Missouri
DEPARTMENT OF ELEMENTARY & SECONDARY
EDUCATION™

Identifying and Serving Traditionally Underrepresented Gifted Students

Guidance for Missouri School Districts

TABLE OF CONTENTS

The Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE), in response to recommendations in the 2015 Annual Report of the Advisory Council on the Education of Gifted and Talented Students, has produced this document to provide guidance for school districts to more equitably identify and meet the needs of traditionally underrepresented students (racial/ethnic subgroups, low SES, ELL, twice exceptional) in state approved gifted education programs. (Appendix A for definition of terms.)

Equitable Services for All Students

All districts are encouraged to evaluate their gifted program to determine if it is providing equitable service to all students. One recognized way to determine if it is meeting minimal equity targets for participation by student sub groups is by using the 20% equity index rule discussed in the court case McFadden v. Board of Education for Illinois School District U-16 (2013).

"… Although Dr. Ford testified that, ideally, participation in gifted programs by minorities would roughly equal their proportion of the student population, she recognized that a 20% allowance for cultural differences and voluntary exclusion from gifted programs by minorities was to be expected. Thus, with a population of approximately 40% Hispanic, the District should expect approximately 32% of the children in its mainstream gifted program to be Hispanic. The fact that only 2% of the children in SWAS were Hispanic demonstrated to Dr. Ford, and the court, that the District's method of identifying gifted Minority Students was flawed and resulted in an obvious disparate impact on those students by separating them from their gifted white peers."

Districts in Missouri are encouraged to apply the 20 % equity index rule to examine if their school district is providing minimally equitable gifted services for all of its students in all of its schools. If a district determines that the percentage rate of participation of any subgroup is below the equity threshold, it should review its selection process and criteria and develop a more equitable way to identify students in the underrepresented populations.

An example of applying the minimal equity threshold would be: If there are 100 students in the district state approved gifted program, and 10% of the district student population is African American, then an appropriate minimum target for African American participation in the district gifted program would be 8%. If there are 100 students in the district state approved gifted program, and 40% of the district student population is low SES, then an appropriate minimum target for participation in the district gifted program would be 32%. (See Appendix B for calculating subgroup participation.)

Pathways for Identifying Traditionally Underrepresented Student Populations

What follows is guidance for Missouri districts in developing acceptable pathways for identifying traditionally underrepresented student populations (racial/ethnic subgroups, low SES, ELL, twice exceptional) in state approved gifted programs and providing them appropriate services. Enrichment programming for those students that do not meet the qualifying criteria for placement in the state approved gifted program is also proposed. Districts are encouraged to examine all possible alternatives to determine what procedures are the best fit for their specific population of underrepresented students and local circumstances.

Districts are cautioned that they need to establish protocols/criteria for determining which students are included in an underrepresented subgroup. The pathways apply *only* to students included in that specific subgroup. Any pathway a district chooses to use must be approved by the Director of Gifted Education Programs in DESE prior to implementation. The process for approval is to submit (1) district data supporting the conclusion that underrepresentation exists, (2) the rationale for the proposed alternative pathway, (3) the targeted participation goal to be achieved, and (4) the timeline for implementing and evaluating progress toward the stated goal. This request for implementing an identification pathway should be submitted electronically.

The Screening Process

Universal Screening

Best practice for screening all students for gifted programming is to include universal screening in the identification procedures. "Universal Screening" means the systematic assessment of all students within a grade level for identifying students with exceptional ability or potential, especially students from traditionally underrepresented populations.

The intent of a universal screener is to find indicators of exceptionality in all student groups. A universal screener is a tool that allows students to show their ability and potential in a variety of areas. Any instrument used at any point in the identification process should have at least one published study in a peer-reviewed journal reporting validity and reliability information supporting the credibility of the instrument in the identification of gifted students.

A universal screener does not need to be used just for the purpose of identifying gifted students. Data collected through a universal screener should provide the district information to support instructional planning for all students. Universal screening data should be used to inform decisions about which students are referred for additional tests and for building a body of evidence before a decision is made to place them in a gifted program.

