

National Surveys of Gifted Programs

Executive Summary 2014

National Research Center on the Gifted and Talented
University of Virginia
[Curry School of Education](#)
Charlottesville, Virginia

Carolyn M. Callahan, Ph.D.

Tonya R. Moon, Ph.D.

Sarah Oh, Ph.D.

The research reported here was supported by the Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education, through Grant R305A060044 to the National Research Center on the Gifted and Talented. The opinions expressed are those of the authors and do not represent views of the Institute or the U.S. Department of Education.

Overview

In order to address concerns about the lack of systematic and specific data regarding programs for gifted students, the U.S. Department of Education commissioned a study to develop a national portrait of the current status of gifted programs at the elementary, middle, and high school levels. This executive summary presents highlights from the study and identifies areas for consideration in future policy development at the federal, state, and local level relating to the education of gifted learners.

With funding provided by the U. S. Department of Education, the research team identified areas in need of comprehensive data to describe the status of gifted education programs nationally. In particular the research team focused on ascertaining the current status of practices and procedures that are reflected in operations of gifted programs in the areas of administration (staffing), identification of gifted students, curriculum and instruction, program delivery models, finance, evaluation, teacher selection, and staff development. We also were interested in the degree to which national standards (i.e., the National Association for Gifted Children [NAGC] PreK-Grade 12 Gifted Education Programming Standards) are used to guide programming.

Draft surveys (for data collection at the elementary, middle, and high school level) were constructed based on current research in the field of gifted education, best practices in the field of gifted education, and national level gifted education standards. The draft surveys were piloted with district coordinators representing various levels of funding and student population sizes and revised accordingly. The final surveys included questions across the areas of funding, identification of gifted students, gifted programming, curricular emphases, teacher qualifications, and program evaluation.

The desired sample size for the surveys was determined by first considering the number of public school districts in the U.S. and by implementing a 95% confidence level with a 3% margin of error, resulting in a suggested sample size of 1,062 for each school level (elementary school, middle school, and high school). In order to account for potential non-responses, the research team sampled 2,000 districts for each school level. Market Data Retrieval provided district level information for each randomly selected public school district in the U.S., stratified according to urbanicity, size, and distribution of ethnic groups. Each sample was made up of 35% urban, 35% suburban, and 25% rural school districts. After sampling for the elementary school gifted program survey, the research team eliminated overlapping districts to avoid sampling the same school districts for the middle school and high school surveys. In addition, school districts that did not serve the targeted grade levels were removed. The final sample for the elementary gifted programs survey included 2,000 districts while the middle school gifted program survey sample was comprised of 1,753 school districts, and 1,160 the high school districts were surveyed.

Surveys were distributed through an online survey platform to district-level coordinators/directors whose email addresses were available from state gifted education directors or the school districts' websites. When district contact email addresses were not available, hard copies of surveys were mailed. The elementary school gifted program survey responses were collected between November 2010 and April 2011. The middle school level survey data were collected between November 2011 and February 2012, and the high school survey data were gathered in March through June 2012.

A gifted program was defined on the survey as a program with a specific process for the identification of a group of students who are provided educational options in ways that differ from regular classroom curricula and/or instructional practices. The survey included both closed (i.e., select best option)

questions and open-ended questions, which allowed for the collection of in-depth information pertinent to the gifted programs at each school level. Frequencies and percentages of responses were computed on each closed-ended item. The open-ended section of the survey and any additional documents supplied by respondents were analyzed inductively seeking patterns and common themes across the responses.

The average response rate was 30.8% across the three surveys, and a total of 1,566 school districts across the nation provided data in response to the three separate surveys (765, 486, and 315 for elementary, middle, and high school surveys, respectively). The research team received approximately the same proportion of responses across urban, suburban, and rural school districts. Schonlau, Fricker, and Elliott (2002) reported that response rates for web surveys typically range from 7% to 44% and that responses to open-ended questions in web surveys provided more complete information when compared to paper surveys. The expansive nature of the surveys resulted in what would be considered a long and demanding survey, which probably decreased response rates.

