DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 393 235 EC 304 679

AUTHOR Belcastro, Frank P.; Kelly, Kathleen
TITLE Richardson Study: Largest vs. Smallest School Districts in Iowa.
PUB DATE 19 Feb 96
NOTE 35p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Academically Gifted; Acceleration (Education); *Delivery Systems; *Educational Practices; *Educational Quality; Elementary Secondary Education; Enrichment Activities; Excellence in Education; Grouping (Instructional Purposes); Needs Assessment; Program Evaluation; School Districts; School District Size; Special Education; Special Programs; Standards; State Surveys
IDENTIFIERS *Iowa; *Richardson Study

ABSTRACT

This study used the questionnaire previously developed and used by the national Richardson Study to survey Iowa school districts concerning the standards, resources, and procedures used in providing special educational services to gifted students. The study focused on comparing the largest and smallest school districts and on comparing districts that offered a large number of 16 possible program types and those that offered a small number of types of gifted programs. The chi-square statistic was used to analyze the comparison. Results indicated that the largest school districts and those that offered a large number of programs were superior to the smaller school districts and those that offered a small number of programs, respectively, in standards, resources, and procedures. The study concluded, however, that even the better school districts offered inadequate programs and all four groups fell short of the principles of excellence. The questionnaire is appended. (Contains 19 references.) (DB)

RICHARDSON STUDY: LARGEST VS. SMALLEST SCHOOL DISTRICTS IN IOWA

Frank P. Belcastro

University of Dubuque

Kathleen Kelly

Northeast Iowa Community College

Abstract

A national survey of public and parochial school districts was conducted (Richardson Study) which provided a profile of the current status of educational practices for gifted students. Using the national questionnaire, a similar survey of Iowa school districts was conducted in 1993. Reported were (a) the comparison of the largest and smallest school districts as to standards, resources, and procedures used in offering the programs, and (b) the comparison of those school districts that offered a large number of programs and those that offered a small number of gifted programs as to standards, resources, and procedures used in offering the programs. The chi-square statistic was the tool of comparison. Results indicated that the largest school district and those that offered a large number of programs both were superior to the smaller school districts and those that offered a small number of programs, respectively, in standards, resources, and procedures. However, even the superiorities were inadequate and all four groups fell short of the principles of excellence.

RICHARDSON STUDY: LARGEST VS. SMALLEST SCHOOL DISTRICTS IN IOWA

The Richardson Study is a national study which surveyed public and parochial school districts nationwide in order to determine the existence and types of programs being offered for gifted students at the elementary and secondary levels (Cox, Daniel, & Boston, 1985; Kelly, 1989). Based on this comprehensive study, recommendations would be made.

The study gathered information on 16 program types which constitute practices or approaches which are appropriate for gifted students. The program types are:

1. Enrichment in the Regular Classroom
2. Part-Time Special Class
3. Full-time Special Class
4. Independent Study
5. Itinerant Teacher
6. Mentorship
7. Resource Rooms
8. Special Schools
9. Early Entrance
10. Continuous Progress
11. Nongraded School
12. Moderate Acceleration
13. Radical Acceleration
14. College Board and Advanced Placement
15. Fast-Paced Courses
16. Concurrent or Dual Enrollment

During the spring of 1993 the national

questionnaire (see Appendix A) was sent to the 431 public school districts in Iowa. Two hundred seventy three or 63% of the school districts responded. The purpose of this study was (a) to compare the largest enrollment school districts (5600+) and the smallest enrollment school districts (0-199) as to standards, resources, and procedures used in offering their gifted programs; and (b) to compare school districts that offered a large number of programs (4-16) and those that offered a small number of programs (0-3) as to standards, resources, and procedures used in offering their gifted programs. Many of the observed characteristics of the school districts were no different than the matching expected characteristics, given the proportion in each category; the results reported in this study are only those where the observed characteristics of the school districts were significantly more or significantly less than expected. This study was one of a series of studies of gifted programs in Iowa using the Richardson questionnaire (Belcastro, 1995; Belcastro, 1996a; Belcastro, 1996b). For this study, it should be noted that the largest-enrollment school districts (5600+) were most often also the same school districts that offered the largest number of gifted programs (4-16).

Statistical Procedure

The chi-square statistic was used to analyze the comparison of the categories of largest school districts and smallest school districts in Iowa; it was also used to compare those school districts with the largest number of gifted programs and those with the smallest number of gifted programs. The t-test was used to compare means of these groupings (Pagano, 1994).

Largest vs. Smallest School Districts

1. The largest-enrollment school districts (5600+) offered an average of 4.7 (8.3 vs. 3.6, over twice as many) more gifted programs than did the smallest-enrollment school districts.
2. The largest-enrollment school districts (5600+) used peer nomination as a procedure in identifying students for gifted programs significantly more (62.5% vs. 7.7%) than did the smallest-enrollment school districts (0-199).
3. The largest-enrollment school districts (5600+) used procedures other than peer nomination, teacher nomination, grades, I.Q. tests or achievement tests in identifying students for gifted programs significantly more (87.5% vs. 23.1%) than did the smallest-enrollment school districts (0-199).
4. The largest-enrollment school districts (5600+) inserviced their teachers of gifted programs on a

regular basis significantly more (87.5% vs. 38.5%) than did the smallest-enrollment school districts (0-199).

