DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 223 168 HE 015 679

AUTHOR Galambos, Eva C.
TITLE School-College Cooperation for Teaching Gifted Students.
INSTITUTION Southern Regional Education Board, Atlanta, Ga.
PUB DATE Oct 82
NOTE 10p.
AVAILABLE FROM Southern Regional Education Board, 1340 Spring Street, N.W., Atlanta, GA 30309.
PUB TYPE Viewpoints (120) -- Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Collected Works - Serials (022)
JOURNAL CIT Regional Spotlight; v14 n3 Oct 1982

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Academically Gifted; *Advanced Placement Programs; College Choice; College Credits; College Programs; *College School Cooperation; Enrollment Trends; Geographic Regions; Higher Education; *High School Seniors; Noncredit Courses; Secondary Education; State Aid; State Programs; Student Participation; Summer Programs; *Talent Identification; Teacher Education
IDENTIFIERS College Entrance Examination Board; Project Advance; *United States (South)

ABSTRACT

Approaches to cooperation between colleges and schools in serving students capable of advanced work are examined. Two major ways of serving bright high school students within their own schools in coordination with colleges are: programs developed by individual colleges with particular high schools, and the College Board's Advanced Placement (AP) program. A notable example of a program developed by an individual college is the Syracuse University Project Advance. The College Board distributes its curriculum materials to high schools that wish to participate in the AP program. The quality of the high school offerings is safeguarded through nationally developed tests in any given discipline that are taken by participating high school students. Data on student participation in the AP program and migration patterns of AP candidates as they go to college are examined by states. Many colleges award sophomore status to high school students who present qualifying grades in enough AP examinations. Courses, institutes, or seminars on college campuses open to high school (and sometimes younger) students represent another approach to serving the needs of bright youths. Some programs are noncredit enrichment efforts, while others award regular college credits. Joint enrollment of high school seniors who earn credits from the college and the high school simultaneously is a growing phenomenon. The most prevalent college involvement in serving gifted youngsters is through special summer offerings. Summer programs funded by state departments of education, early identification of talented students, student fee arrangements, training teachers of the gifted, and state support for educating the gifted are also noted. (SW)

REGIONAL SPOTLIGHT

Southern Regional Education Board

News of Higher Education in the South

Volume XIV, No. 3 October, 1982

SCHOOL-COLLEGE COOPERATION FOR TEACHING GIFTED STUDENTS

REGIONAL SPOTLIGHT

SOUTHERN REGIONAL EDUCATION BOARD

NEWS OF HIGHER EDUCATION IN THE SOUTH

Vol. XIV, No. 3

October, 1982

School-College Cooperation for Teaching Gifted Students

Challenging gifted youngsters to their full potential is a charge that calls for coordination between high schools and colleges. The SREB Task Force on Higher Education and the Schools' report, *The Need for Quality*, in discussing various areas where there is a special need for coordination by the two sectors, states: "Much attention has been focused by the schools and colleges in recent years on minimum competencies. There is the need for comparable emphasis on challenging the full potential of gifted students."[1]

High school programs, by virtue of having to serve students with a wide range of abilities, at best have the tendency to shoot for the middle, and at worst, to focus on achieving acceptable pass rates on mandated minimum competency tests. Thus, there is an opportunity and responsibility for colleges to help high schools in providing a rigorous and stimulating curriculum for the brightest students.

Many colleges have responded to this need. The problem of making the 12th grade interesting to those high school students who complete most graduation requirements by the eleventh year has played a role in the response by higher education. This report presents various approaches to cooperation between colleges and the schools in serving students capable of advanced work.

Programs Within High Schools

Serving talented students within their own high schools, or at least in their own school districts, has several advantages. It allows students to remain with their peers. This is important from the standpoint that an intellectually advanced student may be ready for college work, but emotionally may not be sufficiently mature to be thrust into the unstructured environment of college life.