Context

While the federal Jacob K. Javits Gifted and Talented Children and Youth Education Act of 1988 [Javits Act] (H.R. 543, 1988) acknowledged the need for special programs for gifted children and proposed advancing knowledge and services through funding research, model programs, and leadership training. However, the legislation does not include a national policy on gifted education. Unlike federal policy with regards to other special needs children and adolescents (e.g., children with disabilities), the federal government does not legislate a definition of giftedness that must be adopted by states or local education agencies, nor does it provide specific requirements for services. Furthermore, the only federal funding allocated specifically to research or services for gifted students in the past several decades was provided through the Javits Act. The federal financial allocations for the Javits Act and any research or services designated specifically for gifted education have historically been miniscule relative to both allocations for other educational programs and the total spending on education in general. But even the funding allocated in the Javits Act represented only 1/33 of 1% of the federal education budget. (See Figure 1 for an illustration of the relative funding during 2007, which was one of the years when federal funding for the Javits Act was highest.)

Figure 1: Federal Education Budget 2007



Since 2011, the federal government has allocated \$0 funding dollars for programs through the Javits Act.¹ No other federal legislation is specifically tailored to provide monies for gifted programs and service, and budget cuts at the state and local levels contribute to the challenge of serving the nation's gifted youth. Because of the absence of federal-level policy and financial support, each state has (or does not have) its own policy options for providing educational services for gifted students, including those relating to identification, program options, funding, and teacher qualifications in serving gifted learners. These state-level policies result in wide variations in practices across state and local levels. The results from these surveys highlight the challenges and implications of such variation in policies.

Findings

Status of Gifted Programming

- A majority of the district coordinators (92.5%, 83.7%, and 75.1% at the elementary, middle, and high school level respectively) indicated that their districts offer a program with a specific process for the identification of a group of students who were provided with educational options in ways that differ from regular classroom curricula and/or instructional practices.

Policies on Gifted Education

- **State-level regulations.** The vast majority of respondents (approximately 90%) indicated that there were state regulations in place that provided guidance in the development and implementation of programs for gifted and talented students. Although there was wide variation in the state-level regulations, most regulations centered on similar aspects of gifted programming: the definition of gifted students, the areas of giftedness to be identified, and teacher qualifications. These results were similar to those reported in the *State of the States in Gifted Education: National Policy and Practice Data* (National Association of Gifted Children [NAGC] & Council of State Directors of Programs for the Gifted [CSDPG], 2011, 2013).
- **Funding.** School districts report being dependent on local funding for providing gifted education services. Nearly 40% of districts with elementary gifted programs, 51% of the districts with middle school gifted programs, and 60% of the districts with high school gifted programs received no state funding. The differing proportion of districts receiving state funding across elementary, middle, and high school levels mirrors the differential funding patterns for other educational programs at the federal level. According to Riddle (2011), under Title I, elementary schools received 76% of the school allocations for Title I funds - considerably more than their share of the nation's low-income students (57%). Fourteen percent of Title I funds were allocated to middle schools, which enrolled 20% of all low-income students, and high schools received 10% of Title I funds and enrolled 22% of all low-income students (Year 2004-2005). Survey results indicated little change in the allocation of state funding for gifted education services, as also noted in the report *State of the States in Gifted Education: National Policy and Practice Data 2010-2011* (NAGC & CSDPG, 2011). The research team also collected data relative to specific

¹ After completion of this report, the Congress included \$5 million for the Javits Act in the fiscal year 2014 Consolidated Appropriations Act (H.R. 3547), which was signed into law by President Obama on January 17, 2014.

funding amounts; however, the question was interpreted in many different ways. At one extreme, some districts included salaries and benefits for all personnel teaching in heterogeneous classrooms with gifted students; at the other extreme, only expenses directly relating to gifted education services were reported. For that reason, the research team decided not to report on funding amount.

- **Administrative allocation.** The most prevalent administrative position was a part-time (less than 50%) gifted program administrator, whose assignment included gifted education among other responsibilities. This result suggests a minimum level of dedicated expertise at the leadership level, which adds challenges in the development of high-quality educational programs that support gifted students' learning.
- **Teacher qualification requirements.** A state endorsement in gifted education or parallel credentials were required to teach identified gifted students in 53.6%, 49.1% and 33.8% of the districts at the elementary, middle, and high school levels, respectively. When respondents were asked if there were additional requirements for teaching gifted students beyond state-level requirements, a large proportion of respondents (80.9% and 74.1% at the middle and high school level) reported that their teacher credential requirements did not differ from state-level credential requirements. The elementary survey did not include questions relating to credential requirements relative to state-level requirements.