5. The largest-enrollment school districts (5600+) used museums and industries as resources for their gifted programs significantly more (75% vs. 19.3%) than did the smallest-enrollment school districts (0-199).

6. The largest-enrollment school districts (5600+) had goals written at the district level as opposed to the building level significantly more (100% vs. 38.5%) than did the smallest-enrollment school districts (0-199).

7. The largest-enrollment school districts (5600+) had special procedures for their gifted programs established at the district level as opposed to the building level significantly more (100% vs. 61.5%) than did the smallest-enrollment school districts (0-199).

8. The largest-enrollment school districts (5600+) had special funding other than local, state, federal, and private sources available for their gifted programs significantly more (33.3% vs. 0%) than did the smallest-enrollment school districts (0-199).

9. The larger-enrollment school districts not only offered more programs (c.f. #1) but also offered a greater variety of programs, i.e., any one of the 16 programs could be found in at least one of the larger school districts.

10. Because of their size, the larger school districts

had significantly larger number of students, certified staff, and significantly larger pre-school, elementary, middle/junior high school, and senior high school enrollments than did the smaller school districts.

11. Almost all of the larger school districts had a significantly larger number of Anglo, black, Hispanic, Asian, and Native-American students than did the smaller school districts. This is also a function of size, since larger cities tend to attract minority populations and it is the larger cities that have larger school districts.

Large Number of Programs vs. Small Number of Programs

1. Fifty-two percent (52%) of Iowa school districts offered 0-3 gifted programs while 48% offered 4-16 gifted programs. Sixty-five percent (65%) of Iowa school districts offered 0-4 gifted programs while 35% offered 5-16 gifted programs.

2. Of those school districts that offered a large number of gifted programs (4-16), significantly more than expected (55.4% vs. 44.6%) used I.Q. tests as procedure in identifying students for gifted programs than did those school districts that offered a small number of gifted programs (0-3).

3. Of those school districts that offered a large number of gifted programs (4-16), significantly more than expected (50.6% vs. 49.4%) used achievement tests

as a procedure in identifying gifted students than did those school districts that offered a small number of gifted programs (0-3).

4. Of those school districts that offered a large number of gifted programs (4-16), significantly more than expected (55.2% vs. 44.8%) used procedures other than or along with I.Q. tests, achievement tests, grades, teacher nomination, and peer nomination as a technique in identifying students for gifted programs than did school districts that offered a small number of gifted programs (0-3).

5. Of those school districts that offered a large number of gifted programs (4-16), significantly more than expected (64% vs. 36%) had special requirements for teachers in their gifted programs than did those schools that offered a small number of gifted programs (0-3).

6. Of those school districts that offered a large number of gifted programs (4-16), significantly more than expected (54.4% vs. 45.6%) had teachers in gifted programs participate in inservice programs on a regular basis than did those school districts that offered a small number of gifted programs (0-3).

7. Of those school districts that offered a large number of gifted programs (4-16), significantly more than expected (52% vs. 48%) had all their teachers

participate in inservice programs on a regular basis than did those school districts that offered a small number of gifted programs (0-3).

8. Of those school districts that offered a large number of gifted programs (4-16), significantly more than expected (55.6% vs. 44.4%) used the museum as a resource in their gifted programs than did those school districts that offered a small number of gifted programs (0-3).

9. Of those school districts that offered a large number of gifted programs (4-16), significantly more than expected (58.6% vs. 41.4%) used industry as a resource in their gifted programs than did those school districts that offered a small number of gifted programs (0-3).

10. Of those school districts that offered a large number of gifted programs (4-16), significantly more than expected (58% vs. 42%) used government agencies as a resource in their gifted programs than did those school districts that offered a small number of gifted programs (0-3).

11. Of those school districts that offered a large number of gifted programs (4-16), significantly more than expected (58% vs. 42%) used mentors as a resource in their gifted programs than did those school districts that offered a small number of gifted

programs (0-3).

12. Of those school districts with a large number of gifted programs (4-16), significantly more than expected (53.1% vs. 46.9%) had goals for their gifted programs written at the district level as opposed to the building level than did those school districts that offered a small number of gifted programs (0-3).

13. Of those school districts with a large number of gifted programs (4-16), significantly less than expected (22.2% vs. 77.8%) had no written goals for gifted students written at any level than did not those school districts that offered a small number of gifted programs (0-3).

14. Of those school districts with a large number of gifted programs (4-16), significantly more than expected (53% vs. 47%) included administrators in their advisory group for gifted programs than did those school districts that offered a small number of gifted programs (0-3).

