This is to certify that the

dissertation entitled

GIFTED EDUCATION PROGRAM EVALUATION
IN THE UNITED STATES

presented by

Mary Ann Duranczyk Traxler

has been accepted towards fulfillment
of the requirements for

Ph.D. degree in Education

James E. Stoddy
Major professor

Date July 13, 1983

GIFTED EDUCATION PROGRAM EVALUATION IN THE UNITED STATES

By

Mary Ann Duranczyk Traxler

A DISSERTATION

Submitted to
Michigan State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department of Administration and Curriculum

1983

ABSTRACT

GIFTED EDUCATION PROGRAM EVALUATION
IN THE UNITED STATES

By

Mary Ann Duranczyk Traxler

This study assessed the current status of gifted program evaluation in public schools in the United States. Questionnaires were completed by 192 randomly selected school districts having gifted programs. Analysis of the data was based on total sample, legal status of gifted education in the states (mandated or nonmandated), and geographical divisions of the United States. In addition, evaluation designs in 38 districts recommended by State Directors of Programs for the Gifted were examined.

At least half the gifted programs in this study were not evaluated throughout the year, and approximately one-third had not evaluatd the gifted program components. Very little funding was provided for evaluation, and many people who carried out gifted program evaluation were not trained evaluators.

Within the limitations of this study, evaluation of gifted programs in mandated states was found to be less thorough than that in nonmandated states. Programs in nonmandated states had a higher incidence of systematic program evaluation throughout the year, program evaluation designed before program implementation, program evaluation based on

predetermined goals and objectives, cost of evaluation included in total gifted program budget, and trained program evaluators.

Mandated districts were influenced primarily by the state department of education. The district consultant/coordinator and the building principal exerted more influence in nonmandated districts. Students, outside evaluators, other teachers, and the school board of education had little influence on various aspects of program development.

Various methods were used to evaluate student progress in gifted programs. Teacher observation and creative products were the measures most often used. Although the behavioral objectives model is generally thought to be inappropriate for evaluating the progress of gifted students, this practice was found to be more prevalent in mandated districts than in nonmandated districts.

Little difference was found between the randomly selected districts and those recommended as having an exceptional evaluation component included in the gifted program. Parents were reported to have more influence than the state department of education on funding in recommended districts. Systematic evaluation throughout the year and trained program evaluators were found more frequently in the recommended districts.

To my mom, Ann Elizabeth Duranczyk, who always believed in me and who certainly shares this accomplishment.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I wish to express my appreciation of the following individuals for their assistance and support during this endeavor:

Dr. James Anderson, friend and dissertation director, for picking up the pieces and convincing me that they'd all fall together in the right places. The encouragement and support he has given since my undergraduate days are genuinely appreciated.

Dr. James Snoddy, who served as an efficient committee chairman, for the quality of his attention, encouragement, and sense of humor.

Drs. Gaston Blom and George Sherman, who served on the committee, for their time and feedback during the process of writing this dissertation.

Randy Fotiu, a consultant in the Office of Research Consultation, for his essential assistance with the data analysis and for the time and patience he gave in helping me survive the Michigan State University Computer Center.

The State Directors of Programs for the Gifted, for their genuine intereste in gifted education and in this study. Their wealth of information provided a broad perspective on gifted education in the United States.

Those who responded to the questionnaire, without whom this study would not have been possible. The time and energy given, as well as the overwhelming amount of material sent, are most appreciated.

Susan Cooley, for the meticulous preparation and typing of this manuscript.

Chris Siewertsen, an incredible friend, whose caring and support I could not have done without.

The wonderful children I taught during the creation of this dissertation, for their sensitivity and patience. Their enthusiasm for learning and warm hugs were a daily inspiration.

John Peter Duranczyk, my father, for his caring and loving.

Curt, my loving husband, for his calming and supportive presence in my life.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Statement of the Purpose

The purpose of this study is to examine current practices in the evaluation of gifted education programs in the public schools of the United States and to determine how these practices affect program development.

Research Questions

1. How are programs for gifted children reported to be currently evaluated?

2. What aspects of the program are reported to be evaluated?

3. Who is reported to be involved in the evaluation process?

4. What effects do evaluations reportedly have on program changes?

5. Whose evaluation, i.e., students, parents, teachers, administrators, school board members, outside evaluators, is reported to have the greatest effect on the various aspects of program development for the gifted?

6. How are evaluation results reported to effect changes in various aspects of program development?

7. How is the growth of students in the gifted program reported to be evaluated?

Importance of the Study

Educators generally agree that students, teachers, administrators, as well as total instructional programs must be evaluated. According to Nadler and Shore (1979), however, there has been much controversy regarding the validity and relevance of most educational evaluations. They felt that the underlying mission of these efforts appears to be essentially the same: to determine the degree to which an educational program is meeting the needs of those it is intended to serve. They broadly defined this as an attempt to develop guidelines for narrowing the gap between the actual and the ideal state of affairs.

Evans and Marken (1982) believed that the need for a prominent program evaluation is clear. The major challenge for program implementation, according to these authors, is to create cost-efficient, nonthreatening process-evaluation procedures that are accepted and used convincingly in the classroom setting.

According to Zettel (1980), there are substantial data to suggest that the individuals least likely to receive an educational program designed to facilitate maximum growth may be those who are gifted and talented.

Although Shertzer (1960) felt that gifted programs can only improve and become more effective through systematic and continuous evaluation, he found that few schools examine their program efforts for superior and talented students as critically as they should. In surveying the literature concerning gifted and talented programs, Shertzer located almost no published evaluation studies. He attributed

the lack of evaluative studies in this area to the absence of appropriate criteria or standardized evaluative instruments as well as to the fact that many programs initiate evaluation after the program has been operating for some time rather than designing an evaluation before it begins and evaluating on a continuous basis.

Despite the growing numbers of gifted programs throughout the United States, the actively supported national and international organizations dedicated to the education of gifted and talented children, and the training programs for teachers of the gifted and talented that have been created at colleges and universities across the country, Neuman (1981) maintained that there is a lack of hard data on what works and what doesn't, for whom, and under what conditions.

Gowan and Demos (1964) conceptualized educational evaluation as the meeting edge between a culture's past and its future. They felt there must be change if the culture is to grow and progress, but it must be carefully articulated so that the heritage of the past with its continuity of values can be mediated and reinterpreted to form a framework and matrix out of which the future may develop without loss of content. Furthermore, the authors maintained that one function of evaluation is to introduce the new discoveries to society so that they may become familiar, respectable, and accepted.

Finally, Rimm (1982) believed that if one is committed to gifted programs, a commitment to evaluation must necessarily follow--for evaluation is the only source of discovering what is effective for the gifted child.

Limitations of the Study

1. The Michigan State University Library and the University of Wyoming Library were the major sources of reference material.

2. Information provided by the State Directors of Programs for the Gifted and persons involved in gifted education at the school-district level were the primary sources for data collection.

3. Gifted programs involved in this study were not observed by the writer.

4. The study is subject to the weakness inherent in the use of a questionnaire. It depends upon responses and interpretation of persons cooperating in the study.

5. This study examines the various methods used in evaluating gifted education programs in public schools throughout the United States, but it does not attempt to evaluate any particular individual, school, or school district.

6. Questionnaires were sent to school districts identified as having gifted programs. No independent determination was made as to the extent or comprehensiveness of the programs.

7. State Directors of Programs for the Gifted were asked to recommend gifted programs in their states that include an exceptional evaluation component. Guidelines for recommendation were not provided.

8. The results of this study are determined by data gathered from and apply only to the school districts that responded to the questionnaire.

Definitions of Terms

Gifted/talented/creative (G/T/C) students are those identified by professionally qualified persons who, by virtue of outstanding abilities, are capable of high performance. These are children who require differentiated educational programs and/or services beyond those normally provided by the regular school program in order to realize their contribution to self and society. Children capable of high performance include those with demonstrated achievement and/or potential ability in any of the following areas:

1. general intellectual ability
2. specific academic aptitude
3. creative or productive thinking
4. leadership ability
5. visual and performing arts. (U.S. Commissioner of Education, 1972)

This study includes students and programs encompassing kindergarten through twelfth grade.

Evaluation is a judgment of merit, sometimes based solely on measurements, such as those provided by test scores, but more frequently involving the synthesis of various measurements, critical incidents, subjective impressions, and other kinds of evidence weighed in the process of carefully appraising the effects of an educational experience (Good, 1973).

State Directors of Programs for the Gifted are those persons whose full- or part-time responsibility it is to coordinate gifted programs throughout a state and/or to consult with schools offering gifted education programs.

Gifted coordinator/consultant (district level) is that person whose full- or part-time responsibility it is to coordinate gifted programs throughout a school district, to consult with schools offering gifted education programs, and to provide inservice for the school faculties.

Administration includes building principals and school superintendents.

Gifted/talented/creative (G/T/C) education programs are intended to be qualitatively different programs designed to meet the needs of gifted, talented, or creative students.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The literature pertinent to this study was reviewed in three general areas. The following topics were determined as significant to this study: (1) the purpose of program evaluation, (2) program-evaluation procedures, and (3) program-evaluation models. A summary is presented at the end of the chapter.

The Purpose of Program Evaluation

According to Renzulli (1978), the general purpose of evaluation is to gather, analyze, and disseminate information that can be used to make decisions about educational programs. He maintained that evaluation should always be directed toward action that will hopefully result in the improvement of services to students through the continuation, modification, or elimination of conditions that effect learning. He emphasized that the conditions that effect learning are not necessarily restricted to the instructional process.

Borich and Jemelka (1981) contended that the evaluation of instruction must yield the information that instructional designers need in order to make decisions about the adequacy of instructional programs. According to Saracho (1982), evaluation is used to understand what factors contribute to the effectiveness of the program and how its components produce their effects. Newland (1976)

maintained that it is first necessary to ascertain which of these components are present in the program being evaluated. He felt that this phase is primarily one of description. Once the components are found to be present, determination must be made as to whether they are functioning in the intended manner. This is the judgmental process that must be carried out in the light of a comprehension of the fundamental philosophy of the program.

Whitmore (1980) stated that program evaluation is conducted at two levels:

a. to determine whether the program developed for an individual student was appropriate and has allowed the child to meet his goals; and
b. to evaluate the success and contribution of the program as one of a school district's educational alternatives. (p. 224)

She further suggested that planning for evaluation must begin with the goals as hypothesized effects of the program. Desired outcomes must then be specified as behavioral indices of change that can guide the ongoing evaluation by the teacher. The last facet, she felt, is to identify objective measures that can be administered to the students to assess program effects.

Curriculum evaluation is currently regarded as a technical process by Willis (1981), which assumes that empirically verifiable data collected under carefully controlled procedures should be used to determine causal relationships. Evaluation is thought to be the fit between specified goals and measured results of a curriculum.

Shertzer (1960) defined the evaluation of a superior student program as a systematic effort to ascertain the extent to which the objectives of the program are being attained, and emphasized that it

may be necessary to differentiate between the objectives of such a program and educational objectives in general. He pointed out that evaluation considers the means--the processes, practices, and procedures--by which a superior student program endeavors to achieve its purposes. The determination that a program for superior and talented students is achieving its desired results may serve as an indication that the program should be maintained in a similar fashion. If, however, it is found that the program is not accomplishing its purposes, changes can be made and the program can be redirected. Shertzer cautioned that the purpose of a program for superior students may not be realized for several years after the program is initiated. In the meantime, he suggested that attention be directed to the means by which the program is attempting to accomplish this purpose.

Renzulli (1980) raised a question that he found both critics and people within the field asking: "How do we know that our programs are having any payoff or that one approach to gifted education has certain advantages over another?" He pointed out that respectable evaluation designs cannot be effectively developed when "our programs are little more than patchwork collections of random practices and activities." The author suggested that researchers and evaluators can only obtain effective results when a model or a comprehensive and integrated approach to programming is tested.

The need for program evaluation in gifted education, according to Renzulli (1978), has grown out of a general concern on the part of decision makers for greater accountability in all aspects of education. He stated that gifted programs have been especially

vulnerable to substituting the "trying equals success" attitude for rigorous attempts to evaluate program effectiveness. He further maintained that gifted students, because they are gifted, have the capacity for high-level performance, and their products are often of superior quality. He challenged the evaluator to examine two questions:

- What types of programmatic learning experiences fostered this outstanding performance?
- Was the performance really attributable to the program or did it emerge simply because the child was gifted and we had the good sense to stay out of his way? (p. 468)

According to Lawless (1977), the first reason for evaluation is that many people have been involved in planning and implementing the program and will want to know if what was done was worthwhile, as well as if it would be worth doing again. It is essential to discover which components of the program were successful and which need to be improved or abandoned.

Most writers agree that program evaluation is essential to the success of programs for the gifted and talented. Shannon (1960) listed several good reasons for carrying on systematic program evaluation:

1. Since evaluation is impossible unless planned for at the outset, the plan will necessarily include a clear statement of objectives.
2. There must be some means of evaluating instructional procedure or methodology. Thus poor teaching approaches or inadequate curriculum content can perhaps be discovered.
3. Evaluation tests the quality of decisions made relative to learning activities and teaching procedures. Decision making is an essential part of all program development, and the decisions made must always be subject to revision.
4. Evaluation points up areas of the program that need improvement and provides a sound justification for curriculum changes. Evaluation includes the identification of logical and worthwhile program modifications. (p. 342)

For an evaluation to play a constructive and positive role in the overall process of education, Renzulli (1978) recommended that it should attempt to fulfill as many of the following objectives as possible:

1. To discover how effectively the objectives of a program are being fulfilled.
2. To discover unplanned and unexpected consequences that are resulting from particular program practices.
3. To determine the underlying policies and related activities that contribute to success or failure in particular areas.
4. To provide continuous in-process feedback at intermediate stages throughout the course of a program.
5. To suggest realistic, as well as ideal, alternative courses of action for program modification. (p. 471)

Program-Evaluation Procedures

DeHaan (1960) stated that the educational program for talented students should be continuously and carefully examined for areas that need improvement. He emphasized the need for an evaluation based on clear objectives to be outlined early in the program. Before the program begins, educators should have made decisions concerning what their program should be and what their students should attain. Lawless (1977) agreed that the evaluation format should be designed before the start of the program and felt that it should be feasible, measure what is hoped to be accomplished, and be informal yet objective.

According to Gowan and Demos (1964), every program for any educational objective should be set up so that evaluation can occur naturally as an integral part of the program. Failure to do this, they said, often results in poorly thought out programs. They

offered helpful questions that school personnel should consider when planning curriculum adjustments for gifted children:

- How can we plan the program so that evaluation will be feasible and orderly?
- How will what we propose to do differ from what should be done by any good teacher in any good heterogeneous classroom? (p. 419)

Ganapole (1982) maintained that well-formulated objectives and appropriate measures to assess their attainment are essential elements of any well-planned, systematic effort toward evaluation.

Renzulli (1978) observed that evaluations have all too often been launched as "last-ditch efforts" to save programs that are in danger of being eliminated or sharply reduced in the amount of support they receive. He admitted that a hastily conducted evaluation may be better than none at all, but insisted that the best weapon in the battle for program support and survival is a carefully planned and comprehensive evaluation that will accurately document all aspects of the services being provided for gifted and talented youngsters. Renzulli further emphasized that evaluation should be an essential part of total programming, and each step of the planning and development phases of a program for the gifted should give careful attention to the ways in which evaluative information can be gathered, organized, and presented to decision-making individuals or groups.

Epstein (1979) agreed that evaluation should be carried out during the program's operation to indicate necessary modifications, as well as at the end of the year's program to determine total results. She emphasized the need for a good evaluation plan to highlight the differences between the gifted and the regular program and to show

how they contribute to improving the education of the students involved.

According to Olsen, Newgard, and Maselli (1978), an in-depth program evaluation should be undertaken once a year. They recommended that evaluations focus on the program objectives and that all evaluators be given specific guidelines. They also suggested that the evaluation process include teachers involved in the program, other teachers in the school, students, parents, and possibly outside evaluators.

Renzulli (1978) pointed out that although most contemporary evaluation theorists would agree that measuring the attainment of objectives is the most important goal of evaluation, they would also support the position that the evaluator must be free to investigate any and all conditions that may influence the effective operation of a program. He took the position that any activity or condition that may have a direct or indirect effect on a program is "fair game" for the evaluator. Epstein (1979) also agreed that sometimes there are unexpected but highly desirable results that should be consciously incorporated into revisions of the program.

It is generally accepted that evaluation should be central to course improvement, but Atkin (1968) pointed out that only when evaluation is seen as a facilitating rather than as a limiting function will it be used more effectively by curriculum developers. He suggested that a flexible approach to the role of evaluation be fostered by evaluation specialists themselves. It is essential that

accepted practices be questioned in terms of their relevance and appropriateness.