Best practice is to have a review team evaluate the results of the screening data and determine if the students identified as demonstrating advanced potential also mirror the demographics in the district.

Review Team

The review team should include at least three people, including at least one person certified in gifted education and one person with training and experience in assessing gifted students. The review team should provide opportunities for input from all teachers working with the student and the student's parents or guardians.

The review team should use a body of evidence upon which to base their determination of students identified as demonstrating potential for placement in the state approved gifted program. The evidence should include, at a minimum, the identification assessment results, and multiple types of measures and data sources.

The review team examines the body of evidence and may make one or more of the following determinations:

- Move to formal gifted placement;
- Determine a student may need to be referred for special education assessment in addition to his/her gifted identification (twice-exceptional students);
- Select new tools to collect additional data;
- Determine data does not support placement at this time;
- Determine enrichment services in specific area(s) are needed.

Body of Evidence

A body of evidence should consist of quantitative and qualitative measures to determine if a student meets the criteria for gifted placement and to build a student profile of strengths and interests. Quantitative assessments provide numerical scores or ratings that can be analyzed or quantified. Qualitative assessments provide interpretive and descriptive information about certain attributes, characteristics, behaviors or performances.

Collection of data for a body of evidence should include assessment results from multiple sources and multiple types of data (e.g., qualitative and quantitative data about achievement, cognitive ability, performance, parent and teacher input, and observations of gifted characteristics/behaviors). The body of evidence contains data used to identify students' strength area(s) and appropriate programming services.

Quantitative Measures

Examples of quantitative assessments are norm-referenced tests (e.g., cognitive and achievement) and criterion referenced tests (e.g., MAP state assessments and curriculum-based measures). The state of Missouri has established the 95th percentile ranking and above as the rule for demonstration of exceptionality on a norm-referenced standardized test.

The review team should keep in mind that non-verbal reasoning ability is not the same as verbal or quantitative reasoning ability in any language. It should never be used in isolation for admission into a gifted/talented program. The use of non-verbal assessments in isolation may even be more likely to exclude a gifted/talented learner who excels in other areas that have greater bearing on school success. For these reasons, screening for giftedness with non-verbal tests should be used as "the test of last resort, not the test of first resort." Instead, we should measure all students in verbal, quantitative, and non-verbal reasoning, and then pay particular attention to the highest scores within each ethnic and/or ELL group.

Local Norms

Districts may choose to use local norms on nationally norm-referenced cognitive and achievement tests to ensure access and inclusion of students from underrepresented populations in gifted programs. (An example might be, using the minimum score of the top 5% of students within the district rather than in the top 5% in the nation.)

Districts are cautioned to use local norms only if they determine that such data will enhance services to student groups who have substantial potential for success in their district gifted program.

The use of local norms on norm-referenced cognitive and achievement tests will not allow a student to be placed in any other district state approved gifted program. Students identified with this approach need to meet the criteria of the receiving district for placement if they move to another school or district.

It is the district's responsibility to explain to parents and students that identification and programming may not continue when students transfer to another district.

Qualitative Measures

Examples of qualitative assessments are: rubrics, performance assessments, observational checklists, and interviews. Advanced performance levels may describe exceptionality on qualitative tools, portfolios, performance assessments, and criterion-referenced tests.

Districts that choose to utilize observational tools for a universal screening need to be aware of the instruments' limitations and cautions. To maintain the validity of these research-based observation tools, districts must develop specific guidelines and procedures for the administration of these tools. Proper administration requires specific training of teachers. A plan for annual training of all new staff involved in identification should be developed. Additionally, there must be a plan for the calibration of the scoring process to ensure inter-rater reliability.

Making Decisions Regarding Student Identification and Placement

Gifted identification should never be just a one-time occurrence during students' K-12 educational experience. Identification should be continuous throughout the school years. In addition, not meeting criteria on a single assessment tool should not prevent further data collection or consideration for gifted identification if other indicators suggest exceptional potential as observed in a body of evidence.