15. Of those school districts with a large number of gifted programs (4-16), significantly more than expected (69.2% vs. 30.8%) included others besides or along with students, parents, teachers, and administrators in an advisory group for gifted programs than did those school districts that offered a small number of gifted programs (0-3).

16. Of those school districts with a large number of gifted programs (4-16), significantly less than expected (35.8% vs. 64.2%) did not have an advisory group for their gifted program than did not those school districts with a small number of gifted programs (0-3).

17. Of those school districts with a large number of gifted programs (4-16), significantly more than expected (58% vs. 42%) established procedures for evaluating their gifted programs at the district level as opposed to the building level than did those school districts with a small number of gifted programs (0-3).

18. Of those school districts with a large number of gifted programs (4-16), significantly less than expected (16.6% vs. 83.3%) did not establish any special procedures for evaluating gifted programs at even the district or building levels than did not those school districts with a small number of gifted programs (0-3).

19. The school districts with a large number of gifted programs (4-16): (a) had significantly more population (M=1814 vs. M=776; 2.3 times as many); (b) had significantly less teachers with bachelor's degrees (M=71.8 vs. M=79.2) but significantly more teachers with master's degrees (M=27.6 vs. M=20); (c) had significantly more pre-school students (M=7.8 vs.

M=3.6; 2.16 times as many); (d) had significantly more elementary students (M=930.5 vs. M=395; 2.3 times as many); (e) had significantly more middle/junior high school students (M=373 vs. 168; over twice as many); (f) had significantly more senior high school students (M=495 vs. M=226; over twice as many); (g) had more black students (M= .64 vs. M=.26; almost 2½ times as many); (h) had significantly more Hispanic students (M=.76 vs. M=.26; almost three times as many); (i) had significantly more Asian students (M=.75 vs. M=.42; over one-and-three-quarter times as many); (j) had significantly less Native-American students (M=.81 vs. M=1.5; half as many) than did those school districts with a small number of gifted programs (0-3).

Recommendations

1. The largest enrollment school districts (5600+) and those school districts that offered a large number of gifted programs (4-16) differed in favor of these two groups from the smallest-enrollment school districts (0-199) and those school districts that offered a small number of gifted programs (0-3) in almost all variables on the survey even though only the statistically significant portions were reported. These differences in standards, resources, and procedures gave an advantage to larger school districts because there are greater resources of material and personnel and greater

flexibility and quality in being a larger-sized school district. Because the prime responsibility of state legislatures is to act in the public interest and to resolve matters of public concern (Ruppert, 1996), it is recommended that the Iowa legislature act in the public interest by passing legislation that would force consolidation of school districts so that school districts would be large enough to provide at least a minimally adequate educational programs.

2. Even with the advantage of being larger and being superior to the small school districts in many aspects of this survey, the superiorities of these school districts were still inadequate because they were not high enough so that almost all of the school districts provided the necessary standards, resources, and procedures used in offering their programs. It is recommended that the Iowa Department of Education encourage both large and small school districts to raise their standards, provide greater resources, and more stringent procedures for their gifted programs.

3. With only 38.5% doing so, it is recommended that the smallest-enrollment school districts inservice their teacher of gifted programs on a regular basis. This recommendation also applies to those school districts that offer a small number of gifted programs since only 45.6% did so. Because of the changes in

gifted education today, teachers of gifted students will become less and less effective as time progresses unless they are inserviced regularly.

4. With only 19.3% and 44.4% doing so, respectively, it is recommended that the smallest-enrollment school districts and those school districts that offer a small number of gifted programs use museums and industries as resources for their gifted programs. Recognizing that these districts are rural and small, a consortium of them would be able to provide a large enough number of students in order to bus them to museums and industries so that these resources would not be denied gifted students because of the size of the school district.

5. With only 38.5% doing so, it is recommended that the smallest school districts have goals written at the district level rather than the building level. A uniform policy is generally a fair policy and this can be most often attained at the district level.

6. It is recommended that the 39.5% of the smallest school districts which did not have special procedures for their gifted programs established at the district level, do so.

7. It is recommended that all Iowa school districts, both those that offer a large number of gifted programs and those that offer a small number of gifted programs, include and use I.Q. and achievement tests as two of

many procedures in identifying students for gifted programs.

8. With only 36% doing so, it is recommended that those school districts that offer a small number of gifted programs mandate special requirements for teacher of their gifted programs. Belcastro (1987) recommended that all programs for the gifted should have teachers who are thoroughly trained in gifted education and Maker (1975) offers minimum criteria for the selection of teachers of the gifted. The importance of a knowledgeable and well-trained teacher cannot be overestimated neither in gifted nor regular education programs because the single most important variable in determining the success of any approach is the teacher (Callahan & Renzulli, 1977; Gage & Berliner, 1979).

9. With only 42% doing so, it is recommended that those school districts that offer a small number of gifted programs use government agencies as a resource in their gifted programs. Government agencies have knowledgeable and well-staffed personnel who are often willing to travel to any school to present their programs, especially when several small schools gather for the same presentation. When necessary to travel to the government agency, several small schools could coordinate their efforts so that a reasonable number of

gifted students could made attendance economically feasible.