Also, when bright students can pursue advanced studies within their high schools, they usually do not pay tuition. Thus, public funding meets a special need, just as in the case of special programs for retarded or handicapped students. This system provides equity for talented students from low income households — students who, because of tuition and fees, might not be able to take advantage of opportunities colleges provide on their campuses.

There are two major ways in which bright high school students are served within their own schools in coordination with colleges: (1) programs developed by individual colleges with particular high schools, and (2) the College Board's Advanced Placement program.

Individual College/High School Programs

The most notable example of a program within high schools developed with an individual higher education institution is the Syracuse University Project Advance. This project was initiated by high school faculty who recognized a need to do more for advanced students. Some 4,000 high school seniors in 77 high schools in New York, New Jersey, Massachusetts, and Michigan are now taking freshman college courses within their high schools. High school teachers, specially trained by Syracuse University, teach the courses. There is continuing interaction between the high school teachers and the participating college faculties in corresponding disciplines. Students do pay credit-hour fees, but they are a small fraction of the regular university charge. Minimum requirements for the participating high school teachers include undergraduate and graduate degrees in the content area to be taught, and at least five years of teaching experience in the specific course area to be included in Project Advance.

The program is financed by the schools (with some state support) and in-kind support from Syracuse University. The high schools pay summer stipends to their teachers while they are trained. The teachers become university "adjunct instructors," and are given a 50 percent discount on graduate course fees. Participating professors are paid by Project Advance.

Indiana University has also chosen to serve talented high school students within their own schools and there, too, the participating high school teachers become adjunct faculty members of the university.

Some junior colleges teach credit courses in the high school. In Pinellas County, Florida, for example, the St. Petersburg Junior Col-

There is an opportunity and responsibility for colleges to help high schools in providing a rigorous and stimulating curriculum for the brightest students.

lege staffs some offerings within the public high schools, at no cost to the students.

The College Board's Advanced Placement Program

The College Board's Advanced Placement (AP) program is organized in terms of a curriculum in various disciplines developed by committees of college and high school faculties. The College Board distributes the curriculum materials to high schools that wish to participate in the AP program. The quality of the high school offerings is safeguarded through nationally developed tests in any given discipline that are taken by students of the participating high school. Tests are scored from one to five by nationally controlled standards. Students obtain advanced placement and/or college credit from those institutions that recognize the AP program. Each college decides what score it will accept.

First established during the 1950s, the program has expanded in recent years. From 1973 to 1981, the number of students taking one or more AP examinations rose 152 percent. The region's 1981 percentage of the national AP examinations (21 percent) is less than the South's share of the college population — 26 percent (see Table 1).

When AP examinations are compared to the population of each state, it is even more evident that the region is not participating in the AP program to the same extent as the nation. The 1981 ratio of AP exams per 100,000 inhabitants was 51 in the region, while it was 77 nationwide. However, Maryland, South Carolina, and Virginia exceeded the national ratios.

As the number of students taking AP examinations has increased, so has the number of colleges participating in the program. In 1955, when the College Board took over the program, 130 institutions participated; in 1980-81 there were almost 2,000 institutions in the program. Three institutions in the region — the University of Virginia, Texas A&M, and Rice University — are among the 20 institutions, led by Harvard, that received the largest number of students participating in AP examination scores in 1981. Of the nation's colleges participating in the AP program in 1981, 27 percent were in the South. However, only 22.5 percent of the candidates with AP examinations applied to colleges in the region (see Table 2).

When migration patterns of AP candidates as they go to college are examined by states, it is noteworthy that North Carolina is a substantial gainer — attracting 998 more AP candidates than it lost to out-of-state institutions. Maryland and Florida, on the other hand, are large losers — with many more of their own AP students going out-of-state than are gained from other states. These patterns tend to reflect not only the commitment of individual colleges to the AP program, but also the attractiveness of a state's institutions to bright students. The extent to which higher education in a state can attract its gifted high school graduates depends largely upon the academic reputation of its colleges.