Definition of Giftedness

- **The areas of giftedness.** Prior reports (e.g., NAGC & CSDPG, 2009, 2011) document a wide range of definitions for giftedness at the state level. The survey results reflect this variation in the definitions of giftedness that guide local practice. The vast majority of respondents indicated that their districts followed the definition for giftedness adopted at the state level (81.0% and 74.4% of the districts with middle school and high school gifted programs respectively²).
- **Definition of giftedness adopted by local districts.** The survey results included many local definitions that encompassed a wide range of areas that have been put forth in definitions of giftedness in literature of the field, including creativity and high academic achievement. The most common area of giftedness identified for services by respondents across all school levels was intellectual giftedness.

Although alternative theories of intelligence (e.g., Gardner, 1983; Sternberg & Grigorenko, 1997) and broadened conceptions of giftedness (e.g., Gagné, 1993; Renzulli, 1986) have been offered in the field of gifted education, the survey responses indicated that the broadened conceptions of giftedness have not been widely adopted and/or operationalized in local level practices.

Educators at the local level face more challenges in states where there is no state definition or where state policy does not require districts to use the state definitions. While seemingly providing flexibility, lack of policy often relegates decision-making at the local level to individuals without the time and resources to investigate viable and defensible options for definition, identification, and/or specification of services for gifted students. This is particularly the case in those districts where only 50% or less of a position is dedicated to gifted program leadership.

² Whether districts follow their state definitions of giftedness was not investigated in the elementary gifted program survey.

Identification of Gifted Students

- **Percentage of identified gifted students.** The average reported percentage of elementary level students identified as gifted as 7.8% with a standard deviation of 6.5%. The percentage of students identified as gifted ranged between 0% and 50% at the elementary level. At the middle and high school level, the majority of district coordinators (62.0% and 57.9% respectively) reported that between 1% and 10% of the students were identified as gifted. When respondents were asked if they identify gifted students at the middle and high school level, 81.4% of the districts at the middle school level and 58.9% of the districts at the high school level reported that they have a specific process in place to identify gifted students. The remaining districts did not identify gifted students at the middle and high school level and student eligibility depended on the identification at the prior school level.
- **Identification practices.** Respondents reported a wide array of identification practices in elementary, middle, and high schools, and those practices fell on a continuum representing the degree to which practices recommended in the literature were followed. At one extreme on the continuum the reported identification system relied on only one data point or used an additive combination of cut-off scores for selection to receive services. At the other end of the continuum, there were procedures that included a multi-faceted approach combining exemplary practices such as: collecting information from multiple data sources to create a student profile; decision-making by a committee of trained educators; selecting appropriate identification tools based on the student demographic information (such as race or language proficiency); looking for evidence of a broader skill set matching properties of the adopted definition; purposefully including strategies for considering students who may have a disability; continuously training key personnel to ensure decision-making reliability; and identifying students within the Response to Intervention (RTI) framework.
- **Demographic Representation - Minority Students.** When demographic data were disaggregated by looking at the alignment between the percentage of certain subgroups of students in each district and the percentage of the various racial and socio-economic subgroups in the district's gifted programs, the representation of minority students and economically disadvantaged students in gifted programs varied widely across

The finding that fewer districts identify students as gifted at the middle school and high school level likely has detrimental effects on educators' ability to identify many students who are in need of educational services. Just identifying at the elementary school level ignores evidence that documents the very different developmental trajectories among individuals during childhood and adolescence. Hence it ignores the possibility that some students with very specific talents in specific disciplines may emerge as the curriculum begins to reflect differences in aptitude for high performance or students' development results in the emergence of talent. For example, the discipline of mathematics requires different thinking skills and performances than are required for success in arithmetic. If school districts do not rescreen to identify students who may have been missed in screenings at the elementary school level (often only once at the second or third grade level), they many fail to identify many gifted students. These identified students may be excluded from services at the middle school and high school level. Not having the opportunity to participate in those advanced level services, including but not limited to Advanced Placement or International Baccalaureate options, may have grave implications for subsequent college application and admissions decisions.

school districts. In only 50% of elementary school districts was exact alignment³ reported for Black student representation; 34% of districts at the middle school level and 50% at the high level were in the exact category. Hispanic student representation was similarly disparate. Fifty four percent of coordinators provided data that placed their elementary schools in the exact category; 37% of middle schools and 50% of high school districts fell in the exact category. More than 80% of the district coordinators across all school levels reported exact or adjacent alignment between Black and Hispanic student representation in their districts and in districts' gifted programs.

