu) is funded by the Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education PR/Award # R305C140018
# Project U-stars

Giftedness is expressed in different ways.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>Teacher-pleasing example</th>
<th>Non-teacher-pleasing example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Learns easily</td>
<td>Retains and retrieves information easily</td>
<td>Corrects the teacher and students in class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shows advanced skills</td>
<td>Has a large vocabulary</td>
<td>Manipulates situations for specific purposes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Average is a source of ability</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In bilingual education, students are taught in both their native language and English to help them master curriculum content while developing their English proficiency. (Hakuta, Butler, & Whitt, 2000)

The National Center for Research on Gifted Education (NCRGE – http://ncrge.uconn.edu) is funded by the Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education PR/Award # R305C140018
Funds of Knowledge
(Moll, Amanti, Neff, & Gonzalez, 1992)

• Code Switching (Hughes, Shaunessy, Brice, Ratliff, & McHatton, 2006)
• Translating
• Speed of English Language Acquisition
• Strengths in Leadership, Creativity, and Arts
• Rapid Rate of Acculturation (Granada, 2003)
Universal Screening

Teachers Make Most Nominations (McBee, 2006) and Deficit Thinking Biases Prevail (Ford & Whiting, 2008)

180% Increase Among All Under Represented
130% Increase for Hispanic
80% Increase for Black (Card & Giuliano, 2015)
Data Collection

• Quantitative Methods
  • 3 years of school-reported state data
  • 3 states with mandates for identification and programming for gifted students

• Qualitative Methods
  • 16 schools from 9 districts
  • interviews and focus groups (225 informants)
  • 84 transcripts
  • 2,207 excerpts
  • 6,278 total code applications
  • 208 total axial codes
  • four selective codes (i.e., core categories)
Recommendations to Increase EL Participation
from Qualitative Analysis of Case Studies

• Adopt Universal Screening Procedures
• Create Alternative Pathways to Identification
• Establish a Web of Communication
• View Professional Development as a Lever for Change
Adopting Universal Screening Procedures

Recommendations

• Adopt a policy of universal screening as the initial step in the identification process
• Provide periodic opportunities to assess English language acquisition
• Consider using reliable and valid nonverbal ability assessments
• Select assessment instruments that are culturally sensitive and account for language differences
• Use other identification tools (e.g., nominations, rating scales, portfolios) to supplement results of universal screening
Creating Alternative Pathways to Identification

Recommendations

- Use native language ability and achievement assessments
- Establish a preparation program prior to formal identification procedures
- Create a talent pool list of students who exhibit high potential
Establishing a Web of Communication

Recommendations

- Establish an identification committee
- Focus on the development and implementation of intentional outreach to the school community, particularly parents
- Emphasize collaboration within and across specializations/departments (e.g., general education, ESL, and special education) regarding identification processes
Viewing Professional Development as a Lever for Change

Recommendations

• Provide professional development to support equitable representation of ELs in gifted programs
• Develop a systematic approach to analyzing district and school demographics and status of identified/not identified for gifted programs
  • race/ethnicity
  • free and reduced-price lunch status
  • ELs
• Promote efforts to diversify teaching staff
Four Phases for Improving Identification of English Learners for Gifted and Talented Programs

National Center for Research on Gifted Education (http://ncrge.uconn.edu)

**Pre-Identification**
- Targeted Subgroups
- Broadened Definition of Giftedness
- Informal Data Sources to Identify Giftedness
- Parent Awareness

**Preparation**
- Staffing/Human Resources
- Material Resources

**Identification**
- Universal Screening
- Broadened Definition With Alternative Identification Pathways
- Cultural Awareness/Sensitivity Through Professional Development
- Frequent Screening
- Culturally Appropriate Assessments
- Web of Communication
- Talent Scouts

**Acceptance of Placement**
- Parent Awareness
- Accessibility of Location/Scheduling
- Trustworthiness of the Communicator
- Cultural Awareness/Sensitivity to Being Labeled as Gifted
- Support Services to Ensure Student Success
Model for Improving Identification of EL Students

National Center for Research on Gifted Education (http://ncrge.uconn.edu)

