

**INTELLECTUALLY GIFTED STUDENTS
JOINT STUDY COMMITTEE
REPORT**



Tennessee State Board of Education

January 2004

MEMBERS
INTELLECTUALLY GIFTED STUDENTS JOINT STUDY COMMITTEE

Debra E. Owens

State Board of Education, Deputy Executive Director of Administration

Committee Chair

(Acting on behalf of Dr. Douglas Wood, Executive Director of the State Board of Education)

Carol Berning

President, Tennessee Association for the Gifted
Gifted Education Teacher, Rutherford County

Dianne Calhoun

Parent of Child Identified as Intellectually Gifted
Instructor and Director, Youth Journalism Program, University of Memphis

Dr. David Carleton

President, Tennessee Initiative for Gifted Education Reform
Parent of Child Identified as Intellectually Gifted
Associate Professor, Middle Tennessee State University

Wanda Day

Education Outreach Director, Tennessee Association for the Gifted
Gifted Education Teacher, Memphis City Schools

Linda Dunn

Parent of Child Identified as Intellectually Gifted
Instructor, Middle Tennessee State University
Ph.D. candidate in Special Education, Vanderbilt University

Dr. Harolyn Hatley

Assessment/Gifted Coordinator, Division of Special Education, Tennessee Department of Education
(Acting on behalf of Dr. Lana Seivers, Commissioner of Education)

Lynn Howard

President-Elect, Tennessee Association for the Gifted
Exceptional Education Lead Teacher, Gifted Programs, Hamilton County Schools

Joy Kerby

Gifted Education Coordinator (retired)
Loudon County Schools

Dr. Josie McCamish

Co-Director, Academy for Teachers of the Gifted, Middle Tennessee State University
Gifted Education Teacher, Rutherford County Schools

Dr. Martha Morelock

Program Manager, Adolescent Day Treatment Program, The Guidance Center in Murfreesboro

Donna Parker

President, Tennessee Association of Administrators of Special Education
Director of Special Education, Wilson County Schools

Dr. Steven Ramsey

Tennessee Association of Administrators of Special Education
Assistant Director of Schools, Weakley County

“Let us think of education as the means of developing our greatest abilities, because in each of us there is a private hope and dream which, fulfilled, can be translated into benefit for everyone and greater strength for our nation.”

-- John F. Kennedy

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In recent years, different constituencies have raised a number of issues regarding gifted education services. Teachers have raised issues related to the identification of gifted students and appropriate training. Local administrators have raised issues related to eligibility criteria, administrative costs in time and energy, efficiency, and services to intellectual gifted students. Parents have raised issues of educational planning and access to advanced educational services. All groups have been interested in improving the integration and coordination of general and special education to better meet the needs of our intellectually gifted students.

In response to these concerns, the Tennessee General Assembly passed House Joint Resolution 75, which created The Intellectually Gifted Students Joint Study Committee. Representatives Maddox and Hood sponsored HJR 75, which was signed by the Governor on June 11, 2003 (Appendix A). Three professional/advocacy groups mutually endorsed HJR 75: the Tennessee Association of Administrators of Special Education (TAASE), the Tennessee Association for the Gifted (TAG), and the Tennessee Initiative for Gifted Education Reform (TIGER). These groups represent, respectively, administrators, teachers, and parents.

HJR 75 directed the Committee to examine and make recommendations for changes in State Board of Education rules and regulations in five interrelated areas:

1. Improving and clarifying eligibility criteria for intellectually gifted students.
2. Improving education planning for intellectually gifted students, as well as streamlining procedures and reducing paperwork related to Individualized Education Programs.
3. Making evaluation and reevaluation methods and procedures more efficient and more appropriate for intellectually gifted students.
4. Increasing the likelihood that the needs of intellectually gifted students are addressed and met in regular K-12 classrooms, and that students have easier access to advanced instruction in higher grades and in post-secondary school settings.
5. Providing pre-service, in-service, and advanced teacher training regarding the needs of intellectually gifted students.

The Joint Study Committee met throughout the Fall of 2003, taking public input, reviewing research and available data, sharing personal experiences, and discussing policy options. There is

a shared consensus that the following recommendations will strengthen, improve, and streamline services for intellectually gifted students in Tennessee:

Recommendation 1.1 The State Board of Education request the Department of Education to establish a Task Force for Intellectually Gifted with a representative from the State Board of Education to review the state guidelines and standards established for determining program eligibility criteria, evaluation procedures, and evaluation participants according to Rule 0520-1-9-.07. This Task Force would study the following areas and report to the State Board of Education by May 2005:

- 1) revise or replace the Teacher Observation Checklist and the Teacher Creativity Checklist;
- 2) establish criteria for preschool identification and determination of need;
- 3) determine the guidelines as to the most appropriate grade levels for screening for intellectually gifted while allowing for flexibility for testing at an age appropriate for a given student;
- 4) develop a clear “adversely affects” standard which is appropriate to intellectually gifted students and their needs;
- 5) review the eligibility criteria in relation to the use of a variety of intelligence tests, their new norms, and their uses to identify subpopulations of gifted students including highly gifted, minority gifted, and gifted with dual diagnoses.

Recommendation 2.1: The State Board of Education request the Department of Education to develop and maintain a research-based Best Practices Manual for Intellectually Gifted. Such Manual should include a menu of appropriate goals and objectives for use in gifted IEPs, and a model gifted education curriculum keyed to the minimum program standards (e.g. program standards of the National Association for Gifted Children). The Department of Education will present the Best Practices Manual for Intellectually Gifted to the State Board of Education by February 1, 2005.

Recommendation 3.1 : Add subparagraph (a) to rule 0520-1-9-.05 (6) so it reads: Each local school system shall ensure that an individual evaluation of each child eligible for special education is conducted every three (3) years or more frequently if conditions warrant or if the child’s parent or teacher requests a reevaluation.

- (a) Intellectually gifted students in grades 7-12 are excluded from reevaluation rule 0520-1-9-.05 (6) unless requested by any member of the IEP team.

Recommendation 4.1: The State Board of Education request the State Department of Education include the disaggregated data on academic achievement and progress for students identified as intellectually gifted by state eligibility criteria in the annual publication, Tennessee Student Test Results, Tennessee Comprehensive Assessment Program beginning in 2004.

Recommendation 4.2: Amend Rule “0520-1-9-.02 RELATIONSHIP TO GENERAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS” by replacing the existing paragraph (3) to read:

- (3) School improvement plans must include a continuum of educational strategies and programs to address the educational needs of all students, including the needs of all students eligible for special education, **including intellectually gifted students.**

Recommendation 4.3: Amend State Board of Education Rules and Regulations to allow any high school junior or senior to dual enroll during school hours with the permission of the school and college by deleting the current language in State Board of Education Rule 0520-1-3-.06 (4) (b) and substituting the following language to read:

(b) Option #2.

1. A qualified student enrolled in the 11th and 12th grades may enroll in college level courses which are conducted at times other than the regular school day **and during the school day** at an institution of higher education. The student may receive **dual** credit (high school **and college**) in such courses in accordance with the policy of the local school board of education. State funds to the local school system shall not be diminished because of the student’s participation.

Recommendation 4.4: Amend State Board of Education Rules and Regulations to allow any student in ninth or tenth grade who has a minimum ACT composite score of 21 (or the equivalent SAT score) to enroll in college courses for high school credit with the permission of the high school and college. Modify Rule 0520-1-3-.06 (4) by **adding** subparagraph (d) to read:

(d) **Option #4.**

1. A qualified student enrolled in 9th or 10th grade, who has a minimum ACT composite score of 21 (or the equivalent SAT score) may enroll in college level courses during or outside of school hours at an institution of higher education with the permission of the high school, parent/guardian, and college. The student may receive high school credit in such courses in accordance with the policy of the local school board of education. State funds to the local school system shall not be diminished because of the student’s participation.

Recommendation 4.5: The State Board of Education request the Department of Education publish and update annually an online list of possible, not exclusive distance learning options that local school districts may use to supplement the educational needs of diverse students, including disabled students, intellectually gifted students, and English language learners. This list shall indicate which courses closely follow state curriculum standards and would be good candidates for high school credit. The State Department of Education will have the list online by February 1, 2005.

Recommendation 5.1: Request the State Board of Education to appoint a committee to draft Tennessee standards for Gifted Endorsement in PreK-12 to report to the Advisory Council on

Teacher Education and various constituency groups for their input prior to reporting to the State Board of Education. The Council for Exceptional Children and the National Association for the Gifted have developed a prototype gifted endorsement standard. The State Board of Education would amend its rule to indicate the effective date and conditions for earning the endorsement.

Recommendation 5.2: Amend Rule 0520-1-2-.03 (7) “Employment Standards” to incorporate the gifted education endorsement called for in recommendation 5.1, and ensure that gifted education coordinators, gifted education consultants, and both special and general education teachers have meaningful and appropriate training or assistance to meet the needs of intellectually gifted students.

Recommendation 5.3: State Board of Education appoint a committee to review pre-service standards for school psychologists to include appropriate training in the characteristics, testing, and evaluation of intellectually gifted students. The committee would report to the Advisory Council on Teacher Education and various constituency groups for their input prior to reporting to the State Board of Education.

Recommendation 5.4: State Board of Education appoint a committee to review pre-service standards for school counselors to include appropriate training in the characteristics, testing, and evaluation of intellectually gifted students. The committee would report to the Advisory Council on Teacher Education and various constituency groups for their input prior to reporting to the State Board of Education.

CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
COMMITTEE MEMBERS	i
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	ii
INTRODUCTION	1
FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	3
Improving and Clarifying Eligibility Criteria.....	3
Improving Educational Planning and Reducing IEP Paperwork.....	5
Making Evaluation and Reevaluation Methods More Efficient and Appropriate	6
Meeting Needs in Regular K-12 Classrooms and Access to Advanced Instruction.....	7
Providing Pre-Service, In-Service, and Advanced Teacher Training.....	11
SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS	15
Recommendation 1.1: Establish Task Force to Review Eligibility and Evaluation Standards.....	15
Recommendation 2.1: Best Practices Manual	15
Recommendation 3.1: Exempt Grades 7-12 from Reevaluation	15
Recommendation 4.1: Publication of Performance Data.....	16
Recommendation 4.2: School Improvement Plans.....	16
Recommendation 4.3 Dual Credit, Grades 11-12.....	16
Recommendation 4.4: Dual Enrollment, Grades 9-10.....	16
Recommendation 4.5: Distance Learning Options.....	16
Recommendation 5.1: Gifted Education Endorsement.....	17
Recommendation 5.2: Employment Standards.....	17

Recommendation 5.3: Pre-Service Licensure Requirements for School Psychologists.....	17
Recommendation 5.4: Pre-Service Licensure Requirements for School Counselors.....	17
CONCLUSION.....	18
APPENDICES	
Appendix A: House Joint Resolution 75	19
Appendix B: Acceleration for Gifted Learners.....	22
Appendix C: Tennessee Teacher Licensure Standards: Professional Education, October 31, 2003.....	24
Appendix D: Prototype Gifted Education Endorsement, Council of Exceptional Children.....	31
Appendix E: Resources and References	37

INTRODUCTION

Intellectually Gifted” means a child whose intellectual abilities and potential for achievement are so outstanding that special provisions are required to meet the child’s educational needs.