- **Demographic Representation - Students of Poverty.** Notably, underrepresentation of students of poverty in gifted programs was greater than that of Black or Hispanic students. More than 50% of the respondents across school levels reported much lower representation of students of poverty in their gifted programs than the percentage of the subgroup in their district student population. Only 17.8%, 21.4%, and 15.1% of the districts at the elementary, middle, and high school levels, respectively were in the exact alignment category.
- **Identification of historically underrepresented populations.** In reporting strategies used to identify historically underrepresented student subgroups for gifted programs, 61%, 73% and 50% of the district coordinators (at the elementary, middle, and high school levels, respectively) reported that there was a plan in place to specifically identify gifted students from historically underrepresented populations. Among the strategies reported by those who had strategies in place for identifying underrepresented students, non-verbal assessments and/or gathering student information from multiple sources (e.g., student portfolios, student interviews, anecdotal notes, and teacher observation checklists) were the most commonly cited approaches.
- **Talent development among historically underrepresented student populations.** Fifty-one percent of elementary school districts, 57.1% of middle school districts, and 48.7% of high school districts reported having a plan to develop talent potential in underrepresented populations. Using culturally relevant curriculum pedagogy through differentiated instruction or providing teacher mentorship were the most common talent development strategies reported at the elementary school level. At the middle and high school levels, additional support systems, such as teacher mentoring, tutoring, or special support programs (e.g., Advancement via Individual Determination and Bridge Program) were noted as strategies to develop talent potential in gifted students from underrepresented populations.

Gifted Programming

- **Program goals.** A large portion of district coordinators (92.3% at the elementary, 83.5% at the middle, and 73.6% at the high school level) reported offering educational opportunities for gifted students that differed from regular classroom curricular and instructional practices. Typical goal statements included the goal of providing adequate learning opportunities commensurate with student needs through differentiation, enrichment, and/or acceleration. While the district program goal statements that were provided acknowledged the educational needs of gifted students, student learning outcome goals were rarely reported by respondents across all school

³ See Endnote for a full explanation of how the categories for alignment were determined.

levels. Respondents were more likely to report process goals, such as providing teacher training and developing quality curriculum, rather than student outcome goals to guide gifted programming.

- **Framework for programming.** More than 30% of the respondents (32.1% at the elementary, 40.2% at the middle, and 34.1% at the high school level) indicated that no particular framework guided gifted programming in their districts. When respondents reported adoption of specific models, Tomlinson’s Differentiation Model (Tomlinson, 2001), Renzulli’s Enrichment Cluster Model (Renzulli, 1977) and Kaplan’s Depth and Complexity (Kaplan, 2005) were frequently cited as models used to guide gifted education programs at the elementary and middle school levels. *Advanced Placement*® frameworks and curriculum guides were chosen by the majority of respondents at the high school level.
- **Program service delivery.** Part-time, pull-out classes (51.9%) for one to four hours per week at the elementary level and special classes of homogeneously grouped gifted students within a regular school setting at the middle school (64.3%) were identified as the most frequent service delivery options. *Advanced Placement*® (90.7%) was the predominant program option for gifted students at the high school level. Responding district coordinators also indicated that 100% of the identified students were served by one primary service delivery model at the elementary, and between 75%-99% of the identified students were served by one primary model at the middle and high school levels. These results indicated that identified gifted students are still considered and identified as a homogeneous group of students with all students being served in the same way.
- **Curricular materials.** A variety of curricular materials are used to provide gifted education services. Two-thirds of the district respondents at the elementary level and nearly as many at the middle school level listed specific resources used for instruction including teacher-developed materials, public resources (e.g., Library of Congress materials), pre-developed materials (e.g., LEGO robotics, Junior Great Books, Accelerated Math), curricular materials developed by the university research teams, and academic competition materials (e.g., Destination Imagination, Mock Trial, National History Day, and Science Fair). No particular set of materials dominated. The remaining district respondents (25.4% at the elementary and 36.2% at the middle school level) noted that no particular materials guided instruction. At the high school level, *Advanced Placement*® course resources were identified as the primary curricular materials for gifted students.