Table 1

Student Participation in Advanced Placement Program, 1981

	% Total High Schools in AP 1981	Total AP Exams 1981	AP Exams Per 100,000 Population 1981
United States	22	175,306	77
SREB States	17	38,074	51
South as a Percent of U.S.		20.6	
Alabama	5	777	20
Arkansas	1	60	3
Florida	29	5,652	58
Georgia	17	2,596	48
Kentucky	10	743	20
Louisiana	4	433	10
Maryland	48	5,448	129
Mississippi	1	121	5
North Carolina	30	3,673	63
South Carolina	27	2,602	83
Tennessee	20	3,117	68
Texas	155	4,390	31
Virginia	177	6,346	119
West Virginia	13	116	6

Source: Advanced Placement Program, The College Board, 1982.

When Advanced Placement (AP) examinations are compared to the population of each state, it is evident that the region is not participating in the AP program to the same extent as the nation.

For the nation and the region, about a third of a state's AP students leave their own states. North Carolina, South Carolina, Texas, and Virginia, among the Southern states, have lower than the average loss rate.

Numerous colleges are ready to award sophomore status to high school students who present qualifying grades in enough AP examinations. The extent to which a college provides either advanced placement or credit depends to some degree on the educational philosophy of the institution. A policy of granting advanced placement in college courses, but not credit for the high school course, recognizes that bright students may proceed beyond some average level of knowledge by the time they finish college. If a freshman course begins at an advanced level, a complete curriculum through the senior year of college affords extra scope for the brightest students. On the other hand, where AP courses are given college credit, a bright student may finish the work load expected of the average student in a shorter time.

The extent to which high school students are served in conjunction with colleges *within high schools* depends somewhat on the concentration of talented students in a school district. Obviously, a small school district would have a lesser chance of assembling a sufficient number of talented students to warrant a separate Advanced Placement class than a larger one in which the statistical likelihood of assembling such a class would be greater.

Some colleges have taken a particular interest in promoting Advanced Placement programs in schools that feed into the institution. For example, several years ago Clemson University gave Advanced Placement credits to 50 students. This number increased to 481 last year, with 56 percent of these students placing in at least three subjects. This increase has been possible because the college encouraged a sufficient number of high schools in South Carolina to institute Advanced Placement classes.

Higher education and the state departments of education can stimulate Advanced Placement offerings if they cooperate in training teachers who can staff such courses. The University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, determined in the spring of 1982 that it would promote the instruction of calculus in the state's high schools by offering a five-week summer course to 30 teachers. The State Department of Education provided tuition stipends for many of these teachers.

Programs on College Campuses

Courses, institutes, or seminars on college campuses open to high school (and sometimes younger) students represent another approach to serving the needs of bright youths. The number of such summer or regular session programs in various disciplines is increasing. Some are non-credit enrichment efforts, while other programs entail regular college credits. For the most part, high school students taking college courses or seminars do pay tuition or fees, although there are some instances of reduced charges or free service.

Joint Enrollments

Joint enrollment of high school seniors who earn credits from the college and the high school simultaneously is a growing phenomenon. In some states, such as Georgia and North Carolina, statewide policies exist on joint enrollment in public institutions. In Georgia, for example, under a Board of Regents' policy, all the public two- and four-year colleges may enroll high school seniors, provided there is an agreement with a local school district for such joint enrollment. The students take all or part of their classes in the college, and receive credit both for the high school diploma and for a college degree. These arrangments are particularly needed in school districts without large numbers of talented students — a situation precluding or reducing the practicality of offering advanced placement programs.

A local school district's enthusiasm for participating in a joint enrollment program is sometimes diminished because of the loss of funds that are tied to the district's average daily attendance, and by the loss to their own classes of the stimulus provided by bright students upon their peers.