Scaffolding

Information developed in the process of collecting a body of evidence about traditionally underrepresented students may indicate that there are gaps in their content knowledge or basic skills that need to be addressed to help ensure their success in the gifted program. Providing these "scaffolding" opportunities should be considered part of the process of establishing a more equitable state approved gifted program. Scaffolding might consist of, but not be limited to, any of these types of opportunities: type II opportunities in a Response to Intervention (RTI) setting, after school tutoring sessions in specific content areas, providing a time for underrepresented students meeting together for support and encouragement, summer enrichment opportunities, and parent meetings to help explain the program goals and student content and skill expectations.

Enrichment Programming

Students, whose scores on screening tools are not at the level to meet identification and placement criteria for a state approved gifted program, may be recommended by the review team for further data collection and observation or for inclusion in an enrichment program.

An enrichment program might include students who may demonstrate an advanced or even exceptional ability in a particular area, but at this time, do not meet the criteria for gifted placement. Students in an enrichment program should be provided advanced instructional opportunities that might include, but are not limited to, acceleration in specific content areas, flexible ability grouping, and participation on instructional competition teams. As students are presented with additional levels of challenge and rigor, increased achievement may occur. These students may meet the criteria for gifted placement at a later date.

Local districts determine if an enrichment program is appropriate and the length of time in which a student participates. Selection for an enrichment program should not just be included on a list for future identification. Rather, it should result in an appropriate differentiated programming option necessary to develop an academic or talent aptitude and promote achievement and growth. Some students identified gifted in one domain may be part of an enrichment program for a different domain.

Other Considerations Regarding Identification and Programming Decisions

When only cognitive ability assessment data meet the state criteria in a body of evidence (95th percentile or above), the review team may determine that the student is identified with general or specific intellectual ability. This exception to the typical body of evidence is critical in identifying students with exceptional ability who may not yet be performing academically or demonstrating strong interests in the school environment. This student might lack motivation or have gaps in learning, thereby requiring additional guidance and educational support services. Although the criteria for identification may be met by cognitive assessment data, a comprehensive body of evidence is still collected and examined to determine a student's area of academic strength(s) and their affective needs.

Once a student has been identified, programming continues through graduation. Instead of eliminating gifted students who underachieve from gifted programming, efforts should be made to target the source(s) of the students' underachievement and develop individualized interventions based on this information (Rubenstein, et al., 2012).

Identification Issues Specific to Specific Subgroups of Students

Low Income Students

Barriers to the identification of low-income, high-ability learners and their participation in gifted programs exist and are challenging. Removing these barriers will take training and education for educators, changes in identification methods and program designs, and a strong commitment to fostering the talents of all gifted students.

One of the most significant barriers to the identification of low-income, high-ability learners and the development of their abilities and talents is inaccurate perceptions held by teachers and school administrators about the capabilities of these students and the strengths of their families. Inequalities in teacher nomination for gifted programs and a lack of use of performance assessments and other qualitative data may be the most significant reasons why culturally and linguistically diverse students and low-income children are underrepresented in gifted programs (McBee, 2006).

It is not unusual for teachers to assume that students who come from low-income families or homes in which English is not spoken would not be ready for an advanced, challenging curriculum that emphasizes and requires higher-level thinking. Recent research indicates that providing a high powered, enriched curriculum and scaffolding for advanced thinking and questioning skills rather than remediation and direct teaching, was successful in raising the academic achievement of learners of varying ability and socioeconomic levels. Gavin, M. K., Casa, T. M., Adelson, J. L., Carroll, S. R., & Sheffield, L. J. (2009).

Pathways with programming for low-income, high-ability learners should begin in kindergarten (or earlier) and continue through grade 12 and beyond. These pathways need multiple entry points that serve as gateways to advanced programming. Assistance in the form of additional academic support and guidance, extended learning time, and social support must be provided to smooth transitions and enable students to succeed.

After presentations and discussion at the 2012 NAGC National Summit on Low-Income, High-Ability Learners, participants who work closely with these students developed the following list of recommended best practices that is informed by research and practice and follow these general assumptions:

- Poverty and minority status are not the same. Although there is overlap, poverty manifests differently based on geography, ethnicity, and race;
- Poverty is pervasive and includes students from all demographic groups;
- Typical characteristics of gifted students may manifest differently in low-income, high-ability learners.