Services for gifted and talented students should be based on programmatic goals that provide a framework for determining the specific educational objectives of the gifted program to guide curricular and instructional decisions (e.g., cognitive objectives, affective objectives, behavioral objectives). These educational objectives identify the types of measurable gifted learner outcomes that are expected as a result of the implementation of the educational program. Without documentation of learner outcomes, it is impossible to use evidence to improve student learning and to build and sustain program excellence over time.

The reported delivery systems suggest a “one-size-fits-all” approach that runs counter to the research findings that gifted students are not a homogeneous group with the same learning needs (e.g., Kenny, Archambault, & Hallmark, 1995; Reis & Renzulli, 2009) and that Advanced Placement programs at the high school level are not a fit for all gifted high school students (Gallagher, 2009; Hertberg-Davis, Callahan, & Kyburg, 2006).

- Content areas and skills developed.** Given the development of expanded conceptions of giftedness and recognition that students might be gifted in one or more specific academic area, we expected that schools would offer a more balanced range of areas of emphasis in content and skills. However, the area of language arts at the elementary (47.2%) and high school levels (35.3%) and the area of mathematics at the middle school level (41.7%) were identified as the most developed content areas for serving gifted students. Note that in choosing one area of emphasis, respondents were not given the option of other areas of emphasis in assessing the most developed skills in the programs offered to gifted students. The largest number of school district coordinators reported focus on creative-thinking skills at the elementary school level (32.9%) and problem-solving skills at the middle and high school levels (26.5% and 39.3%, respectively).
- Learning outcome measures.** The majority of the district respondents (40.1% at the elementary and 64.0% at the middle school level) identified informal classroom assessments (e.g., teacher developed checklists, interviews, or student satisfaction questionnaires) as the primary measures used to assess student outcomes. At the high school level, 45.8% identified *Advanced Placement*[®] tests as the most prevalent student outcome measure.
- Results of measuring student learning outcomes.** Only 8% of the district respondents at the elementary school level indicated that they used student learning outcome results for program improvement such as curriculum and instruction modification, planning intervention, or professional development. The remaining elementary respondents did not elaborate on the types of decisions made based on outcome data or how the outcome results impacted policy or practices relating to elementary gifted programs. At the secondary school level, 95.1% of middle school and 69.2% of high school respondents noted use of outcome data for curricular and instructional modification and professional development.
- Use of the national gifted education programming standards.** NAGC's *Pre-K-Grade 12 Gifted Education Programming Standards* (NAGC, 2010) provide a structure for rules, policies, and procedures for systemic programming for gifted learners. However, only 53.6% of respondents at the elementary level, 39.1% of respondents at the middle school level, and 27.5% of respondents at the high school level use the NAGC Standards to guide programming. Among the districts that employed them, the NAGC standards relating to curriculum planning and instruction

The heavy emphases on the areas of English Language Arts and mathematics is most likely a result of federal and state-level policies (e.g., NCLB, Common Core State Standards) that specifically target these two content areas.

Beyond simply justifying the investment of school district funds for gifted programming, measuring gifted learner outcomes at the program and classroom levels is necessary to improve practice. While it is not hard to argue that learning outcomes are critically important and useful to measure, two questions should be asked regarding the measurement of gifted program learning outcomes:

- 1) Can the district/school/program provide data on which students have mastered particular learning outcomes and provide evidence (e.g., assessed student work) for that determination?; and/or*
- 2) Can students, parents, teachers, and administrators articulate the desired learning outcomes of the gifted program?*

Without being able to answer each of these questions with solid evidence, a gifted program is vulnerable to cuts in funding, staff, or resources; programs even may be eliminated.

reportedly guided the planning of 45% of those districts, which is less than 20% of the total sample. No other set of NAGC standards was reported as applied by more than 39% of the district respondents who reported using the NAGC standards at all. Respondents in only 33.9% districts at the elementary level reported using the NAGC standards for guidance across all six standards areas.