According to Borich and Jemelka (1981), the primary purpose of evaluation has traditionally been to provide decision makers with information about the effectiveness of an instructional program. Within this framework, evaluation is viewed as a process in which data are obtained, analyzed, and synthesized into relevant information for decision making.

Renzulli (1978) stated that decision making is a fundamental goal of evaluation and it is, therefore, important to identify decision makers and the actions over which they have control at the beginning of any evaluation endeavor. He recommended that the evaluator and decision makers work closely together in an attempt to identify the parameters of change over which each decision-making individual or group has control. He maintained that economy and efficiency can be improved in an evaluation design if we begin by raising three interrelated questions:

1. Who are the decision makers at various levels of possible action?
2. Over what actions do decision makers have control?
3. What information is necessary for making decisions? (p. 469)

According to Saracho (1982), the evaluator's major responsibility is to provide sufficient information about the program so that others have a basis to make decisions. She felt that only persons who are involved in the program are in a position to determine its direction. The information provided by the evaluator, together with the knowledge and experience of those who are involved, should determine program modifications.

Most writers in the field of evaluation stress the importance of involving the evaluator from the start of any educational endeavor. Renzulli (1978) felt that through such involvement the evaluator can continually bring to the attention of program developers the steps that must be taken and the resources that must be allocated if evaluation is to serve useful purposes. He also pointed out a problem that he called "the tail wagging the dog" problem. That is, "in his efforts to develop a 'respectable' evaluation design, the evaluator may 'steer' a program in very subtle ways."

Renzulli (1978) emphasized the need for the evaluator to create a positive atmosphere of helpfulness rather than destructiveness. He suggested that the evaluator point out that he is interested in reporting the positive aspects of the program as well as those that are in need of change. He also maintained that unless those being evaluated see some value and benefit for themselves as a result of participating in the evaluation, they are likely to approach the process halfheartedly or may even try to distort evaluative information.

There is no easy way to resolve the dilemma that often exists between the evaluator's need to be rigorous and scientific and the program developer's desire to be innovative and flexible in programming for gifted and talented students, Renzulli (1978) admitted. He recommended that a basic guide should be that the program determines the type of evaluation design and the instruments to be used, and that it is the evaluator's responsibility to respect the integrity of the program when he is planning his evaluation activities. Renzulli

emphasized that suggestions made by the evaluator while the program is in progress should "grow" out of findings about the program as it exists in its natural form rather than as a result of the evaluator's influence on the program. Finally, in terms of the evaluator, Renzulli (1980) maintained that regardless of who hires and pays the evaluator, he must keep the best interests of the student in mind. He reminded educators that an honest evaluation is impossible unless the students' best interests are foremost in the evaluator's mind.

According to Gallagher (1964), most school systems use a rather simple method of evaluation by asking teachers:

1. Do the children like it?
2. Do they seem to be learning from it?
3. Are the teachers comfortable and convinced that the method is useful? (p. 115)

Although he felt that this method is reasonably effective, Gallagher questioned its adequacy. The only drawback that he pointed out is that most new programs generate excitement and enthusiasm, which may affect the teachers' responses. Rather than reacting to the innate virtues of the program, teachers may simply be responding to the program's newness.

To make the program evaluation as effective and efficient as possible, Clark (1979) suggested that a plan be designed that allows for information to be cycled throughout the year. She made the following recommendations:

1. Know clearly what each person or group involved in your program needs to know.
2. Choose instruments and tools to give you that information.
3. Set up collection points throughout the year in addition to your assessment procedure.
4. Collect only useful data.

5. Communicate your information to all concerned persons and groups. It is impossible to get the kind of support your program needs if key people remain unaware of what you are doing.
6. Use your evaluation data to produce growth in the program and with the gifted students. If done properly, evaluation will never be a final judgment. (pp. 156-57)

Willis (1981) listed four basic processes of criticism inherent in any fully developed evaluation: observation, description, interpretation, and judgment. He pointed out that the dominant form of curriculum evaluation often focuses on description only, rather than on the development of all four processes from a variety of perspectives.

Once decisions makers who will use the evaluation information to modify the program operation are identified, Renzulli and Callahan (1978) suggested that specific goals and objectives be defined based on both cognitive and affective aspects of student development. Sources of information and a timeline for collecting it must then be determined. Evaluation instruments appropriate for the needs of the program should be selected. The data should then be analyzed and the evaluation findings presented to the intended audience.

According to Shannon (1960), educational evaluation often refers to a process concerned with the study of the status of, or the changes in, children's behavior with reference to the attainment of educational goals. She listed the steps that she felt are involved in the evaluation process:

1. Isolation and description of the problem to be studied.
2. Clarification of values bearing on the problem.
3. Development of criteria for studying the problem.
4. Expansion of the criteria in terms of behavior sought.

5. Establishment of situations in which behavior can be studied.
6. Use of instruments to gather behavioral data.
7. Analysis of behavioral change.
8. Implementation of decisions made upon the basis of the findings. (pp. 341-42)

Newland (1976) maintained that the evaluation procedure must not be perceived only in terms of extant tests, questionnaires, or other convenient devices and procedures and that the concept of evaluation must incorporate both short-term and long-term time spans.

Callahan (1981) pointed out that evaluations of programs for the gifted and talented have been criticized for their overreliance on attitudinal data for assessing program merit, use of inappropriate tests for assessing student achievement, and lack of careful documentation and evaluation of the curriculum implemented in the program.

According to Parke and Buescher (1982), evaluators have difficulty following the standardized-testing approach to evaluation because programs for the gifted and talented rely on individualized objectives, multiple-programming options, curricular activities emphasizing higher level mental processes, and involve students selected by their unusually high performance. The authors maintained that assessing programs for the gifted and talented necessitates moving beyond the norm and designing methods that will be sensitive to the nature of the program and will provide useful information for decision makers.

Although the testing industry has provided a vast array of instruments for measuring the mastery of basic skills and general achievement, Renzulli (1980) pointed out that there has thus far been an absence of technology when it comes to evaluating the more complex types of learning and the creative accomplishments that oftentimes

characterize programs for the gifted and talented. Epstein (1979) agreed that while higher levels of thinking and changes in attitudes are difficult to measure, they are central to a gifted program and should not be omitted from evaluation.

According to Shertzer (1960), school officials must devise and improvise instruments to assess and evaluate the objectives, practices, and procedures of their programs for superior students. He suggested that teachers be trained to observe the growth of individual students' creative, critical, and independent thinking, including involvement with the challenge of problems and the mastery of problem-solving techniques. The development of a mature philosophy should also be considered. Instruments devised to evaluate these aspects of the program may be crude by the standards of a professional researcher, he admitted, but they can be of great value in a specific school situation.

Renzulli (1980) maintained that creative products are the right and proper types of data upon which our evaluations should focus. They may not be as precise and objective as scores on a standardized test, he admitted, but strongly felt that "it is far better to have imprecise information about the right type of objective than precise information about the wrong objective." Rimm (1982) agreed that the objectives of a gifted program cannot always be measured by tests. She suggested two criterion-referenced approaches to evaluating products. The first compares pre- to post-test samples of work, whereas the second is based on a percentage of criteria achieved.

Because of the relatively unique objectives of programs for the gifted and talented, Renzulli (1980) felt that the traditional models, instruments, and procedures that have been used to evaluate programs in other areas of education are largely inappropriate for evaluating programs that serve the gifted. He described the behavioral-objectives model as being inappropriate for gifted programs because it focuses primarily on those behaviors that are most easily measured, as well as the most trivial.

Shertzer (1960) felt that standardized tests may not be appropriate for evaluating the superior student program because these tests cannot adequately measure all the important outcomes of education. He pointed out that superior students frequently score near the top on standardized tests of ability, achievement, and aptitude, and in retesting there is not enough ceiling to reflect the students' growth. He suggested administering tests of creativity and problem solving or advanced-level tests to measure these students' achievement and attitudes.

In addition, Ganopole (1982) stated that norm-referenced tests are constructed to measure generalized abilities and are typically intended to meet a wide variety of educational- and administrative-decision purposes. It is unlikely that the content of a norm-referenced test will exactly match the specific curricular emphasis of any given program. She suggested that such probability is even further diminished in programs for the gifted in which unique content, skills, and abilities are emphasized.

Renzulli (1978) reported that many experts in the testing field believe that complex objectives, i.e., analysis, synthesis, evaluation, and critical and creative thinking, can be evaluated. He pointed out that Robert Stake (1973), considered to be one of America's foremost authorities on evaluation, suggested that the total cost of measuring such objectives may be 100 times that of administering a 45-minute standardized paper-and-pencil test. The errors of testing increase markedly, according to Stake, when moving from highly specific areas of performance to items that attempt to measure higher mental processes and unreached human potential. Renzulli seemed to agree with Stake in his contention that the only reason that test error in standardized instruments has been tolerated is because very few important educational decisions are ever based on test scores alone.

According to Morgan, Tennant, and Gold (1980), gifted students can be encouraged to evaluate their own work and to make improvements until it has become their best. They maintained that, in this way, students will learn to consider the content to determine if their output would be improved through further knowledge or better skill or a more positive attitude. They also suggested that these students need to be able to review the thinking processes used and make changes where necessary.

Parke and Buescher (1982) suggested that students become documenters of their own progress toward the goals and objectives of the program. The authors felt that this student-derived information in concert with additional appropriately chosen instruments can

provide evaluators with a wealth of information on program products and processes.

Whitmore (1980) stated that a child must assume ownership of both the goal and the problems blocking the attainment of the goal in order for him to develop intrinsic achievement motivation. She felt that this basically involves an evaluative process in which the student determines the needed changes in order for him to experience success in meeting his goals. Whitmore further stated that an emphasis on student self-evaluation does not eliminate the professional judgment of the teacher, but rather emphasizes the partnership of teacher and student with each bringing unique skills to the task. She described the teacher as knowing best how the child's performance compares to that of other students, what errors in thinking may be causing mistakes in completed work, how to remediate weaknesses, and how to view more objectively effort and quality of work. The student was described as knowing best how he feels and may possess more accurate perceptions of himself, his ability, his school work, and his future. She concluded that with the combined information from the student and the teacher, more accurate and constructive evaluation can occur.

Ganopole (1982) maintained that changes in learner behavior or performance are the single most significant source for evaluating a program. Such changes can best be ascertained, she felt, through the use of appropriate, well-constructed measures designed to assess the explicitly stated desired outcomes of a program.

Clark (1979) advised that the students' growth be considered individually, comparable only to their own past achievements and developed criteria. She suggested the possibility of the student and the teacher deciding together what form the evaluations should take in order to best show achievement when the learning goal has been completed. In addition to information about pupil progress, Clark reminded educators to evaluate the learning situation. The structure, time, classroom atmosphere, and the goals of the program must all be considered.

In an evaluation of the worth and effectiveness of a program for superior and talented students, Shertzer (1960) felt that the effect of the program on the school's total climate is highly important. For this reason, he suggested that evaluative information be obtained from as many participants as possible--students, teachers, counselors, administrators, and parents. The objectives of the program; its organizational pattern; the contributions of teachers, counselors, administrators, and others to the program; and the attitudes and understandings of the community toward the program are all essential components of the superior student program evaluation.

Renzulli (1978) emphasized that the purpose of an evaluation is not to come up with a simple score or rating that attempts to express the success or failure of a given program. He felt that an evaluation must provide relatively specific information that supports the maintenance, modification, or termination of particular program components. He concluded, then, that an evaluation should be "diagnostic" in the sense that it pinpoints by careful examination the

circumstances and conditions that result in identifiable changes in performance, attitude, or other indicators of program effectiveness.

Gowan and Demos (1964) cited Passow et al. (1955) for presenting one of the best discussions in the literature on evaluation. They indicated specific criteria as:

- improved identification
- increased achievement
- increased interest
- increased college-going
- improved teaching procedures
- improved social status
- improved personal adjustment
- improved attitudes toward school
- improved community attitudes
- clearer vocational interests
- improved guidance procedures. (p. 420)

Gowan and Demos (1964) stated that those who look at education from a naively scientific point of view think that it is evaluation that determines whether a given program will continue. They suggested, however, that programs are not dropped or retained based on whether or not they prove effective, but rather in terms of whether the community and the educators want them to continue.

Program-Evaluation Models

A number of evaluation models have been developed and are discussed in this section. The advanced programs in Palo Alto consist of enrichment classes, resource specialists, Independent Study Center, Alternative High School, Honors, and Advanced Placement. Lundy (1979) reported that evaluation in these programs consists of measures that are district designed to measure parent, student, and teacher satisfaction.

According to Feldhusen and Wyman (1980), the Super Saturday program was evaluated formally with specifically designed survey instruments, rather than with informal verbal feedback. In addition to its primary focus on determining student, parent, and teacher satisfaction with the completed program, they pointed out that the surveys also request information to be used in planning the next Super Saturday sessions.

In A Longitudinal Study of the Gifted Disadvantaged, Smilansky and Nevo (1978) established an evaluation plan to provide information on the merit of the program and to guide its development when the first group of students was accepted into the program. Although the evaluation design has undergone various changes, they maintained that it has always been based on the assumption that evaluation should be an integral part of the development of this program.

Nadler and Shore (1979) presented the Judicial Evaluation Model, which was used by the Bureau for the Education of the Handicapped to investigate the feasibility of implementing the Individual Education Program (I.E.P.) Component of Public Law 94-142. They found that this model uses a format analogous to a jury trial. Evaluation proceeds via a hearing or forum in which two advocates, designated as case analysts, defend opposing views of a program or policy.

Rimm (1982) developed an evaluation model that demonstrates how different aspects of the educational program fit together and how evaluation can monitor all educational inputs, processes, and outcomes. Use of the model helps to prevent the implementation of any activity

without its evaluation. It also encourages decision makers to be aware of how their decisions are related to student outcomes.

The Student Self-Documentation Process Model, designed for students nine years and above, was developed by Parke and Buescher (1982). It is said to be flexible enough to adjust to changing curricula and is substantial enough to be used as a component in more comprehensive evaluation efforts. To assess the relationship between the planned and actual program outcomes, program objectives are compared with actual activities by the students' self-documentation.

According to Barbe and Renzulli (1975), the need for evidence of program effectiveness is well recognized within the field of education for the gifted. They pointed out that the particularized objectives and relatively unique learning experiences that characterize truly differential programs require the use of objective evaluative schemes that take into account a variety of important program dimensions.

Newland (1976) found Renzulli and Ward's Diagnostic and Evaluative Scales for Differential Education of the Gifted to be considerably more encompassing and reflecting a distillation of the opinions of experts in the field of the gifted. Renzulli (1975) stated that the DESDEG was developed as a guide for both self-study as well as for assessment by an external evaluation team. DESDEG consists of five interrelated components: the Manual, the Evaluative Scales, the Basic Information Forms, the Evaluator's Workbook, and the Summary Report. Renzulli (1975) pointed out the Evaluative Scales, which consist of 15 Program Requirements that were judged by a group of

experts to be important characteristics of comprehensive programs for the gifted. The Program Requirements are organized around five "Key Features," which represent general areas of consideration in program development and implementation. These Key Features are philosophy and objectives, student identification and placement, the curriculum, the teacher, and program organization and operation.

Renzulli (1975) discussed several program-evaluation models. Following is a summary of these models.

Eash's Differential Evaluation Model was specifically designed for the evaluation of new and innovative programs. Eash formulated a three-stage evaluation methodology that parallels the stages of program maturation because he felt that new programs need the freedom to evolve and clarify objectives as experience dictates. Evaluation is carried out along a continuum that is composed of three models: the initiatory model, the developmental model, and the integrated model. Renzulli felt that the most valuable feature of Eash's model is its allowance for modifications in program objectives over time.

The Provus Discrepancy Model is intended to facilitate design changes and data gathering essential to making judgments about the effectiveness of a program. Its purpose is to guide the evaluator in making comparisons between a program and its design on one hand, and a series of agreed-upon program standards on the other. Information essential to program improvement is collected, and discrepancies are noted between performance and standards. This discrepancy information is then useful in modifying the program so that performance and design standard become equalized.

Stufflebeam identified four types of educational decisions: planning, structuring, implementing, and recycling decisions. Corresponding to these decisions are four kinds of evaluation: Context, input, process, and product. These are the key components of this model and come at different times in the evaluation process. They also serve different decision-making functions. Renzulli found that a general structure for implementing the evaluation is common to each stage. This structure consists of six components: focusing the evaluation, information collection, information organization, information analysis, information reporting, and the administration of the evaluation. Renzulli felt that the positive aspect of this model is that it provides for evaluation throughout the program. On the negative side, however, he felt that the procedures suggested by Stufflebeam are both complex and costly.

Stake's "Countenance" Model involves both description and judgment. Stake proposed that the evaluator consider three types of information:

1. antecedent data--data existing prior to the teaching and learning experience which may relate to program outcomes.
2. transaction data--encounters which comprise the process of education, dynamic interactions between teacher and student.
3. outcome data--the impact of instruction and the consequences of the program, both short- and long-term.