Identification Practices

Identification practices should be inclusive, culturally responsive, cast a wide net, and begin early to get a holistic assessment of students. Other recommendations include:

- Use multiple and varied types of assessments including tests, observational data, and rating scales with adequate technical qualities (see NAGC position paper on assessment: www.nagc.org,) that are appropriate to students' cultural backgrounds and language;
- Provide multiple entry points into gifted programs (e.g., offer opportunities for students to retest or qualify for programs at later times as their skills develop);
- Create multiple pathways (e.g., qualify on the basis of test scores and/or a portfolio) into gifted programs;
- Evaluate students' potential for advanced study in view of previous learning opportunities by using local and subgroup norms;

- Mine assessment data for patterns of performance that indicate upward trajectories and rapid growth and improvement;
- Present students with challenging curriculum and monitor response as a means to identify and collect evidence of advanced academic potential;
- Identify giftedness for subsequent talent development but also develop talent to subsequently identify giftedness;
- Provide training to all teachers that focus on the importance of respecting and valuing cultural differences, irrespective of socioeconomic status, and prepare them to become better talent spotters for all gifted students.

Programs and Services

Programming and services for low-income, high-ability students must be culturally responsive, should always include challenging curriculum and opportunities for extended contact with peers, and should have a strong focus on the development of both cognitive and psychosocial skills.

Recommendations include:

- Provide challenging, enriching learning experiences to all students as early as preschool;
- Create preparatory programs that intensely front-load challenging curricula aimed at preparing students to succeed in gifted programs;
- Use challenging and enriched instruction with underperforming, high-ability students that is designed to develop advanced skills, rather than remediation, in order to fill in skills or content gaps;
- Provide training in advanced content in areas in which teachers lack a strong background;
- Increase learning time and provide further opportunities for advanced learning through after-school and summer programs;
- Include as a critical aspect of programming opportunities for gifted students to be together so they can form friendships and receive support from peers;
- Create talent development paths for students that are comprised of continuous opportunities for appropriately advanced and enriched curriculum (e.g., pre-AP to AP, Middle Years IB to IB);
- Create partnerships with local institutions of higher education or community organizations in order to provide more comprehensive services such as internships and mentorships to students and augment students' social networks with supportive adults and peers;
- Ensure that curriculum is multicultural and enables students to make connections to their lives;
- Infuse learning opportunities into the curriculum that cultivate psychological skills that support continued commitment to high achievement, including attitudes toward effort and learning;
- Create parent programs that simultaneously build cultural and social capital among families and capitalize on the strengths of families to support their child's talent development.

Twice Exceptional Students

Twice exceptional (2e) individuals evidence exceptional ability and disability, which results in a unique set of circumstances. Their exceptional ability may dominate, hiding their disability; their disability may dominate, hiding their exceptional ability; each may mask the other so neither is recognized or addressed (National Twice-Exceptional Community of Practice Definition - 2e CoP). Twice exceptional students may perform below, at or above grade level.

Identification Practices

There is no single identification method for twice exceptional students. As with all students, it is important to use a combination of tests, rating scales, and other measures. In the case of 2e, however, it is essential to take

into consideration the possible interaction of students' exceptionalities. Thus, the following elements must be considered as part of an identification process addressing twice exceptional students:

- Flexibility in the use of test data for determining gifted program eligibility that include subtest scores to denote discrepancies between ability and achievement;
- Including Gifted Education teachers on the teacher support teams responsible for referrals and further evaluation of twice-exceptional populations;
- Use of traditional and nontraditional data that further demonstrates student strength areas including tests for gifted identification, teacher, parent, and student nominations, student product assessments, behavior checklists, record review, portfolio assessment, and progress monitoring;
- Portfolio with outside-school assessments and student products.

Programs and Services

It is necessary to offer twice-exceptional students high quality, challenging curriculum to allow them to rise to their potential. Failing or neglecting the process of identifying twice-exceptional students with gifted abilities often causes them to slide through school without much effort. Many unchallenged twice-exceptional gifted children never learn to work hard during their school experience. They often become disillusioned with the educational process. It is important that these students be offered challenging curriculum in order for them to develop strong work habits, feelings of accomplishment, perseverance, and to develop their intellectual potential.