The State Board of Education and the Board of Community Colleges in North Carolina have sought to work out the competition between them for talented students through an agreement that divides attendance credit between the two sectors. A high school student who takes as many as three courses in the high school is counted as a full entity for average daily attendance purposes, and the college receives one-third full-time enrollment credit for every course the student takes there. The principal of the student's school must approve the joint enrollment. Agreements of this nature may be the answer for working out a solution that gives first consideration to the student's needs rather than the school's or college's quest for funds.

The extent to which higher education in a state can attract its gifted high school graduates depends largely upon the academic reputation of its colleges.

In Louisiana, the State Board of Elementary and Secondary Education recently developed a policy permitting high school students to earn high school credits through college courses. Gifted students eligible under this joint enrollment policy must score on state-approved evaluation instruments.

Some colleges have developed joint enrollment programs in the absence of statewide policies. The University of Texas at El Paso began such a program last year, serving 47 gifted local area youths aged 12 through 18. The "junior scholars" are limited to one course per semester, except that seniors may take two courses. A minimum SAT of 900 is required for the 12- to 14-year-olds, and of 1,000 for the older high school students. These SAT scores exceed the 700 minimum required for admission of regular college freshmen.

Most high school students enrolled in college courses for credit pay regular fees and tuition. Thus, there is an added cost, as compared to their remaining in the high schools. However, to the extent that such credits reduce the remaining number of credits a student will need to earn for a degree, there is no extra cost beyond the amount normally charged for course requirements. Hood College in Frederick, Maryland charges one-half of its regular tuition for summer joint enrollees.

Summer College Programs for Talented Students

By far the most prevalent college involvement in serving gifted youngsters is through special summer offerings. These entail residential as well as day programs. Most of

Table 2
College Enrollment Patterns of Advanced Placement Students, 1981

	Total Colleges Receiving AP Grades	Total Candidates to Colleges in State*	In-State and Out-of-State Attendance Number and Percent of Candidates					
			Remaining in State		Entering the State	Leaving the State		Net Gain/Loss Candidates Entering Compared to Leaving
			No.	%	No.	No.	%	
United States	1,818	84,664	52,682	62	31,982	31,218	38	764**
SREB States	499	19,059	12,021	63	7,038	7,009	37	—
South as a Percent of U.S.	27.4	22.5	—	—	—	—	—	—
Alabama	27	458	256	55	202	207	45	−5
Arkansas	10	69	24	44	45	31	56	+14
Florida	58	1,781	1,410	54	371	1,201	46	−830
Georgia	44	1,329	639	59	690	447	41	+243
Kentucky	24	431	263	56	150	205	44	−55
Louisiana	20	406	117	56	289	92	44	+197
Maryland	35	1,607	1,008	38	599	1,632	62	−1,033
Mississippi	13	122	44	61	78	28	39	+50
North Carolina	66	3,313	1,905	82	1,408	410	18	+998
South Carolina	29	1,472	1,171	76	301	361	24	−60
Tennessee	37	1,561	944	60	617	634	40	−17
Texas	67	2,782	2,005	77	777	585	23	+192
Virginia	54	3,592	2,201	66	1,391	1,127	34	+264
West Virginia	15	154	34	41	120	49	59	+71

*Represents all candidate AP examination grades sent to colleges within the state from anywhere in the nation.
**Represents foreign students.
Source: Advanced Placement Program, The College Board, 1982.

First consideration should be given to the student's needs rather than the school's or college's quest for funds.

the offerings are specially designed for these students. College credits are not usually given for these summer experiences, although there are exceptions. Emory University's residential summer program for rising high school seniors provides up to two college credit hours.

Fees are usually charged, although reduced fees and scholarships are offered. The fees vary considerably, depending on program length, residential or day offerings, and other factors. The six-week nonresidential summer program at the University of South Florida for eighth, ninth, and tenth graders costs only $10-$60, while a three-week residential program at Gardner-Webb College in Boiling Springs, North Carolina costs $450.

Industry has helped in funding some summer academic enrichment for gifted students. The Charlotte-Mecklenburg County Project Excel, which is housed on four cooperating campuses in North Carolina, initially was funded in part by the local Chamber of Commerce. The local School Board continues to subsidize the cost of the program.

