INFORMATION TO USERS

This manuscript has been reproduced from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. Each original is also photographed in one exposure and is included in reduced form at the back of the book.

Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. Higher quality 6" x 9" black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to order.



University Microfilms International A Beil & Howell Information Company 300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346 USA 313/761-4700 800/521-0600

Order Number 9208802

The status of gifted and talented programming in relation to equity in high-minority schools in Michigan

> Lewis, Nancy M., Ph.D. Michigan State University, 1991



THE STATUS OF GIFTED AND TALENTED PROGRAMMING IN RELATION TO EQUITY IN HIGH-MINORITY SCHOOLS IN MICHIGAN

By

Nancy M. Lewis

A DISSERTATION

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

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department of Teacher Education

ABSTRACT

THE STATUS OF GIFTED AND TALENTED PROGRAMMING IN RELATION TO EQUITY IN HIGH-MINORITY SCHOOLS IN MICHIGAN

Вy

Nancy M. Lewis

The status of gifted and talented programming in Michigan's high-minority schools in relation to equity was reported in this study. Using survey methodology, four areas of gifted programming were examined. They were (1) program option and model availability, (2) racial/gender distribution, (3) degree of student involvement, and (4) identification practices.

The study showed that in Michigan's high-minority school districts academic options were the most popular type of program option, followed by multiple emphasis programs (programs designed to address more than one talent or skill area within one program option). It further showed that programming tended to be more heavily concentrated at the elementary level than at the middle and high school level.

The most popular models in the surveyed districts were found to be pullout programs, before/after school programs, and self-contained classrooms.

Although minorities were found in gifted programming at a rate higher than the national average, Blacks and Hispanics were shown to be underrepresented in the three program types studied (academic, multiple emphasis, and creativity development), with creative options showing the greatest underrepresentation.

Some evidence of clustering of Black students into multiple emphasis programs was also found.

Although the study revealed an approximately equal number of sustained and short-term programs, it was found that sustained programs generally accommodated larger numbers of students. Therefore, there were considerably more students placed in sustained than in short-term programs.

Finally the study showed that the practices used to identify students in Michigan's high-minority districts were comparable to the state and nation, but in many districts did not fully comply with The Association for Gifted guidelines adopted by the Michigan Department of Education. In addition, the study showed that in well over half of the programs, a selection process followed the identification process, indicating that the students who were in gifted programming were not necessarily representative of those who were identified.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Doctoral studies can be a lonely ordeal for commuting students. Without the collegial support of fellow students and a readily accessible doctoral committee, commuting students often feel isolated and insecure. Those feelings of isolation were no different for me, and at times they seemed overwhelming.

Had it not been for the support and encouragement of my husband Jim and my son Chris, I might not have seen this dissertation to its completion. My parents, John and Bessie Clark, were also supportive and often provided the listening ear I needed to express my disappointments and triumphs. Their confidence in me never wavered, even when mine did.

Finally, my advisor, Dr. Robert Poland, provided the professional expertise and guidance needed to complete a project of this magnitude.

My family and my faith gave me the strength to see this dissertation through. I am grateful for both. I hope that I can now return the favor by giving those who supported me the time and attention they so richly deserve.

i٧

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF	TABLES		•		•	•	•	•	•	vii
Chapter										Page
I.	INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY		•	• •	•	•	•	•	•	1
	Introduction		•					•		1
	Statement of the Problem .	• •	•	• •	•	•	•	•	•	4
	Purpose of the Study		•		•		•	•	•	7
	Need for the Study		•				•		•	8
	Research Questions									9
	Assumptions				•					9
	Procedural Design									11
	Delimitations									12
	Limitations									13
	Definitions of Terms	•••	•	• •	•	•		•	•	14
	Overview	• •	•	• •	•	•	•		•	17
	04014104	• •	•	• •	•	•	•	•	•	1,
II.	REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE .	• •	•			•	•	•	•	19
	Introduction									10
	The Aggesistian for Cifted	· · ·	nde	 	•	•	•	•	•	10
	The Association for diffed	bla	nue	trus	•	•	•	•	•	19
	Program models and options	• •	•	• •	•	٠	•	•	•	20
	Racial/Gender Distribution	• •	•	• •	•	•	•	•	•	24
	Degree of Involvement	• •	•	• •	•	٠	•	•	•	26
	Methods of Identification	• •	•		•	•	•	•	•	27
III.	DESIGN AND PROCEDURE	• •	•	• •	•	•	•	•	•	34
	Introduction				_				_	34
	Population			• •	•	•				34
	Survey Design		•	•••	•	•	•	•	•	35
	Survey Procedures	• •	•	• •	•	•	•	•	•	41
	Data Analygia	• •	•	• •	•	•	•	•	•	13
	Summour	• •	•	• •	•	•	•	•	•	40
	Summary	• •	•	• •	•	•	•	•	•	40
IV.	PRESENTATION OF DATA		•		•	•	•	•	•	47
	Introduction									47
	Target Population/Survey Re	Spo	nse							48
	District Data				•					48
	District Demographics				•		-	-	-	48
	Gifted Demographics		•	•••	•	•	•			52
					•	-	-	•	•	