Ongoing collaboration among special education professionals, general education professionals, gifted education professionals, and families is critical for identification and long-term planning for these students. It is essential that any disability be identified so appropriate services can be provided.

The following recommendations are suggested for addressing the needs of 2e students:

- Enriched/advanced educational opportunities that develop the child's interests, gifts and talents while also meeting the child's learning needs;
- Simultaneous supports that ensure the child's academic success and social-emotional well-being, such as accommodations, interventions, and specialized instruction;
- Programming should have as its goal dual differentiation – managing the disability while also developing the ability;
- In-service training for general, special, and gifted education teachers on the characteristics and needs of twice-exceptional students.

English Language Learners

Success of identifying and serving high-ability English Language Learners is enhanced by the establishment of formal channels of communication among teachers of gifted programming, teachers of English Language Learner programs, and classroom teachers. Discussions during implementation should include ways to: (1) maximize an English Language Learner's ability to express knowledge of content while minimizing their need to rely on English to express it, (2) understand that the concept of giftedness within the boundaries of an English Language Learner's culture may vary from the traditional meaning of gifted, (3) resolve the individualistic identification of gifted students within cultural contexts that highly value group solidarity, and (4) overcome the discrimination that results from believing limited English fluency indicates a lack of academic potential.

Characteristics of English Language Learners

Gifted English Language Learners have varying degrees of the following characteristics:

- acquires a second language rapidly;
- shows high ability in mathematics;
- displays a mature sense of diverse cultures and languages;
- code switches easily (think in both languages);
- demonstrates an advanced awareness of American expressions;
- translates at an advanced level (oral);
- navigates appropriate behaviors successfully within both cultures.

The researchers derived these characteristics from their earlier work called Project GOTCHA (Galaxies of Thinking and Creative Heights of Achievement) that emphasizes an English Language Learner's unique creative abilities.

Use of Multiple Sources of Identification Information

The Missouri Department of Education requires multiple selection criteria for identifying gifted and talented students from the total student population. This approach involves obtaining student information from several quantitative and qualitative sources, and is helpful in making accurate referrals. The multiple criteria used to identify English Language Learner students for gifted programming may involve any combination of the following:

- English language proficiency tests;
- acculturation scales;
- input from the student's cultural group;
- prior academic performance in the child's home school; and
- parent interviews.

In addition, it is helpful to consider other factors, such as:

- assessment data;
- student observations;
- performance-based indicators;
- portfolio assessments;
- teacher and/or parent nominations; and
- behavioral rating scales.

How information from multiple sources is used is just as important as what information is used. The following will provide some perspectives to consider when using the various criteria to screen English Language Learners for gifted/talented programs.

- Without understanding a student's level of English proficiency, any attempt at assessing their other abilities is premature. An English language proficiency screener is administered when a child first enters school to see if that student qualifies for English language services. If they do, then their English language proficiency is assessed yearly with the ACCESS for ELLs 2.0 assessment (provided through the WIDA consortium) until the student reaches a level of English proficiency that entitles them to exit the ESL/ELL program.

- Students in different phases of English language acquisition have inherently different educational needs; therefore, knowing a child's English proficiency level is vital in deciding on their placement in a gifted/talented program. Results from English proficiency tests offer descriptors of the child's English acquisition level that range from "Level 1 - Entering" to "Level 6 - Reaching" in the areas of listening, speaking, reading, and writing.

- Considering a child's level of English proficiency when making decisions about placement in gifted/talented programming is not meant to be used as an exclusionary tool. Instead, it should be used to provide insight into the child's educational profile and to compliment other information provided to the review team. For example, if a child is at the Entering or Beginning levels of English acquisition, then it is not appropriate for the

review team to consider scores from verbal domains on tests written in English. Instead, it would be more appropriate to assess the English Language Learner's ability to verbally comprehend in their own language and compare their level of verbal skills to other students who are at similar proficiency levels. In addition, the review team could observe their performance within other symbol systems (i.e., quantitative, non-verbal).