- Tenn. Admin. Rules, State Board of Education, 0520-1-9-.01(15)(h))

In all school districts there are children who have the potential of learning at a level and pace that is significantly above the ability of their same age peers. Many of these children need educational interventions to help them move forward academically and to help them avoid the concomitant problems associated with spending much of their day in classrooms where they are not academically challenged.

The State of Tennessee has recognized the importance and responsibility of identifying and meeting the unique needs of intellectually gifted students for over three decades. In 1972, the Tennessee General Assembly passed the Weldon Act (Tennessee Public Acts of 1972, Chapter 839), which defined intellectual giftedness as a handicapping condition in state law and required that all handicapped children receive a "free education appropriate to their needs."

This year nearly twenty thousand intellectually gifted school children in Tennessee are identified and receive needed interventions and services. These students represent a cross section of cultural groups, regions, and income levels, and they attend schools in our largest cities and smallest towns.

State law provides a foundation for addressing the needs of intellectually gifted students, but improvements are needed in several areas. It is the aim and purpose of The Intellectually Gifted Students Joint Study Committee to propose changes to Tennessee State Board of Education rules and regulations that will strengthen, improve, and streamline the identification, educational planning and services for these students.

In recent years, different constituencies have raised a number of issues regarding gifted education services. Teachers have raised issues related to the identification of gifted students and appropriate training. Local administrators have raised issues related to eligibility criteria, administrative costs in time and energy, efficiency, and services to intellectual gifted students. Parents have raised issues of educational planning and access to advanced educational services. All groups have been interested in improving the integration and coordination of general and special education to better meet the needs of our intellectually gifted students.

In response to these concerns, the Tennessee General Assembly passed House Joint Resolution 75, which created The Intellectually Gifted Students Joint Study Committee. Representatives Maddox and Hood sponsored HJR 75, which was signed by the Governor on June 11, 2003, (Appendix A). Three professional/advocacy groups mutually endorsed HJR 75: the Tennessee Association of Administrators of Special Education (TAASE), the Tennessee Association for the

Gifted (TAG), and the Tennessee Initiative for Gifted Education Reform (TIGER). These groups represent, respectively, administrators, teachers, and parents.

HJR 75 directed the Committee to examine and make recommendations for changes in State Board of Education rules and regulations in five interrelated areas:

1. Improving and clarifying eligibility criteria for intellectually gifted students.
2. Improving education planning for intellectually gifted students, as well as streamlining procedures and reducing paperwork related to Individualized Education Programs.
3. Making evaluation and reevaluation methods and procedures more efficient and more appropriate for intellectually gifted students.
4. Increasing the likelihood that the needs of intellectually gifted students are addressed and met in regular K-12 classrooms, and that students have easier access to advanced instruction in higher grades and in post-secondary school settings.
5. Providing pre-service, in-service, and advanced teacher training regarding the needs of intellectually gifted students.

The Joint Study Committee met throughout the Fall of 2003, taking public input, reviewing research and available data, sharing personal experiences, and discussing policy options. There is a shared consensus that the recommendations enumerated in this report will, in very practical ways, strengthen, improve, and streamline services for intellectually gifted students in Tennessee.

The report proceeds in several stages. The following section addresses each of the five areas mandated by HJR 75 individually, providing a narrative of the issues discussed, findings, and specific recommendations for improvement. A summary of these recommendations are listed in the next section followed by the conclusion. Appendices provide information on relevant resources and references.

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee examined each of the five mandated study areas separately, discussing areas of concern and possible improvement, reviewing policy options, and reaching consensus on areas of recommendation. These discussions for each area are not necessarily concerns held by every member of the committee. Only the recommendations have the consensus of the full committee. The issues in the five areas tend to overlap or impact one another and, as a result, many Committee recommendations address two or more of the mandated study areas. In the interest of brevity and clarity, the recommendations are not repeated in each and every area in which they might be fitted. Rather, each recommendation is presented just once, under the area with which it is most closely related.

1. Improving and clarifying eligibility criteria for intellectually gifted students.

The Committee heard and expressed a variety of concerns about the current eligibility criteria for intellectually gifted children. Children are eligible for an IEP and special educational services if they meet the criteria for identification and need for services.

The evaluation process leading to a determination of a child's eligibility has several steps:

- (1) Screening: All children must be screened once in elementary school, according to Department of Education policy. In addition, a parent, teacher, or student may refer a student in any grade for screening. From the data gathered during screening, a recommendation is made for a comprehensive evaluation or for no further assessment.
- (2) Identification: A comprehensive evaluation includes testing or evaluation in the areas of Cognition or IQ, Achievement, Academic Performance, and Creative Thinking. Using all assessment data, the IEP team applies a "four-option" formula for determining whether a student is identified as intellectually gifted. In the first option, a very high score on a Cognition test is required, but in the other options the required Cognition score decreases while required scores in other assessment areas increase. A student must qualify under at least one option to be considered for eligibility.
- (3) Determination of need for services: The IEP team uses the assessment data and all relevant information to determine if a child identified as intellectually gifted is eligible for services. Children are eligible for services only if their intellectual abilities "adversely affect" their education performance in the regular curriculum.

Members of the Committee expressed concerns about all phases of this process, which is defined in Department policy. Regarding the screening process, some members believe that schools are not screening early enough. It was felt that schools often wait until the third or fourth grade to screen students using TCAP scores and that many students are missed by not screening earlier, especially children in poverty who may experience a drop in achievement in the early years. Early screening is important for all students since habits related to underachievement are often developed in the early years. Alternatively, some Committee members expressed real concern about the financial and administrative costs of earlier screening.

Concerns were expressed about the comprehensive assessment. Many felt that the checklists commonly used in the Academic Performance and Creativity categories were too subjective or not valid. In particular, the Teacher Observation Checklist and the Creative Thinking Checklist were questioned for their use, reliability, and validity. Some felt that assessment procedures for preschool children should be clarified and made age-appropriate. There was much discussion about the current use of intelligence tests for gifted students, and whether current best practices and procedures are being consistently applied across the state. There was concern that the current identification criteria are too complex and too broad, and a minimum Cognition score should be used.

Finally, there was broad agreement that the criteria used to determine need for services should be significantly improved. The Committee spent much time discussing the primary criterion used to determine need for services, which is the “adversely affects” standard.

According to Rule 0520-1-9-.01, “adversely affects” means when a child’s disability significantly impacts progress in the general curriculum.” The Committee received public input on this issue and itself believes that the definition of “adversely affects” is too subjective and is applied quite differently throughout the state. With respect to subjectivity, it is perceived that determinations are often dependent on the particular school district and/or who is on the IEP team rather than clear, objective standards. Even if test data show large cognitive or achievement differences from the norm or the child exhibits concomitant problems, it is sometimes difficult to secure services unless there is a significant lack of "progress in the general curriculum." Since the gifted child may have already mastered much of the grade-level regular curriculum before the start of school, the “adversely affects” standard as it is currently defined can be used to hold a student back.

The main source of the problem is that the current definition of "adversely affects" is a construct that is difficult to apply to students at both ends of the learning spectrum. The potential adverse effect for intellectually gifted students is not a lack of progress in the general curriculum, but that the general curriculum neither challenges nor allows progress for the student. When the “adversely affects” construct is applied as a determination of need to intellectually gifted students, it often limits students to grade level expectations and inappropriate learning environments. The current definition of “adversely affects” is not consistent with the purpose of identifying gifted students, who are by definition, those students who have the potential of learning at a level beyond the regular curriculum.

The Committee made no recommendations regarding specific changes to eligibility criteria or identification procedures. However, the committee concluded that the problems are significant and should be thoroughly addressed by the Department of Education in consultation with the State Board of Education.

Recommendation 1.1: The State Board of Education request the Department of Education to establish a Task Force for Intellectually Gifted with a representative from the State Board of Education to review the state guidelines and standards established for determining program eligibility criteria, evaluation procedures, and evaluation participants according to Rule 0520-1-

9-.07. This Task Force would study the following areas and report to the State Board of Education by May 2005:

- 1) revise or replace the Teacher Observation Checklist and the Teacher Creativity Checklist;
- 2) establish criteria for preschool identification and determination of need;
- 3) determine the guidelines as to the most appropriate grade levels for screening for intellectually gifted while allowing for flexibility for testing at an age appropriate for a given student;
- 4) develop a clear “adversely affects” standard which is appropriate to intellectually gifted students and their needs;
- 5) review the eligibility criteria in relation to the use of a variety of intelligence tests, their new norms, and their uses to identify subpopulations of gifted students including highly gifted, minority gifted, and gifted with dual diagnoses.

2. Improving education planning for intellectually gifted students, as well as streamlining procedures and reducing paperwork related to Individualized Education Programs.

Provision of appropriate services for intellectually gifted students entails administrative costs for Local Education Agencies—meetings, staff time, and completion of necessary assessments, evaluations, and IEP documents. As with all public services, it is important to make these processes as efficient as possible. The goal is to streamline the processes while maintaining needed information, planning, and protections.

The Committee's mandate links improved educational planning with the reduction of administrative overhead. Sound planning of appropriate services for a child minimizes problems throughout a school year, and so minimizes the meetings and staff time and paperwork associated with addressing those problems. Good educational planning thus is a route to reduced administrative cost.

In this area, four issues were addressed by the Committee: data on gifted student progress, a best practices manual for LEA use, flexibility in amending IEP's and the definition and application of “Adversely Affects”.

Data on Gifted Student Progress. Data is currently collected on both academic achievement and progress of all students, but it is not currently disaggregated for the sub-population of students identified as intellectually gifted. The committee has suggested specific language for improved data collection, see **Recommendation 4.1**.

Best Practices Manual. Crafting IEPs appropriate for intellectually gifted students can be quite different from those written for other student populations. Different types of issues arise,

different services are needed, and different goals and objectives are required. Many LEAs and staff have limited experience with gifted IEPs, and so crafting a solid IEP for an intellectually gifted student can mean added administrative time and effort. Provision of a sound, research-based Best Practices Manual would thus help LEAs, both improving planning and streamlining the process. Such a manual ought to include a model gifted education curriculum and a menu of appropriate goals and objectives for LEAs to use in writing IEPs for gifted students.