Mathematics and science are receiving more emphasis in summer offerings by colleges, perhaps reflecting the dearth of high school coverage in these areas. Computer programming is another popular offering. Yet the humanities, including the arts and foreign languages, are also prevalent.

Saturday programs are offered by some colleges during the regular school year. Middle Tennessee State University, for example, provides an eight-week session for gifted third to eighth graders at $60 per semester. Students with an IQ of 120 may attend Saturday instruction in art, foreign language, computer mathematics, and literature at the University of South Alabama in Mobile at a cost of $50 per quarter.

Governor's Honors Programs

Summer programs initiated and designed by individual colleges are differentiated from the summer programs funded by state departments of education (frequently called "Governor's Honors Programs") that are housed on college campuses. The Georgia and North Carolina honors programs do not charge fees to the students selected statewide to attend these residential programs. The Georgia program is staffed by teachers recruited for this purpose by the public education system, which pays the colleges for the use of their facilities. Faculty from the campuses selected to house the program often interact both with teachers and honors students.

The new residential year-round programs for gifted students in special high schools (which may be housed on college campuses) are another kind of program sponsored by the state departments of education, rather than by joint school-college efforts. North Carolina, with its special school for math and science students, and Louisiana, with its recently funded school for gifted and talented eleventh and twelfth graders to be housed at Northwestern State University, are examples of recent moves by states to give special attention to gifted high school students. The Virginia General Assembly in 1982 directed the State Department of Education to study the feasibility of establishing a residential school for the gifted.

Early Identification of Talented Students

Early identification of exceedingly bright junior high school students has been promoted by two institutions in the region: Johns Hopkins University and Duke University.

The Johns Hopkins program, begun in 1980, identifies youngsters who can score 700 or above on the math portion of the Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT), or above 630 on the verbal portion. These students are then invited to residential and commuter summer programs where they participate in advanced instruction.

The Duke University program, which follows the same approach, concentrates its talent identification on the top three percent of seventh graders in 13 states, 11 of which are in the SREB region. The average math score in 1981 for more than 8,000 students taking the SAT test under the auspices of the Duke program was 404 for boys and 375 for girls. The average score for high school juniors or seniors, by comparison, was 416 for males and 390 for females.

The philosophy behind these Talent Identification Programs (TIP) is to gain early identification of truly bright students and then to provide counsel and support to challenge them to their intellectual potential. Duke University, in cooperation with state departments of education and local colleges, holds award ceremonies in each of the participating states to recognize outstanding 12- and 13-year-olds. The principals and the state coordinators of gifted student programs are kept apprised of the test results and are encouraged to work with these students. Duke University selects some 150 "profoundly gifted" from the group to attend summer sessions, where they complete fast-paced, intensive courses in three weeks. The Duke program assists TIP students in

Most activities represent reactions developed locally, and often at the college's initiative.

locating local colleges that provide enrichment experiences.

Training Teachers of the Gifted

Another area in which colleges can cooperate with public education to meet the needs of gifted students is to train the teachers who will serve these youngsters in the schools. Some 15 states now have special certification requirements for teachers of the gifted; eight of these states are in the Southern region.[2] These requirements call for graduate courses that specifically relate to teaching gifted students.

At the present, the consensus on how best to meet the needs of elementary school gifted students is to provide "resource rooms" staffed by specially trained teachers, to which youngsters are assigned part of the school day. There seems to be grave doubt that the regular classroom teacher can offer enrichment, because individualized teaching is more goal than fact.[3] At the secondary level, however, separate classes for advanced students gain wider support than other strategies. These strategies depend on staffing by teachers who are qualified to challenge bright students. Individuals who have concentrated on how to provide education to gifted students look to the colleges to help upgrade teaching personnel through in-service or summer training.

The University of South Carolina College of Education is an example of a program that is responding to this need. It has entered into a cooperative arrangement with Richland County school districts. Summer programs for gifted elementary and middle school children are used as laboratories to train teachers of the gifted.