Information concerning the discrepancies between the descriptive record of what educators intend to happen and what observers actually find is essential. Although Stake suggested that the judgmental aspects of evaluation can be accomplished with respect to some absolute standards of excellence as reflected by personal judgments of

experts in a given field or a relative comparison with the characteristics of outcomes themselves, Renzulli seemed to disagree. He maintained that a decision should not be made with regard to a single characteristic from a single program. Rather, he suggested that the evaluator set the priorities, determine which characteristics he will attend to, and decide what type of judgment data he will use. A recommendation is then made as a result of this process.

Morra and Hill (1978) described the Program for Talented Elementary Students in Alexandria, Virginia, 1974-1977. It offered three program options:

- Interest Activity: students participated in activities in the area of their gift as supervised by a trained teacher. This took place outside the regular classroom and did not substitute for regular instruction.
- Curriculum Area Learning Center: pupils participated in an advanced class in the subject-area of their gift; this class substituted for regular instruction in the subject.
- Enrichment: a special teacher assisted the regular teacher in providing additional materials to enrich the child's classroom work. The "enrichment" teacher met frequently with the child to provide additional instruction and to monitor progress. (pp. 114-15)

During each of the three years of this study, evaluation involved the pre- and post-administration of achievement, creativity, and self-concept tests.

John Ferrell, Director of the Area Service Center for Educators of Gifted Children, John A. Logan College, Carterville, Illinois, has provided two evaluative devices that reflect a growing concern for realistic evaluations of programs for the gifted and talented. The Ferrell Gifted Program Evaluation Instrument for Teachers is a form developed for teachers for the purpose of gathering

information based on the assumption that a gifted program involves qualitative changes in student thinking, as well as quantitative content changes.

The Evaluation of Instructional Programs for Gifted and Talented Children is based on a concern for the total gifted education program offered within the local district as well as the extent to which the local program meets the assessed needs of the individual gifted students within the program.

Newland (1976) offered the following questions that might be considered in the evaluation of gifted programs:

1. Were the teachers of bright pupils given, or required to obtain any special preparation that would help them to accomplish properly their particular instructional tasks?
2. Did the teachers actually do the kind of "teaching" appropriate to helping bright children learn effectively?
3. What measuring devices or procedures were used in identifying children and in ascertaining the outcomes of their learning experiences?
4. Were teachers provided with criteria for selecting students?
5. What was the nature and possible contributive effect of school and social factors in both the school and nonschool lives of gifted children before they were exposed to the different educational experience? (pp. 338-39)

In assessing organized classroom enrichment programs, Kough (1960) felt that classroom teachers should have identified the students who are gifted and be able to describe the specific curriculum modifications being made for each youngster.

In evaluating a program for gifted and talented youngsters, Shannon (1960) recommended assessment of program objectives, screening techniques and identification procedures, learning experiences for students, program leadership, and financial backing. Important considerations also include gifted students' acceptance among their peers

in various school situations, their attitudes toward self and toward school, as well as the effects of experiences in different programs on their attitudes. Shannon maintained that evaluation demands the continuous and cooperative participation of all personnel related to the endeavor. She felt that schools must gather evaluative data in order to be able to determine whether or not they are actually providing experiences appropriate for the optimum development of gifted students.

Finally, Renzulli (1975) believed that evaluation is basically a simple process that need not be shrouded in complicated language, statistics, or the jargon of psychometrics. He saw evaluation as a logical process that should not be an end in itself. He found that people usually raise simple, straightforward questions, and felt that the evaluation should attempt to provide simple, straightforward answers.

Summary

Program evaluation is essential to the success of programs for the gifted and talented and should be an integral part of program development. Well-formulated objectives should serve as the basis for systematic program evaluation, which should be clearly outlined before a program is implemented. Decision making is the fundamental goal of both formative and summative evaluation. Gifted programs should be assessed both throughout their operation in order that necessary modifications can be addressed and at the year's end to determine total results.

It is generally felt that the evaluator should be involved in the program development from the start and should operate with specific guidelines in mind. Evaluative information should be obtained from all who are involved in the program. The primary responsibility of the evaluator is to provide decision makers with sufficient information about the program. The findings should then be considered and decisions made as to the maintenance, modification, or termination of specific program components.

Research indicates that more complex types of learning and creative accomplishments are difficult to evaluate and yet of greatest significance in programs for the gifted and talented. Traditional instruments and procedures, such as standardized tests and behavioral objectives, are often inadequate for evaluating the progress of gifted students. The program-evaluation models discussed offer a variety of evaluation alternatives.

CHAPTER III

RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

This chapter presents the research design for this study. The following elements are discussed: the population and sample, the pilot study, the survey instrument, the procedures for data gathering, and the analysis of the data.

Population and Sample

A list of State Directors of Programs for the Gifted was obtained from the Office of Gifted and Talented in Washington, D.C. (See Appendix A.) A letter requesting general information was sent to all 50 state directors as well as directors in American Samoa, the District of Columbia, Guam, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and the Department of Defense Dependents Schools. (See Appendix E.) Forty-five state directors and the Gifted and Talented Education Coordinator in Guam responded by mail. Information was obtained from one state director by phone. No response was received from four states that mandate gifted education nor from American Samoa, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, or the Department of Defense Dependents Schools. In addition to a request for general information, directors were asked to recommend school districts that might be contacted for more specific information concerning their evaluation

procedures. Twelve state directors recommended specific districts to the researcher.

The population for this study included all school districts having gifted programs in the 50 states. Unless otherwise indicated by state directors, it was assumed that all school districts had gifted programs in states mandating gifted education.

A stratified random sample of 325 school districts was selected. Randomization was achieved by constructing alphabetical lists of school districts having gifted programs and making alternate selections from the lists. At least 5% of the districts listed by state directors and no fewer than two districts in a given state comprised the sample. Unless a specific list of school districts having gifted programs was provided by the state director, 5% of the total number of school districts in states mandating gifted education were included in the sample. (Appendix B contains a list of states mandating gifted education.)

In addition, 75 districts were recommended by 12 State Directors of Programs for the Gifted. Because six was the mean number of programs recommended, it was arbitrarily determined that no more than six districts be randomly selected and contacted in any given state. Gifted programs in 50 recommended districts constituted this sample. Randomization was achieved by making alternate selections from alphabetical lists of school districts. Data collected from these districts were analyzed separately.

Pilot Study

To obtain information about the coherence and comprehensiveness of the questionnaire, a pilot study was conducted. Fifteen school districts having gifted programs in Michigan were randomly selected from the list of districts reporting that their gifted program evaluation process included program evaluation. This list is presented in the 1981-82 Data Summary, Gifted and Talented Program, Michigan Public Schools. Eleven of the 15 questionnaires (73%) were returned. In addition, five individuals recognized as competent in the field of gifted education were asked to critique the questionnaire. All five responded with suggestions. Revisions in the questionnaire were made based on input from those involved in the pilot study.

Instrumentation

The instrument comprised three sections. (See Appendix C.) The first requested school district information, including gifted program enrollment. The second section dealt with gifted education program information. Respondents were asked to check "yes" or "no" in answer to the following questions:

1. Is gifted education mandated in your state?
2. Are gifted students specifically identified for programming in your district?
3. Do you feel that most classroom teachers are able to describe the specific curriculum modifications being made for gifted students?
4. Is there a specific budget for gifted education in your district?

Given a list of program models, respondents were asked to check which model or models best described what was offered in their respective school districts. They were then asked to rank specified individuals based on their supervisory responsibility for the gifted program.

The third section focused specifically on evaluation information. Respondents were asked to check "yes" or "no" in answer to the following questions:

1. Is your gifted program systematically evaluated throughout the year?
2. Is your gifted program evaluated only at the end of the school year?
3. Was the program evaluation designed before the program was implemented?
4. Is your program evaluation based on pre-determined goals or objectives?
5. Are specific guidelines given to all those involved in the evaluation?
6. Are those conducting the evaluation of the gifted programs trained as program evaluators?
7. Is the cost of evaluating the gifted program part of the total gifted program budget?

Respondents were asked to indicate the percentage of the gifted program budget that was spent on evaluation. Questions developed to determine which individual or group of individuals had the greatest influence on funding, personnel, curriculum, identification, and student time spent in the gifted program were included in this section. Respondents were then asked to indicate those who were directly informed of the program evaluation results as well as the means that were used to convey this information. Finally, respondents were asked to indicate how the progress of students in the gifted program

was evaluated. Additional comments concerning evaluation procedures or provisions made for gifted students were encouraged.

The instrument, a cover letter describing the nature of the research, and a stamped self-addressed envelope were mailed to the selected school districts. (A copy of the questionnaire and cover letter may be found in Appendix C.)

Procedures for Data Gathering

A list of State Directors of Programs for the Gifted was obtained from the Office of Gifted and Talented in Washington, D.C. A letter was sent to the directors requesting general information. This included the number and types of gifted programs provided throughout the state and a description of evaluation models used by the state or individual districts to evaluate their program. State directors were also asked to recommend districts the researcher should contact for more specific information concerning their evaluation procedures.

Thirty-five state directors responded initially. A follow-up letter was then sent to those who had not responded. Ultimately, 45 state directors (90%) and the Gifted and Talented Education Coordinator in Guam responded by mail. Information was obtained from one state director by phone.

A questionnaire was developed by the researcher, and the pilot study was conducted. The final draft of the questionnaire included input from those involved in the pilot study. Questionnaires were then sent to the 325 randomly selected districts and to the 50 randomly selected recommended districts. A follow-up postcard

was sent to those who had not responded. (See Appendix C.) Data were coded and typed into the computer system at Michigan State University for analysis.

Analysis of Data

Responses from the questionnaire were coded on worksheets. These data were then typed into the computer system at Michigan State University. Statistical analysis of the data was accomplished through the use of a Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) from the Vogelback Computing Center at Northwestern University and made available at the Michigan State University Computer Center. Descriptive information was acquired, which included frequencies, means, and percentages. An analysis of the frequency distribution of the responses was made in terms of the entire sample, the geographical region of the country, and the legal status of gifted education in the states. Data collected from districts recommended by state directors were processed similarly in a separate file. Additional information submitted by respondents was reviewed and summarized.

CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

Introduction

This study examined current practices in the evaluation of gifted education programs in the public schools of the United States and their impact on program development. This chapter presents an analysis and discussion of the data collected.

Data were analyzed in terms of the total sample, the legal status of gifted education in the states (mandated or nonmandated), and the geographical division of the United States. A list of states that mandate gifted education can be found in Appendix B. The nine geographical divisions of the United States were those used by the National Center for Education Statistics and are listed in Appendix D. Tables displaying data pertinent to this study are included and discussed in the text. Items in the tables are listed in the same order in which they appear in the questionnaire.

Normative Data

Questionnaires were mailed to 325 randomly selected school districts having gifted programs in the 50 states. Of the 325, responses were received from 62% (203) of the participants. One was returned as undeliverable. Data were analyzed from 59% (192) of the responses. Eleven of the questionnaires were not included in the

data analysis either because the gifted program in the district was only in its planning stages or the program had been deleted from the curriculum due to budget cuts.

The sample was representative of 47 of the 50 states. The range of state representation was .5% to 7.8%. The percentage of return in each state ranged from 33.3% to 100%. The contribution of the state to the sample does not represent its percentage of return. Complete data are shown in Appendix B.

Of the 50 questionnaires mailed to school districts recommended as exceptional by State Directors of Programs for the Gifted, 76% (38) were returned. Data from this sample are discussed separately at the end of this chapter.

Characteristics of the Population

The participants were asked to answer several demographic questions regarding the status of gifted education in their respective school districts. In Table 1, the professional positions held by the 192 persons who responded are presented.

Table 1.--Professional positions held by respondents.

Professional Positions	Absolute Frequency	Relative Frequency (%)
Gifted program consultant/coordinator	66	34.4
Superintendent	15	7.8
Building principal	18	9.4
Curriculum director	15	7.8
Gifted program teacher	16	8.3
Director of special education	13	6.8
Other	44	22.9
Not indicated	5	2.6

Various position titles comprising the "other" category included the following: counselor, teacher, exceptional children's program director, director of pupil personnel services, administrative assistant, librarian, director of special services/programs, school psychologist, federal programs coordinator, home school visitor, director--evaluation and research, director--administrative services, director--prep/tech program, projects coordinator, supervisor--major work honors program, and coordinator--elementary guided independent study program.

Of the 192 participants, 40.6% (78) were in states that mandate gifted education, and 57.8% (111) were in states that do not mandate gifted education. About 2% (3) did not respond to the question concerning mandated gifted education. According to a list of states that mandate gifted education, the three districts were located in states that do not mandate gifted education. Data from these districts were included with those from the nonmandated districts for analysis.

The nine geographical divisions of the United States used in this study are shown in Table 2, along with the legal status of gifted education in the divisions.

Gifted Education Program Information

Gifted students were reported to be specifically identified for programming in 96.4% (185) of the 192 participating districts. Gifted students were not identified for a specific program in 3.6% (7) of the participating school districts. In terms of student

Table 2.--Mandated and nonmandated districts by geographical division.

Regions	Mandated		Nonmandated		Total	
	Absolute Freq.	Relative Freq. (%)	Absolute Freq.	Relative Freq. (%)	Absolute Freq.	Relative Freq. (%)
Pacific	2	11.1	16	88.9	18	9.4
Mountain	6	37.5	10	62.5	16	8.3
West North Central	13	43.3	17	56.7	30	15.6
West South Central	15	88.2	2	11.8	17	8.9
East North Central	1	3.0	32	97.0	33	17.2
East South Central	6	50.0	6	50.0	12	6.3
South Atlantic	18	75.0	6	25.0	24	12.5
Middle Atlantic	18	58.1	13	41.9	31	16.1
New England	0	0.0	11	100.0	11	5.7

Chi-square = 65.31852 df = 8 Significance = .0000

identification, no significant difference was found between mandated and nonmandated districts nor among the geographical divisions of the country.

Of the 192 respondents, 60.4% (116) felt that most classroom teachers were unable to describe the specific curriculum modifications being made for gifted students. This item received a positive response from 38% (73) of the respondents, and 1.6% (3) offered no opinion. In terms of teacher awareness of curriculum modifications for gifted students, no significant difference was found between mandated and nonmandated districts nor among the geographical divisions.

A specific budget for gifted education was reported in 76% (146) of the 192 school districts. No specific budget for gifted education was reported by 24% (46) of the participants. A significant difference (.0003) in budgeting was found between mandated and nonmandated districts. Of the 146 districts reporting a specific budget for gifted education, 33.6% (49) were in districts with mandated gifted education. This comprised 62% of the 79 districts with mandated gifted education. Of the 146, 66.4% (97) were in districts without mandated gifted education. This comprised 85.8% of the 113 districts with nonmandated gifted education. Data specific to geographical division are presented in Table 3.

Table 3.--Budget allocation for gifted education program by geographical division.

Geographical Divisions	Budget for Gifted Education		No Budget for Gifted Education	
	Absolute Frequency	Percent	Absolute Frequency	Percent
Pacific	18	100.0	0	0.0
Mountain	11	68.8	5	31.3
West North Central	22	73.3	8	26.7
West South Central	10	58.8	7	41.2
East North Central	30	90.9	3	9.1
East South Central	5	41.7	7	58.3
South Atlantic	21	87.5	3	12.5
Middle Atlantic	21	67.7	10	32.3
New England	8	72.7	3	27.3

Raw chi-square = 23.78047 df = 8 Significance = .0025

Program Models

Respondents were asked to indicate the gifted program model or models that best describe what is offered in their respective school districts. The following categories were designated by the researcher: pull-out 2 hours or less a week, pull-out 1 day or more a week, cluster groups within classrooms, advanced placement/ acceleration, Enrichment Triad Model, honors programs, magnet schools, ability grouping, and Saturday seminars. Respondents were asked to describe any other program models that were offered in their districts. The categories were not mutually exclusive. Each category was analyzed individually as to the number who responded positively compared with the total number of respondents. As Table 4 indicates, the most popular program models were pull-out programs for two hours or less a

week and advanced placement/acceleration. Magnet schools and Saturday seminars seemed to be the least popular.

Table 4.--Gifted program models.

Program Models	Absolute Frequency	Relative Frequency (%)
Pull-out 2 hours or less a week	87	45.3
Pull-out 1 day or more a week	46	24.0
Cluster groups within classrooms	50	26.0
Advanced placement/acceleration	86	44.8
Enrichment Triad Model	41	21.4
Honors programs	55	28.6
Magnet schools	11	5.7
Ability grouping	63	32.8
Saturday seminars	14	7.3
Other	76	39.6

The following program models were mentioned in addition to those designated: pull-out programs of various time durations, curriculum compacting, mentor programs, field trips, clubs, independent study, summer programs, self-contained classrooms, Feldhusen's 3-Stage Model, projects, after-school programs, various seminars, leadership courses, college courses open to identified junior and senior high school students, career-option programs, and enrichment within the regular curriculum.