- **Staff development activities.** When professional development on the education of gifted students was offered, differentiation strategies for teaching gifted students was the most frequently noted focus across all school levels. Among those secondary districts that offered targeted professional development, 57.6% and 62% of the districts at the middle and high school levels, respectively reported less than five hours per school year of professional development activities focused on gifted students. Professional development commitments at the elementary school level varied widely from district to district, ranging from as low as 15 minutes to four days per year.

Evaluation and Program Improvement

- **Evaluation of gifted programs.** More than 50% of the districts at each school level (51.2%, 50.2% and 58.8% respectively) did not report that they had a program evaluation requirement or strategic plans to monitor and report on the quality of gifted program services. Among the districts with program evaluation requirements, 59.8%, 49.6% and 63.8% of the districts at the elementary, middle and high school level reported a limited scope of internal evaluation carried out by educators in the gifted education program.
- **Planned changes.** The most frequent response relating to planned change was a report of no plans for change in the next 12-18 months (41.5%, 42.4% and 58.7% at the elementary, middle and high school level respectively). Among the district respondents that indicated planned changes, modifications to programs services and service delivery options were selected as the area of focus for change by the greatest number of districts across all school levels.

In the face of competing funds, evaluation of a gifted program is the vehicle that affords local school districts the opportunity to respond to accountability and to create data for program improvement, development, refinement, and/or expansion.

Valuable information can result from learning that a gifted program is achieving its goals, but equally valuable information can be obtained from examining why a program is not achieving its goals. The intent of the evaluation process is to systematically look at not only “what works or not” but also for whom, where, and under what conditions. This type of data provides information to stakeholders about program effects, potential limitations of the program, and strengths of the program.

As indicated earlier, without specifically identifying program outcomes and being able to provide solid evidence of effectiveness, including areas of needed improvement, the risk is high that a gifted program fail to serve gifted learners, will be drastically reduced or will be cut completely, especially when considering competition for funds within a district.

Implications

A gifted program can be thought of as one sub-system within a larger system (the district) that provides the context for the gifted program. Factors such as funding level, guiding state regulations, student demographics, teaching faculty (e.g., number, qualifications, skills) all play a significant role in the context of the gifted program and also have a significant impact on the quality of program. Within the gifted program are several components of primary importance. First, the gifted program should be guided by a philosophical belief statement about giftedness. This belief undergirds all subsequent components - from defining what it means to be gifted in a particular district to the identification procedures employed to assess giftedness. These two components; definition and identification, in theory, should directly guide the types of services that are delivered to students within the program, the curriculum, instruction, and supporting resources that are used for instruction, and the types of professional development opportunities offered to program faculty. In addition, the philosophical belief also guides the evaluation component, regardless of whether an evaluation is internal or external. This organized scheme for a gifted program outlines how each component is connected to form the whole – i.e., the gifted program – and it highlights that weaknesses and/or strengths in one component have implications for all other components.

Based on the data collected for this study, the typical gifted program does not operate within an aligned system like the one described above. For example, the NAGC Programming Standards are used in less than half of the districts; one fourth of respondents at the elementary level and one third at the middle school level indicated that their gifted program had no specific curricular materials that guided program activities; at the high school level, the predominant default curriculum was *AP* courses, a program now widely believed to be suitable for all high school students. Furthermore, the use of clearly identified learner outcomes and routine cycles for program evaluation are rarities for gifted programs at all school levels. Without these components as an integral part of gifted programming, school districts cannot ascertain whether their efforts in all other stages of program development and implementation are producing the desired outcome—high quality education for gifted students. Professional development specifically targeted at providing educators with the knowledge and skills to provide services and instruction to gifted learners is also limited. Because each of these areas is a component within a gifted program system, this strongly suggests that gifted programs, in many instances, are not providing the types of services necessary to fully address gifted youth’s academic, social, and emotional needs so that they may reach their full potential. Furthermore, based on these data it also appears that there has been limited transfer, if any at all, of the work of experts (research and theory development) into the field of practice. We are in a time in this country where the practices of gifted education should be leading the way in educating all our youth. Yet, based on the survey responses, in many school districts, practices are at the same level they were 30 or more years ago. It is time for a national dialogue focused on shaping the future of gifted education for the 21st century.