State Support for Educating the Gifted

The Southern states, in appropriations to their state departments of education, have been generous in support of programs for gifted students. For 1981, states responding to a survey on program allocations for gifted students[4] reported a total of $148 million nationally, with 46 percent of this total reported by states in the South (see Table 3). To some extent, however, this seemingly greater emphasis on programs for the gifted in the South reflects the heavier dependence on state rather than local financing of the region's public education than is true for the nation as a whole. This interpretation is borne out when estimates of the total number of gifted or talented youngsters are compared with the number not being served.

According to Gallagher's research, based on survey responses from 46 state departments of education, in 1980, approximately 56 percent of the students estimated as gifted nationwide were served by programs designed to meet their needs. Yet for four of the Southern states, the estimated proportions served range from only five to 34 percent.[5]

Even these estimates may be optimistic. The statistics "of how many gifted students participate in special programs . . . fail to reveal the nature and the quality of those programs and the level and com-

Table 3
State Support for Gifted Education in the Public Schools 1980-81

	Pupils in Programs	State Funding	$ per Pupil
United States	**922,161**	**$148,477,000**	**$161**
SREB States	**231,033**	**68,960,000**	**298**
South as a Percent of U.S.	**25**	**46**	**185**
Alabama	•	•	•
Arkansas	**1,000**	**280,000**	**280**
Florida	**30,683**	**17,000,000**	**554**
Georgia	**39,941**	**13,140,000**	**329**
Kentucky	**9,208**	**1,200,000**	**130**
Louisiana	**8,104**	**2,500,000**	**308**
Maryland	**24,605**	**600,000**	**24**
Mississippi	**6,500**	**6,000,000**	**706**
North Carolina	**55,492**	**16,000,000**	**288**
South Carolina	**11,000**	**1,480,000**	**135**
Tennessee	**10,000**	**2,500,000**	**250**
Texas	**28,000**	**3,000,000**	**107**
Virginia	—	**2,370,000**	—
West Virginia	**4,500**	**2,890,000**	**642**

*Non-respondent state.
Source: *Report on Education of Gifted. Volume I. Surveys of Education of Gifted Students.* by James J. Gallagher, et. al. Chapel Hill, NC. Frank Porter Graham Child Development Center, University of North Carolina, 1952, p. 39.

Insuring that financial aid is available to encourage high ability secondary school graduates from poor families to attend college may be the most important agenda item for cooperation between colleges and schools.

petency of the teaching and supervision."[6]

State support for special programs to serve gifted students take various forms. While staffing of special classes, development of resource centers, summer honors programs, and separate high schools for the gifted are offered by one or more states, Florida recently took a different approach. The 1982 Florida legislature appropriated $500,000 to fund the Challenge Grant Program for the Gifted. Local school districts will compete for these funds by submitting projects that must be developed in cooperation with a community or four-year college. Florida has also established the Academic Scholars Fund which will be used to award scholarships to state students maintaining a 3.2 grade-point average throughout their high school years. The scholarships are awarded only to students choosing Florida colleges, and the high school curriculum these students take must include four years of advanced mathematics, two years in a foreign language, as well as requirements in other areas. This program is an incentive for high school students to excel, and to stay within their own state for a college education.

The University of Texas in Austin is encouraging gifted Texas students to enroll in the university. The 700 brightest high school juniors in the state attended a weekend colloquium in the summer of 1982, where they were exposed to lectures and campus activities. Each of these students who elects to enroll as a freshman in the fall of 1983 will receive a University of Texas scholarship of at least $1,000.