10. With only 42% doing so, it is recommended that mentors be used as a resource in their gifted programs by those school districts that offered a small number of gifted programs. Every community no matter how small has capable and expert persons who are more than willing to be mentors. Where specific expertise cannot be found locally and where there is a will on the part of the school district administration, travel to these mentors could be arranged.

11. Without goals, any program is rudderless and progress cannot be measured. It is recommended that both those school districts that offer a large number of gifted programs and those that offer a small number of gifted programs set goals for their gifted programs and do this at the district level.

12. It is recommended that not only those school districts that offer a small number of gifted programs but also those that offer a larger number of gifted programs include administrators in an advisory group for gifted programs. An administrator in an advisory group for a gifted program develops ownership in that program and is more likely to support it financially and morally.

13. With only 42% doing so, it is recommended that

those school districts with a small number of gifted programs establish procedures for evaluating their gifted programs at the district level as opposed to the building level. Worse, 83.3% of these districts did not have any procedures for evaluation at any level. Improvement can only be made when weaknesses or inadequacies in programs are made known; this can only be done by evaluations of these programs. Most often, reliable and valid evaluations are found at the district level.

Conclusions

1. School districts with the smallest enrollments (0-199) and school districts with the smallest number of gifted programs (0-3) in Iowa fall short of principles of excellence and need improvement in the standards, resources, and procedures used in offering their gifted programs.

2. Several studies and research syntheses have demonstrated the effectiveness of calculators and computers for improving students' cognitive outcomes (Bitter & Hatfield, 1993; Huang & Wayman, 1996; Liao, 1992; Niemiec & Walberg, 1992; Ryan, 1991). Because of their greater intellectual ability, gifted students are best able to make use of calculators and computers in their mathematics and other classes. All gifted programs should integrate computers into their

curriculum and use them often. This includes e-mail, the World Wide Web, word processing, and searches for information--all available on the Internet, which should be available for the use of all students but especially gifted students.

3. The average curriculum units offered and taught by public school districts in Iowa in the 1994-1995 school year varied by enrollment categories; in the subject areas of English/Language Arts, Mathematics, Science, Social Studies, and Foreign Languages, as the enrollment category increased, the number of average curriculum units offered increased. The discrepancy between the lowest enrollment category (<250) and the highest enrollment category (7500+) in average curriculum units taught in these subject areas varied from 4.5 to 9.3 times as many in favor of the highest enrollment category (Iowa Department of Education, 1995). In order to offer gifted and all students in Iowa the opportunity to take as many curriculum units as desired and to develop these students to their fullest potential, school consolidation is imperative in order to form high enrollment schools.

4. Gifted and average students use different reading process strategies (Fehrenbach, 1991). Therefore, it is concluded that gifted and average students be taught reading separately and also taught separately in those

subject areas requiring reading comprehension.

5. Gifted young women fare well psychologically in a supportive early college entrance program. Accelerants in their first year made consistent gains in personality adjustment which is indicative of healthy personality growth (Cornell, Callahan, & Loyd, 1991). Iowa parents need have no fears about and should encourage early college entrance for their gifted female offspring.

References

Belcastro, F. (1987). Elementary pull-out programs for the intellectually gifted--boon or bane? Roeper Review, 9, 208-212.

Belcastro, F. (1995). Richardson Study: U.S. vs. Iowa. (Will appear in January 1996 issue of ERIC). Reston, VA: Council for Exceptional Children. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. EJ 304138).

Belcastro, F. (1996a). Richardson Study: Characteristics of five gifted programs in Iowa. Manuscript submitted for publication.

Belcastro, F. (1996b). Richardson Study: Iowa results. Manuscript submitted for publication.

Bitter, G. G., & Hatfield, M. M. (1993). Integration of the math explorer calculator into the mathematics curriculum: The calculator project report. Journal of Computers in Mathematics and Science Teaching, 12(1), 59-81.

Callahan, C. M., & Renzulli, J. S. (1977). The effectiveness of a creativity training program in the language arts. Gifted Child Quarterly, 4, 538-545.

Cornell, D. G., Callahan, C. M., & Loyd, B. H. (1991). Personality growth of female early college entrants: A controlled, prospective study. Gifted Child Quarterly, 35, 135-143.

Cox, J., Daniel, N., & Boston, B.O. (1985). Educating able learners: Programs and promising practices. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.

Fehrenbach, C. R. (1991). Gifted/average readers: Do they use the same reading strategies? Gifted Child Quarterly, 35, 125-127.

Gage, N. L., & Berliner, D. C. (1979). Educational psychology. Chicago: Rand McNally.

Huang, S. L., & Waxman, H. C. (1996). Classroom observations of middle-school students' technology use in mathematics. School Science and Mathematics, 96, 28-30.