In Table 5, data specific to program models in mandated and nonmandated districts are presented. Each category is analyzed individually as to the number who responded positively compared with the total number of mandated or nonmandated districts.

Table 5.--A comparison of gifted program models between mandated and nonmandated districts.

	Mandated		Nonmandated		Total	
	Absolute Freq.	Relative Freq. (%)	Absolute Freq.	Relative Freq. (%)	Absolute Freq.	Relative Freq. (%)
Pull-out 2 hours or less a week	42	53.2	45	39.8	87	45.3
Pull-out 1 day or more a week	15	19.0	31	27.4	46	24.0
Cluster groups within classrooms	15	19.0	35	31.0	50	26.0
Advanced placement/ acceleration	35	44.3	51	45.1	86	44.8
Enrichment Triad Model	10	12.7	31	27.4	41	21.4
Honors programs	17	21.5	38	33.6	55	28.6
Magnet schools	1	1.3	10	8.8	11	5.7
Ability grouping	23	29.1	40	35.4	63	32.8
Saturday seminars	4	5.1	10	8.8	14	7.3
Other	35	44.3	41	36.3	41	36.3

In analyzing the program-model data based on geographical division, the trend seemed to be that the Middle Atlantic division had the highest rate (71.0%) of pull-out programs for two hours or less a week. The Pacific division reported the highest percentage of advanced placement/acceleration (66.7%), cluster groups within classrooms (61.1%), and honors programs (72.2%). Complete data are shown in Appendix D.

Gifted Program Supervisory Responsibility

The district consultant/coordinator for gifted education was found to have the most supervisory responsibility for the gifted program. This was indicated by 34.9% (67) of the respondents. Building principals and gifted program teachers were ranked second and third, respectively. Less frequently mentioned as having the most responsibility for the district's gifted programs were: elementary director, director of special education, director of exceptional children's program, curriculum director, librarian, assistant superintendent, assistant principal, counselor, director of special services, Project Challenge management committee, and gifted and talented instructional supervisor. In relation to supervisory responsibility for the gifted program, no significant difference was found between mandated and nonmandated districts nor among the geographical divisions of the United States.

Research Questions

As the data were being analyzed, an interaction was found between the gifted program components and the evaluation process

examined in response to the research questions found on page 1. This necessitated discussion of more than one research question at a time.

1. How are programs for gifted children reported to be currently evaluated?

Participants were asked to respond to several questions concerning the timing of the gifted program evaluation process. Gifted program evaluation was reported to be carried on systematically throughout the year by 43.2% (83) of the 192 respondents. In 50% (96) of the reporting school districts, evaluation did not occur throughout the year. About 7% (13) of the participants did not respond to this item. A significant difference (.0381) was found between mandated and nonmandated districts. Of the 74 districts mandating gifted education, 36.5% (27) reported that systematic program evaluation occurred throughout the year. Of the 105 districts not mandating gifted education, 53.3% (56) reported that systematic evaluation occurred throughout the year. No significant difference was found among the geographical divisions of the country.

Gifted programs were reported to be evaluated only at the end of the year by approximately half the respondents. About 9% (18) of the participants did not respond to this item. No significant difference was found between mandated and nonmandated districts nor among the geographical divisions of the United States.

Approximately half the respondents reported that the district's gifted program evaluation was designed before the program was implemented. About 9% (14) of the participants did not respond to this question. A significant difference (.0501) was found between mandated

and nonmandated districts. Of the 71 districts in states mandating gifted education, 40.8% (29) reported having the program evaluation designed before the program's implementation. Of the 107 districts in states not mandating gifted education, 57% (61) reported this procedure. No significant difference for this item was found among the geographical divisions.

A program evaluation based on predetermined goals or objectives was reported by 70.8% (136) of the respondents. Predetermined goals or objectives did not serve as the basis for program evaluation in 21.4% (41) of the participating districts, and 7.8% (15) offered no response. Differences were significant at .0103 for mandated and nonmandated districts. Of the 71 districts in states mandating gifted education, 66.2% (47) reported predetermined goals or objectives as the basis for the district's gifted program evaluation. Of the 106 districts in states not mandating gifted education, 84% (89) reported this procedure. No significant difference for this item was found among the geographical divisions of the United States.

2. What aspects of the program are reported to be evaluated?

3. Who is reported to be involved in the evaluation process?

5. Whose evaluation, i.e., students, parents, teachers, administrators, school board members, outside evaluators, is reported to have the greatest effect on the various aspects of program development for the gifted?

Gifted education programs comprise a number of components that are affected by the various people who are involved in the programs. This study addressed funding, personnel, curriculum, identification of the gifted, and student time spent in the gifted program

as they are influenced by the following people: students, parents, gifted program teachers, other teachers, building principals, district consultant/coordinator, superintendent, school board of education, state department of education, and outside evaluators.

Funding

Of the 192 participants, 42.7% (82) indicated that the cost of evaluating the gifted program was part of the total gifted program budget. This was not the case with 48.4% (93) of the respondents, and 8.9% (17) offered no response. A significant difference (.0016) was found between mandated and nonmandated districts. Of the 72 respondents in states having mandated gifted education, 31.9% (23) reported that the cost of evaluating the gifted program was part of the total gifted program budget, compared with 57.3% (59) of the respondents in states without mandated gifted education. Although no significant difference was found among the geographical divisions, this practice seemed to be more prevalent in the Mountain and East North Central divisions.

Participants were asked to indicate the percentage of the gifted program budget that is spent on evaluation. Of 192 respondents, 83.3% (160) reported spending 0-5% on evaluation. Almost 6% (11) of the respondents reported spending more than 5%. No response was made by 10.9% (21) of the reporting districts. A comparison of data from mandated and nonmandated districts yielded similar results. In terms of funding for the gifted program evaluation, no significant difference was found among the geographical divisions.

Of the 192 respondents, 33.3% (64) did not indicate which persons were most influential in causing changes in funding for the gifted program. The state department of education was reported to have the greatest influence in this area by 25.8% (33) of the 128 who responded. Students, outside evaluators, and other teachers were found to have the least influence on funding changes. No significant difference was found between mandated and nonmandated districts. The data implied, however, that parents may have had more influence on funding in nonmandated districts. In terms of geographical division, the tendency was for the state department of education to have little influence on funding changes in the East North Central division. Funding in this division was affected by parents and the district consultant/coordinator for gifted education. The superintendent had some influence on funding in all but the Pacific division. A number of respondents mentioned funding problems due to the reduction or elimination of federal, state, and/or local resources.

Personnel

Of the 192 respondents, 64.1% (123) indicated that those responsible for conducting the evaluation of the gifted program were not trained as program evaluators. Trained evaluators were reported by 29.2% (56) of the respondents, and 6.8% (13) did not respond. Of the 56 respondents who reported trained program evaluators, 32.1% (18) were in mandated districts and 67.9% (38) were in nonmandated districts. Although no significant difference was found among the geographical divisions, New England reported the highest percentage (60%) of trained evaluators.

Of 192 participants, 90.1% (173) responded to the item concerning specific guidelines given to those involved in the evaluation. Approximately half the respondents reported having such guidelines. Of the 85 school districts that reported having specific guidelines, 34.1% (29) were in mandated districts and 65.9% (56) were in non-mandated districts. A significant difference was found among the geographical divisions. The Pacific and New England divisions reported the highest rate for existence of evaluation guidelines. (See Table 6.)

Table 6.--Gifted program evaluator guidelines by geographical divisions.

Geographical Divisions	Guidelines for Evaluators		No Guidelines for Evaluators	
	Absolute Frequency	Percent	Absolute Frequency	Percent
Pacific	14	82.4	3	17.6
Mountain	6	46.2	7	53.8
West North Central	11	40.7	16	59.3
West South Central	6	42.9	8	57.1
East North Central	17	54.8	14	45.2
East South Central	4	36.4	7	63.6
South Atlantic	12	54.5	10	45.5
Middle Atlantic	8	28.6	20	71.4
New England	7	70.0	3	30.0

Raw chi-square = 16.39230 df = 8 Significance = .0371

Of the 192 participants, 29.2% (56) did not specify whose evaluations were most influential in causing changes in personnel. The changes to be considered were number of personnel, roles of personnel, and preparation of personnel. The district consultant/coordinator for gifted education was reported to have the most

influence in causing personnel changes by 29.4% (40) of the 136 who responded. Students and outside evaluators were found to have the least effect on personnel changes. In terms of mandated and non-mandated districts, the superintendent and the state department of education had more influence in mandated districts. The district consultant/coordinator and the building principal had more influence on personnel changes in nonmandated districts. These differences are presented in Table 7.

Table 7.--Factors influencing personnel changes in mandated and nonmandated school districts.

Influencing Factors	Mandated		Nonmandated	
	Absolute Frequency	Percent	Absolute Frequency	Percent
Students	0	0.0	1	1.4
Parents	4	6.5	3	4.1
Gifted program teachers	6	9.7	2	2.7
Other teachers	1	1.6	3	4.1
Building principals	7	11.3	18	24.3
District consultant/ coordinator	13	21.0	27	36.5
Superintendent	15	24.2	10	13.5
School board of education	2	3.2	6	8.1
State department of education	13	21.0	3	4.1
Outside evaluators	1	1.6	1	1.4

Raw chi-square = 22.24724 df = 9 Significance = .0081

Although no significant difference was found among geographic divisions, the tendency was for the building principal and the superintendent to have more influence than the district consultant/coordinator in the West South Central division and the state

department of education to have more influence on personnel changes in the East South Central division.

Influences on Curriculum

Of the 192 participants, 20.3% (39) did not indicate whose evaluations were most influential in changing the gifted program curriculum. Gifted program teachers were reported to have the most influence on the program's curriculum by 37.3% (57) of the 153 who responded. The school board of education and outside evaluators were found to have the least influence on curriculum. It was reported that the state department of education had more influence on curriculum in mandated districts, and the district consultant/coordinator had more influence in nonmandated districts. Differences in responses from mandated and nonmandated districts are presented in Table 8.

Table 8.--Factors influencing curriculum changes in mandated and nonmandated school districts.

Influencing Factors	Mandated		Nonmandated	
	Absolute Frequency	Percent	Absolute Frequency	Percent
Students	3	4.6	6	6.8
Parents	1	1.5	1	1.1
Gifted program teachers	28	43.1	29	33.0
Other teachers	1	1.5	5	5.7
Building principals	4	6.2	6	6.8
District consultant/ coordinator	9	13.8	34	38.6
Superintendent	5	7.7	2	2.3
School board of education	1	1.5	1	1.1
State department of education	11	16.9	3	3.4
Outside evaluators	2	3.1	1	1.1

Raw chi-square = 21.84573 df = 9 Significance = .0094

Although no significant difference was found among geographical divisions, the tendency was for the district consultant/coordinator to have more influence on curriculum in the Pacific, East North Central, and East South Central divisions. The state department of education seemed to have more influence on curriculum in the West South Central division.

Influences on Identification of Gifted Students

Of the 192 respondents, 24% (46) did not indicate whose evaluations were most influential in causing changes in the identification of the gifted. The district consultant/coordinator for gifted education was reported to have the most influence in this area by 30.8% (45) of the 146 who responded. The state department of education was ranked second by 20.8% (40) of the respondents as having the greatest influence on the identification of gifted students. Students, the school board of education, and outside evaluators were found to have the least effect on identification procedures. It was reported that the district consultant/coordinator had more influence on student identification in nonmandated districts, while the state department of education had more influence on this component in mandated districts. Differences in responses are presented in Table 9.

Although no significant difference in influence was found among geographical divisions, the tendency was for the state department of education to have more influence in the Pacific, West South Central, East South Central, and South Atlantic divisions. The

gifted program teacher seemed to have more influence on the identification of gifted students in the Mountain division.

Table 9.--Factors influencing changes in gifted student identification in mandated and nonmandated school districts.

Influencing Factors	Mandated		Nonmandated	
	Absolute Frequency	Percent	Absolute Frequency	Percent
Students	0	0.0	0	0.0
Parents	1	1.7	1	1.1
Gifted program teachers	13	22.0	22	25.3
Other teachers	2	3.4	6	6.9
Building principals	2	3.4	6	6.9
District consultant/ coordinator	7	11.9	38	43.7
Superintendent	2	3.4	1	1.1
School board of education	1	1.7	0	0.0
State department of education	28	47.5	12	13.8
Outside evaluators	3	5.1	1	1.1

Raw chi-square = 32.21830 df = 8 Significance = .0001

Influences on Student Time Spent in the Gifted Program

Of the 192 participants, 28.1% (54) did not indicate whose evaluations were most influential in causing changes in student time spent in the gifted program. The gifted program teacher was reported to have the most influence in this area by 25.4% (35) of the 138 who responded. The district consultant/coordinator was ranked second as having the greatest influence on student time spent in the gifted program. Outside evaluators and students were found to have the least effect on student time spent in the gifted program. Although

no significant difference was found between districts in mandated and nonmandated districts, the data seemed to imply that parents and the district consultant/coordinator had more influence on student time spent in the gifted program in nonmandated districts. In terms of geographic divisions, the tendency was for the state department of education to have more influence on student time spent in the gifted program in the East South Central division.

7. How is the growth of students in the gifted program reported to be evaluated?

Participants were asked to specify the measures used to evaluate the progress of students in the gifted program. At least one method of evaluation was indicated by 189 participants. Those designated by the researcher were the following: intelligence tests, mastery of behavioral objectives, teacher-made tests, creative products, standardized achievement tests, student self-evaluation, and teacher observation. It was possible for participants to indicate more than one method of evaluation. Relative frequency was based on the number of responses in a given category compared with 189 respondents. The frequency of responses is presented in Table 10.

Participants were asked to list other measures used to evaluate students' progress in the gifted program. These included the following:

- parent, teacher, and student questionnaires
- creative-thinking tests
- correct completion of tasks in the program
- parent observation

- pre/post assessment with creativity test, Rorschach Test using the Projection Regression evaluation model
- extracurricular activities
- results of creative competitions
- completion of goals on Individualized Education Program (IEP)
- indications that student is searching out more information
- evaluation by counselors who maintain ongoing program with elementary students

Table 10.--Methods of evaluating students in gifted programs.

Methods of Evaluation	Absolute Frequency	Relative Frequency (%)
Intelligence tests	41	21.7
Mastery of behavioral objectives	93	48.4
Teacher-made tests	97	50.5
Creative products	132	68.8
Standardized achievement tests	94	49.0
Student self-evaluation	110	57.3
Teacher observation	172	89.6
Other	29	15.1

The only measure that was found to be significantly different (.0044) between mandated and nonmandated districts was the mastery of behavioral objectives. Of the 77 mandated districts, 62.3% (48) evaluated student progress in relation to the mastery of objectives and 37.7% (29) did not. Of the 112 respondents in nonmandated districts, 40.2% (45) used this method and 59.8% (67) did not.

The only method of evaluating student progress that was found to be significantly different among the geographic divisions was the use of standardized achievement tests. This measure was found to be most prevalent in the East South Central and West South Central

divisions. It was reported to be used the least in the Middle Atlantic division. (See Table 11.)

Table 11.--Achievement tests as measures of student progress in gifted programs by geographic division.

Geographic Divisions	Relative Frequency (%)
East South Central	75.0
West South Central	73.3
Pacific	66.7
East North Central	60.6
New England	50.0
West North Central	46.7
Mountain	37.5
South Atlantic	37.5
Middle Atlantic	25.8

4. What effects do evaluations reportedly have on program changes?

6. How are evaluation results reported to effect changes in various aspects of program development?

Evaluation results can and should be used to effect appropriate changes in program development. At least half the gifted programs involved in this study were not evaluated throughout the year, and approximately one-third had not evaluated the components of the program. Very little funding was provided for evaluation, and few districts reported planned evaluation procedures. Many respondents indicated that program changes had not occurred since the gifted program had been initiated.

Participants were asked to indicate the persons who were directly informed of the program evaluation results and the means that

were used to convey the information. Between 18.2% and 34.4% of the 192 participants did not respond to these items.

Of the 192 respondents, 28.1% (54) indicated that no evaluation results were conveyed to students in the gifted program. The local news media received no report in 39.1% (75) of the responding school districts. Written reports were submitted to the superintendent (47.4%), building principals (43.2%), gifted program teachers (42.2%), district consultants/coordinators (42.2%), state department of education (39.1%), school board of education (32.8%), and parents of the gifted (29.7%). It was reported that other teachers received an oral report in 25.5% of the cases reported and a written report in 24.0% of the cases reported.

Significant differences were found in reporting methods to building principals and to the state department of education between mandated and nonmandated districts. (See Tables 12 and 13.)