Assessment Data: A Multi-Edged Sword

When an English Language Learner takes a test of academic content in English, they have a dual challenge. First, the student must understand the language, then respond to the content. The end result is that the student's lack of English skills will likely affect their test performance.

Suggestions to lessen the possible negative impact:

- Provide an interpreter to answer questions;
- Use visuals to help the student understand what is being tested;
- Employ test tasks such as drawing, sequencing or matching pictures and/or concepts and using graphic organizers;
- When testing quantitative achievement and reasoning, use problems with "language free" calculations but be aware that not all cultures use the same symbols for math operations;
- Avoid using timed tests or requiring that tests be timed;
- Permit the use of a translation dictionary;
- Read the test directions for the student (for non-reading tests); and/or offer word pronunciations or meanings when this type of assistance does not influence valid assessment of the subject of skills tested;
- Educators should take all possible steps to maximize a student's ability to express knowledge of content while minimizing the need to rely on English to express these ideas;
- At the same time, it should be remembered that for many English Language Learners their culture and experiences are very different from those of the people who design and excel on assessment and ability tests.

Home Language Testing

Some educators argue that testing a child in their first language will reduce assessment errors and increase test validity. They suggest that tests in the student's home language may be free of the types of cultural differences and nuances that are subject to misinterpretation. Unfortunately, for English Language Learners whose heritage language is other than Spanish, translated tests are rarely an option. Few, if any, standardized measures of ability and achievement in languages, such as Bosnian or Vietnamese, are available to school districts.

Even when the tests are given in the first language, they may not accurately measure English Language Learner's verbal abilities. Translated tests still contain items that may be misinterpreted due to the translation process itself. In addition, geographic variations in the student's first language may cause difficulty for English Language Learners whose regional dialect is not the language of the test.

In most cases, children's verbal abilities in their first language tend to decrease during the time they are away from their home cultures and their first language is not taught at school. This decrease often coincides with the time they are acquiring English in their U.S. schools. For students such as these, non-verbal tests may be the most culturally fair way of measuring global ability.

When available, another option is to use an interpreter. It is critically important when selecting an interpreter that they are fluent in the technical language of testing (the terms used to instruct the student on how to take the test), as well as the child's heritage language. It is also key that the interpreter does not hesitate to ask for clarification when necessary.

Non-Verbal Assessments

Non-verbal assessments, by definition, do not rely on language to complete, so some researchers are convinced that these tests provide a more equitable method of identifying gifted/talented students from historically underrepresented populations. There may also be a more appropriate means of assessing bilingual students. But their suitability for English Language Learners depends on their not having elaborate verbal directions written in English.

Some scholars argue that academic proficiency relies on verbal and quantitative reasoning abilities, not on non-verbal reasoning abilities. So students who will most likely be successful in school are those who are capable of reasoning verbally. But what should we do about the English Language Learners who have not been exposed to the English language enough to develop verbal reasoning skills? Waiting three to seven years for them to acquire English proficiency is hardly a viable option.

One solution is to assess students in all three symbol systems of language: verbal reasoning, non-verbal/spatial reasoning, and quantitative reasoning. That is, non-verbal assessment should not be used in isolation to identify gifted/talented English Language Learners.

If an ELL who has been in a U.S. school for one year has a high score on the Naglieri Non-Verbal Abilities Tests (NNAT) or the non-verbal subtest of the CogAT, they would also have to demonstrate upper level accomplishment in the particular subject area (such as math or reading) in which they will be placed in gifted programming. In addition, they would have to have a high score in comparison to other ELLs who had been in a U.S. school for the same length of time. In this sense, the use of non-verbal scores adds to the student's portfolio, but does not make or break the admission decision.

Programs and Services

Ideally, attempts to identify English Language Learners for inclusion into gifted/talented programs should begin when they first enroll in school, if such programming options are available at their grade level. In this way, a student's mastery of English is not a requirement for consideration. Even if programming options do not begin immediately, English Language Learners should be considered for inclusion at the earliest time possible in their educational career.