Chapter

IV.	Programmi Gifted Su Gifted Ph Gifted Po Building-Le Program O Program M Racial/Ge Degree of Identific Identific Summary .	ng	s	54 56 58 59 59 65 67 74 78 82 84
۷.	FINDINGS AN	D CONCLUSIONS	S	. 85
	Introductio The Populat District Fi Student R Programmi Gifted Su Identific Building-Le Program O Program M Racial/Ge Degree of Identific Comparisons Conclusions Recommendat Reflections	n	n	85 86 87 87 87 88 89 89 90 90 92 93 92 93 92 93 95 95 96 97 99 103 105
REFERENC	ES			108
APPENDIX	2			
	Appendix A. Appendix B. Appendix C. Appendix D. Appendix E. Appendix F.	Cover Lette Survey List of Mic Districts Map of Mich Districts Follow-up I Comparative State and	er	114 115 131 133 134 135

LIST OF TABLES

Table	<u>Title</u>	Page
1	Sizes of Surveyed and Responding Districts	49
2	Enrollment Profile of Responding Districts	50
3	Students in Responding Districts by Race	52
4	Gifted Option Availability in Responding Districts	53
5	1990–91 Total and Gifted Population by Race	54
6	District Criteria for Gifted Program Expansion	55
7	Titles of Gifted and Talented Supervisors	57
8	Status of District Philosophy Statements	57
9	Methods Used to Identify Gifted Potential	59
10	Gifted Option Types in Responding Districts	60
11	Availability of Programming by Grade Level	62
12	Scope of Programming By School Level	64
13	Maximum Number of Students Per Program Option	65
14	Program Models by School Level	66
15	Race/Gender Representation in Academic Options	68
16	Race/Gender Representation in Multiple Options	70
17	Race/Gender Representation in Creative Options	71
18	Representation in Options by Race/Gender	73
19	Sustained Versus Short-term Programs	74
20	Racial Groups in Sustained Vs. Short-term Options	75
21	Total Students in Sustained and Short-term Program	s 76
22	Kinds of Sustained Programming	77

LIST OF TABLES

<u>Tabl</u>	e <u>Title</u>	Page
23	Kinds of Short-term Programming	78
24	Identification Methods Used in Districts	79
25	Identification Methods by School Level	80
26	Method Used for Final Placement	81
27	Tests Used to Identify Gifted Students	83

.

CHAPTER 1

Introduction to the Study

Introduction

In his article, "A Magic Circle," Frank E. Williams (1988) writes about the current emphasis on gifted education, citing it as the third occurrence of such emphasis in education history. The first wave occurred in the 1920s and 1930s, right after the Terman studies began; the second wave during the 1960s, following the launching of Sputnik. Williams cautions us about this most recent upsurge in gifted education:

. . . the rise and fall of gifted education in this country in the past can probably be attributed to the faults of those who planned and conducted such programs just as much as to the whims of the times. (p. 2)

Williams argues that some in the gifted education movement have been elitists, who were using it for personal gain. In fact, much of the rise and fall of gifted education, argues Williams, can be attributed to the tension created by the dual concerns of equity and excellence. Goldberg (1986) says it this way:

The two belief systems about the role of education in a democracy have existed in American society since its inception. They have always been uneasy

bedfellows, displacing one another as the weight of socio-political events and consequent anxieties activated the one or the other. (p. 227)

This equity/excellence tension is prevalent not only in the United States (Gallagher, 1986; Tannenbaum, 1979; Gardner, 1961), but in other countries as well (Gallagher, 1984; Berezine and Foleyeva, 1972; Dunstan, 1983; Gold, 1986).