Recommendation 2.1: The State Board of Education request the Department of Education to develop and maintain a research-based Best Practices Manual for Intellectually Gifted. Such Manual should include a menu of appropriate goals and objectives for use in gifted IEPs, and a model gifted education curriculum keyed to the minimum program standards (e.g. program standards of the National Association for Gifted Children). The Department of Education will present the Best Practices Manual for Intellectually Gifted to the State Board of Education by February 1, 2005.

Flexibility with IEP Process. Finally, the Committee discussed adding flexibility to the IEP process. Currently, IEPs must be written annually, and all changes to an IEP, however minor, require a full team meeting, involving staff and administrative time. The committee made no recommendation to change this procedure because some school districts did not want to create a dual system for IEPs. A second system could create more paperwork and time than the time eliminated by streamlining the current IEP process. The committee was aware that IDEA is in the process of reauthorization and some paperwork special education requirements may be modified in the near future.

Adversely Affects. This definition is discussed at length under the first study area, and the recommendation to review this construct can be found in **Recommendation 1.1.**

3. Making evaluation and reevaluation methods and procedures more efficient and more appropriate for intellectually gifted students.

Evaluation and reevaluation methods and procedures are closely related to eligibility criteria. The committee listened to feedback and discussed in length about the pros and cons of requiring a minimum cognition score as part of the evaluation procedure. There was also a concern for the administration and application of the new versions of intelligence tests, specifically Stanford Binet Intelligence Scales, Fifth Edition (SB-V) and Weschler Intelligence Scale for Children. There are new interpretive manuals and norms for both tests. The publishers of the SB-V strongly recommend using the procedures outlined in their Assessment Service Bulletin #3 for accurately assessing high abilities in children (Ruff, 2003). Some members of the committee believed state manuals should clarify the variety of cognitive assessments available for all students. The committee also discussed the definition of “adversely affects” and possible change in the definition. Lastly, a recommendation to eliminate unnecessary three-year reevaluations of older students identified as intellectually gifted is listed below.

IQ tests. See **Recommendation 1.1** which asks the Task Force to review the use of a variety of the current intelligence tests in relationship to eligibility criteria.

Adversely Affects. This definition is discussed at length under the first study area and the recommendation to review this construct can be found in **Recommendation 1.1.**

Three-year Reevaluations for Grades 7-12. Three-year reevaluations for intellectually gifted students in grades 7-12 are expensive, time consuming for students and staff, and are often irrelevant at these grade levels. The committee believes that this requirement is an unnecessary burden on school systems and students. It recommends that intellectually gifted students be exempted from this reevaluation requirement in grades 7-12 with the provision for a reevaluation if deemed necessary by the school system, parent, or any member of the IEP team.

Recommendation 3.1: Add subparagraph (a) to rule 0520-1-9-.05 (6) so it reads: Each local school system shall ensure that an individual evaluation of each child eligible for special education is conducted every three (3) years or more frequently if conditions warrant or if the child's parent or teacher requests a reevaluation.

- (a) Intellectually gifted students in grades 7-12 are excluded from reevaluation rule 0520-1-9-.05 (6) unless requested by any member of the IEP team.

4. Increasing the likelihood that the needs of intellectually gifted students are addressed and met in regular K-12 classrooms, and that students have easier access to advanced instruction in higher grades and in post-secondary school settings.

It is essential that general and special education work together to meet the needs of intellectually gifted children; even when a gifted student receives special services, he/she will spend most of the school day in the regular K-12 classroom. The extent to which students have access to advanced and challenging instruction in the general education program will reduce the demands on special education, thus both meeting student needs and easing administrative costs. The Committee discussed numerous classroom interventions, including acceleration for gifted learners (Appendix B), and the references have an array of resources for schools. The Committee addressed some key areas related to regular K-12 classrooms and advanced instruction: the lack of state reporting of achievement data on gifted students, the limited planning for gifted students in school improvement plans, the meaning and application of "least restrictive environment", college and dual enrollment, and distance learning as an accelerated learning option.

Data on Intellectually Gifted Student Achievement and Progress. Data is currently collected on both academic achievement and progress of all students, but it is not currently disaggregated for the sub-population of students identified as intellectually gifted. Such information would help in evaluating the effectiveness of programming and allow for improved planning in the future. The Committee therefore recommends the State Board adopt a policy requesting the annual reporting of Tennessee Student Test Results, Tennessee Comprehensive Assessment Program, include disaggregated data on academic achievement and progress of intellectually gifted students enrolled in special education. Again, this data already exists; the recommendation is simply to put it in usable and readily available form.

Recommendation 4.1: The State Board of Education request the State Department of Education include the disaggregated data on academic achievement and progress for students identified as intellectually gifted by state eligibility criteria in the annual publication, Tennessee Student Test Results, Tennessee Comprehensive Assessment Program beginning in 2004.

School Improvement Plans. Every Tennessee school should annually review its gifted education programs while it is reviewing school wide programs for all students. The creation of exemplary school programs for intellectually gifted students may be facilitated by utilizing an evaluation rubric. One such rubric is entitled “The National Association for Gifted Children Pre-K-12 Gifted Education Programming Standards,” which addresses standards in the following areas: curriculum and instruction, program administration and management, program design, program evaluation, socio-emotional guidance and counseling, professional development, and student identification. Other evaluation rubrics have been developed by The Association for the Gifted, a division of the Council for Exceptional Children. The Committee did not endorse any standards to be included in school improvement plans but recommended a rule revision. The new rule emphasizes that school improvement plans must address the educational needs of intellectually gifted students.

Recommendation 4.2: Amend Rule “0520-1-9-.02 RELATIONSHIP TO GENERAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS” by replacing the existing paragraph (3) to read:

- (3) School improvement plans must include a continuum of educational strategies and programs to address the educational needs of all students, including the needs of all students eligible for special education, including intellectually gifted students.

Least Restrictive Environment. The Board of Education rule defining “least restrictive environment” (0520-1-9-.01(35)) and its application to intellectually gifted students has created confusion regarding student placement, access to advanced instruction, and program design. The least restrictive environment for children with disabilities who have learning or physical limitations is usually the heterogeneous, same-age, general education classroom. This environment provides most disabled children with a larger range of social interactions and a more challenging curriculum than would be available in a special class or school. However, the regular same age classroom does not always provide gifted students with a similar opportunity for growth. It often does not offer access to an appropriately challenging curriculum or opportunities to interact with students of similar ability levels. There was no specific recommendation on how to resolve some of the issues related to least restrictive environment. However, the committee suggested a variety of recommendations to strengthen academic services to intellectually gifted students.

College and Dual Enrollment. College and dual enrollment programs, sometimes called “concurrent enrollment” programs, are ways to offer older K-12 students access to coursework not available in their middle or high schools. Dual enrollment in Tennessee is regulated in both State law and Board rules. State law (TCA 49-6-3111) allows intellectually gifted students to dual enroll as early as ninth grade if the student has a 3.2 grade point average and the enrollment is specified in an IEP and approved by the college. Board rule 0520-1-3-.06 (4) defines three options for college enrollment. The first option allows a high school senior with a 3.5 grade point average and a score of 25 on the ACT to enroll in college full time and apply college credits

toward the high school graduation requirement. The second option allows a qualified junior or senior to enroll in college courses after school hours. The third option allows all school districts to conduct college classes on their high school campuses.

Student eligibility for college and dual enrollment programs varies widely among states, but the trend is to open college access to a wider range of students, with the hope that less-motivated and underachieving high school students will benefit from the challenge of college courses. Dual enrollment can acclimate students, including those in the middle of the achievement distribution, to a college environment while they are still in high school, and it can give students and schools an early indication about their level of preparedness.

In the face of budgetary pressures, schools must often limit the courses that they offer, particularly in science and technical areas that require expensive lab equipment, and upper level courses, which usually have small enrollments. Smaller and rural school districts, in particular, are often limited in their abilities to offer such advanced instruction, and dual enrollment offers a ready means to offer this instruction to those students who need and would benefit from such challenge.

The Committee strongly recommends that the State Board of Education expand the dual enrollment options so that more students may take college classes before graduation. School districts should be encouraged to partner with colleges to make dual enrollment easier and open to more students. Moreover, early college experiences should not be limited to intellectually gifted students with IEPs and exceptionally high achieving students.

Recommendation 4.3: Amend State Board of Education Rules and Regulations to allow any high school junior or senior to dual enroll during school hours with the permission of the school and college by deleting the current language in State Board of Education Rule 0520-1-3-.06 (4) (b) and substituting the following language to read:

(b) Option #2.

1. A qualified student enrolled in the 11th and 12th grades may enroll in college level courses which are conducted at times other than the regular school day **and during the school day** at an institution of higher education. The student may receive **dual** credit (high school **and college**) in such courses in accordance with the policy of the local school board of education. State funds to the local school system shall not be diminished because of the student's participation.

Recommendation 4.4: Amend State Board of Education Rules and Regulations to allow any student in ninth or tenth grade who has a minimum ACT composite score of 21 (or the equivalent SAT score) to enroll in college courses for high school credit with the permission of the high school and college. Modify Rule 0520-1-3-.06 (4) by **adding** subparagraph (d) to read:

(d) Option #4.

2. A qualified student enrolled in 9th or 10th grade, who has a minimum ACT composite score of 21 (or the equivalent SAT score) may enroll in college

level courses during or outside of school hours at an institution of higher education with the permission of the high school, parent/guardian, and college. The student may receive high school credit in such courses in accordance with the policy of the local school board of education. State funds to the local school system shall not be diminished because of the student's participation.

Distance learning. Distance learning is defined as any educational situation in which teacher and student are not located in the same location—Internet based, correspondence, and television or video conferencing courses. Advancements in media technology and increased access to the Internet have led to a rapid increase in the availability of online courses from many other sources. Many intellectually gifted students would benefit from distance learning courses because their school offerings are limited. Distance learning options are especially important in smaller and poorer school districts, which may lack the staff and resources to provide a wide range of advanced courses in the traditional classroom format. One advantage of most distance learning courses is that they are self-paced. They can allow a gifted grade-school student to complete a high school course at their pace and a gifted middle or high school student to complete the course at an accelerated rate, perhaps in several months.

Not all distance-learning programs are suitable for gifted students, and some are of higher quality than others. The best courses are offered by accredited institutions, have aligned their curricula with state standards, provide a mentor or teacher that can assist the student, and allow the student to learn at his or her own pace.

The Committee recommends that the Board request the Department of Education publish and update annually a list of distance learning options and to indicate which courses closely follow state curriculum standards.