Table 12.--Method of reporting gifted program evaluation results to building principals.

Method of Reporting	Mandated		Nonmandated	
	Absolute Frequency	Percent	Absolute Frequency	Percent
No report	6	10.2	7	7.2
Oral report	14	23.7	9	9.3
Written report	31	52.5	52	53.6
Oral and written reports	8	13.6	29	29.9

Raw chi-square = 9.71616 df = 3 Significance = .0211

Table 13.--Method of reporting gifted program evaluation results to the state department of education.

Method of Reporting	Mandated		Nonmandated	
	Absolute Frequency	Percent	Absolute Frequency	Percent
No report	13	23.2	16	16.8
Oral report	16	28.6	12	12.6
Written report	21	37.5	42	44.2
Oral and written reports	6	10.7	25	26.3

Raw chi-square = 10.12982 df = 3 Significance = .0175

Several participants in mandated districts indicated that the state department of education conducted an on-site evaluation.

Although no significant difference was found among geographical divisions, the trend seemed to be that the greatest percentage of written reports was submitted to the state department of education in the Pacific, East South Central, and South Atlantic divisions.

Summary of Findings

The major findings in this study are:

1. At least half the gifted programs in this study were not evaluated throughout the year.

2. Pull-out programs and advanced placement/acceleration were the most popular gifted program models.

3. It was felt that most classroom teachers were unable to describe specific curriculum modifications made for gifted students.

4. A specific budget for gifted education was provided in most school districts having gifted programs.

5. Very little funding was provided for evaluating gifted programs.

6. Many people who carried out gifted program evaluation were not trained evaluators.

7. Approximately one-third of the school districts involved in this study had not evaluated the components of the gifted program.

8. Nonmandated when compared to mandated districts showed a higher incidence of the following: (a) systematic program evaluation throughout the year, (b) program evaluation designed before implementation of the program, (c) program evaluation based on predetermined goals and objectives, (d) cost of evaluation included in total gifted program budget, and (e) trained program evaluators.

9. Mandated districts were influenced more by the state department of education. Nonmandated districts were influenced more by the district consultant/coordinator and the building principal.

10. The West South Central and South Atlantic divisions included a higher percentage of mandated districts.

11. Funding was most affected by the state department of education. Personnel and the identification of gifted students were most affected by the district consultant/coordinator. Curriculum and student time spent in the program were most affected by the gifted program teacher.

12. Students, outside evaluators, other teachers, and the school board of education had little influence on the various aspects of the gifted program.

13. Teacher observation and creative products were the measures most often used to evaluate student progress in the gifted program. Intelligence tests were used the least.

14. Mastery of behavioral objectives was used more in mandated districts than in nonmandated districts to evaluate student progress in the gifted program.

15. Written reports of gifted program evaluation results were the most frequently used system of reporting gifted program evaluation results.

School Districts Recommended by State Directors of Programs for the Gifted

The State Directors of Programs for the Gifted were asked to recommend gifted programs in their states that included an exceptional evaluation component. Data from these recommended districts were compared with data from the randomly selected districts on the assumption that programs recognized as exceptional would differ from the randomly selected sample.

Of the 50 questionnaires mailed to school districts recommended by State Directors of Programs for the Gifted, 76% (38) were returned. The district consultant/coordinator for gifted education completed 42.1% (16) of the questionnaires. Two each were completed by superintendents and building principals. One was completed by a curriculum director, and one participant did not provide this information. Other professional positions were held by 42.1% (16) of the respondents. These included the following: special education coordinator, director of exceptional education, director of instruction, teacher of the

gifted, project specialist, elementary coordinator, director--staff and curriculum development, director--pupil personnel services, and extended learning program coordinator.

The majority of the respondents (47.4%) were from the South Atlantic division. The West North Central division was represented by 23.7%, the Mountain and East North Central divisions by 10.5% each, the West South Central division by 5.3%, and the New England division by 2.6%. The Pacific, East South Central, and Middle Atlantic divisions were not represented in this sample.

Of the 38 participants, 36.8% (14) were in states that mandate gifted education and 63.2% (24) were in states that do not mandate gifted education.

Gifted students were reported to be specifically identified for programming in 97.4% (37) of the 38 school districts. It was felt by 55.3% (21) of the respondents that most classroom teachers were unable to describe the specific curriculum modifications being made for gifted students. In comparison, 44.7% (17) of the respondents indicated that most classroom teachers were able to describe the specific curriculum modifications being made for gifted students. A specific budget for gifted education was reported by 86.8% (33) of the districts. About 13% (5) reported no specific budget for gifted education. These characteristics are similar to those found in the randomly selected school districts.

The most popular program model among this group of respondents was advanced placement/acceleration. This category was selected by 68.4% (26) of the participants. Magnet schools and Saturday seminars

seemed to be the least popular. The following program models were mentioned in addition to those designated by the researcher: summer schools, Future Problem Solving, independent study, Olympics of the Mind, after-school programs, curriculum compacting, College for Kids, mentorships, center programs, self-contained class, pull-out programs for various time durations, modification of regular curriculum, and college tuition paid for junior and senior high school students when appropriate classes aren't available as part of the regular curriculum. Although pull-out programs for two hours or less were not found as frequently in the recommended districts, the remainder of the program models were similar to those found in the randomly selected districts.

The district consultant/coordinator for gifted education was found to have the most supervisory responsibility for the gifted program. This was indicated by 57.9% (22) of the respondents. The building principal and the gifted program teacher were found to share responsibility for the program. The program coordinator and assistant principal were also reported by some participants as having the most supervisory responsibility for the gifted program. Supervisory responsibility for the gifted program was handled similarly in the randomly selected districts.

Gifted program evaluation was reported to be carried on systematically throughout the year by 63.2% (24) of the 38 respondents. Evaluation did not occur throughout the year in 34.2% (13) of the reporting districts. Gifted programs were reported to be evaluated only at the end of the year by 36.8% (14) of the respondents. This

was not the case in 57.9% (22) of the reporting districts. A higher rate of systematic evaluation throughout the school year was found in the recommended districts.

Approximately half the respondents reported that the district's gifted program evaluation was designed before the program was implemented. A program evaluation based on predetermined goals or objectives was reported by 89.5% (34) of the respondents. About 8% (3) of the participants responded negatively to this item, and one offered no response. These procedures were similar to those found in the randomly selected districts.

Of the 38 participants, 57.9% (22) indicated that the cost of evaluating the gifted program was part of the total gifted program budget. In comparison, 34.2% (13) indicated that the gifted program budget did not include the cost of evaluation, and 7.9% (3) of the participants offered no response. One respondent stated that there was no gifted program budget. Participants were asked to specify the percentage of the gifted program budget that is spent on evaluation. Of the 38 participants, 86.8% (33) reported spending 0-5% on evaluation. One respondent reported spending 12-15% on evaluation, and 10.5% (4) did not respond to this item. These budget practices were similar to those reported in the randomly selected districts.

Parents were reported to have the most influence on funding by 26.7% (8) of the 30 who responded. Outside evaluators were found to have the least influence in this area. In contrast, the state department of education was found to have the most influence on funding in the randomly selected districts.

Approximately half the respondents indicated that those responsible for conducting the evaluation of the gifted program were trained as program evaluators. Specific guidelines were reported to be provided to those involved in the evaluation by 71.1% (27) of the respondents. About 26% (10) responded negatively to this item, and one participant did not respond. A higher incidence of trained program evaluators as well as specific guidelines provided to those involved in the evaluation was found in the recommended districts.

The district consultant/coordinator was reported to have the most influence on personnel changes by 41.4% (12) of the 29 who responded. The changes considered were number of personnel, roles of personnel, and preparation of personnel. Students had the least influence in this area.

About 21% (8) of the participants did not indicate whose evaluations were most influential in changing the gifted program curriculum. Gifted program teachers were reported to have the most influence on the gifted program's curriculum by 43.3% (13) of the 30 who responded. Outside evaluators and the school board of education were found to have the least effect on the curriculum.

About 21% (8) of the participants did not indicate whose evaluations were most influential in causing changes in the identification of the gifted. The district consultant/coordinator was reported to have the most influence on student identification by 36.7% (11) of the 30 who responded. Students and outside evaluators had the least influence.

About 21% (8) of the participants did not indicate whose evaluations had the greatest influence on student time spent in the program. The gifted program teacher was reported to have the most influence in this area by 36.7% (11) of the 30 participants who responded. About 33% (10) of the participants indicated that the district consultant/coordinator had the greatest influence on student time spent in the gifted program. The superintendent and outside evaluators were found to have the least effect on this component.

Influences in recommended districts on personnel, curriculum, identification of the gifted, and student time spent in the gifted program were similar to those found in the randomly selected districts. There was, however, a higher rate of response to these items from the recommended districts.

Participants were asked to specify the measures used to evaluate the progress of students in the gifted program. All 38 participants indicated at least one method of evaluation. Those designated by the researcher were the following: intelligence tests, mastery of behavioral objectives, teacher-made tests, creative products, standardized achievement tests, student self-evaluation, and teacher observation. It was possible for participants to indicate more than one method of evaluating student progress. Relative frequency was based on the number of responses in a given category compared with 38 respondents. The measures most often used were creative products, student self-evaluation, and teacher observation. The frequency of responses is presented in Table 14.

Table 14.--Methods of evaluating students in gifted programs in school districts recommended by State Directors of Programs for the Gifted.

Methods of Evaluating Student Progress	Absolute Frequency	Relative Frequency (%)
Intelligence tests	11	28.9
Mastery of behavioral objectives	18	47.4
Teacher-made tests	17	44.4
Creative products	33	86.8
Standardized achievement tests	23	60.5
Student self-evaluation	30	78.9
Teacher observation	37	97.4
Other	8	21.1

Participants were asked to list other measures used to evaluate students' progress in the gifted program. These included the following:

- parent and peer reactions
- teacher-student conferences for evaluation and goal setting or differentiated curriculum contracts
- parent evaluation of product and progress
- creativity tests
- parent observations
- student attitude toward school, self, subject area
- teacher attitude toward gifted students and differentiated instruction

Participants were asked to indicate the persons who were directly informed of the program evaluation results and the means which were used to convey the information. Written reports were submitted to the state department of education (60.5%), building principals (52.6%), gifted program teachers (44.7%), district consultant/

coordinator (42.1%), superintendent (42.1%), school board of education (34.2%), and the local news media (26.3%). Of the 38 participants, 47.4% (18) indicated that students in the gifted program received oral reports, and 34.2% (13) indicated that other teachers received oral reports. Both oral and written reports were submitted to the state department of education by 34.2% (13) of the respondents. Reports were submitted to parents of the gifted students in 81.6% (31) of the reporting districts: 34.2% oral, 31.6% written, and 15.8% oral and written. No report was submitted to all parents in the school district in 50% (19) of the reporting districts.

Results of the gifted program evaluation were reported similarly in the recommended districts and the randomly selected districts. A greater frequency of written reports, however, was submitted to the state department of education by the recommended districts. In addition, students were more likely to receive an oral report of the evaluation results in the recommended districts.

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter presents a discussion of the findings in this study, implications of the study, and recommendations for further research.

Discussion of the Findings

This study assessed the current status of gifted program evaluation. The participants in this study included 192 randomly selected school districts having gifted programs and 38 districts recommended by State Directors of Programs for the Gifted. Analysis of the data was based on the total sample, the legal status of gifted education in the states, and the geographical divisions of the United States. In addition to completing the items on the questionnaire, many respondents provided further insight into their programs through written comments and/or printed material.

Most of those who responded were gifted program consultants/coordinators at the district level. They were reported to have the most supervisory responsibility for the gifted program. Changes in personnel and the identification of gifted students were affected most by the district consultant/coordinator.

Although gifted students were specifically identified for programming in almost all the participating districts, it was felt

that many classroom teachers were unable to describe the specific curriculum modifications being made for these students. Although this may be attributed to lack of interest in some cases, many times it is simply a lack of time that prevents classroom teachers from becoming more aware of and involved in the programs being offered outside their own classrooms. Perhaps school districts should offer more inservice dealing with the specific needs of gifted students and how they can be addressed both in and outside the classroom. It may be that classroom teachers should be included in the initial planning of the gifted program. Allowing time for regular communication between the classroom teacher and the gifted program teacher should also be considered.

A variety of gifted programs have been implemented throughout the country. The most popular of these were pull-out programs for two hours or less a week and advanced placement/acceleration. The latter was primarily found at the secondary level. There has been great debate on the issue of acceleration, particularly at the elementary level, in relation to social adjustment. Very few magnet schools for the gifted were found in the districts that participated in this study.

Evaluation does not seem to be a priority in gifted programs as approximately half the programs in this study were not evaluated throughout the year. Many evaluations conducted at the end of the year were done to comply with state laws or regulations.

Perhaps it is felt that anything above and beyond the standard curriculum offered to gifted students is better and does not require

evaluation. It may be that gifted program teachers are so enthusiastic and excited about the content of their programs that they do not have or take the time to see if what they are doing is making a difference. It is simply assumed that any special program makes a difference.

Gifted programs are generally limited to a specific budget. Is it possible that the enthusiasm for initiating and maintaining the program prevents expenditures for evaluation? Oftentimes, gifted program evaluation is not even considered until it is requested or required by the school board or the state department of education. If meaningful program changes are to be made, however, continuous evaluation throughout the year as well as at the end of the school year is essential.

Although the literature emphasized the importance of designing the evaluation before implementing the gifted program, this only occurred in approximately half the participating districts. It was reported, however, that most program evaluations were based on predetermined goals or objectives. It would seem to be quite efficient, then, to determine the goals or objectives and design the evaluation of the attainment of those goals or objectives concurrently before the program's implementation.

Many of those involved in evaluating gifted programs had not been trained as program evaluators, nor had they been given specific guidelines concerning the evaluation process. It may be that qualified program evaluators are difficult to find and that the cost to the district would be prohibitive. Perhaps other alternatives should

be explored. University personnel could be contracted for consulting services. A district consultant/coordinator from another district might be willing to conduct the evaluation. Perhaps an inservice workshop could be offered to a group of professional personnel in the district so that they could conduct an adequate evaluation.

The gifted program components addressed in this study were funding, personnel, curriculum, identification of the gifted, and student time spent in the gifted program. Approximately one-third of the participants had not evaluated these components. In some cases, this was due to the program's newness. In others, no changes had been made based on evaluation.

Funding seems to be a major problem for gifted programs. Many have been affected by the reduction or elimination of federal, state, or local funds. Programs that were initiated with federal or state funds often fell by the wayside when these resources were reduced or withdrawn unless the local district was able to finance the program and was committed to its existence.

Data in this study seemed to indicate that generally the state department of education had the most influence on changes in funding for gifted programs. This was not the case in the East North Central division of the United States, where poor economic conditions were the probable cause of reduced funding for education to the local districts.

Although a specific budget for gifted education was reported by most participants, less than half indicated that the cost of evaluation was included in the total program budget. Almost all respondents indicated that the cost of evaluation comprised less than 5% of the

gifted program budget. Given a limited amount of money to support the gifted program, educators may feel it necessary to use these funds for qualified personnel and materials. Evaluation is evidently not important enough to require funding. If a school district spends thousands of dollars implementing a gifted program--including the hiring of personnel, identification of gifted students, development of a curriculum, and purchase of materials--would it not seem reasonable to appropriate funding for program evaluation? Would it not be efficient and economically sound to determine if the resources allocated are being used effectively?

Evaluation in some districts focused only on personnel. Teacher evaluation has been standard procedure in all areas of education. Can it be assumed that the quality of the teacher determines the adequacy of the program?

In other districts, evaluation has focused primarily on the curriculum. The data in this study indicated that changes in the curriculum were influenced the most by the gifted program teacher. Changes prompted by the teacher's perception of the program's strengths and weaknesses may be based on student input, usually in the form of a questionnaire. All too often this has simply been a matter of asking students what they liked and did not like about the program. Although student input is essential, perhaps it should be more substantive. Students could be involved in planning the curriculum in terms of its purposes and intended effects. Their contribution would then be more useful in assessing the need for changes.

Data collected for this study indicated that students had almost no effect on any of the gifted program components. Of particular concern is their lack of influence on the curriculum and on student time spent in the gifted program. Should gifted students not be encouraged, or at least permitted, to pursue areas of study that are of particular interest to them? Is it essential that every aspect of education be prescribed by an educator? It would seem that the most meaningful curriculum is one that is shaped by the student and teacher together.

It also seems reasonable for students to have some control over their time spent in the gifted program. Students should be given the opportunity to make choices and decisions concerning the management of their time. It is certainly possible that the gifted program will not always be able to accommodate the various needs and interests of all the students involved. There may be times when students would prefer to remain in their regular classroom for a variety of reasons. With guidance from parents and teachers, students can learn to make appropriate decisions concerning the expenditure of their time.