Williams encourages educators to study and learn from the previous two waves of gifted education and to "be responsible enough to monitor their own motives and behavior" (p. 2) during this third era. Doing so, he argues, will prevent a third "fall" in gifted education.

The inequities most often cited in the literature regarding gifted education are related to the underrepresentation of minority groups. The demise of gifted education usually follows allegations of race and sex discrimination, as evidenced by this underrepresentation. As a result, many educators today are sensitive to race and gender distributions in such differentiated programs. By subjecting themselves to self-monitoring activities, educators discourage allegations of discrimination.

In 1974, the Michigan Legislature appropriated funds under Section 47 for the development of programming for gifted and talented students in grades K-12. This commitment to gifted and talented programming was reaffirmed

in 1983 in a position statement, which includes the following policy:

It is the policy of the Michigan State Board of Education that educational institutions at all levels address the unique needs of gifted and talented students by providing planned educational opportunities which will enable them to achieve optimum personal growth. (p. 5)

The State Department of Education requires that all school districts receiving Section 47 funds submit an annual report regarding the status of their gifted programming. This report includes some information regarding racial/gender representation, program options offered, and program models available in the district. However, this report is somewhat limited in the amount of detail it provides. For example, the racial/gender numbers are reported in an aggregate form. That is, the numbers reported are for all schools within the district (K-12) and for all program options and models combined. In order to understand the status of gifted programming in Michigan in relation to equity, it is important to know the racial and gender distribution within the various program options. Such information can reveal any clusterings of subpopulations within the various program options which would result in unequal representation of racial and gender groups across existing programming options.

The amount of student involvement of the racial and gender groups in various program options is also important to an understanding of the status of gifted programming. In the past this degree of involvement has not been regularly reported. Equitable treatment of all racial and gender groups should mean that all groups receive an approximately equal number of hours of regular and sustained intervention.

Finally, equity in gifted programming should mean that nationally accepted practices for identifying all racial and gender groups are utilized in high-minority schools. In Michigan no regular reporting of identification practices occurs. Therefore, the responsiveness of Michigan educators to recommended identification practices in unknown. This unreported data seem vital in order to fully understand the status of gifted programming in relation to equity. The need for this information led to the following study.

Statement of the Problem

The underrepresentation of minorities in gifted programs is well documented (Baldwin, 1987; McKenzie, 1986; Chambers, 1980; Frasier, 1989; Masten, 1985). In her 1985 <u>Roeper Review</u> journal article, E. Susanne Richert reported on the results of a national study on gifted education. One of the findings indicated that "education equity is being violated in the identification of significant subpopulations" (p. 69). Citing national figures published by the United States Department of Education's Office of

Civil Rights, Richert reported that "minority groups such as Blacks, Hispanics, and Native Americans are underrepresented by 30 to 70 percent" (p. 69). According to Richert, these figures are collected annually, but have not been published since 1980.

A review of recent educational literature revealed a real concern on the part of educators regarding such inequities. An April, 1990, ERIC search on the subject of culturally diverse gifted students listed 134 abstracts on the subject. In many of these articles, papers, and books, the possible causes, as well as recommended solutions, for minority underrepresentation are suggested. As a result of this increased attention, minority involvement in gifted programming appears to be somewhat on the rise. However, the aggregate manner in which these data are reported leaves a number of questions unanswered regarding the status of gifted programming for minority students.

Three aspects of minority involvement which are infrequently reported, but are important in order to fully describe the status of gifted programming in relation to equity are (a) the racial/gender distribution within each type of program option, (b) the degree of involvement for students within various program options, and (c) the method(s) of identification used for the various program options. The lack of these data makes it difficult to completely analyze the current status of gifted and talented programs in terms of equity. This problem, as explained in

the following paragraphs, was the central focus of this study.