Recommendation 4.5: The State Board of Education request the Department of Education publish and update annually an online list of possible, not exclusive distance learning options that local school districts may use to supplement the educational needs of diverse students, including disabled students, intellectually gifted students, and English language learners. This list shall indicate which courses closely follow state curriculum standards and would be good candidates for high school credit. The State Department of Education will have the list online by February 1, 2005.

5. Providing pre-service, in-service, and advanced teacher training regarding the needs of intellectually gifted students.

Gifted learners are entitled to be served by professionals who have specialized preparation in gifted education, expertise in appropriate differentiated content

and instructional methods, involvement in ongoing professional development, and who possess exemplary personal and professional traits.

- *Pre-K Grade 12 Gifted Program Standards,*
(National Association for Gifted Children, 1998)

Throughout Committee deliberations, the need for well and highly trained staff arose again and again. If effective changes are to be made relative to eligibility, testing and evaluation, and advanced instruction in regular classrooms, as outlined above, trained personnel are absolutely essential. Two general areas of needed training were addressed: pre-service and advanced training for teachers, and pre-service training for psychologists and counselors.

Pre-Service and Advanced Training for Teachers. Currently, the State Board of Education requires that all teachers of intellectually gifted students with IEPs meet an employment standard. Teachers can meet this standard in one of three ways: (1) through college coursework or an approved in-service training program, (2) by consulting with a special education teacher who has met the training provision, or (3) by consulting with a special education teacher who received his or her license prior to September 1, 1989 and has not met the training provision. (Tennessee Administrative Rules, State Board of Education, 0520-1-2-.03 (7)).

In October of 2003, the State Board of Education adopted new pre-service rules for teacher licensure (Tennessee Teacher Licensure Standards: Professional Education, October 31, 2003, see Appendix C). These new rules ensure that all new teachers will be exposed to best teaching practices related to various student sub-populations, including intellectually gifted students. The Committee believes that these revised licensure standards are a major advancement, and at this time suggests no additional pre-service requirements in gifted education for general and special education teachers-in-training.

There was a consensus that additional advanced training requirements are needed. The employment standard for teachers does not require or encourage in-depth training, and as a result, few Tennessee school districts have subject matter experts in gifted education. A core of highly trained staff in our schools would greatly strengthen the capacity of schools to meet the needs of all gifted students.

Teachers who earn a gifted education endorsement are better able to provide differentiated content and strategies that match identified student needs. They can more reliably identify high-ability students in their classrooms through assessments and behavioral observations. They understand the unique challenges of identifying and educating gifted students in poverty and from diverse cultural backgrounds. They are better able to understand the overt, hidden, and masked behaviors of gifted students and to respond to their affective needs. They are better able to collaborate with families and others in the assessment and educational planning for gifted students. They understand and have empathy for their students' widely divergent interests, and seek ways to help gifted children express their areas of passion and excellence. They can act as role models for other teachers and coach their colleagues in the use of instructional methods and accommodations. These individuals could serve more successfully in gifted program management roles.

Therefore, the Committee strongly recommends that the Board of Education create an endorsement in gifted education, and that the employment standard be amended to include the endorsement. Tennessee is currently the only state in the Southeast that does not offer such an endorsement, and only such an endorsement will allow interested teachers to gain the type of detailed and in-depth training that is needed.

Recommendation 5.1: Request the State Board of Education to appoint a committee to draft Tennessee standards for Gifted Endorsement in PreK-12 to report to the Advisory Council on Teacher Education and various constituency groups for their input prior to reporting to the State Board of Education. The Council for Exceptional Children and the National Association for the Gifted have developed a prototype gifted endorsement standard (Appendix D). The State Board of Education would amend its rule to indicate the effective date and conditions for earning the endorsement.

The Committee believes that the current employment standards need to be modified to strengthen the teaching force serving intellectually gifted students. There was agreement on many aspects of a new employment standard. However, the employment standard requires more deliberation and input from persons outside of the Committee. The following is one of the many draft employment standards suggested and discussed by the Committee. Following this draft is the specific recommendation on the employment standard.

Draft of rule: Amend Rule 0520-1-2-.03 (7) “Employment Standards” to specify who should hold the endorsement:

- (7) Teaching Personnel in Gifted Education.
 - (a) A teacher who provides specialized, direct instruction to intellectually gifted with IEPs as part of their special education caseload and a teacher who serves as gifted education coordinator or gifted education consultant in regular or special education shall meet the following employment standards in 1. and 2.:
 - 1. A teacher must be endorsed in the appropriate content area and at the appropriate grade level or must hold a special education endorsement.
 - 2. A teacher shall meet one of the following employment standards:
 - (i) The teacher shall have completed six semester hours of college or university coursework or the equivalent in contact hours on the nature and needs and methods of teaching gifted students;
 - ii) The teacher shall hold a gifted education endorsement;
 - iii) The teacher shall have served such students prior to July 1, 1988, shall hold the special education endorsement prior to September 1, 1989, and shall have completed an in-service training program

approved by the Department of Education on the nature and needs and methods of teaching gifted students.

- (b) A classroom teacher who is endorsed in the appropriate content area and at the appropriate grade level may work in concert with a consulting teacher who meets the employment standard in 7) a or shall meet the employment standard specified in 7) a.

Recommendation 5.2: Amend Rule 0520-1-2-.03 (7) “Employment Standards” to incorporate the gifted education endorsement called for in recommendation 5.1, and ensure that gifted education coordinators, gifted education consultants, and both special and general education teachers have meaningful and appropriate training or assistance to meet the needs of intellectually gifted students.

Pre-Service Training for Psychologists and Counselors. Non-teaching school personnel who work with gifted students — school psychologists and school counselors — need to have a general awareness and exposure to relevant gifted education issues through pre-service training. Therefore, the Committee strongly recommends that the Board add a pre-service requirement for psychologists-in-training and counselors-in-training.

School psychologists who receive training in identifying intellectually gifted students are better able to select, administer, and interpret the appropriate high-ceiling testing instruments. They are more knowledgeable about the array of currently available high-ceiling and out-of-level screening and assessment instruments for culturally diverse students, gifted/learning disabled students, highly gifted students, and English language learners. They can help develop research-based school and district screening programs. They can better understand the social and emotional aspects of gifted students.

School counselors who receive specialized training in counseling intellectually gifted students understand the positive and negative impact that asynchronous intellectual development can have on an individual's life and his or her family. They better understand social-emotional issues that commonly affect intellectually gifted students including underachievement, perfectionism, difficulty in peer relationships, and inappropriate expectations. They can assist in screening for gifted students and can provide early career and college counseling for accelerated students.

Therefore, to address the need for reaching a “broader” audience with pre-service training, the Committee recommends the establishment of appropriate licensure standards in gifted education for school psychologists and school counselors.

Recommendation 5.3: State Board of Education appoint a committee to review pre-service standards for school psychologists to include appropriate training in the characteristics, testing, and evaluation of intellectually gifted students. The committee would report to the Advisory Council on Teacher Education and various constituency groups for their input prior to reporting to the State Board of Education.

Recommendation 5.4: State Board of Education appoint a committee to review pre-service standards for school counselors to include appropriate training in the characteristics, testing, and evaluation of intellectually gifted students. The committee would report to the Advisory Council on Teacher Education and various constituency groups for their input prior to reporting to the State Board of Education.

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

Listed below is a summary of the recommendations presented in the preceding sections. The recommendations specify the proposed changes in the rules, regulations or policies of the State Board of Education.

Recommendation 1.1 The State Board of Education request the Department of Education to establish a Task Force for Intellectually Gifted with a representative from the State Board of Education to review the state guidelines and standards established for determining program eligibility criteria, evaluation procedures, and evaluation participants according to Rule 0520-1-9-.07. This Task Force would study the following areas and report to the State Board of Education by May 2005:

- 1) revise or replace the Teacher Observation Checklist and the Teacher Creativity Checklist;
- 2) establish criteria for preschool identification and determination of need;
- 3) determine the guidelines as to the most appropriate grade levels for screening for intellectually gifted while allowing for flexibility for testing at an age appropriate for a given student;
- 4) develop a clear “adversely affects” standard which is appropriate to intellectually gifted students and their needs;
- 5) review the eligibility criteria in relation to the use of a variety of intelligence tests, their new norms, and their uses to identify subpopulations of gifted students including highly gifted, minority gifted, and gifted with dual diagnoses.

Recommendation 2.1: The State Board of Education request the Department of Education to develop and maintain a research-based Best Practices Manual for Intellectually Gifted. Such Manual should include a menu of appropriate goals and objectives for use in gifted IEPs, and a model gifted education curriculum keyed to the minimum program standards (e.g. program standards of the National Association for Gifted Children). The Department of Education will present the Best Practices Manual for Intellectually Gifted to the State Board of Education by February 1, 2005.

Recommendation 3.1 : Add subparagraph (a) to rule 0520-1-9-.05 (6) so it reads: Each local school system shall ensure that an individual evaluation of each child eligible for special education is conducted every three (3) years or more frequently if conditions warrant or if the child’s parent or teacher requests a reevaluation.

- (a) Intellectually gifted students in grades 7-12 are excluded from reevaluation rule 0520-1-9-.05 (6) unless requested by any member of the IEP team.

Recommendation 4.1: The State Board of Education request the State Department of Education include the disaggregated data on academic achievement and progress for students identified as intellectually gifted by state eligibility criteria in the annual publication, Tennessee Student Test Results, Tennessee Comprehensive Assessment Program beginning in 2004.

Recommendation 4.2: Amend Rule “0520-1-9-.02 RELATIONSHIP TO GENERAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS” by replacing the existing paragraph (3) to read:

- (3) School improvement plans must include a continuum of educational strategies and programs to address the educational needs of all students, including the needs of all students eligible for special education, **including intellectually gifted students.**

Recommendation 4.3: Amend State Board of Education Rules and Regulations to allow any high school junior or senior to dual enroll during school hours with the permission of the school and college by deleting the current language in State Board of Education Rule 0520-1-3-.06 (4) (b) and substituting the following language to read:

(b) Option #2.

1. A qualified student enrolled in the 11th and 12th grades may enroll in college level courses which are conducted at times other than the regular school day **and during the school day** at an institution of higher education. The student may receive **dual** credit (high school **and college**) in such courses in accordance with the policy of the local school board of education. State funds to the local school system shall not be diminished because of the student’s participation.

Recommendation 4.4: Amend State Board of Education Rules and Regulations to allow any student in ninth or tenth grade who has a minimum ACT composite score of 21 (or the equivalent SAT score) to enroll in college courses for high school credit with the permission of the high school and college. Modify Rule 0520-1-3-.06 (4) by **adding** subparagraph (d) to read:

(d) Option #4.