Iowa Department of Education. (1995). The annual condition of education report: A report on elementary, secondary, and community college education in Iowa (6th ed.). Des Moines, IA: Author.

Kelly, J. (1989). Recommendation: Comprehensive programming. G/C/T, 12, 54-56.

Liao, Y. K. (1992). Effects of computer-assisted instruction on cognitive outcomes: A meta-analysis. Journal of Research on Computing in Education, 24. 367-380.

Maker, C. J. (1975). Training teachers for the gifted and talented: A comparison of models. Reston, VA: The Council for Exceptional Children.

Niemiec, R. P., & Walberg, H. J. (1992). The effects of computers in learning. International Journal of Educational Research, 17, 88-108.

Pagano, R. (1994). Understanding statistics in the behavioral sciences (4th ed.). Minneapolis, MN: West.

Ruppert, S. (1996). The politics of remedy: State legislative views on higher education. Littleton, CO: Educational Systems Research.

Ryan, A. W. (1991). Meta-analysis of achievement effects of microcomputer applications in the elementary schools. Educational Administration Quarterly, 27, 161-184.

APPENDIX A

THE RICHARDSON STUDY

IOWA QUESTIONNAIRE

The Sid Richardson Foundation in Fort Worth, Texas, is continuing its national study of elementary and secondary programs for gifted students. We are collecting data on programs that are identified as special programs for the gifted and also on other provisions for the most able and talented students which may not be identified as "Gifted Programs."

This questionnaire, though rather lengthy, should require only a few minutes of your time since not all of it will be applicable to any one district. You will notice that the programs are identified by a Roman numeral in the margin and that they are separated by double lines. We request that you complete the General Information section at the beginning and any other sections which apply to your district. The results of the study will be available state-wide to all who are concerned with this important issue.

An addressed envelope, requiring no postage, is enclosed for your convenience.

GENERAL INFORMATION

School District_____
Name of District

Name of person completing questionnaire_____

Person's title_____ Telephone No._____

Address_____
Street

_____ _____
City S.ate Zip

A. What is the total population of the area served by your school district?

____(1) Less than 50,000 ____(2) 50,000-100,000 ____(3) 100,001-200,000
____(4) 200,001-300,000 ____(5) 300,001-400,000 ____(6) 400,001-500,000
____(7) More than 500,000

B. Please list the number of certified staff members in your district.

____(1)

C. What percentage of teachers have as their highest degree:

____(1) B.S., B.A. ____(2) M.S., M.A., M.Ed. ____(3) Ph.D., D.Ed.

D. Is the school:

____(1) Public ____(2) Private
____(3) Parochial ____(4) Other. Please specify._____

_____

E. Is the student population:

____(1) All male ____(2) All female ____(3) Co-educational

F. Please list the number of students enrolled in:

____(1) Pre-School ____(2) Elementary (Inc. K.)
____(3) Middle/Junior High ____(4) Senior High

G. The student ethnic ration is:

____(1) % Anglo ____(2) % Black ___(3) % Hispanic
____(4) % Asian ____(5) % Native American
____(6) Other. Please specify._____

H. What percentage of students receive free or reduced-priced lunch?

____(1) None ____(2) List the percentage who do.

I. Check the procedures included in identifying students for special programs or provisions for gifted students.

____(1) None ____(2) I.Q. tests ____(3) Achievement tests
____(4) Grades ____(5) Teacher nomination ____(4) Peer nomination
____(7) Other. Please specify._____

J. Are there special requirements for teachers in these programs?

____(1) No ____(2) Yes. Please specify._____
_____

K. The following staff members participate in inservice training on a regular basis:

____(1) None ____(2) Teachers in gifted/talented programs
____(3) All teachers ____(4) Counselors ____(5) Administrators
____(6) Other. Please specify._____

L. Is a staff member at the supervisory ot administrative level responsible for the gifted program?

____(1) Yes. Specify title._____ ____(2) No

M. Check the following resources your program uses.

____(1) Library ____(2) Museum ____(3) Industry ____(4) Government agency
____(5) Mentors ____(6) Others. Please specify._____
_____

N. Does the district have a written philosophy for educating gifted students?

____(1) Yes ____(2) No

O. Goals for gifted/talented students are written:

____(1) For the district level ____(2) For the building level ____(3) Not at all

P. An advisory group for the gifted/talented program includes:

____(1) Students ____(2) Parents ____(3) Teachers ____(4) Administrators
____(5) Others. Please specify._____ ____(6) Does not exist

Q. Special procedures for evaluating the gifted/talented program are established.

____(1) At the district level ____(2)At the building level ____(3) Neither

R. What is the per pupil expenditure in your district?

____(1) Less than $1,500 ____(2) $1,500-$2,000 ____(3) $2,001-$2,500
____(4) $2,501-$3,000 ____(5) $3,001-$3,500 ____(6) $3,501-$4,000
____(7) $4,001-$4,500 ____(8) $4,501-$5,000 ____(9) More than $5,000

S. Are special additional budgetary provisions made for gifted/talented students?

____(1) Yes ____(2) No

T. If special funding is available for gifted/talented, check any of the following sources which apply:

____(1) State ____(2) Local ____(3) Federal ____(4) Private
____(5) Other. Please specify._____

U. Please list the program or school in your district which you recommend for a visit from an outside observer.

Name of school_____

Address_____
Street

_____
City State Zip

Person to contact_____Position_____

Telephone No._____ / _____
AC

I. ENRICHMENT IN THE REGULAR CLASSROOM. The teacher with or without special assistance, provides enrichment activities for gifted students in a heterogeneous classroom. We include individualized instruction in this category.