Although recent emphasis on state funding of programs to serve the gifted has focused on the elementary and secondary schools, there may be a need for more attention at the college level. There was a marked discrepancy between college attendance rates for high ability 1972 high schol graduates from high and low socioeconomic families. As shown in Table 4, only seven percent of the highest ability students from the wealthiest families did not go to college, while over one-third from the poorest families were never enrolled. The failure in the mid-Seventies to enroll so many high ability students from the lowest socioeconomic sector constitutes a waste of human resources. The extent to which expanded financial aid programs enacted in the later Seventies may have corrected this discrepancy is not known. Results of the follow-up on the high school class of 1980, and its college-going rate by ability level and socioeconomic status, will not be known until 1983.

Table 4
College Entrance Pattern of Highest Ability Quartile of 1972 High School Class, by Socioeconomic Status

Socioeconomic Status (SES) Quartile	First Enrolled in 1972	First Enrolled 1973 to 1976	Never Enrolled
Lowest SES Quartile	53.4%	9.2%	37.4%
Middle SES Quartiles	63.3	9.7	27.0
Highest SES Quartile	84.8	8.2	7.0

Source: *College Attainment Four Years After High School*, National Center for Educational Statistics, 1982, Washington, DC, p. 60.

Conclusions

Colleges and schools are cooperating in many localities, and in a variety of ways, to meet the needs of gifted students. The examples of coordination outlined in this report are evidence of the heightened awareness by both sectors of education that serving gifted students presents a fertile area, with many opportunities to share resources and talents.

Yet the review of what is offered raises questions too. To what extent are the needs of the brightest youngsters subordinated to the rigidities of the respective systems? For example, do funding formulas that reward schools and colleges on the basis of headcounts impede programs that best meet the needs of the students, rather than those of the institutions? To what extent are the gifted students not fully encouraged because fees and tuitions are required if they are to take advantage of special summer programs or joint high school-college enrollments? How outreaching have colleges been in sharing their resources, such as libraries, computers, and faculties, when talented young people have exhausted what local schools offer? With the current shortage of math and science teachers in the schools, how many colleges have made efforts to reach out to their local area schools to jointly address the problem?

While some moves for cooperation depend on policies developed

by state public and higher education agencies, there is great room for initiative, at the local level, between college presidents and school superintendents. Indeed, most activities reported herein represent reactions developed locally, and often at the college's initiative. Hood College exemplifies higher education leadership to meet the needs of the gifted. It not only provides joint enrollment, but cuts tuition by one-half during the summer and allows tuition-free enrollment for bright high school students in its own math courses. These moves, as well as the concerted effort by Clemson University in South Carolina to expand advanced placement courses in feeder high schools, could well be adopted by other institutions throughout the region.

Insuring that financial aid is available to encourage high ability secondary school graduates from poor families to attend college may be the most important agenda item for cooperation between colleges and schools. The preoccupation over the past decade with increasing "access" to higher education, often without sufficient concern about the likelihood of academic success of all those enrolled, might better be refocused on those students who show the greatest promise of succeeding in college. Individual professions, such as engineering, law, and the medical specialties, with their special efforts to encourage high ability minority students as early as possible to consider these fields, have led the way in making sure that financial aid and other encouragement would promote and facilitate high aspirations among these youths. Similar early cooperative action is needed to attract gifted young people into teaching, a profession that is increasingly threatened by failure to recruit the most able students.

Notes

1. Task Force on Higher Education and the Schools. *The Need for Quality*. Southern Regional Education Board. Atlanta, GA. 1981. p. 25.

2. Bruce Mitchell, Eastern Washington University, Department of Education. Cheney, WA. Unpublished data.

3. James J. Gallagher. *Report on Education of the Gifted, Volume 1, Surveys of Education of Gifted Students*, Frank Porter Graham Child Development Center, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, NC. 1982. p. 15.

4. *Ibid.*, p. 40.

5. *Ibid.*, p. 42.

6. Bernard and Betty Miller. "Recognizing the Gifted: Is Differentiation Undemocratic?", *The College Board Review*, Spring 1980. p. 5.

This issue of *Regional Spotlight* was prepared by Eva C. Galambos, SREB research associate and staff director for activities of the SREB Task Force on Higher Education and the Schools.