3. A qualified student enrolled in 9th or 10th grade, who has a minimum ACT composite score of 21 (or the equivalent SAT score) may enroll in college level courses during or outside of school hours at an institution of higher education with the permission of the high school, parent/guardian, and college. The student may receive high school credit in such courses in accordance with the policy of the local school board of education. State funds to the local school system shall not be diminished because of the student’s participation.

Recommendation 4.5: The State Board of Education request the Department of Education publish and update annually an online list of possible, not exclusive distance learning options that local school districts may use to supplement the educational needs of diverse students,

including disabled students, intellectually gifted students, and English language learners. This list shall indicate which courses closely follow state curriculum standards and would be good candidates for high school credit. The State Department of Education will have the list online by February 1, 2005.

Recommendation 5.1: Request the State Board of Education to appoint a committee to draft Tennessee standards for Gifted Endorsement in PreK-12 to report to the Advisory Council on Teacher Education and various constituency groups for their input prior to reporting to the State Board of Education. The Council for Exceptional Children and the National Association for the Gifted have developed a prototype gifted endorsement standard. The State Board of Education would amend its rule to indicate the effective date and conditions for earning the endorsement.

Recommendation 5.2: Amend Rule 0520-1-2-.03 (7) “Employment Standards” to incorporate the gifted education endorsement called for in recommendation 5.1, and ensure that gifted education coordinators, gifted education consultants, and both special and general education teachers have meaningful and appropriate training or assistance to meet the needs of intellectually gifted students.

Recommendation 5.3: State Board of Education appoint a committee to review pre-service standards for school psychologists to include appropriate training in the characteristics, testing, and evaluation of intellectually gifted students. The committee would report to the Advisory Council on Teacher Education and various constituency groups for their input prior to reporting to the State Board of Education.

Recommendation 5.4: State Board of Education appoint a committee to review pre-service standards for school counselors to include appropriate training in the characteristics, testing, and evaluation of intellectually gifted students. The committee would report to the Advisory Council on Teacher Education and various constituency groups for their input prior to reporting to the State Board of Education.

CONCLUSION

The State of Tennessee adopted legislation to provide appropriate services to intellectually gifted students in 1972, one of the first states to do so. Tennessee can be proud of this and the fact that tens of thousands of Tennessee children have received a better and stronger and more meaningful education because of this commitment. This Joint Study Committee was established and worked to find common ground among teachers, administrators, and parents on ways to strengthen, improve, and streamline the administration of gifted education services throughout the State. The Committee is pleased to present this report and its recommendations—shared and practical proposals to better meet the academic, social, and emotional needs of our intellectually gifted students.

APPENDIX A
House Joint Resolution 75

Unofficial Copy

Sponsored by Representatives Maddox and Hood

Filed for Introduction February 19, 2003

Final House Action: Adopted May 27, 2003

Final Senate Action: Adopted May 29, 2003

Signed by Governor: June 11, 2003

A RESOLUTION to create a special joint study committee
to review Tennessee Board of Education rules and
regulations regarding intellectually gifted students.

WHEREAS, intellectually gifted children and youth are found in every region of Tennessee, in all cultural groups and across all economic strata, in rural areas, in towns of every size, and in every school district; and

WHEREAS, the well being and educational attainment of all students, including those who are intellectually gifted, is an important public policy goal; and

WHEREAS, in order to meet the needs and maximize the capabilities of intellectually gifted students in Tennessee public schools, intellectually gifted students often need educational planning as well as different instruction, educational arrangements, and advanced or special classes which may not be offered as part of the regular program to their age peers; and

WHEREAS, to develop recommendations to improve the quality, effectiveness, and efficiency of education planning and the appropriateness of educational services for intellectually gifted students in Tennessee, it is imperative that a study of existing State Board of Education rules and regulations be conducted; now, therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE ONE HUNDRED THIRD GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE STATE OF TENNESSEE, THE SENATE CONCURRING, That there is hereby created a special joint study committee to review Tennessee Board of Education rules and regulations regarding intellectually gifted students.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, That the committee shall examine only existing Board of Education rules and regulations governing gifted education, and shall recommend changes to those regulations to improve the quality, effectiveness, and efficiency of gifted education. The areas of review and possible recommendation shall be limited to:

- (a) improving and clarifying eligibility criteria for intellectually gifted students;
- (b) improving education planning for intellectually gifted students, as well as streamlining procedures and reducing paperwork related to Individualized Education Programs;
- (c) making evaluation and reevaluation methods and procedures more efficient and more appropriate for intellectually gifted students;
- (d) increasing the likelihood that the needs of intellectually gifted students are addressed and met in regular K-12 classrooms, and that students have easier access to advanced instruction in higher grades and in post-secondary school settings; and
- (e) providing pre-service, in-service, and advanced teacher training regarding the needs of intellectually gifted students.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, That the committee shall consist of twelve (12) members, to be appointed within sixty (60) days of passage of the resolution, as follows:

- (1) The Executive Director of the Tennessee Board of Education, or his or her designee, who shall serve as the chair of the committee;
- (2) The Commissioner of Education, or his or her designee;
- (3) The following members, as appointed by the Governor:
 - (i) Two (2) supervisors of special education selected from a list of at least four (4) nominees submitted by the Tennessee Association of Administrators of Special Education;
 - (ii) Two (2) gifted education teachers from a list of at least four (4) nominees submitted by the Tennessee Association for the Gifted;
 - (iii) Three (3) parents of identified gifted students from a list of at least five (5) nominees submitted by the Tennessee Initiative for Gifted Education Reform; and
 - (iv) Three (3) professors or professionals with demonstrated expertise in gifted education, at least one (1) of whom shall possess demonstrated expertise in the emotional and social needs of intellectually gifted students, selected from a list of at least five (5) nominees submitted by the Tennessee Association for the Gifted.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, That if for any reason a vacancy occurs in the committee membership, the vacancy shall be filled in the same manner as the initial appointment.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, That the committee shall meet at least three (3) times with a quorum of more than half of its members present before issuing a final report of recommendations.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, That all appropriate state agencies shall provide assistance and information to the committee upon request of the chair.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, That the committee shall report its findings and recommendations to the Governor, the General Assembly, and the Tennessee Board of Education by January 30, 2004, at which time the committee shall cease to exist.

APPENDIX B

Acceleration for Gifted Learners

Program	Range and Types of Acceleration
Early entrance to kindergarten or first grade	The student is admitted to school prior to the age specified by the district for normal entry to first grade.
Grade skipping	The student is moved ahead of normal grade placement. This may be done during an academic year (e.g. placing a third grader directly into fourth grade, skipping the last 2 years of high school to enter college) or at year end (e.g. promoting a third grader to fifth grade)
Continuous progress	The student is given material deemed appropriate for current achievement as the student becomes ready.
Self-paced instruction	The student is presented with materials that allow him or her to proceed at a self-selected pace. Responsibility for selection of pacing is the student's.
Subject-matter acceleration	The student is placed for a part of a day with students at more advanced grade levels for one or more subjects without being assigned to a higher grade (e.g. a fifth grader going to sixth grade for science instruction).
Combined classes	The student is placed in classes where two or more grade levels are combined (e.g. third and fourth grade split rooms). The arrangement can be used to allow younger children to interact with older ones academically and socially.
Curriculum compacting	The student is given reduced amount of introductory activities, drill, review and so on. The time saved may be used to move faster through the curriculum.
Telescoping curriculum	The student spends less time than normal in a course of study (e.g. completing a 1 year course in 1 semester, or finishing junior high school in 2 years rather than 3).
Mentorships	The student is exposed to a mentor who provides advanced training experiences and pacing in a content area.
Extracurricular programs	The student is enrolled in course work or summer programs that confer advanced instruction and/or credit for study (e.g. fast-paced language or math courses offered by universities).
Concurrent enrollment	The student is taking a course at one level and receiving credit for successful completion of a parallel course at a higher level (e.g. taking algebra at the junior high level and receiving credit for high school algebra as well as junior high math credits upon successful completion or taking a college physics course in lieu of high school physics).
Early graduation	Graduate from high school or college in 3 _ years or less.
Advanced placement	The student takes a course in high school that prepares him or her for taking an examination that can confer college credit for satisfactory performances.

Program	Range and Types of Acceleration
Credit by examination	The student receives credit (at high school or college level) upon successful completion of an examination.
Correspondence courses	The student takes high school or college courses by mail (or, in more recent incarnations, through video and audio course presentation).
Acceleration in College	The student is admitted with full standing to an advanced level of instruction at least 1 year early.
Early entrance into junior high, high school, or college	The student completes two or more majors in a total of four years and/or earns a Master's degree along with the Bachelor's.

Materials compiled from: Southern, W. T., & Jones, E.D. (1991). Academic acceleration: Background and issues. In W.T. Southern, & E.D. Jones (Eds.). *The academic acceleration of gifted children* (pp. 1-29) New York: Teachers College Press and Benbow, C.P. (1979). The components of SMPY's smorgasbord of accelerative options. *Intellectually Talented Youth Bulletin* 5, 21-23.

APPENDIX C
Tennessee Teacher Licensure Standards: Professional Education,
October 31, 2003
(Revisions are noted in bold)

All teacher candidates complete studies in professional education. Professional education is a lifelong undertaking that is initiated in college course work, refined in field experiences, and enhanced during professional practice. The course work and related field and laboratory experiences enable the teacher candidate to meet the following performance standards **in teaching all students including students at risk, students with disabilities, English language learners, economically disadvantaged students, highly mobile students, intellectually gifted students, and students from different racial and ethnic backgrounds:**

Standard 1

Discipline Taught. Candidates know, understand, and use the central concepts, tools of inquiry and structures of the discipline(s) they teach and can create learning experiences that develop student competence in the subject matter.

Supporting Explanation

Candidates demonstrate a broad general understanding of the major concepts of the discipline they teach. They understand and are able to use assumptions and the processes of inquiry for the discipline being taught. Candidates create interdisciplinary learning experiences that allow students to integrate knowledge, skills and methods of inquiry from several related subject areas. They use connections in instruction across disciplines and draw on their knowledge to build understanding and motivate students. **They demonstrate an understanding of the implications of disability legislation and special education policies and procedures and they provide equitable access to and participation in the general curriculum for students with disabilities.**

Standard 2

Student Learning and Development. Candidates understand how **students** learn and develop and provide learning opportunities that support student intellectual, social and personal development.

Supporting Explanation

Candidates understand how learning occurs—how **all** students construct knowledge and acquire skills—and are able to provide learning opportunities that support their intellectual, social and personal development. When making instructional decisions, candidates draw upon an in-depth knowledge of developmental progression in student physical, social, emotional, moral, and

cognitive domains **and recognize that students with disabilities may exhibit greater individual variation and that a disability often influences development and functioning in more than one area. Candidates use this knowledge to optimize learning opportunities for each student.**

Standard 3

Diverse Learners. Candidates understand how students differ in their approaches to learning and create instructional opportunities that are adapted to diverse learners.