V. How many students participate in the enrichment activities?

____(1) All of the class ____(2) Those identified as gifted/talented
____(3) Those identified as gifted/talented plus others, but not including the entire class.

W. How much time is allotted to enrichment activities per week?

____(1) Less than 3 hours ____(2) 3-5 hours ____(3) More than 5 hours

X. Which content areas are enriched?

____(1) Math ____(2) Science ____(3) English/
____(4) Social Studies ____(5) Multidisciplinary Language Arts
____(6) Other. Please specify._____

Y. The curricular materials used in the enrichment activities are:

____(1) The same as those used in the basic program.
____(2) Different from those used in the basic program.

Z. What strategies are used in the enrichment activities?

____(1) Group instruction ____(2) Individual instruction
____(3) Special projects ____(4) Puzzles and games
____(5) Other. Please specify._____

II. PART-TIME SPECIAL CLASS. The gifted student is with a heterogeneous class part of the time but is with students of similar ability part of the time. At the elementary level, this provision might be described as a "pull-out" program; on the secondary level it would include honors classes. Resource rooms are considered later as a separate category.

AA. How many days per week does the special class meet?

____(1) 1 day per week ____(2) 2-4 days per week ____(3) 5 days per week

BB. What is the length of each class session?

____(1) Less than 1 hour ____(2) 1-2 hours ____(3) More than 2 hours

CC. Which content areas are studied in the special class?

____(1) Math ____(2) Science ____(3) English/ Language Arts
____(4) Social Studies ____(5) Multidisciplinary
____(6) Other. Please specify._____

DD. What strategies are used in the special class?

____(1) Group instruction ____(2) Individual instruction
____(3) Special projects ____(4) Puzzles and games
____(5) Other. Please specify._____

EE. Do the regular classroom teacher and the special class teacher co-ordinate their curricular plans:

____(1) Regularly ____(2) Occasionally ____(3) Not at all

FF. Is a student required to make up work covered in the regular classroom during his/her absence?

____(1) Yes ____(2) No

III. FULL-TIME SPECIAL CLASS. At the elementary level, this might be a self contained or departmentalized classroom of high-ability students. At the secondary level, this might be a single course in which the student's curriculum in enriched and accelerated. See XV for situations where two or more classes are integrated and fast-paced.

GG. Which content areas are studied in the special class?

____(1) Math ____(2) Science ____(3) English/ Language Arts
____(4) Social Studies ____(5) Multidisciplinary
____(6) Other. Please specify._____

HH. Are the curricular materials the same as those studied in regular classes?

____(1) Yes ____(2) No

II. How are students assigned to special classes?
____(1) Specific selection criteria ____(2) Self-selection

JJ. Is the amount of curricular material covered:
____(1) About the same as in the regular classes ____(2) Greater than in the regular classes

---

IV. INDEPENDENT STUDY. A student chooses certain areas for investigation and assumes a high degree of responsibility for meeting objectives.

KK. How much time is allotted to independent studies per week?
____(1) Less than 3 hours ____(2) 3-5 hours ____(3) More than 5 hours

LL. In which content areas do students engage in independent study?
____(1) Math ____(2) Science ____(3) English/
____(4) Social Studies ____(5) Multidisciplinary Language Arts
____(6) Other. Please specify._____

MM. What resources do the students use in indpendent study?
____(1) Staff ____(2) Library ____(3) Community ____(4) Laboratory
____(5) Other. Please specify._____

NN. How is a student's independent study progress evaluated?
____(1) Self ____(2) Teacher
____(3) Other. Please specify._____

V. ITINERANT TEACHER. A teacher with special skills in gifted education teaches gifted students in more than one school on a regular basis.

OO. How many schools do itinerant teachers serve?
____(1) Less than 5 ____(2) 5-10 ____(3) More than 10

PP. Do itinerant teachers teach in:
____(1) The regular classroom teacher's room
____(2) A permanent classroom assigned for the purpose
____(3) In a variety of settings

QQ. Do the regular classroom teacher and the itinerant teacher co-ordinate their curricular plans?
____(1) Regularly ____(2) Occasionally ____(3) Not at all

RR. What is the average number of miles driven by an itinerant teacher per week, exclusive of the distance to and from the home?
____(1) Less than 50 miles ____(2) 50-100 miles ____(3) More than 100 miles

---

VI. MENTORSHIPS. We define mentorships as a program which assigns gifted students to work or study with adults who have special knowledge or skills in the students' areas of interest. We include the High School Executive Internship Program in this category.