- Identification Preparation Opportunities
- Universal Screening
- Alternative Identification Pathways
- More Frequent Screening
- Culturally Appropriate Assessments

Increased Identification of EL Students for Gifted Services

- Improved Acceptance and Placement for Gifted Services
- Increased Trustworthiness of Communications

Champion for Identifying EL Students

Professional Development

Improved School Personnel Awareness of EL Identification Issues

Evolution of a Web of Communication Among Administration, Faculty, Staff, Specialists, & Parents/Guardians

Modifications in Program Services

- Inclusion of Culturally Responsive Curriculum
- Adding Support Services to Ensure Student Success

Develop Practice of Being Talent Scouts

Increase Trustworthiness of Communications
Web of Communication Processes for Improving Identification of English Learners for Gifted and Talented Programs

National Center for Research on Gifted Education (http://ncrge.uconn.edu)

**Web of Communication**

- **Professional Development**
- **Awareness of EL Gifted Identification Issues**
- **Changes in Identification Practices**
  - Identification Preparation Opportunities
  - Universal Screening
  - Broadened Definition With Alternative Identification Pathways
  - More Frequent Screening
  - Culturally Appropriate Assessments
  - Develop Practice of Being Talent Scouts
- **Modifications in Program Services**
  - Inclusion of Culturally Responsive Curriculum
  - Adding Support Services to Ensure Student Success
- **Increased Parental Understanding of Program Services and Trustworthiness of Communications**
- **Increased Identification and Placement of EL Students for Gifted and Talented Programs**
○ States are concerned about under-identification.
○ Gifted services are not equally distributed across schools within districts.
○ Underserved populations are not being identified at the same rates as non-underserved students even after controlling for student achievement.
○ Very few districts reassess students.
○ Extensive use of cognitive tests to identify students.
○ Third grade achievement is directly related to identification gaps.
○ Very few districts offer programs to identify and recruit potentially gifted students.
○ Practices such as universal screening and nonverbal tests do not appear to be panaceas.
○ Universal screening with modification shows promise at reducing under-identification.
○ Majority of schools use pull-out classes for gifted instruction.
○ Greater focus on critical thinking and creative thinking than Reading/Language Arts and Mathematics.
○ Gifted programs seldom focus on core curriculum such as math and reading.
○ Gifted students start ahead in reading and mathematics achievement but don’t grow any faster than other groups.
○ Teacher autonomy positively influences academic achievement.
○ EL reclassification is linked to gifted identification.
○ Talent scouts are effective in finding gifted English learners; don’t wait for EL students to surface.

○ High level of agreement between district and teacher reports of practice and curriculum.
Best practices involve a fair and equitable nomination process. This requires a paradigm shift where the focus changes from identifying and remediating weaknesses to identifying strengths and giftedness through multiple lenses (Esquierdo & Arreguin-Anderson, 2012).
Talent Development is a Two Step Process—
1. We must provide opportunities for talent to surface
2. Then we must provide programs that develop students’ talents
“Our lives begin to end the day we become silent about things that matter.”

- Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.
The only way our country will reach its potential is if we help all our children reach their potential.
Gifted Education’s Dilemma:
What is gifted education?
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Three School Conditions Being Studied

- Full-Time Gifted Academic Content Program, $n=150$ schools
- Part-Time Gifted in Mathematics Academic Content Area, $n=10$ schools
- Part-Time Gifted in Reading/LA Academic Content Area, $n=40$ schools

- GT Reading/LA
- GT Math
- Regular Reading/LA
- GT Math
- GT Reading/LA
- Regular Math
1a. What is the impact on reading/language arts achievement of gifted students receiving reading/language arts instruction in a part-time gifted class when compared with gifted students in part-time gifted settings who receive reading/language arts instruction in a regular education setting?
1b. What is the impact on mathematics achievement of gifted students receiving mathematics instruction in a part-time gifted class when compared with gifted students in part-time gifted settings who receive mathematics instruction in a regular education setting?
2a. What is the impact on reading/language arts achievement of gifted students receiving reading/language arts instruction in a full-time gifted setting when compared with gifted students who receive reading/language arts instruction in a part-time gifted setting?