Of the 192 randomly selected school districts, approximately 40% were in states with mandated gifted education and 60% were in states with nonmandated gifted education. Mandated gifted programs do not imply mandated quality program evaluation. Rather, it was found that nonmandated districts were more likely to design the program evaluation before the program's implementation and to carry on systematic evaluation throughout the year. A higher incidence of

trained program evaluators and of a program evaluation based on predetermined goals or objectives was found in nonmandated districts. Having the cost of evaluation included in the total gifted program budget was also more likely in nonmandated districts.

The state department of education seemed to influence all aspects of the gifted program in mandated districts. There seemed to be some feeling of resentment on the part of those responsible for gifted programs in these districts. Does mandated gifted education imply that the state should control student identification, curriculum, and student time spent in the gifted program? Is it assumed that the state is better able to make these determinations than the local school district? In some cases, gifted education has been mandated without funding from the state. Should local districts be expected to accommodate the mandates of the state, or should they be permitted to develop their own programs?

Various methods were used to evaluate student progress in the gifted program. Teacher observation and creative products were the measures most often used, and intelligence tests were least often used. Although evaluating creative products may be rather subjective, it is probably the most appropriate measure of a gifted student's achievement (Renzulli, 1980). Although intelligence tests are often used to identify gifted children, 41 respondents indicated their use for evaluating student progress in the gifted program. Is it possible that changes in intelligence are expected as a result of participating in a gifted program?

In spite of the fact that the behavioral-objectives model is generally not seen as suitable for evaluating the progress of gifted students, this practice was found to be more prevalent in mandated districts than in nonmandated districts. A number of participants expressed concern about the difficulty of evaluating higher-level thinking skills and creative products using this method. Perhaps those involved in mandating gifted education should consider other alternatives for evaluating student progress.

In comparing the randomly selected districts with those recommended by State Directors of Programs for the Gifted, many similarities were found. There appears to be little difference between the randomly selected districts and those recommended as having an exceptional evaluation component included in the gifted program. The data seemed to indicate the following differences:

1. A higher rate of systematic evaluation throughout the year was found in the recommended districts.

2. Parents were reported to have more influence than the state department of education on funding in the recommended districts.

3. A higher incidence of trained program evaluators as well as specific guidelines provided to those involved in the evaluation was found in the recommended districts.

It is interesting that many of the recommended districts did not rely on the state for funding. Rather, parents were more influential in this area. Perhaps this involved appearances at school board meetings or fund-raising projects. Is it possible that this approach offers the program more freedom?

Implications of the Study

Evaluation must be an integral part of program development. Gifted programs should be evaluated throughout the year so that necessary modifications can be addressed. Evaluation should also occur at the year's end to determine total results and to make adjustments in planning for the following year.

Gifted program evaluation procedures should be designed before the program is implemented and should be based on predetermined goals and objectives. District personnel will need to determine who will conduct the evaluation. A number of possibilities exist and should be explored before a decision is made.

Gifted programs are created to meet the needs of particular students. Based on what has been reported in this study, students are offered almost no opportunity to react to the programs they are involved in. Their input is neither sought nor considered. If students are to become self-directed, independent adults, they must be encouraged to explore alternatives and formulate decisions. Gifted students are certainly capable of participating in determining their areas of study and time spent in the program. It is unfortunate that those responsible for gifted programs have failed to recognize the value of students in shaping gifted programs.

Evaluation of gifted programs in mandated districts was less thorough than that in nonmandated districts. Within the limitations of this study, no advantages were found for mandating gifted education. One would think that mandated programs would have a more sophisticated evaluation model. This was not the case in the districts

surveyed in this study. Factors considered to be important in the evaluation of gifted programs were found more frequently in non-mandated than in mandated districts.

Most educators agree that it is essential to provide appropriate educational programs for all students. Mandating these programs, complete with specific guidelines and paperwork with little room for flexibility for the local district, is not the answer. Programs that are created and grow from the grass roots generally meet with greater success in that they are more apt to suit local people and situations rather than mandates from the state.

The likelihood of a gifted program being eliminated is greatly reduced when parents have some ownership and involvement in it. All too often, gifted programs simply exist in mandated states. Gifted program teachers and district consultants/coordinators are occupied with reams of paperwork and are left with little time to plan for and work with students and teachers.

A feeling of resentment on the part of some of the respondents in mandated states was apparent. Mandating an appropriate education for every child with general guidelines is sufficient. The state need not insult the local education specialists and administration by dictating program details.

Progress of students in the gifted program must be monitored. Although the behavioral-objectives model is recognized as too limiting to evaluate gifted students adequately, this model is favored more in mandated states. Perhaps it appears to be the simplest measure of student success, however inaccurate that measure may be.

Creative products provide a more accurate assessment of achievement. Criteria should be developed to evaluate creative products. Student self-evaluation could also become a part of this total assessment.

Recommendations for Further Research

The following recommendations for further research are suggested:

1. Because this researcher's data did not support mandated gifted education, it is recommended that the intricacies of gifted programs in states mandating gifted education be studied.

2. A study comparing student attitudes toward the gifted program in mandated and nonmandated districts could be enlightening.

3. Advanced placement/acceleration was found primarily at the secondary level. This model could be examined at the elementary and middle school levels.

4. Differences in state laws mandating gifted education could be examined.

5. Since it was felt that many classroom teachers were unaware of what was being done for gifted children, a study concerning inservice for teachers might be beneficial.

6. Perhaps it would be possible to compare programs in which students' opinions are valued with those in which they are ignored.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

LIST OF STATE DIRECTORS OF PROGRAMS FOR THE GIFTED

State Directors of Programs for the Gifted--January 7, 1982

ALABAMA

Marsha Johnson
State Consultant for Gifted Programs
Alabama State Department of Education
868 State Office Building
Montgomery, AL 36130
(205) 832-3230

ALASKA

Diane Le Resche, Consultant
Office of Exceptional Children
Pouch F
State Department of Education
Juneau, AK 99811
(907) 465-2970

AMERICAN SAMOA

Lui Tuitele, Consultant
Gifted/Talented Education
Pago Pago, American Samoa 96799
Deputy's #-Telea Falealiz
011-684-633-5237 (Overseas Operator)

ARIZONA

Lola P. Gross, State Coordinator
State Coordinator
Education for Gifted/Talented
Division of Curriculum and Instruction
1535 West Jefferson
Phoenix, AZ 85007
(602) 255-5008/9

ARKANSAS

Clifford D. Curl
Consultant, Gifted/Talented
Special Education Section
Division of Instructional Services
Arch Ford Education Building
Little Rock, AR 72201
(501) 371-2161

CALIFORNIA

Clinor S. McKinney
Program Manager/Gifted Education
721 Capitol Mall
Sacramento, CA 95814
(916) 322-5954

Jack Mosier
Consultant, Gifted/Talented
721 Capitol Mall
Sacramento, CA 95814
(916) 322-5954

CALIFORNIA (Cont'd)

Paul Plowman
Consultant, Gifted/Talented
721 Capitol Mall
Sacramento, CA 95814
(916) 322-5954

COLORADO

Gerald Villars, State Coordinator
Gifted/Talented Student Programs
Colorado Department of Education
201 East Colfax
Denver, CO 80203
(303) 866-5721

CONNECTICUT

William G. Vassar
Consultant, Gifted/Talented
State Department of Education
P.O. Box 2219
Hartford, CT 06115
(203) 566-3695

DELAWARE

Donald Ames, State Supervisor
Programs for Exceptional Children
State Department of Public Instruction
Townsend Building
Dover, DE 19901
(302) 736-4667

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Phyllis Hines
Coordinator, Gifted Education
Room 311-A
Seaton Elementary School
10th & Rhone Island Ave. N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20001
(202) 673-7054

FLORIDA

Shirley Perkins
Consultant, Gifted Education
Bureau of Education for Exceptional Children
Knott Building
Tallahassee, FL 32301
(904) 488-1106

GEORGIA

Dr. Arthur E. Bilyeu
Attn.: Alan White, Acting Coordinator
Programs for the Gifted
Department of Education
State Office Building
Atlanta, GA 30334
(404) 656-2425

Mary Lillian White, Consultant
Programs for the Gifted
Department of Education
State Office Building
Atlanta, GA 30334
(404) 656-2425

Joyce E. Gay, Consultant
Programs for the Gifted
Department of Education
State Office Building
Atlanta, GA 30334
(404) 656-2425

GUAM

Victoria T. Harper
Associate Superintendent
Special Education
Department of Education
P.O. Box DE
Agana, GU 96910
Overseas Operator -
011+44+671+Local Number:
472-8906; 472-8703;
472-9082; 472-9352

HAWAII

Pearl Ching, Educational Specialist
Gifted/Talented
Office of Instructional Services
Department of Education #805
1270 Queen Emma Street
Honolulu, HI 96813
(808) 548-6414

IDAHO

Genelle Christensen
Coordinator, Gifted/Talented
State Department of Education
Len B. Jordan Building
650 West State
Boise, ID 83720
(208) 334-3940

ILLINOIS

Wilma Lund
Gifted Education Coordinator
Educational Innovation & Support Section
State Department of Education
100 North First Street
Springfield, IL 62777
(217) 782-3810

INDIANA

Arlene Munger, Consultant
Gifted/Talented Education
Department of Public Instruction
229 State House
Indianapolis, IN 46204
(317) 927-0111

IOWA

Dr. Leland Walf
Consultant, Gifted and Talented Education
Grimes State Office Building
East 14th & Grand Avenue
Des Moines, IA 50319
(515) 281-3198

KANSAS

Woody Houseman
Education Program Specialist-Gifted
120 East 10th
Topeka, KS 66612
(913) 296-3866

KENTUCKY

Susan Leib, Program Manager
Gifted Education
1831 Capitol Plaza Tower
Frankfort, KY 40601
(502) 564-2106

LOUISIANA

Ruth Castille, Section Chief
Gifted/Talented Programs
State Department of Education
P.O. Box 44064
Baton Rouge, LA 70804
(504) 342-3636

Dean Frost, Supervisor
Talented Programs
State Department of Education
P.O. Box 44064
Baton Rouge, LA 70804
(504) 342-3636

MAINE

Patricia O'Connell, Coordinator
Gifted/Talented
State House Station #23
Augusta, ME 04333
(207) 289-3451

MARYLAND

Janice Wickless
Senior Staff Specialist
Gifted/Talented Education
State Department of Education
200 W. Baltimore Street
Baltimore, MD 21201
(301) 659-2312

Lynn Cole
Specialist, Gifted/Talented
State Department of Education
200 W. Baltimore Street
Baltimore, MD 21201
(301) 659-2313

Karen Davidson
Specialist, Gifted/Talented
State Department of Education
200 W. Baltimore Street
Baltimore, MD 21201
(301) 659-2314

MASSACHUSETTS

Roselyn Frank, Director
Programs for Gifted/Talented
Massachusetts Department of Education
Bureau of Curriculum Services
31 St. James Avenue
Boston, MA 02116
(617) 727-5750

MICHIGAN

Nancy Mincemoyer, Specialist
Gifted-Talented Education
Michigan Department of Education
P.O. Box 30008
Lansing, MI 48909
(517) 373-8793

MINNESOTA

Lorraine Hertz
Program Specialist in Gifted Education
641 Capitol Square
St. Paul, MN 55101
(612) 296-4072

MISSISSIPPI

Betty Walker
Consultant, Gifted/Talented
Special Education Section
P.O. Box 771
Jackson, MS 39205
(601) 354-6950

MISSOURI

Robert Roach, Director
Gifted/Alternative Programs
State Department Elementary/Secondary
Education
P.O. Box 480
Jefferson City, MO 65102
(314) 751-2453

MONTANA

Nancy Lukenbill
Specialist, Gifted/Talented
Office of Public Instruction
Helena, MT 59620
(406) 449-5660

NEBRASKA

Sheila Brown
Programs for the Gifted
301 Centennial Mall South
Lincoln, NE 68509
(402) 471-2446

NEVADA

Jane Early, Consultant
Nevada Department of Education
400 West King Street
Carson City, NV 89710
(702) 885-3140

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Trina Osher
Consultant, Special Education
State Department of Education
105 Loudon Road
Concord, NH 03301
(603) 271-3741

NEW JERSEY

Ted Gourley
Consultant, Gifted/Talented
State Department of Education
225 West State Street
Trenton, NJ 08625
(609) 292-8412

NEW MEXICO

Ronald Rubenzer
Coordinator, Gifted Education
Special Education Division
State Department of Education
State Education Building
Santa Fe, NM 87503
(505) 827-2793

NEW YORK

David Irvine
Specialist, Gifted Education
State Education Department
Room 367 EBA
Albany, NY 12234
(518) 474-5966

James E. Shea
Specialist, Gifted Education
State Education Department
Room 367 EBA
Albany, NY 12234
(518) 474-5966

NORTH CAROLINA

Gail Smith, Chief Consultant
Gifted Education
Division of Exceptional Children
State Department of Public Instruction
Raleigh, NC 27611
(919) 733-3004

Ruby Murchison
Consultant, Gifted Education
Region IV Education Center
P.O. Box 786
Carthage, NC 28327
(919) 947-5871

NORTH DAKOTA

La Donna Whitmore
Coordinator, Gifted/Talented
Department of Public Instruction
State Capitol
Bismarck, ND 58505
(701) 224-2652

OHIO

George Fichter, Consultant
Programs for Gifted/Talented
Division of Special Education
933 High Street
Worthington, OH 43085
(614) 466-2650

OKLAHOMA

Dorothy Dodd, Administrator
Gifted/Talented Section
State Department of Education
2500 N. Lincoln Boulevard
Oklahoma City, OK 73105
(405) 521-4287

OREGON

Robert J. Siewert
Gifted/Talented Specialist
700 Pringle Parkway SE
Salem, OR 97219
(503) 378-8460

PENNSYLVANIA

Jean Farr, Coordinator
Gifted/Talented Programs
Penn-STAR
1013 West Ninth Avenue
King of Prussia, PA 19406
(215) 265-3706

PUERTO RICO

Consultant, Gifted
Office of External Resources
Department of Education
Hato Rey, PR 00924
(809) 765-1475

RHODE ISLAND

Judy Edsal, Project Manager
School/Community Partnership
235 Promade Avenue
Providence, RI 02908
(401) 277-2825

SOUTH CAROLINA

Ann Elam, Coordinator
Programs for the Gifted
1420 Senate Street
Columbia, SC 29210
(803) 758-2652

SOUTH DAKOTA

Robert R. Giegle, Program Specialist
Gifted/Talented Programs
Special Education Education
Richard F. Kneip Building
Pierre, SD 57501
(605) 773-3678

TENNESSEE

Barbara Russell
Coordinator, Gifted/Talented
132-A Cordell Hull Building
Nashville, TN 37219
(615) 741-3659

TEXAS

Ann G. Shaw, Program Director
Gifted/Talented Education
Texas Education Agency
201 East 11th Street
Austin, TX 78701
(512) 475-6582

Evelyn L. Hiatt, Chief Consultant
Gifted/Talented Education
Texas Educational Agency
201 East 11th Street
Austin, TX 78701
(512) 475-6582

TRUST TERRITORY

Melody Actouka, Coordinator for
Bilingual Education/Equity Programs
Trust Territory Office of Education
Office of the High Commissioner
Saipan, CM 96950
(Overseas Operator 160+671+Saipan 9312,
9428, or 9319)

UTAH

Jewell Bindrup, Consultant
Gifted/Talented Education
State Board of Education
250 East 5th, South
Salt Lake City, UT 84111
(801) 533-6040

VERMONT

James G. Lengel
Chief, Elementary Curriculum
State Department of Education
Montpelier, VT 05602
(802) 828-3141

VIRGIN ISLANDS

State Director of Special Education
Department of Education
Box 630, Charlotte Amalie
St. Thomas, VI 00801
(809) 774-0100, ext. 271

VIRGINIA

Dr. John D. Booth
Associate Director
Special Programs for Gifted/Talented
Division of Special Education
State Department of Education
P.O. Box 6Q
Ninth Street Office Building
9th & Grace Streets
Richmond, VA 23216
(804) 225-2070

WASHINGTON

Pupil Personnel Services/Gifted Education
ESD #113
601 McPhee Road, SW
Olympia, WA 98502
(206) 754-2933

Mary Henri Fisher
Consultant, Gifted Education
7510 Armstrong Street, SW
FG11
Tumwater, WA 98504
(206) 753-6733

WEST VIRGINIA

Barbara Jones, Coordinator
Programs for the Gifted
Capitol Complex
337 B
Charleston, WV 25305
(304) 348-7010

WISCONSIN

Tom Diener, Supervisor
Gifted/Talented Programs
P.O. Box 7841
125 S. Webster
Madison, WI 53707
(608) 266-3560

WYOMING

Sue Holt, Coordinator
Language Arts/Gifted/Talented
Wyoming Department of Education
Hathaway Building
Cheyenne, WY 82002
(307) 777-6238

APPENDIX B

STATES MANDATING GIFTED EDUCATION AND COMPOSITION OF THE SAMPLE BY STATES

States Mandating Appropriate Education for Gifted Children

Alabama
Alaska
Arizona
California
Florida
Idaho
Kansas
Louisiana
Nevada
New Jersey
New Mexico
North Carolina
Oklahoma
Pennsylvania
South Dakota
Virginia
West Virginia

Table B-1.--Composition of sample by state.