SS. How much school time is allotted to a student to work with a mentor?
____(1) None; it is an out of school program ____(2) Less than 3 hours per week
____(3) 3-5 hours per week ____(4) More than five hours per week

TT. Is Carnegie credit awarded for work with mentors?
____(1) Yes ____(2) No ____(3) Sometimes

UU. How are mentors selected?
____(1) On a voluntary basis ____(2) Specific criteria ____(3) Recommendations

VV. Who are the mentors?
____(1) School staff ____(2) University faculty
____(3) Business and professional people ____(4) Other. Please specify._____

WW. Do mentors receive special training?
____(1) Yes ____(2) No

XX. Are mentors paid?
____(1) Yes ____(2) No

VII. RESOURCE ROOMS. This might be a corner of the library or an entire room where gifted students go individually or in groups to explore special areas of study.

YY. How much time per week does a student spend in a resource room?
____(2) Less than 3 hours ____(3) 3-5 hours ____(4) More than 5 hours

ZZ. Time scheduled in the resource room is:
____(1) The same each week ____(2) Varied from week to week

AAA. Who is in charge of the resource room?
____(1) Special teacher of the gifted ____(2) Librarian
____(3) Aide ____(4) Parent ____(5) Community Volunteers

BBB. What materials are available in the resource room?
____(1) Books ____(2) Films ____(3) Packets
____(4) Other. Please specify._____

CCC. What equipment is available in the resource room?
____(1) Labarotory equipment ____(2) Shop tools
____(3) Other. Please specify._____

DDD. Where is the resource room located?
____(1) In a separate room ____(2) In the library
___(3) Other. Please specify._____

VIII. SPECIAL SCHOOLS. These include magnet schools which focus on a single discipline as well as those which include the entire spectrum. Also included are residential schools for the gifted.

EEE. The special school is:
____(1) Residential ____(2) Non-residential

FFF. The special school has a:
____(1) General curriculum
____(2) Special area of concentration. Please specify_____

GGG. Is the school considered a magnet school?
____(1) Yes ____(2) No

HHH. How are the students selected?
____(1) Self-selected ____(2) Specific criteria

III. Is the school considered a school for gifted students?
____(1) Yes ___(2) No

JJJ. Do the students pay tuition?
____(1) Yes ____(2) No

KKK. How long has the school been in existence?
____(1) Less than 5 years ____(2) 5-10 years ___(3) More than 10 years

---

IX. EARLY ENTRANCE. We define early entrance as a policy allowing students to enter a school earlier than the normal age for that district.

LLL. At what level(s) is the provision for early entrance made?
____(1) Kindergarten ____(2) First grade
____(3) Middle/Junior High School ____(4) Senior High School

MMM. How many students entered these levels last year due to early entrance policy? List the numbers please.
____(1) Kindergarten ____(2) First grade
____(3) Middle/Junior High School ____(4) Senior High School

NNN. On what basis were early assignments made? Check all that apply.

____(1) Ability test ____(2) Achievement test
____(2) Teacher recommendation ____(4) Parental request
____(5) Other. Please specify._____

OOO. Of the number accepted last year as early entrants, how many continued for at least one full year? List numbers at the appropriate levels please.

____(1) Kindergarten ____(2) First grade
____(3) Middle/Junior High School ____(4) Senior High School

PPP. Last year how many students left high school prior to graduation to enter college or university?

____(1) None ____(2) List the number, please

QQQ. How long has the early-entrance policy existed in your district?

____(1) Less than 5 years ____(2) 5-10 years ____(3) More than 10 years

X. CONTINUOUS PROGRESS. We define continuous progress as a provision for students to progress through the curriculum of one or more subject areas as the required skills are mastered.

RRR. At which level(s) is continuous progress in operation?

____(1) Pre-School ____(2) Elementary (Inc. K)
____(3) Middle/Junior High School ____(4) Senior High School

SSS. In what content areas does continuous progress allow students to advance at their own pace?

____(1) Math ____(2) Science ____(3) Social Studies
____(4) Language Arts (Inc. Reading) ____(5) English
____(6) Foreign Language ____(7) Other. Please specify._____

TTT. On what basis does a student move from one level to another?

____(1) Standardized tests ____(2) Teacher made tests
____(3) Demonstrated competency ____(4) Other. Please specify._____

UUU. What percentage of students are functioning above grade level in one or more content areas this year?

____(1) Less than 5% ____(2) 5-10% ____(3) 11-20% ____(4) More than 20%

VVV. How would you describe the continuous progress program?

____(1) Group instruction ____(2) Individual instruction
____(3) Other. Please specify._____

WWW. How long has the continuous progress program been in operation?