Supporting Explanation

Candidates understand and identify differences in student approaches to learning and performance. They design instruction and adapt instructional techniques for **all students within the broader context of their families, cultural backgrounds, socioeconomic classes, languages, communities, peer/social groups and exceptional learning needs.** Candidates create a learning community which is inclusive and in which individual differences are respected.

Standard 4

Teaching Strategies. Candidates understand and use a variety of instructional strategies to encourage development of critical thinking, problem solving and performance skills in students.

Supporting Explanation

Candidates understand and use the principles and techniques associated with various instructional strategies that reflect best practice (such as cooperative learning, direct instruction, whole group instruction, independent study and interdisciplinary instruction) and that foster high expectations for **all** students. They organize instruction to create learning experiences that connect subject matter to real life experiences and enable students to apply learning to future careers. Candidates vary their role in the instructional process (e.g. instructor, facilitator, coach, audience) to achieve different instructional purposes and to meet **individual** student needs.

Candidates use multiple teaching and learning strategies in active learning opportunities to promote the development of critical thinking, problem solving and performance capabilities in the content areas. Using a wide variety of resources and methods, including technology **and assessment data,** candidates develop and use clear, accurate presentations of concepts to promote student learning. **Candidates use reading comprehension and writing strategies in the content area and assist students in applying mathematics concepts to subject content. They support acquisition of English necessary for continuous learning in the content area of students whose first language is not English.**

Standard 5

Learning Environment. Candidates use an understanding of individual and group motivation and behavior to create a learning environment that encourages positive social interaction, active engagement in learning and self-motivation.

Supporting Explanation

Drawing on their knowledge of human motivation and behavior, candidates create a learning environment that is inclusive and supports positive social interaction, active engagement in learning and self-motivation **for all students**. They organize and manage resources such as time, space, facilities, technology, activities, instructional assistants and volunteers to engage **all** students in productive tasks and maximize the amount of class time spent in learning. They develop shared expectations for all students and create and maintain a positive, **inclusive** classroom climate of mutual respect, support and inquiry. Candidates understand and use a wide variety of classroom management strategies that foster self control and self discipline. They can defuse potential conflict and use conflict resolution strategies to maintain a smoothly functioning learning community.

Standard 6

Communication. Candidates use knowledge of effective verbal, nonverbal and media communication techniques to foster active inquiry, collaboration and supportive interaction in the classroom.

Supporting Explanation

Candidates understand language development, the role of language in learning and how **culture, gender, and exceptional learning needs affect** communication in the classroom. They recognize effective verbal and nonverbal communication techniques and use them to support **all** students learning. Candidates model effective communication strategies in conveying ideas and information, asking questions, listening, giving directions, probing for student understanding, and helping students express their ideas. Using a variety of tools, including technology, candidates support and expand student expression in speaking, writing and technical media.

Standard 7

Planning. Candidates plan instruction based upon knowledge of subject matter, students, the community, and curriculum goals.

Supporting Explanation

Candidates use their knowledge of subject matter, learning theory, curriculum and student development, **assessment measures**, and assessed student needs in planning instruction **for all**

students. They evaluate, select and create learning experiences that are developmentally appropriate, **aligned with Tennessee curriculum standards**, relevant to students and based upon the principles of effective teaching. They are able to help students connect learning to real life and future careers. Candidates identify long-range instructional goals, sequence short-range instructional objectives, and develop units and daily lessons that target these goals and objectives. Candidates effectively integrate a variety of resources, including teacher-created materials, textbooks, technology, community and business resources, to promote student learning. **Working with others in developing individualized plans, candidates adjust goals, teaching strategies or supports to help students with disabilities succeed in the general curriculum and plan for students who require an expanded curriculum.**

Standard 8

Assessment and Evaluation. Candidates know, understand and use formal and informal assessment strategies to evaluate and ensure the continuing intellectual, social and physical development of the learner.

Supporting Explanation

Candidates understand the characteristics, uses, advantages and limitations of different types of assessments for evaluating student learning. **They understand state and federal accountability requirements.** Candidates select, construct and use formal and informal assessment strategies and instruments appropriate to the learning expectations being evaluated to make instructional decisions based on **student performance** information. They actively solicit and use information about students' learning needs and progress from parents, other colleagues and the students themselves. Candidates develop and maintain useful records of student work and progress and responsibly communicate student progress to students, parents and other colleagues. **They collaborate with special education teachers and others to plan and design accommodations, modifications, adaptations or alternate assessments, based on the results of recommended individual assessments.**

Standard 9

Reflective Practitioner. Candidates are reflective practitioners who continually evaluate the effects of their choices and actions on others (students, parents and other professionals in the learning community) and who actively seek out opportunities to grow professionally.

Supporting Explanation

Candidates consistently reflect on their teaching practices by continually evaluating the effect their instruction has on **all** students. They monitor teaching strategies and behavior in relation to student success and use the information to modify and revise instruction accordingly. **Candidates continually examine their teaching performance within the context of state and local standards and federal and state accountability requirements. Using their data-based**

reflections, candidates engage in actions that consistently support and promote the achievement of students with disabilities.

Candidates seek professional literature, engage colleagues, participate in professional organizations, and use other resources to support their continuing professional development. To guide professional behavior, candidates draw upon a broad knowledge of legal and ethical responsibilities, educational policy, and organizational, historical, and professional dimensions of classrooms and schools.

Standard 10

Colleagues, Parents, and Community. Candidates foster relationships with school colleagues, parents and agencies in the larger community to support students' learning and well-being.

Supporting Explanation

Candidates consult with families and teachers, and collaborate with other professionals within the school and within community agencies to foster student learning. They participate in collegial activities designed to make the entire school a productive learning community. Candidates act as advocates for all students, advise them, recognize student problems, and seek additional help as needed and appropriate. Candidates understand schools as organizations within the larger community and effectively communicate school goals and accomplishments to the community and general public.

Standard 11

Technology.

11.a. Candidates use technology and technology based resources to facilitate developmentally appropriate student learning.

Supporting Explanation

Candidates use technology resources to guide classroom decisions regarding student learning. They integrate instructional technology to facilitate interdisciplinary teaching and learning in their classrooms, to supplement instructional strategies, to design instructional materials, and to enhance hands-on experiences and problem solving activities for all students. Candidates select and use grade-level and content-specific technology resources, including assistive technology, to increase student participation in the total curriculum. They apply technology to analyze assessment data and to target individual student learning needs.

11.b. Candidates use technology to enhance their professional growth and productivity.

Supporting Explanation

Candidates use technology in their own learning process and to change their current educational practice. They use technology to gather, sort, and analyze information needed for their own research projects and to communicate and collaborate effectively with other professionals. Candidates use tools such as databases and spreadsheets for sorting, compiling, and analyzing data gathered from a variety of sources. They use presentation tools in a networked environment for sharing information in multiple professional formats.

- 11.c. Candidates effectively use and manage all technology available to them and explore uses of emerging resources. They promote the equitable, ethical and legal use of technology resources.

Supporting Explanation

Candidates design effective environments for using and managing technology in the classroom. They are able to perform minor trouble-shooting operations. When planning units of instruction, candidates address software purchasing agreements, copyright laws, issues related to intellectual property, the importance of virus protection, and policies for acceptable use of Internet resources. Candidates seek information from technical manuals and journals as well as on-line resources to learn about emerging technologies and to explore their possible educational applications. They model the legal and ethical use of technology resources.

Program Implementation Standards:

1. All teaching areas include the standards in the professional education core; course work and related field experiences apply the standards to specific teaching areas.
2. Courses that comprise the professional education core may include some of the performance standards for specific subject or grade-level endorsements.
3. Candidates in teacher preparation programs participate in ongoing, well-structured field experiences in varied school settings with diverse learners prior to the internship or student teaching. Field experiences and student teaching or the internship assist teacher candidates develop the knowledge, skills, and dispositions necessary to help all students learn and are consistent with NCATE standards.
4. The teacher education unit, other institutional units, and P-12 schools actively and continuously collaborate in partnership activities in developing, implementing and evaluating teacher preparation programs, consistent with NCATE standards.
5. **The teacher education unit systematically collects data verifying the candidate's knowledge, skills and dispositions. The unit extends the assessment of candidate performance beyond program completion through the induction years. The unit**

systematically uses the results of those assessments to implement changes in professional educator preparation programs.

6. Institutions of higher education use the following documents (as they may be amended) when planning, implementing and evaluating teacher preparation programs: Model Standards for Beginning Teacher Licensing: A Resource for State Dialogue, developed by the Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (1992); **Model Standards for Licensing General and Special Education Teachers of Students with Disabilities: A Resource for State Dialogue, Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium**, (2001 Draft); NCATE 2000 Standards (2000); Foundation Technology Standards for All Teachers, International Society for Technology in Education (1997); Tennessee Framework for Evaluation and Professional Growth (1997); Tennessee Curriculum Standards in related subject areas; **Tennessee Teacher Licensure Standards, Special Education Core (2002)**; and resources from the Education Edge Initiative (1996).
7. These licensure standards become effective **for candidates seeking licensure no later than September 1, 2007. Institutions with licensure programs will submit standards for conditional approval no later than September 1, 2004.**

APPENDIX D

Prototype Gifted Education Endorsement, Council of Exceptional Children

Council of Exceptional Children (CEC) Knowledge and Skill Base for All Beginning Special
Education Teachers of Students with Gifts and Talents

Special Education Standard #1: Foundations Gifts and Talents

Knowledge:	
GT1K1	Historical foundations of gifted and talented education.
GT1K2	Models, theories, and philosophies that form the basis for gifted education.
GT1K3	Laws and policies related to gifted and talented education.
GT1K4	Relationship of gifted education to the organization and function of educational agencies.
GT1K5	Issues in definition and identification of individuals with gifts and talents, including those from culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds.
GT1K6	Incidence and prevalence of individuals with gifts and talents.
GT1K7	Issues, assurances and due process rights related to assessment, eligibility, and placement within a continuum of services.
GT1K8	Impact of labeling individuals with gifts and talents.
GT1K9	Potential impact of differences in values, languages, and customs that can exist between the home and school.
GT1K10	Impact of the dominant culture on shaping schools and the individuals who study and work in them.
GT1K11	Rights and responsibilities of students, parents, teachers and other professionals and schools related to exceptional learning needs.
GT1K12	Issues and trends in gifted education and related fields.
GT1K13	Laws, policies, and ethical principles regarding behavior management planning and implementation.
GT1K14	Teacher attitudes and behaviors that influence behavior of individuals with gifts and talents.
GT1K15	Historical points of view and contributions of culturally diverse groups.
Skills:	None

Special Education Standard #2: Development and Characteristics of Learners Gifts and Talents

Knowledge:	
GT2K1	Typical and atypical human growth and development.
GT2K2	Similarities and differences of individuals with and without gifts and talents and the general population of learners.
GT2K3	Similarities and differences among individuals with gifts and talents.
GT2K4	Educational implications of various gifts and talents.
GT2K5	Characteristics and effects of the cultural and environmental milieu of the child and the family.
GT2K6	Effects of medications on individuals with gifts and talents.
GT2K7	Cognitive characteristics of individuals with gifts and talents in intellectual, academic, creative, leadership, and artistic domains.
GT2K8	Affective characteristics of individuals with gifts and talents in intellectual, academic, creative, leadership, and artistic domains.