State	% Returned	% of Sample
Alabama	83.3	2.6
Alaska	33.3	.5
Arizona	80.0	2.1
Arkansas	50.0	.5
California	68.4	6.8
Colorado	50.0	.5
Connecticut	57.1	2.1
Delaware	100.0	1.0
Florida	33.3	.5
Georgia	88.8	4.2
Hawaii	100.0	1.0
Idaho	50.0	.5
Illinois	56.0	7.3
Indiana	100.0	1.0
Iowa	66.6	1.0
Kansas	66.6	5.2
Kentucky	66.6	1.0
Louisiana	33.3	.5
Maryland	100.0	1.0
Massachusetts	42.8	1.6
Maine	0.0	0.0
Michigan	71.4	2.6
Minnesota	62.5	2.6
Mississippi	50.0	1.6
Missouri	100.0	2.6
Montana	66.6	1.0
Nebraska	66.6	1.0
Nevada	100.0	1.0
New Hampshire	33.3	.5
New Jersey	75.0	1.6

Table B-1.--Continued.

State	% Returned	% Sample
New Mexico	50.0	1.0
New York	52.0	6.8
North Carolina	57.1	2.1
North Dakota	100.0	1.0
Ohio	100.0	3.1
Oklahoma	48.0	6.3
Oregon	50.0	1.0
Pennsylvania	60.0	7.8
Rhode Island	100.0	1.0
South Carolina	100.0	2.1
South Dakota	44.4	2.1
Tennessee	66.6	1.0
Texas	50.0	1.6
Utah	100.0	1.0
Vermont	50.0	.5
Virginia	42.8	1.6
Washington	0.0	0.0
West Virginia	0.0	0.0
Wisconsin	40.0	3.1
Wyoming	100.0	1.0

APPENDIX C

QUESTIONNAIRE, COVER LETTER, AND FOLLOW-UP POSTCARD

DISTRICT INFORMATION

State _____ City (Town) _____

School District _____

Address _____

K-12 Enrollment _____

Gifted Program Enrollment _____

Name of Respondee _____

Position _____

GIFTED EDUCATION PROGRAM INFORMATION

	Yes	No
1. Is gifted education mandated in your state?		
2. Are gifted students specifically identified for programming in your district?		
3. Do you feel that most classroom teachers are able to describe the specific curriculum modifications being made for gifted students?		
4. Is there a specific budget for gifted education in your district?		

5. Check the gifted program model or models which best describes what is offered in your school district.

   a. _____ Pull-out 2 hours or less a week
   b. _____ Pull-out 1 day or more a week
   c. _____ Cluster groups within classrooms
   d. _____ Advanced placement/acceleration
   e. _____ Enrichment Triad Model
   f. _____ Honors Programs
   g. _____ Magnet Schools
   h. _____ Ability grouping
   i. _____ Saturday Seminars
   j. _____ Other (please describe)

6. Who has supervisory responsibility for the gifted program? (Rank the three highest with 1 = most supervisory responsibility)

a. _____ classroom teacher
b. _____ building principal
c. _____ superintendent
d. _____ gifted program teacher
e. _____ district consultant/ coordinator
f. _____ other (indicate position)

EVALUATION INFORMATION

	Yes	No
7. Is your gifted program systematically evaluated throughout the year?		
8. Is your gifted program evaluated only at the end of the school year?		
9. Was the program evaluation designed before the program was implemented?		
10. Is your program evaluation based on pre-determined goals or objectives?		
11. Are specific guidelines given to all those involved in the evaluation? (Please enclose guidelines if available)		
12. Are those conducting the evaluation of the gifted programs trained as program evaluators?		
13. Is the cost of evaluating the gifted program part of the total gifted program budget?		

14. What percentage of the gifted program budget is spent on evaluation? (Check one)

a. _____ 0-5%
b. _____ 6-11%
c. _____ 12-15%
d. _____ 16-20%
e. _____ more than 20%

Please rank the three most influential for each question (1 = most influential, 2 = second most influential, 3 = third most influential)

	Students	Parents	Gifted Program Teachers	Other Teachers	Building Principals	District Consultant/Coordinator	Superintendent	School Board of Education	State Department of Education	Outside evaluators (University or private firm)
15. Whose evaluations have caused changes in funding for the gifted program?										
16. Whose evaluations have caused changes in personnel involved in the gifted program? (number of personnel, roles of personnel, preparation of personnel)										
17. Whose evaluations have caused changes in the curriculum for the gifted?										
18. Whose evaluations have caused changes in the identification of the gifted?										
19. Whose evaluations have caused changes in student time spent in the gifted program?										

20. Please indicate who is directly informed of the program evaluation results and what means are used to convey the information.

	A no report	B oral report	C written report
students in the gifted program			
parents of the gifted			
all parents in the school district			
gifted program teachers			
other teachers			
building principals			
district consultant/coordinator			
superintendent			
school board of education			
State Department of Education			
local news media			

21. How is the progress of students in the gifted program evaluated? (Check all that apply)

a. _____ intelligence tests

b. _____ standardized achievement tests

c. _____ mastery of behavioral objectives

d. _____ student self-evaluation

e. _____ teacher-made tests

f. _____ teacher observation

g. _____ creative products

h. _____ other (please list)

22. Additional comments about evaluation procedures or provisions made for gifted students would be appreciated.

I WOULD APPRECIATE RECEIVING A COPY OF YOUR EVALUATION PROCEDURES. THANK YOU.

1605 Woodbrook Drive #122
East Lansing, Michigan 48823

I am pursuing doctoral studies in gifted education at Michigan State University. My dissertation deals with current practices in the evaluation of gifted programs and the impact of their results on program development.

I would appreciate your completing the enclosed questionnaire which will require approximately fifteen minutes of your time. Please return it in the stamped addressed envelope as soon as possible. Your response is an integral part of my study.

The results will be compiled and tabulated by state. School districts will remain anonymous and no attempt will be made to evaluate any particular school or school district. I'll be glad to send you a summary of the results.

Thank you for participating in this study. Your input is most appreciated.

Mary Ann Traxler

If you are interested in receiving a summary of the results, please complete your name and address.

Name _____

Address _____

_____

Mary Ann Traxler
1605 Woodbrook Dr. #122
East Lansing, MI 48823

Several weeks ago I sent you a questionnaire concerning the gifted program in your school district. Please take the time during your busy days to complete and return it in the envelope provided. Although school districts will remain anonymous, it is essential that I adequately represent each state. Your response, therefore, is an important part of my study.

Thank you for your input.

Mary Ann Traxler

APPENDIX D

GEOGRAPHICAL DIVISION OF STATES IN THE UNITED STATES AND COMPARISON OF GIFTED PROGRAM MODELS, BASED ON GEOGRAPHICAL DIVISIONS

Geographical Division of States in the United States

Pacific	Mountain	West North Central
Washington	Montana	North Dakota
Oregon	Idaho	South Dakota
California	Wyoming	Minnesota
Alaska	Nevada	Nebraska
Hawaii	Utah	Iowa
	Colorado	Kansas
	Arizona	Missouri
	New Mexico	

West South Central	East North Central	East South Central
Texas	Wisconsin	Mississippi
Oklahoma	Michigan	Alabama
Arkansas	Illinois	Kentucky
Louisiana	Indiana	Tennessee
	Ohio	

South Atlantic	Middle Atlantic	New England
Florida	New York	Maine
Georgia	New Jersey	New Hampshire
South Carolina	Pennsylvania	Vermont
North Carolina		Massachusetts
West Virginia		Rhode Island
Virginia		Connecticut
Maryland		
Delaware		

Source:

The Condition of Education: A Statistical Report
U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
National Center for Education Statistics
1982 Edition

Table D-1.--A comparison of gifted program models, based on geographical divisions (in percent).

Program Models	Pacific	Mountain	West North Central	West South Central	East North Central	East South Central	South Atlantic	Middle Atlantic	New England
Pull-out 2 hours or less a week	55.6	25.0	43.3	41.2	51.5	33.3	33.3	71.0	18.2
Pull-out 1 day or more a week	44.4	31.3	13.3	11.8	18.2	33.3	41.7	12.9	27.3
Cluster groups within classrooms	61.1	12.5	30.0	23.5	36.4	25.0	8.3	16.1	18.2
Advanced placement/ acceleration	66.7	56.3	26.7	23.5	51.5	33.3	54.2	41.9	54.5
Enrichment triad model	22.2	18.8	23.3	11.8	24.2	8.3	16.7	25.8	36.4
Honors programs	72.2	50.0	10.0	17.6	24.2	16.7	25.0	29.0	27.3
Magnet schools	16.7	0	0	5.9	12.1	0	0	6.5	9.1
Ability grouping	44.4	25.0	23.3	29.4	45.5	33.3	20.8	32.3	45.5
Saturday seminars	22.2	6.3	3.3	0	12.1	0	8.3	6.5	0
Other	33.3	56.3	40.0	47.1	21.2	25.0	45.8	45.2	54.5

APPENDIX E

CORRESPONDENCE

Mary Ann Traxler
Box 746
Encampment, WY 82325

April 17, 1982

Dear

I am pursuing doctoral studies in gifted education under the direction of Dr. Yvonne Waskin at Michigan State University. My dissertation will deal with current practices in the evaluation of gifted programs in the United States and the impact of their results on program development.

Any information that you could send me concerning the gifted programs in your state will be very much appreciated. I am particularly interested in acquiring the following data:

-- percentage of districts that have gifted programs.

-- percentage of children served at the elementary, middle, and high school levels.

-- types of programs being conducted, i.e., pullout, enrichment in the classroom, acceleration, mentors, etc.

-- if and how gifted programs are evaluated by the State Department of Education.

-- copies of evaluation forms that are currently being used.

I would also appreciate your sending a list of district addresses that you'd recommend I contact for more specific information concerning their evaluation procedures.

Thank you so much for your time and effort. I look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,

Mary Ann Traxler

1605 Woodbrook Drive #122
East Lansing, Michigan 48823
October 18, 1982

Dear Gifted Coordinator,

I am pursuing doctoral studies in gifted education at Michigan State University. My dissertation will deal with current practices in the evaluation of gifted programs in the United States and the impact of their results on program development.

Quite some time ago I wrote to you requesting information about gifted programs in your state. I am particularly interested in acquiring the following data:

- a list of districts having gifted programs and their addresses.
- types of programs being conducted, i.e. pullout, enrichment in the classroom, acceleration, mentors, etc.
- if and how gifted programs are evaluated by the State Department of Education.
- copies of evaluation forms that are currently being used.

I would also appreciate your indicating the districts that you'd recommend I contact for more specific information concerning their evaluation procedures.

Thank you so much for your time and effort. I look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,

Mary Ann Traxler

APPENDIX F

UNTABULATED COMMENTS BY RESPONDENTS

Untabulated Comments by Respondents

At this time we do not have a formal written evaluation procedure for the program; just for evaluation of teachers.

All evaluations are conducted quite informally, at the instigation of the coordinator. No one beyond the staff of the gifted program seems to care.

The state mandated the program without funding.

Teachers develop questionnaires and send them home to parents at the end of the year for their own information.

Evaluation procedures are being considered but nothing formal has been formalized or adopted.

We are a new program--2nd year in existence and on our 3rd director.

The state needs to develop some more specific placement guidelines and evaluation guidelines. These need some flexibility to allow local districts to adapt them to their specific situations.

We have no formal evaluation of the gifted program other than the evaluation by the State Department of Education and the building principal's evaluation of the teacher.

Evaluation of G/T is at least difficult--due to fact that our program goals are quite often intrinsic, affective and difficult to measure objectively according to "normal" procedure of our educational system.

I'm evaluated frequently by building principal and superintendent (who wish the state hadn't mandated gifted education).

This is my first year in the Ac. Talented Program after 16 yrs. in the classroom. I have been given no direction--evaluation has never been mentioned.

In small rural school districts such as _____, there is a lot of "face" evaluation. Activities are exhibited or reported and judgments are made based on what is seen or heard--for better or for worse. This informality drives people who are interested in formal evaluations up the proverbial wall. We have so much diversity in our small program that evaluation could be virtually a full-time job.

Formal evaluation on a systemwide basis is not undertaken. An approach is determined by attitudes of principals and teachers and situations.

It's gratifying to know someone is pursuing this whole evaluation issue. I'm not really comfortable with what we're doing and always interested in making improvements.

This evaluation is not a systemized process but a mental exercise by the coordinator in organizing a program around very limited funds, teacher time, student time and available space. A different approach for the Gifted Elementary Program is being planned for the 1983-84 school year. An evaluation process has not been discussed at this time.

Our school system implemented the gifted program beginning with high school the first year, mid school the second, and elementary the third year (next year). We are in the process of having our first full year with the gifted program in the high school, so our evaluation process is in the process of "evolving." We hope to have an ongoing evaluation with major changes, if any, implemented at the beginning of each academic school year.

We have reviewed several evaluation plans but find most not applicable to our area. Most decisions are based upon budgets by the superintendents and boards of education. They do not value time and money investment put into evaluation. They want simplistic answers and satisfaction of the community expectations. The expectations here are not very sophisticated at this stage. Evaluation reports made in depth are not given much attention and we must grow into a more sophisticated and extensive model. It is not likely outside evaluators will be used here in the foreseeable future.

We have found it difficult over the years to find an evaluation instrument that clearly measures the program's success and limitations. This year we are involving parents in a committee with teachers of gifted to design an assessment survey for parents.

Our program is in its 4th year. Initial evaluation efforts were adequate for a beginning program but will be revised this year. First looks tend to emphasize how students and parents "like" what is going on, about perceptions re how youngsters are responding. A more refined evaluation will likely focus on needs that would influence curriculum and instruction more directly.

Provisions are very loose and guidelines are nonexistent. Probably just as well, as we are still developing this facet of our program.

The evaluation procedures were developed before the program started. Our program has been in operation for 2 years and we are in the process of redoing parts of the original proposal.

We have had parent and teacher evaluation of our program, but no systematic program evaluation. We are in the process of writing behavioral objectives for our students, but we find it very difficult in the area of creativity.

Our program is weak at this time. We are seeking to improve and expand to other levels.

Gifted program should not be mandated.

Our gifted program is still floundering and not well organized. I personally feel the gifted program should be taken out of the special education mandate of our state. I feel that most parents having their child in this program are on an ego trip to build their own personal image. I feel that a student in our school who really desires to go beyond the bounds of normal classroom activities can get the help they need without having a special "gifted teacher" on the staff.

A very difficult task. Easy to enter a candidate. Difficult to remove a pupil who is not performing.

Participation in quiz bowl each year and trophies and ribbons won prove to public, and there is good coverage by news media.

Our gifted program is being refined this year. The evaluation procedure has not been addressed totally yet.

Our evaluation is done very informally--we do not purchase a tool for evaluation because we have not found one that meets our needs (not even the Ross Test). Students, teachers, and parents fill out forms in which questions such as the following are asked: (1) What is the most beneficial/positive thing you've seen come from this program? (2) The most negative? (3) What changes would you like to see?

The gifted program in _____ is a very low-profile item because of a large population with conservative religious beliefs. Therefore, if no one's feathers are ruffled by the program no one really looks at the program except the staff. We are required by law to complete IEPs and semi-annual evaluations.

There have been no changes due to evaluation.

We interview students who graduated from the program.

_____ is facing severe money problems. We are unsure of what program will be left next fall.

All evaluation is based on Individual Education Programs (IEPs). Once every three years the State Dept. of Education conducts a review of all special education programs to determine compliance with state laws.

This report would have looked a lot different if you had requested it one year ago! Our pull-out program of 1 day a week of service per class was totally cut last spring due to budget cuts. Four teachers (myself included) are attempting to "limp along" and develop a cluster with a team-teaching situation. Consequently, any evaluation forms I developed are now obsolete!

I'm afraid we haven't developed an evaluation program even though no unit is completed until the instructor is completely satisfied with all students' progress.

Funding for an adequate gifted program is not possible in light of the current economy.

Evaluation costs in Time!

Our regional consultant does an annual audit of process, procedure, and paperwork in our GT program.

This is our first year. We are still struggling with an appropriate evaluation tool.

Funding has gone from $12,000 to $1,200.

Our program is creative in itself. We have provided programs for the youngsters without funding--other than a small grant.

No funding except teacher salaries.