Racial/Gender Distribution

Most school districts report the total minority involvement in all gifted program options. However, they seldom report the minority involvement in each <u>individual</u> option within the total district program. This situation exists in Michigan as well. The data reported annually in the Michigan Department of Education Section 47 Final Report include only the total number of students in a district who are involved in some component of the total gifted program. Minority and gender involvement within the individual components is not reported.

Degree of Involvement

The number of hours that students participate in the various program options is seldom reported. Consequently, there is no way to describe the degree of involvement of minority students in each program option or the number of minority students involved in sustained versus short-term programs. Michigan is one of the states that does not regularly report student involvement.

Identification

Many school districts do not report their method(s) of student identification for each program option. Therefore, there is no way to determine whether or not culturally diverse schools are responding to recommended practices for identifying gifted students in all racial and gender groups. This is the case in Michigan schools as well.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to investigate the current status of gifted and talented programming in Michigan by examining (a) the gifted and talented program options available in high-minority schools in Michigan, (b) the racial/gender distribution within these various types of options, (c) the degree of involvement of students within these options, and (d) the predominant methods of identification for various program options.

It is believed that the results of this study can enrich the current body of information regarding gifted and talented programming in Michigan and give educators another way to examine programs in relation to equity. It is also believed that the study will contribute to the understanding of educators regarding the complexity of equity issues and the need to look at all facets of gifted and talented programming carefully in order to fully understand how all racial and gender groups are affected by program organization and design.

Finally, it is hoped that the study will generate an interest in the examination and, if warranted, the redesign of individual gifted and talented programs in order to ensure fair and equitable practices in all districts.

Therefore, although the main purpose of the study was to describe the current status of gifted and talented programming in Michigan, it is hoped that it will motivate all educators to examine in greater detail their own programs and that it will stimulate the development of selfmonitoring processes aimed at ensuring equitable programming for all students regardless of race or sex.

Need for the Study

The more information educators have about the present organization and structure of gifted and talented programming, the better the chances are for quality, equitable programming. Although this study was limited to Michigan practices, the results of the study may give educators across the country a better understanding of gifted education. Perhaps it will encourage other states to conduct similar studies. By examining the results of this study, educators can be better informed about the organizational and distributional tendencies of gifted and talented programming. Such information should be useful in guiding and planning local programs.

The focus of this study differs from previous studies of gifted and talented programming in Michigan. Because this study provides new information about the status of gifted programming, it should give educators a better understanding of racial/gender involvement in such programs. It is another way to focus attention on the importance of

constant examination of all types of programming--not just gifted and talented programming--in relation to equity. Although this study is focused on equity as it relates to gifted and talented programming, it is also about equity in education as a whole. The importance of the study, therefore, is not only to provide additional information about the current status of gifted and talented programming, but also to encourage a similar examination of other curriculum areas as well.

Research Questions

The main research question for this study was: What is the current status of gifted and talented programming in relation to equity in high-minority schools in Michigan? In order to answer the main research question, four subsidiary questions were asked. They were:

- 1. What program options and models are available in high-minority schools?
- 2. What is the racial/gender distribution within the program options?
- 3. What is the degree of involvement of students in gifted programming in the surveyed schools?
- 4. How are students identified for the various program options?

Assumptions

It was assumed that the position taken by the Michigan Department of Education regarding the appropriateness of gifted and talented programming is correct. That is, it is assumed that a differentiated curriculum for gifted and

talented students is a desirable goal. Otherwise, a study such as this one that informs, and perhaps guides, gifted and talented educators would have been inappropriate.

It was also assumed that a focus on high-minority schools was an appropriate way to look at issues of equity. Although equity is important <u>regardless</u> of the minority representation of a school, culturally diverse schools should be especially sensitive to the needs of minority students. Therefore, a focus on the status of such schools seemed warranted.

Also assumed was a high level of integrity on the part of the gifted and talented coordinators who were asked to describe program options in a typical elementary, middle, and high school in their respective districts. By assuming the accuracy of this information, the results of this study can used to inform and guide educators about gifted programming in Michigan, as well as in other states.

Finally, because this study was intended to be descriptive, not evaluative in nature, it was assumed that all of the gifted and talented program options described in the surveys were legitimate program options. That is, it was assumed that the options described fit within the generally accepted guidelines for appropriate gifted and talented programming.