GT2K9	Effects of families on the development of individuals with gifts and talents.
GT2K10	Family systems and the role of families in supporting development and educational progress for students with gifts and talents.
Skills:	None

Special Education Standard #3: Individual Learning Differences Gifts and Talents

Knowledge:	
GT3K1	Impact of diversity on educational placement options for individuals with gifts and talents.
GT3K2	Variations in beliefs, traditions, and values across and within cultures and their effects on relationships among individuals with gifts and talents, family, and schooling.
GT3K3	Impact gifts and talents can have on an individual's life.
GT3K4	Academic characteristic of individuals with gifts and talents, and disabilities.
GT3K5	Affective characteristics of individuals with gifts and talents, and disabilities.
GT3K6	Impact of multiple exceptionalities that may result in sensory, motor, or learning needs.
GT3K7	Differing learning styles of individuals with gifts and talents including those from culturally diverse backgrounds and strategies for addressing these styles.
GT3K8	Impact of learners' academic and social abilities, attitudes, interests, and values on instruction and career development.
GT3K9	Cultural perspectives influencing the relationship among families, schools, and communities as related to effective instruction.
Skills:	None

Special Education Standard #4: Instructional Strategies Gifts and Talents

Knowledge:	
GT4K1	Sources of differentiated materials for individuals with gifts and talents.
GT4K2	Technology for planning and managing the teaching and learning environment.
Skill:	
GT4S1	Select, adapt, and use instructional strategies and materials according to characteristics of individuals with gifts and talents.
GT4S2	Use instructional time effectively.
GT4S3	Teach individuals to use self-assessment, problem solving and other cognitive strategies to meet their needs.
GT4S4	Choose and use technologies to modify the instructional process.
GT4S5	Use strategies to facilitate effective integration into various settings.
GT4S6	Integrate social skills into the curriculum.
GT4S7	Use procedures to increase the individual's self-awareness, self-management, self-control, self-reliance, self-esteem, and self-advocacy.

Special Education Standard #5: Learning Environments and Social Interactions Gifts and Talents

Knowledge:	
GT5K1	Ways specific cultures are negatively stereotyped.
GT5K2	Strategies used by diverse populations to cope with a legacy of former and continuing racism.
GT5K3	Effective management of teaching and learning for students with gifts and talents.

GT5K4	Acceleration, enrichment, and counseling within a continuum of service options for individuals with gifts and talents.
GT5K5	Grouping practices that support differentiated learning environments.
GT5K6	Ways to create learning environments that allow individuals to retain and appreciate their own and each others' respective language and cultural heritage.
GT5K7	Strategies for crisis prevention and intervention.
GT5K8	Strategies for preparing individuals to live harmoniously and productively in a culturally diverse world.
Skills:	
GT5S1	Establish and maintain rapport with individuals with gifts and talents.
GT5S2	Structure, direct and supervise the activities of paraeducators, volunteers and tutors.
GT5S3	Create a safe, equitable, positive, and supportive learning environment in which diversities are valued.
GT5S4	Design learning environments that encourage active participation in individual and group activities.
GT5S5	Create an environment that encourages self-advocacy and increased independence.
GT5S6	Teach self-advocacy.
GT5S7	Prepare and organize materials to implement daily lesson plans.
GT5S8	Design and manage daily routines.
GT5S9	Direct activities of classroom volunteers.
GT5S10	Use universal precautions.
GT5S11	Organize, develop, and sustain learning environments that support positive intracultural and intercultural experiences.
GT5S12	Use communication strategies and resources to facilitate understanding of the subject matter for students whose primary language is not the dominant language.
GT5S13	Prepare individuals to exhibit self-enhancing behavior in response to societal attitudes and actions.
GT5S14	Mediate controversial intercultural issues among students within the learning environment in ways that enhance any culture, group or person.

Special Education Standard #6: Language Gifts and Talents

Knowledge:	
GT6K1	Effects of cultural and linguistic differences on growth and development.
GT6K2	Characteristics of one's own culture and use of language and the ways in which these can differ from other cultures and uses of language.
GT6K3	Importance of the teacher serving as a model for individuals with gifts and talents.
GT6K4	Ways of behaving and communicating among cultures that can lead to misinterpretation and misunderstanding.
Skills:	None

Special Education Standard #7: Instructional Planning Gifts and Talents

Knowledge:	
GT7K1	National, state or provincial, and local curricula standards.
GT7K2	Scopes and sequences of general and special curricula.
GT7K3	Theories and research that form the basis of curriculum development and instructional practice.

GT7K4	Identify and prioritize areas of the general curriculum and accommodations for an individual with exceptional learning needs.
GT7K5	General and differentiated curricula for individuals with gifts and talents.
GT7K6	Differential curriculum needs of individuals with gifts and talents.
GT7K7	Community-based and service learning opportunities for individuals with gifts and talents.
Skills:	
GT7S1	Prepare lesson plans for individuals with gifts and talents.
GT7S2	Design cognitively complex learning experiences for individuals with gifts and talents.
ST7S3	Plan instruction using cognitive, affective, and ethical taxonomies.
GT7S4	Sequence, implement, and evaluate individualized learning objectives.
GT7S5	Integrate affective, social, and career skills with academic curricula.
GT7S6	Develop and select instructional content, resources, and strategies that respond to cultural, linguistic, and gender differences.
GT7S7	Develop and implement comprehensive, longitudinal individualized programs in collaboration with team members.
GT7S8	Make responsive adjustments to instruction based on continual observations of gifted students.
GT7S9	Select instructional models to differentiate specific content areas.
GT7S10	Involve the individual and family in setting instructional goals and monitoring progress.
GT7S11	Identify realistic expectations for personal and social behavior in various settings.

Special Education Standard #8: Assessment Gifts and Talents

Knowledge:	
GT8K1	Basic terminology used in assessment.
GT8K2	Legal provisions and ethical principles regarding assessment of individuals.
GT8K3	National, state or provincial, and local assessment, accommodations and modifications.
GT8K4	Screening, pre-referral, referral, and identification procedures for individuals with gifts and talents.
GT8K5	Use and limitations of assessment instruments for students with gifts and talents.
Skill:	
GT8S1	Gather relevant background information.
GT8S2	Use formal and informal assessments.
GT8S3	Interpret information from formal and informal assessments.
GT8S4	Develop and administer nonbiased, informal assessment procedures.
GT8S5	Use assessment information in making eligibility, program, and placement decisions for individuals with gifts and talents, including those from culturally and/or linguistically diverse backgrounds.
GT8S6	Identify supports needed for integration into various program placements.
GT8S7	Develop or modify individualized assessment strategies.
GT8S8	Evaluate instruction and monitor progress for individuals with gifts and talents.
GT8S9	Use performance data and information from all stakeholders to make or suggest modifications in learning environments.
GT8S10	Evaluate learner products and portfolios.
GT8S11	Report assessment results to all stakeholders using effective communication skills.
GT8S12	Create and maintain records.
GT8S13	Use technology to conduct assessments.

**Special Education Standard #9: Professional and Ethical Practice
Gifts and Talents**

Knowledge:	
GT9K1	Personal cultural biases and differences that affect one’s teaching.
GT9K2	Organizations and publications, relevant to the field of gifted education.
GT9K3	Continuum of lifelong professional development.
Skills:	
GT9S1	Articulate personal philosophy of gifted education.
GT9S2	Access information on meeting the needs of students with gifts and talents.
GT9S3	Conduct self-evaluation of instruction.
GT9S4	Evaluate program activities for continued improvement.
GT9S5	Maintain confidential communication about individuals with gifts and talents.
GT9S6	Use verbal, nonverbal, and written language effectively.
GT9S7	Demonstrate commitment to developing the highest educational potential of individuals with gifts and talents.
GT9S8	Demonstrate sensitivity for the culture, language, religion, gender, disability, socio-economic status, and sexual orientation of individual students.
GT9S9	Uphold high standards of competence and integrity and exercise sound judgment in the practice of the profession.
GT9S10	Engage in professional activities that benefit individuals with exceptional learning needs, their families, and colleagues.
GT9S11	Conduct professional activities in compliance with applicable laws and policies.
GT9S12	Practice within one's skills limit and obtain assistance when needed.
GT9S13	Practice within the CEC Code of Ethics and other standards of the profession.
GT9S14	Maintain knowledge of research and literature in special and gifted education.
GT9S15	Participate in the activities of professional organizations related to gifted and talented education.
GT9S16	Reflect on one's practice to improve instruction and guide professional growth.
GT9S17	Act ethically in advocating for appropriate services.

**Special Education Standard #10: Collaboration
Gifts and Talents**

Knowledge:	
GT10K1	Culturally responsive factors that promote effective communication and collaboration with individuals, families, school personnel, and community members.
GT10K2	Concerns of families of individuals with gifts and talents and strategies to help address these concerns.
GT10K3	Services, networks, and organizations for individuals with gifts and talents.
GT10K4	Models and strategies for consultation and collaboration.
Skills:	
GT10S1	Collaborate with families and others in assessment of individuals with gifts and talents.
GT10S2	Foster respectful and beneficial relationships between families and professionals.
GT10S3	Assist individuals with gifts and talents and their families in becoming active participants in the educational team.
GT10S4	Plan and conduct collaborative conferences with individuals with gifts and talents and their families.
GT10S5	Use group problem solving skills to develop, implement, and evaluate collaborative activities.
GT10S6	Communicate with school personnel about the characteristics and needs of individuals with gifts and talents.

GT10S7	Communicate effectively with families of individuals with gifts and talents from diverse backgrounds.
GT10S8	Model techniques and coach others in the use of instructional methods and accommodations.