Once identified, some possible options for gifted/talented programming that welcome English Language Learners include the following:

- A curriculum that is inclusive of the students' interests and allows them to make choices in what they want to learn, including a focus on cultural themes;
- Expansion beyond addressing intellectual talent, by including leadership, creativity, and art;
- Hands-on units that address the needs of gifted/talented English Language Learners once they are admitted into programming;
- Classes in Spanish (or other heritage) culture and rhetoric, as well as AP language classes in the English Language Learner's First language;
- Translation of written class assignment instructions into the first language and more time to complete the assignments;
- Collaboration of English as a Second Language (ESL) teachers to help English Language Learners express their ideas verbally and in writing in their first language;
- Bilingual activities that involve English Language Learners and native-English speakers;
- Having an older bilingual student serve as a mentor for a younger student. The benefits are greatest when the students share the same cultural background. The older student generally serves as a role model of success for the younger student.

- Involving parents in their children's education. Most parents are eager to be involved. However, educators need to be aware of several unique issues that affect these parents' participation and engagement. When asking parents of an English Language Learner to take an active role in their child's schooling, it is important to keep in mind the following questions: How long have they resided in the United States? Would you need an interpreter to communicate with the parents? How supportive are the school and community toward the parents and their children? What are the parents' prior experiences with schools in their heritage country and in the United States? What is the parent's work schedule and are there transportation complications?

Summary Comments

Identification and placement should be a comprehensive process set by the local district that encompasses procedures, materials, and personnel for successful identification practices across schools and student groups. Implementation of this process with fidelity is critical for the integrity of the gifted program.

These guidelines attempt to provide local school districts with decision points about how referrals are sought, what screening method and tools could be conducted, what qualitative and quantitative tools could be used for recognizing strengths, the composition of the review team; and placement decisions.

The result of identification is programming. The ultimate outcome of identification is that all gifted students attain career and college goals; act with self-esteem and self-advocacy; and are creative, productive members of society.

In developing this guidance document, we have used information from several documents created in other states. The reader is encouraged to read these documents in their entirety to gain a greater understanding of the issues involved in the appropriate identification and serving of underrepresented populations. These documents will also provide excellent examples of how other states are addressing these issues. Special thanks go to the gifted education leaders in three states, Jacqueline Medina in Colorado, Michael Hall in Montana, and Rosanne Malek in Iowa, for granting us permission to use their state documents as sources of information. We used information extensively from these documents.

WORKS REFERENCED

These materials have been adapted from a document created and used by the Colorado Department of Education. Colorado Department of Education, Gifted *Identification, Chapter 3 - Revised*, March 2015 https://www.cde.state.co.us/gt/giftedidentification

Iowa Department of Education, The Connie Belin and Jacqueline N. Blank International Center for Gifted Education and Talent Development 2008, *Identifying Gifted and Talented English Language Learners Grades K-12,* https://www.educateiowa.gov/documents/advanced-learning-opportunities/2013/03/identifying-gifted-and-talented-english-language

Ford, D. Y. (2013). Recruiting and retaining culturally different students in gifted education. Waco, TX: Prufrock Press

Gavin, M. K., Casa, T. M., Adelson, J. L., Carroll, S. R., & Sheffield, L. J. (2009). The impact of advanced curriculum on the achievement of mathematically promising elementary students. *Gifted Child Quarterly, 53*, 188–202

Johnsen, S. K. (2004). Identifying gifted students: A practical guide. Waco, TX: Prufrock Press

McBee, M. T. (2006). A descriptive analysis of referral sources for gifted identification screening by race and socioeconomic status. *Journal of Advanced Academics, 17*, 103–111

McFadden v. Board of Education for Illinois School District U-16, in the United States District Court for the Northern District of Illinois, Eastern Division, July 9, 2013

Montana Office of Public Instruction, *Montana Gifted and Talented Education Program, Planning Guide and Strategies, Serving Montana's High Ability/High Potential Students*, http://www.opi.mt.gov/pdf/Gifted/GTPlanningGuideStrategies.pdf

Morrison, William F. and Rizza, Mary G., Bowling Green University, Creating a Toolkit for Identifying Twice-Exceptional Students, Journal for the Education of the Gifted. Vol. 31, No.1, 2007, pp.57-76, Prufrock Press Inc.