At this point, only individual students are evaluated and not the program as a whole. In _____, gifted education is under the special-education umbrella and all regulations regarding evaluation of students apply.

Extensive evaluation was carried out while the program was a Federal Project. Now little evaluation is done in addition to regular (district) evaluation (i.e., standardized test analysis, etc.) is carried on by the district.

Evaluators were used in our grant year but will not be used this year.

We have no formal program evaluation at this time.

This is only the second year we have had a program, and it has a long way to go before it meets everyone's satisfaction.

We have no formal evaluation, but we try to evaluate curriculum each year.

We pilot every program for gifted before implementing it. We look carefully at instructional-management modifications that will need to take place and how we will inservice teachers as well as plan for the maintenance and change of the program.

The students are provided with an audience as much as possible as they finish their projects. I feel it is important for their achievements to be recognized outside the classroom. This gives them some feedback on how others evaluate or react to what they have accomplished.

Evaluation is based on superintendent's whims.

At the present time, the school board has ruled that our all-county program in one central meeting place is to be split into the three elementary schools--tiny classes, traveling teacher, a real step backwards and no fun or group action for kids. Our new curriculum director is "working toward a meeting for next year's plans" as she says all new directions are coming from State level. I doubt this, but we'll see. More structure, support/aid the classroom teacher, use classroom curriulum -- ? Can't believe it! I'd send [copy of evaluation procedures] but the coordinator hasn't used them in my two years. In fact, we never see <u>him</u>. Can never get a policy decision, etc.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Atkin, J. Myron. "Some Evaluation Problems in a Course Content Improvement Project." In Teaching Gifted Students--A Book of Readings, pp. 151-56. Edited by James J. Gallagher. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1965.

Borich, Gary G., and Jemelka, Ronald P. "Definitions of Program Evaluation and Their Relation to Instructional Design." Educational Technology 21 (August 1981): 31-38.

Bray, James L. "The Governor's School of North Carolina: A Summer Program for Gifted and/or Talented High School Students." In Educational Programs and Intellectual Prodigies, pp. 34-37. Baltimore, Md.: The Johns Hopkins University, 1978.

Callahan, Carolyn M.; Covert, Robert; Aylesworth, Martin S.; and Varco, Peggy. "Evaluating a Local Gifted Program: A Cooperative Effort." Exceptional Children 48 (October 1981): 157-63.

Clark, Barbara. Growing Up Gifted: Developing the Potential of Children at Home and at School. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Co., 1979.

Correll, Marsha M. Teaching the Gifted and Talented. Bloomington, Ind.: Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation, 1978.

Cox, Ann. "Teaching Gifted Students in Regular Classrooms." The Education Digest 45 (February 1980): 17-19.

Cushenbery, Donald C., and Howell, Helen. Reading and the Gifted Child--A Guide for Teachers. Springfield, Ill.: Charles C. Thomas Publisher, 1974.

De Haan, Robert F. "Essentials of a Talent Development Program." In Working With Superior Students: Theories and Practices, pp. 134-41. Edited by Bruce Shertzer. Chicago: Science Research Associates, 1960.

De Haan, Robert F., and Havighurst, Robert J. Educating Gifted Children. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1961.

Dressel, Paul L. "Models for Evaluating Individual Achievement." The Journal of Higher Education 51 (March/April 1980): 194-206.

Eash, Maurice J. "Issues in Evaluation and Accountability in Special Programs for Gifted and Talented Children." Unpublished paper, 1971. Cited by Joseph S. Renzulli, Working Draft--A Guidebook for Evaluating Programs for the Gifted and Talented. Ventura, Calif.: Office of the Ventura County Superintendent of Schools, 1975.

Epstein, Carol B. The Gifted and Talented--Programs That Work. Arlington, Va.: National School Public Relations Association, 1979.

Evans, Ellis D., and Marken, Dan. "Multiple Outcome Assessment of Special Class Placement for Gifted Students: A Comparative Study." Gifted Child Quarterly 26 (Summer 1982): 126-32.

Feldhusen, John F., and Wyman, Ann Robinson. "Super Saturday: Design and Implementation of Purdue's Special Program for Gifted Children." Gifted Child Quarterly 24 (Winter 1980): 15-21.

Ferrell, John. "The Ferrell Gifted Program Evaluation Instrument for Teachers and Evaluation of Instructional Programs for Gifted and Talented Children." In Readings in Foundations of Gifted Education, pp. 120-37. Guilford, Conn.: Special Learning Corporation, 1980.

Gallagher, James J. Teaching the Gifted Child. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1964.

Ganopole, Selina J. "Measuring the Educational Outcomes of Gifted Programs." Roeper Review 5 (September 1982): 4-7.

George, William C.; Cohn, Sanford J.; and Stanley, Julian C., eds. Educating the Gifted--Acceleration and Enrichment. Revised and Expanded Proceedings of the Ninth Annual Hyman Blumberg Symposium on Research in Early Childhood Education. Baltimore, Md.: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1979.

Gibson, Joy, and Chennells, Prue, eds. Gifted Children--Looking to Their Future. London: Latimer New Dimensions, Ltd., with The National Association for Gifted Children, 1976.

Good, Carter V., ed. Dictionary of Education. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1973.

Goodenough, F. L. Exceptional Children. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1956.

Gowan, John Curtis, and Demos, George D. The Education and Guidance of the Ablest. Springfield, Ill.: Charles C. Thomas Publisher, 1964.

Gowan, John; Khatena, Joe; and Torrance, Paul, eds. Educating the Ablest. Itasca, Ill.: Peacock, 1979.

Kaplan, Sandra. Providing Programs for the Gifted and Talented. Ventura, Calif.: Office of the Superintendent of Schools, 1974.

Karnes, Frances A., and Collins, Emily C. Handbook of Instructional Resources and References for Teaching the Gifted. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1980.

Kearney, Elizabeth I., and Brockie, Jane S. "Educating Gifted Children in California." In Educational Programs and Intellectual Prodigies, pp. 18-28. Baltimore, Md.: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1978.

Kirschenbaum, Robert. "Who Are the Gifted and Why Are They Different?" The Education Digest 45 (November 1979). Condensed from Roeper Review 2 (September 1979): 3-4.

Kough, Jack. "Administrative Provisions for the Gifted." In Working With Superior Students: Theories and Practices, pp. 142-60. Edited by Bruce Shertzer. Chicago: Science Research Associates, 1960.

Lanza, Leonard G., and Vassar, William G. "Designing and Implementing a Program for the Gifted and Talented." In Psychology and Education of the Gifted, pp. 316-23. Edited by Walter B. Barbe and Joseph S. Renzulli. New York: Irvington Publishers, Inc., 1975.

Lawless, Ruth F. A Guide for Educating a Gifted Child in Your Classroom. Buffalo, N.Y.: D.O.K. Publishers, Inc., 1976.

_____. Programs for Gifted/Talented/Creative Children. Buffalo, N.Y.: D.O.K. Publishers, Inc., 1977.

Laycock, Frank. Gifted Children. Glenview, Ill.: Scott, Foresman and Co., 1979.

Lowery, Joyce. "Developing Creativity in Gifted Children." Gifted Child Quarterly 26 (Summer 1982): 133-39.

Lundy, Ruthe A. "AP in PA--Advanced Programs in Palo Alto." Gifted Child Quarterly 23 (Fall 1979): 526-31.

Mitchell, Bruce M. "An Update on the State of Gifted/Talented Education in the U.S." Phi Delta Kappan 63 (January 1982): 357-58.

Morgan, Harry J.; Tennant, Carolyn G.; and Gold, Milton J. Elementary and Secondary Level Programs for the Gifted and Talented. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1980.

Morra, Frank, Jr., and Hills, Richard. "Evaluation of the Alexandria, Virginia, Program for Talented Elementary Students, 1974-77." In Readings in Foundations of Gifted Education, pp. 114-18. Edited by David M. Jackson. Guilford, Conn.: Special Learning Corporation, 1980.

Nadler, Barbara, and Shore, Kenneth. "Evaluating Educational Programs: An Experience With the Judicial Evaluation Model." Education 99 (Summer 1979): 387-91.

National School Public Relations Association. The Gifted and Talented Programs That Work. Arlington, Va.: National School Public Relations Association, 1979.

Neuman, Donald B. "It's Time to Get Together on Gifted Programs." Curriculum Review 20 (April 1981): 114-17.

Newland, T. Ernest. The Gifted in Socioeducational Perspective. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1976.

Nie, Norman H.; Hull, C. Hadlai; Jenkins, Jean G.; Steinbrenner, Karin; and Bent, Dale H. Statistical Package for the Social Sciences, Version 8.3. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1981.

Olsen, Adrienne; Newgard, Robert; and Maselli, Samuel. How to Get Out of an Egg Without Cracking the Shell. Oak Lawn, Ill.: Ideal Publications, 1978.

Olson, Willard. "Individual Differences: A Precious Asset." Educational Leadership 15 (December 1957): 142-43.

Owens, Leroy. "Programs for the Gifted and Talented in Anchorage, Alaska." Cited in Educating the Gifted--Acceleration and Enrichment. Edited by William C. George, Sanford J. Cohn, and Julian C. Stanley. Revised and Expanded Proceedings of the Ninth Annual Hyman Blumberg Symposium on Research in Early Childhood Education. Baltimore, Md.: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1979.

Parke, Beverly N., and Buescher, Thomas M. "Evaluating Programs for the Gifted Through Student Self-Documentation." Roeper Review 5 (September 1982): 15-17.

Passow, A. Harry. "A Look Around and a Look Ahead." In The Gifted and Talented: Their Education and Development, pp. 439-56. The Seventy-Eighth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education. Edited by A. Harry Passow. Chicago, Ill.: The National Society for the Study of Education, 1979.

_____, and others. Planning for Talented Youth. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1955.

Povey, Robert. "Educating the Gifted Child: An Overview." In Educating the Gifted Child, pp. 7-24. Edited by Robert Povey. London: Harper and Row Publishers, 1980.

Pra Sisto, Albert J. "The Saturday Workshop of the Gifted Child Society of New Jersey." In Educational Programs and Intellectual Prodigies, pp. 38-45. Baltimore, Md.: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1978.

Provus, Malcolm. "Evaluation of Ongoing Programs in the Public School Systems." In Educational Evaluation: New Roles, New Means. The Sixty-Eighth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part II. Edited by R. W. Tyler. Chicago: NSSE, 1969. Cited by Joseph S. Renzulli, Working Draft--A Guidebook for Evaluating Programs for the Gifted and Talented. Ventura, Calif.: Office of the Ventura County Superintendent of Schools, 1975.

Renzulli, Joseph S. The Enrichment Triad Model: A Guide for Developing Defensible Programs for the Gifted and Talented. Wethersfield, Conn.: Creative Learning Press, 1977.

_____. "Evaluation: Who Needs It?" In Yearbook of Special Education 1978-79, pp. 467-80. 4th ed. Chicago, Ill.: Marquis Academic Media, 1978.

_____. Working Draft--A Guidebook for Evaluating Programs for the Gifted and Talented. Ventura, Calif.: Office of the Ventura County Superintendent of Schools, 1975.

_____. "Identifying Key Features in Programs for the Gifted." Exceptional Children 35 (November 1968): 217-21.

_____. "Identifying Key Features in Programs for the Gifted." In Psychology and Education of the Gifted, pp. 324-29. Edited by Walter B. Barbe and Joseph S. Renzulli. New York: Irvington Publishers, Inc., 1975.

_____. "Identifying Key Features in Programs for the Gifted." From Conn-Cept: Connecticut's Programming for the Gifted and Talented, 1976. Connecticut State Department of Education, Bureau of Pupil Personnel/Special Educational Services. In Readings in Gifted and Talented Education. Guilford, Conn.: Special Learning Corporation, 1978.

_____. "Some Concerns About Educational Acceleration for Intellectually Talented Youth, Or Are Treadmills Really Different If We Run Them at a Faster Rate?" In Educating the Gifted--Acceleration and Enrichment. Edited by William C. George, Sanford J. Cohn, and Julian C. Stanley. Revised and Expanded Proceedings of the Ninth Annual Hyman Blumberg Symposium on Research in Early Childhood Education. Baltimore, Md.: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1979.

_____. "Will the Gifted Child Movement Be Alive and Well in 1990?" Gifted Child Quarterly 24 (Winter 1980): 3-4.

_____, and Callahan, C. Evaluation of Programs for the Gifted and Talented. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Office of Education, Office of the Gifted and Talented, 1978. Cited in Ron Rubenzer, "Identification and Evaluation Procedures for Gifted and Talented Programs." The Gifted Child Quarterly 23 (Summer 1979): 304-16.

Rimm, Sylvia. "Evaluation of Gifted Programs--As Easy as ABC." Roeper Review 5 (September 1982): 8-11.

Rubenzer, Ron. "Identification and Evaluation Procedures for Gifted and Talented Programs." The Gifted Child Quarterly 23 (Summer 1979): 304-16.

Saracho, Olivia. "New Dimensions in Evaluating the Worth of a Program." Education 103 (Fall 1982): 74-78.

Scriven, M. Perspectives on Curriculum Evaluation. AERA Monograph Series on Curriculum Evaluation, No. 1. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1967.

Shannon, Gail. "Evaluating Programs for Superior and Talented Students." In Working With Superior Students: Theories and Practices, pp. 340-45. Edited by Bruce Shertzer. Chicago: Science Research Associates, 1960.

Shertzer, Bruce, ed. Working With Superior Students. Chicago: Science Research Associates, 1960.

Sisk, Dorothy A. "Education of the Gifted and Talented: A National Perspective." In Yearbook of Special Education 1979-80, p. 356. 5th ed. Chicago, Ill.: Marquis Academic Media, 1979.

_____. "Issues and Future Directions in Gifted Education." Gifted Child Quarterly 24 (Winter 1980): 29-32.

Smilansky, Moshe, and Nevo, David. "A Longitudinal Study of the Gifted Disadvantaged." In Advantage: Disadvantaged Gifted, p. 70. Presentations from the Third National Conference on Disadvantaged Gifted. Ventura, Calif.: Ventura County Superintendent of Schools Office, January 1978.

Smith, Vernon H. "Eight States Now Require IEPs for Gifted Students." Phi Delta Kappan 63 (February 1982): 372.

Stake, Robert E. "The Countenance of Educational Evaluation." Teacher's College Record 68 (1967): 523-40.

Stanley, Julian; George, William; and Solano, Cecilia. The Gifted and the Creative: A Fifty-Year Perspective. Baltimore, Md.: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1977.

Steele, J. Instructional Climate in Illinois Gifted Classes. Springfield: Illinois State Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction, Department of Program Planning for Gifted, 1969. Cited by Barbara Clark, Growing Up Gifted: Developing the Potential of Children at Home and at School. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Co., 1979.

Stufflebeam, Daniel L. et al. Educational Evaluation and Decision Making. Itasca, Ill.: F. E. Peacock Publishers, Inc., 1971. Cited by Joseph S. Renzulli, Working Draft--A Guidebook for Evaluating Programs for the Gifted and Talented. Ventura, Calif.: Office of the Ventura County Superintendent of Schools, 1975.

Thomason, Jo. "Education of the Gifted: A Challenge and a Promise." Exceptional Children 48 (October 1981): 101-103.

Treffinger, Donald J. "Editorial: Gifted Education and School Programs." Gifted Child Quarterly 24 (Fall 1980): 146.

_____. "Editorial: School Districts Should Support Gifted Programming." Gifted Child Quarterly 26 (Spring 1982): 50.

Tremaine, Claire D. "Do Gifted Programs Make a Difference?" The Gifted Child Quarterly 23 (Fall 1979): 500-17.

U.S. Commissioner of Education. Education of the Gifted and Talented: Report to the Congress of the United States. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1972.

Ward, Virgil S. "Program Organization and Implementation." In Psychology and Education of the Gifted, pp. 295-302. Edited by Walter B. Barbe and Joseph S. Renzulli. New York: Irvington Publishers, Inc., 1975.

_____, and Renzulli, J. S. "Program Evaluation in Differential Education for the Gifted." In CEC Selected Convention Papers, pp. 36-41. Washington, D.C.: The Council for Exceptional Children, 1967.

Waters, John. "The STS Program in Phoenix Union High School." In Working With Superior Students: Theories and Practices, pp. 311-19. Edited by Bruce Shertzer. Chicago: Science Research Associates, 1960.

Whitmore, Joanne Rand. Giftedness, Conflict, and Underachievement. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1980.

Williams, Clifford. "Characteristics and Objectives of a Program for the Gifted." In Education for the Gifted. Edited by Nelson B. Henry. Fifty-Seventh Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1958.

Willis, George. "Democratization of Curriculum Evaluation." Educational Leadership 38 (May 1981): 630-38.

Zettel, J. J. Gifted and Talented Education From a Nationwide Perspective. Reston, Va.: Council for Exceptional Children, 1980.