APPENDIX E

Resources and References

(This list is provided, but not necessarily endorsed, by the committee)

Organizations:

American Association for Gifted Children
www.aagc.org

Center for Gifted Education
<http://cfge.wm.edu>

Council for Exceptional Children (CEC)
www.cec.sped.org

Davidson Foundation
www.davidsonfoundation.org

Hollingworth Center for Highly Gifted Children
www.hollingworth.org

National Association for Gifted Children (NAGC)
www.nagc.org

National Foundation for Gifted and Creative Children
www.nfgcc.org

National Research Center on the Gifted and Talented (University of Virginia)
<http://curry.edschool.virginia.edu/gifted/projects/NRC>

National Research Center on the Gifted and Talented (University of Connecticut)
www.ucc.uconn.edu/~wwwgt/nrcgt.html

Gifted Development Center
www.gifteddevelopment.com

GiftedTN
www.giftedtn.org/home.html

GT World
www.gtworld.org

Hoagies' Gifted Education Page
www.hoagiesgifted.org

Supporting Emotional Needs of the Gifted (SENG)
www.sengifted.org

Tennessee Association for the Gifted (TAG)
www.tag-tenn.org

Tennessee Initiative for Gifted Education Reform (TIGER)
www.TIGERnetwork.org

Books:

Baldwin, Alexinia, and Sally Reis. (eds.), *Culturally Diverse and Underserved Populations of Gifted Students*. SAGE, 2004.

Baum, Susan M., John Dixon, and Steven V. Owens. *To Be Gifted and Learning Disabled: From Definitions to Practical Intervention Strategies*. Creative Learning Press, 1991.

Bireley, Marlene. *Crossover Children: A Sourcebook for Helping Children who are Gifted and Learning Disabled*. Council for Exceptional Children, 1995.

Castellano, Jamie A., and Eva Diaz. (eds.) *Reaching New Horizons: Gifted and Talented Education for Culturally and Linguistically Diverse Students*. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn and Bacon, 2002.

Cline, Starr, and Diane Schwartz. *Diverse Populations of Gifted Children: Meeting Their Needs in the Regular Classroom*. Pearson Education, 1999.

Colangelo, Nicholas, and Gary A. Davis. *Handbook of Gifted Education*. 3rd edition. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn and Bacon, 2002.

Davis, Gary, and Sylvia Rimm. *Education of the Gifted and Talented*. (5th ed.), Pearson Education, 2003

Delisle, James. *Guiding the Social and Emotional Development of Gifted Youth: A Practical Guide for Educators and Counselors*. Longman, 1992.

Delisle, James, and Judy Galbraith. *When Gifted Kids Don't Have All the Answers: How to Meet Their Social and Emotional Needs*. Minneapolis: Free Spirit Publishing, 2002.

Eyre, Deborah, and Hilary Lowe. (eds.) *Curriculum Provision for the Gifted and Talented in Secondary School*. David Fulton Publishers, 2003.

Ford, Donna. *Reversing Underachievement Among Gifted Black Students: Promising Practices and Programs*. New York: Teachers College Press, 1996.

Gailbrath, Judy. *Managing the Social and Emotional Needs of the Gifted: A Teacher's Survival Guide*. Free Spirit Publishing, 1990

Gross, Miraca. *Exceptionally Gifted*. Routledge Press, 2003.

Jones, Carroll J. *Social and Emotional Development of Exceptional Students: Handicapped and Gifted*. Charles C. Thomas Publishers, 1997.

Kay, Keisa. *Uniquely Gifted: Identifying and Meeting the Needs of the Twice Exceptional Student*. Avocus Publishing, 2000.

Landrum, Mary. *Aiming for Excellence: Gifted Program Standards: Annotations to the Nags Pre-K – 12 Gifted Program Standards*. Prufrock Press, 2000.

Neihart, Maureen, Sally M. Reis, Nancy M. Robinson, and Sidney M. Moon. (eds.) *The Social and Emotional Development of Gifted Children: What Do We Know?* Prufrock, 2001.

Perry, Theresa, Claude Steele, and Asa G. Hilliard. *Young, Gifted, and Black: Promoting High Achievement Among African-American Students*. Beacon Press, 2003.

Porter, Louise. *Gifted Young Children: A Guide for Teachers and Parents*. Open University Press, 1999.

Rogers, Karen B. *Re-Forming Gifted Education: Matching the Program to the Child*. Scottsdale, AZ: Great Potential Press, 2002.

Smutny, Joan. *The Young Gifted Child: Potential and Promise: An Anthology*. Cresskill, N.J.: Hampton Press, 1999.

Smutney, Joan Franklin, Sally Yahnke Walker, and Elizabeth A. Meckstroth. *Teaching Young Gifted Children in the Regular Classroom*. Minneapolis: Free Spirit Publishing, 1998.

Sousa, David. *How the Gifted Brain Learns*. Washington, D.C.: SAGE, 2002.

Southern, S. Thomas, Eric D. Jones, and William T. Southern. (eds.) *The Academic Acceleration of Gifted Children*. Teachers's College Press, 1991.

Stopper, Michael J. *Meeting the Social and Emotional Needs of Gifted and Talented Children*. David Fulton Publishers, 2000.

Tomlinson, Carol Ann, Jeanne H. Purcell, Jann Leppien, and Sandra N. Kaplan. *The Parallel Curriculum: A Design to Develop High Potential and Challenge High-Ability Learners*. Washington, D.C.: SAGE, 2001.

VanTassel-Baska, Joyce. *Comprehensive Curriculum for Gifted Learners*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1994.

Webb, James T., Elizabeth A. Meckstroth, and Stephanie S. Tolan. *Guiding the Gifted Child: A Practical Source for Parents and Teachers*. Great Potential Press, 1983.

West, Thomas. *In the Mind's Eye: Visual Thinkers, Gifted People with Dyslexia and other Learning Difficulties, Computer Images and the Ironies of Creativity*. Prometheus Publishing, 1997.

Winebrenner, Susan. *Teaching Gifted Kids in the Regular Classroom: Strategies and Techniques Every Teacher Can Use to Meet the Needs of the Gifted and Talented*. Minneapolis: Free Spirit Publishing, 2001.

Winner, Ellen. *Gifted Children: Myths and Realities*. Basic Books, 1997.

JOURNAL ARTICLES:

Baker, Jean A., Rober Bridger, and Karen Evans, Models of underachievement Among Gifted Preadolescents." *Gifted Child Quarterly*, Vol 42 No. 1, Winter 1998 5-15

Borland, J.H., & Wright, L. (1994). Identifying young potentially gifted, economically disadvantaged students. *Gifted Child Quarterly*, 38(4), 164-171.

Brody, L. E., & Mills, C. J. (1997). Gifted Children with learning disabilities: A review of the issues. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 30, 282-296.

Brody, L. E., & Benbow, C. P. (1987). Accelerative strategies: How effective are they for the gifted? *Gifted Child Quarterly*, 31, 105-110.

Crammond, Bonnie, Shawn Carter, and Robin Shy, "Early entrance to college: A lifesaver?" *Roeper Review*, February/March 1996, Vol 18 No 3. P. A--4

Dexter, D. Kay, "Cluster Grouping: A Strategy for Effective Teaching" *Gifted Child Today*, May/June 1998 P. 20-23,48

Elmore, R.F., & Zenus, V. (1994). Enhancing social-emotional development of middle school gifted students. *Roeper Review*, 16(3), 182-185.

Gross, U.M. (1994). Radical acceleration: Responding to academic and social needs for extremely gifted adolescents. *Journal of Secondary Gifted Education*, 5 (4), 7-18.

Gutierrez, R., and Slavin, R. E. "Achievement Effects of the Nongraded Elementary School: A Best-Evidence Synthesis." *Review of Educational Research*, 62/4 (Winter 1992): 333-376.

Hansen, J.B., & Feldhusen, J.F. (1994). Comparison of trained and untrained teachers of gifted students. *Gifted Child Quarterly*, 38(3), 115-123.

Hebert, Thomas P., "Gifted Black Males in an Urban High School: Factors that Influence Achievement and Underachievement." *Journal for the Education of the Gifted*, Vol 21, No. 4, 1998, P 385-414.

Hunsaker, S.L., & Callahan, C.M. (1995). Creativity and giftedness: Published instruments uses and abuses. *Gifted Child Quarterly*, 39, 110-114.

Kearney, Kathi, "Highly Gifted Children in Full Inclusion Classrooms" *Highly Gifted Children*, Summer/Fall 1996, 12 (4)

Linchevski, Liora, and Bilha Kutcher, "Tell me with whom you're learning, and I'll Tell You How Much You've Learned: Mixed Ability Versus Same Ability Grouping in Mathematics." *Journal for Research in Mathematics Education*, (1998) V 29 (5) 533-554.

Mills, C. J., Stork, E. J., & Krug, D. (1992). Recognition and development of academic talent in educationally disadvantaged students. *Exceptionality*, 3, 165-180.

Passow, A. Harry, and Mary M. Frasier, "Toward Improving Identification of Talent Potential among Minority and Disadvantaged Students." *Roeper Review*, February/March 1996, Vol 18 No. 3 P. 198-202.

Reis, S.M., Westberg, K.L. (1994). The impact of staff development on teachers' ability to modify curriculum for gifted and talented students. *Gifted Child Quarterly*, 38(3), 127-135.

Reis, S.M., & Purcell, J.H. (1993). An analysis of content elimination and strategies used by elementary classroom teachers in the curriculum compacting process. *Journal for the Education of the Gifted*, 16 (2), 147-170.

Ruff, D. L. *Use of the SB5 in the Assessment of High Abilities*. In Stanford-Binet Intelligence Scales, Fifth Edition Assessment Service Bulletin No. 3. Itasca, IL: Riverside Publishing, 2003.

Sayler, M.F., & Brookshire, W.K. (1993). Social, emotional, and behavioral adjustment of accelerated students, students in gifted classes, and regular students in eighth grade. *Gifted Child Quarterly*, 37 (4), 150-154.

Thraillkill, Colleen, "Patrick's Story: A Gifted Learning Disabled Child." *Gifted Child Today*, May/June 1998 P. 24-27.

Tyler-Wood, T., & Carri, L. (1993). Verbal measures of cognitive ability: The gifted low SES students' albatross. *Roeper Review*, 16 (2), 102-105.

GOVERNMENT DOCUMENTS:

Gifted Education Manual, Tennessee Department of Education
www.giftedtn.org/docs/seintgiftglines.pdf

National Excellence: A Case for Developing America's Talent, U.S. Department of Education
www.ed.gov/pubs/DevTalent/coverpge.html

Rules and Regulations Database, Tennessee State Board of Education
www.state.tn.us/sos/rules/0520/0520-01/0520-01.htm

F:\Debbie\Intellectually Gifted Committee\Gifted Report.doc vlb 1/28/04