Olszewski-Kubilius, Paula and Clarenbach, Jane, Unlocking Emergent Talent: Supporting High Achievement of Low-Income, High-Ability Students, November 2012

Rubenstein, L. D., Siegle, D., Reis, S. M., McCoach, D. B., & Burton, M. G. (2012). A complex quest: The development and research on underachievement interventions for gifted students. Psychology in Schools, 49, 678- 694

APPENDIX A:

DESE DEFINITION OF TERMS

The term English Language Learner (**ELL**) refers to students who were not born in the US or whose native language is a language other than English.

The term Low Socioeconomic Status (**Low SES**) refers to students who qualify for a free or reduced priced lunch.

The term **Racial/Ethnic Subgroup** refers to students who are Asian, Black, Hispanic, Indian, White (non-Hispanic), Hawaiian or Pacific Islander, or are Multi-Race.

The term **Twice Exceptional** (2e) refers to students who evidence exceptional ability and disability, which results in a unique set of circumstances. Their exceptional ability may dominate, hiding their disability; their disability may dominate, hiding their exceptional ability; each may mask the other so neither is recognized or addressed.

APPENDIX B:
SUBGROUP PARTICIPATION TARGETS IN GIFTED PROGRAMS

% of sub-group population in the district	Minimum target % participation in the gifted program
10%	8%
20%	16%
30%	24%
40%	32%
50%	40%
60%	48%
70%	56%
80%	64%
90%	72%
100%	80%

APPENDIX C:
FREQUENTLY USED TESTS FOR IDENTIFYING GIFTEDNESS

Frequently Used Intelligence Tests (Districts are **not** limited to these tests only.)

Wechsler Intelligence Scales (The Psychological Corporation)
Stanford-Binet Intelligence Tests (Riverside Publishing)
Kaufman Assessment Battery for Children (American Guidance Services)
Leiter International Performance Scale (Western Psychological Services)
Matrix Analogies Test (Naglieri) (The Psychological Corporation)
Naglieri Non-Verbal Abilities Test (The Psychological Corporation)
Raven's Progressive and/or Coloured Matrices (The Psychological Corporation)
Test of Non-Verbal Intelligence (TONI) (PRO-ED)
Cognitive Abilities Test* (Riverside Publishing)
Otis-Lennon Mental Ability Test* (The Psychological Corporation)

*If group intelligence tests are used, students must meet the criterion on two different instruments.

Frequently Used Achievement Tests* (Districts are **not** limited to these tests only.)

Comprehensive Test of Basic Skills (CTB/McGraw-Hill)
Iowa Test of Basic Skills (Riverside Publishing)
Metropolitan Achievement Test (The Psychological Corporation)
Peabody Individual Achievement Test (American Guidance Services)
Stanford Achievement Test Series (Harcourt Brace Ed. Measurement)
Terra Nova (CTB/McGraw-Hill)
Wechsler Individual Achievement Test (Harcourt Brace Ed. Measurement)
Woodcock Johnson Test of Achievement (Riverside Publishing)

*Districts must use a composite score or majority of subtests for placement in interdisciplinary academic programs.

Frequently Used Creativity, Reasoning, and Problem-Solving Ability Instruments (Districts are **not** limited to these instruments only.)

Torrance Tests of Creative Thinking (Scholastic Testing Service)
Screening Assessment for Gifted Elementary Students - SAGES (Western Psychological Services)
Structure of Intellect - Learning Abilities (Western Psychological Services)
Creativity Assessment Packet (PRO-ED)

Frequently Used Items for Other Documented Evidence (Districts are **not** limited to these items only.)

HOPE Scale (Prufrock Press); The *Scales for Rating the Behavioral Characteristics of Superior Students* are commonly referred to as the Renzulli Scales or Renzulli-Hartman Scales. (Prufrock Press);
Portfolio of outstanding student work; MAP scores or other ability measures; Anecdotal records