Note

For ease of reporting (necessary to increase response rates) we asked survey respondents to indicate the percentages of subgroups in their general school population and in their gifted programs by deciles (i.e., < 1%, 1-10%, 11-20%, etc.). To compare the reported proportions of Black, Hispanic, and children categorized as low-socioeconomic in the general population to the proportion of those students in gifted programs we created three categories. The “exact” category included districts whose coordinators reported that the proportion of a subgroup was in the same decile as the proportion of those students in the gifted program. Placement in the “exact” category did not mean percentage was exactly the same. The possible range of difference in percentage in the exact category was 9 percent. The “adjacent” proportion category included districts who reported that their proportions were in adjacent decile categories. For example, if a district coordinator reported that the general population was comprised of 41-50% Black students and the population of its gifted program services was comprised of 31-40% Black students, that district was placed in the “adjacent” category.

References

- Gagné, F. (1993). Constructs and models pertaining to exceptional human abilities. In K. A. Heller, F. J. Monks, & A. H. Passow (Eds.), *International handbook of research and development of giftedness and talent* (pp.69-87). Oxford, England: Pergamon Press.
- Gallagher, S. A. (2009) Myth 19: Is Advanced Placement an adequate program for gifted students? *Gifted Child Quarterly*, 53, 286-288.
- Gardner, H. (1983). *Frames of mind: The theory of multiple intelligences*. New York, NY: Basic Books.
- Hertberg-Davis, H., Callahan, C.M., & Kyburg, R.M. (2006). *Advanced Placement and International Baccalaureate programs: A "fit" for gifted learners?* (RM06222). Storrs: University of Connecticut, National Research Center on the Gifted and Talented
- House Representatives 543 [H.R. 543], 100th Congress: Jacob K. Javits Gifted and Talented Children and Youth Education Act of 1987 (1987) (enacted).
- Kaplan, S. N. (2005). Layering differentiated curriculum for the gifted and talented. In F. Karnes & S. Bean (Eds.), *Methods and materials for teaching gifted students* (2nd ed., pp. 107-132). Waco, TX: Prufrock Press.
- Kenny, D. A., Archambault, F. X., Jr., & Hallmark, B. W. (1995). *The effects of group composition on gifted and non-gifted elementary students in cooperative learning groups* (Research Monograph 95116). Storrs: University of Connecticut, National Research Center on the Gifted and Talented.
- National Association for Gifted Children. (2010). *Pre-K-Grade 12 gifted programming standards*. Retrieved from <http://www.nagc.org/index.aspx?id=546>
- National Association for Gifted Children & the Council of State Directors of Programs for the Gifted. (2011). *State of the states in gifted education: National policy and practice data 2010-2011*. Washington, DC: National Association for Gifted Children.
- National Association for Gifted Children & the Council of State Directors of Programs for the Gifted. (2013). *State of the states in gifted education: National policy and practice data 2012-2013*. Washington, DC: National Association for Gifted Children.
- Reis, S. M., & Renzulli, J. S. (2009). Myth 1: The gifted and talented constitute one single homogeneous group and giftedness is a way of being that stays in the person over time and experiences. *Gifted Child Quarterly*, 53, 233-235.
- Renzulli, J. S. (1977). *The enrichment triad model: A guide for developing defensible programs for the gifted and talented*. Wethersfield, CT: Creative Learning Press.
- Renzulli, J. S. (1986). *The three ring conception of giftedness: A developmental model for creative productivity* In R. J. Sternberg & J. E. Davidson (Eds.), *Conceptions of giftedness* (pp. 246-279). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Riddle, W. (2011). Title I and high schools: Addressing the needs of disadvantaged students at all grade levels. *Policy Brief: Alliance for Excellent Education*. Retrieved from <http://www.all4ed.org/files/TitleIandHSs.pdf>
- Schonlau, M., Fricker, R. D., & Elliott, M. N. (2002). *Conducting research surveys via email and the web*. (MR 1480). Santa Monica, CA: Rand Corporation.
- Sternberg, R. J., & Grigorenko, E. (Eds.). (1997). *Intelligence, heredity, and environment*. NY, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Tomlinson, C. A. (2001). *How to differentiate instruction in mixed-ability classrooms* (2nd ed.). Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.