____(1) Less than 5 years ____(2) 5-10 years ____(3) More than 10 years

XI. NONGRADED SCHOOL. We define a nongraded school as one in which the usual labels, such as first grade, have been removed, and students progress at their own pace. Thus, one child might complete what is normally covered in one grade in less than the usual amount of time, and another child might require more than the usual amount of time to gain the skills generally acquired in one year in a graded school system.

XXX. At what level(s) is your district nongraded?

____(1) Pre-School
____(2) Elementary (Inc. K)
____(3) Middle/Junior High School
____(4) Senior High School

YYY. Do some students complete the level(s) checked in fewer years than is normally required?

____(1) Yes
____(2) No

ZZZ. If you answered "Yes" how many students:

____(1) Received additional enrichment only
____(2) Were offered curricula from the next higher level but did not leave the first school
____(3) Moved on to the next higher school

AAAA. How long has your district been nongraded?

____(1) Less than 5 years
____(2) 5-10 years
____(3) More than 10 years

XII. MODERATE ACCELERATION. We define moderate acceleration as any kind of provision which allows a student to complete the grades K-12 in less than thirteen years but more than ten.

BBBB. How many students were in last year's graduating class?

____(1) Less than 100
____(2) 100-500
____(3) More than 500

CCCC. Of this number, how many spent fewer than 13 years but more than 10 in grade K-12?

____(1) Less than 2%
____(2) 2-5%
____(3) More than 5%

DDDD. How long has your school had a policy which allowed or encouraged moderate acceleration?

____(1) Less than 2 years
____(2) 2-5 years
____(3) More than 5 years

XIII. RADICAL ACCELERATION. We define radical acceleration as any kind of provision which allows a student to complete grades K-12 in fewer than 11 years.

EEEE. How many students were in last year's graduating class?

____(1) Less than 100
____(2) 100-500
____(3) More than 500

FFFF. Of this number, how many spent fewer than 11 years in grade K-12?

____(1) Less than 1%
____(2) 1-2%
____(3) More than 2%

DDDD. How long has your school had a policy which allowed or encouraged radical acceleration?

____(1) Less than 2 years
____(2) 2-5 years
____(3) More than 5 years

XIV. COLLEGE BOARD ADVANCED PLACEMENT. As the name specifies, we refer to the Advanced Placement of the College Board.

HHHH. How long has your school offered College Board Advanced Placement Courses?
____(1) Less than 5 years ____(2) 5-10 years ____(3) More than 10 years

IIII. In what content areas does your school offer Advanced Placement courses?
____(1) American History ____(2) Art-History ____(3) Biology ____(4) Chemistry
____(5) English Composition/Literature ____(6) English Language/Composition
____(7) European History ____(8) French ____(9) German ____(10) Latin
____(11) Mathematics ____(12) Music ____(13) Physics ____(14) Spanish

JJJJ. How many students completed at least one Advanced Placement course last year? List the number please.
____(1) Sophomores ____(2) Juniors ____(3) Seniors
____(4) Other. Please specify.____

KKKK. How many students took at least one Advanced Placement examination last year? List the number please.
____(1) Sophomores ____(2) Juniors ____(3) Seniors
____(4) Other. Please specify.____

LLLL. What percentage of the examinations received were of:
____(1) "3" ____(2) "4" ____(3) "5"

MMMM. How were the Advanced Placement opportunities offered?
____(1) Conventional classes ____(2) Independent study
____(3) Seminars ____(4) Correspondence courses
____(4) Other. Please specify.____

XV. FAST PACED COURSES. We define fast paced courses as an arrangement which allows a student to complete two or more courses in a discipline in an abbreviated time span.

NNNN. Last year, how many students were enrolled is such courses in:
____(1) Mathematics ____(2) Foreign language ____(3) Science
____(4) Other. Please specify.____

XVI. CONCURRENT OR DUAL ENROLLMENT. We define concurrent or dual enrollment as an arrangment which allows a student to enroll in classes on two campuses. For example, a middle/junior high student who takes one or moreclasses at the high school or a high school student who takes one or more classes on a college campus.

OOOO. How many students enrolled in classes on two campuses last year? Please specify the numbers.
____(1) Middle/Junior High and Senior High combination
____(2) Middle/Junior High and College combination
____(2) Senior High and College combination

PPPP. Of the number who enrolled in classes at both the middle/junior high and senior high, what percentage satisfactorily completed the class?
____(1) Less than 50% ____(2) 50-75% ____(3) 76-99% ____(4) 100%

QQQQ. Of the number who enrolled in classes at both the middle/junior high and college, what percentage satisfactorily completed the class?
____(1) Less than 50% ____(2) 50-75% ____(3) 76-99% ____(4) 100%

RRRR. Of the number who enrolled in classes at both a senior high school and college, what percentage satisfactorily completed the class?
____(1) Less than 50% ____(2) 50-75% ____(3) 76-99% ____(4) 100%

OTHER. If your school has a provision or program for gifted students not listed in any of the above sections, please describe it briefly.

Thank You!

Dr. Frank P. Belcastro
Dept. of Ed./Psychology
University of Dubuque
Dubuque, Iowa 52001