**Full-Time Gifted Academic Content Program**
- $n=150$ schools
- GT Reading/LA
- GT Math

**Part-Time Gifted in Mathematics Academic Content Area**
- $n=10$ schools
- Regular Reading/LA
- GT Math

**Part-Time Gifted in Reading/LA Academic Content Area**
- $n=40$ schools
- GT Reading/LA
- Regular Math
2b. What is the impact on reading/language arts achievement of gifted students receiving mathematics instruction in a full-time gifted setting when compared with gifted students who receive mathematics instruction in a part-time gifted setting?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Full-Time Gifted Academic Content Program $n=150$ schools</th>
<th>GT Reading/LA</th>
<th>GT Math</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Part-Time Gifted in Mathematics Academic Content Area $n=10$ schools</td>
<td>Regular Reading/LA</td>
<td>GT Math</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-Time Gifted in Reading/LA Academic Content Area $n=40$ schools</td>
<td>GT Reading/LA</td>
<td>Regular Math</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Secondary Research Questions

Full-Time Gifted Academic Content Program  
$n=150$ schools

- GT Reading/LA
- GT Math

Part-Time Gifted in Mathematics Academic Content Area  
$n=10$ schools

- Regular Reading/LA
- GT Math

Part-Time Gifted in Reading/LA Academic Content Area  
$n=40$ schools

- GT Reading/LA
- Regular Math

HANG (High Achieving Non-identified Gifted)

- Reading without G
- Math without G
- Reading with G
- Math without G
- Reading without G
- Math with G
3a. What is the impact on reading/language arts achievement of high achieving non-gifted students receiving reading/language arts instruction in a regular education setting where gifted students are present only for mathematics instruction, compared with students in regular education settings where gifted students are present only for reading/language arts instruction?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Full-Time Gifted Academic Content Program</th>
<th>GT Reading/LA</th>
<th>GT Math</th>
<th>Reading without G</th>
<th>Math without G</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Part-Time Gifted in Mathematics Academic Content Area</td>
<td>Regular Reading/LA</td>
<td>GT Math</td>
<td>Reading with G</td>
<td>Math without G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-Time Gifted in Reading/LA Academic Content Area</td>
<td>GT Reading/LA</td>
<td>Regular Math</td>
<td>Reading without G</td>
<td>Math with G</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3b. What is the impact on mathematics achievement of high achieving non-gifted students receiving mathematics instruction in a regular education setting where gifted students are present only for reading/language arts instruction, compared with students in regular education settings where gifted students are present only for mathematics instruction?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Full-Time Gifted Academic Content Program</th>
<th>GT Reading/LA</th>
<th>GT Math</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>150 schools</td>
<td>Reading without G</td>
<td>Math without G</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part-Time Gifted in Mathematics Academic Content Area</th>
<th>Regular Reading/LA</th>
<th>GT Math</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10 schools</td>
<td>Reading with G</td>
<td>Math without G</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part-Time Gifted in Reading/LA Academic Content Area</th>
<th>GT Reading/LA</th>
<th>Regular Math</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>40 schools</td>
<td>Reading without G</td>
<td>Math with G</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

HANG (High Achieving Non-identified Gifted)
4a. What is the impact on reading/language arts achievement of high achieving non-gifted students receiving reading/language arts instruction in a regular education setting where gifted students are present only for mathematics instruction, compared with students in regular education settings where gifted students are never present?

**Full-Time Gifted Academic Content Program**
- $n=150$ schools

**Part-Time Gifted in Mathematics Academic Content Area**
- $n=10$ schools

**Part-Time Gifted in Reading/LA Academic Content Area**
- $n=40$ schools

**Regular Math**
- Math without G

**GT Math**
- Math without G

**Regular Reading/LA**
- Reading without G

**GT Reading/LA**
- Reading without G

**Reading with G**

**GT Reading/LA with G**

**Reading without G**

**Math with G**

**HANG (High Achieving Non-identified Gifted)**
4b. What is the impact on mathematics achievement of high achieving non-gifted students receiving mathematics instruction in a regular education setting where gifted students are present only for reading/language arts instruction, compared with students in regular education settings where gifted students are never present?