Procedural Design

The focus of this study was equity. In order to examine this issue as it relates to gifted programming, a questionnaire was designed to answer the four subsidiary research questions. The subjects for the study were all Michigan school districts with a minority population of 24 percent or more. The questionnaire was sent to the gifted and talented coordinator of each district. These names were acquired through the Gifted and Talented Division of the Michigan Department of Education.

The data from the surveys were tabulated and analyzed using descriptive statistics. Particular attention was given to the types of program options available in the schools and the subpopulation groupings within each option. The methods of identification for the various program options were tabulated and a comparison was made between recommended Michigan practices and nationally recognized and recommended practices for culturally diverse populations. Finally, the number of sustained versus short-term program options was examined in relation to minority groups to determine the amount of minority involvement.

In a series of tables and graphs the survey results are summarized in a form that is intended to make the data more usable and understandable.

The purpose of the above programming analyses was to examine the racial and gender distribution and degree of involvement within each type of program option in order to

get some sense of equitable treatment. Although the main purpose for the examination of common identification practices was to simply report the most predominant methods, this information can also help other educators understand the distribution patterns that may result from such identification and/or selection practices. It may also encourage further research on the relationship between identification/selection practices and minority representation.

Delimitations

Equity is a broad and complex issue. It was not the intent of this study to investigate all of the aspects of equity in relation to gifted and talented programming. Although it is hoped that the outcome of the study will contribute to the body of information about gifted programs, the data provided by this study alone are not enough. There are many other phenomena that affect equity. Program quality was not examined, nor was teacher training or qualifications, teacher effectiveness, quality of identification procedures, parental or student satisfaction, or many other areas that affect students involved in gifted programming. It would have been inappropriate, therefore, to make conclusive statements regarding equity based on this study alone. Only by combining the data from this study with previous and follow-up studies can conclusions be drawn regarding program equity.

It also was not the intent of this study to evaluate in any way the quality of gifted programming in Michigan. The focus of the study was on the current status of gifted and talented programs in relation to equity. The findings and conclusions, therefore, make no statements regarding the quality of programming available to students.

Finally, although predominant identification procedures were investigated, there was no attempt to link specific identification practices with the racial/gender distributions within individual program options. Although the findings of this study may lead to further research along these lines, no such correlations were developed.

Limitations

Survey research by its very nature is impersonal. With no personal contact between the researcher and the respondent, the data may seem somewhat sterile and lifeless. The survey form was simple and straightforward by design in order to increase the likelihood of return. Detailed information about each district's gifted and talented programming was not solicited. The questions were designed to be answered by simply checking a box or writing a few numbers or words. It was recognized, however, that asking respondents to fit answers into pre-established categories might conceal significant details. However, it was believed that the benefits of a higher return rate outweighed the loss of detail.

The results of this study reflect the status of gifted programming in high-minority schools only. It would be inappropriate to generalize these findings to all schools.

Definitions of Terms

To ensure a common understanding of the terms used in this study, the following definitions have been provided:

<u>Gifted and Talented</u>: In 1978 the United States Office of Education adopted the following definition of gifted and talented:

Gifted and talented children means children, and whenever applicable, youth, who are identified at the preschool, elementary or secondary level, as possessing demonstrated or potential abilities that gives evidence of high performance capability in areas such as intellectual, creative, specific academic, or leadership ability, or in the performing and visual arts, and who, by reason thereof, require services or activities not ordinarily provided by the school. (Public Law 95-56 1, Title II, Part A Section 902)

In 1979 the Michigan State Advisory Council for the Gifted and Talented adopted this same definition, and it is the one used for purposes of this study.

<u>Program Option</u>: For purposes of this study, a program option was assumed to be any school-sponsored activity offered exclusively to identified gifted and talented students. Program options are often categorized by general talent area such as <u>general intellectual</u>, <u>specific academic</u>, <u>creative thinking</u>, <u>leadership</u>, <u>visual arts</u>, and <u>performing</u> <u>arts</u>. Options may also be listed under such specialized categories as <u>seminars</u>, <u>mentorships</u>, <u>advanced placement</u>, <u>independent study</u>, <u>flexible scheduling</u>, <u>clubs</u>, <u>grade</u> <u>acceleration</u>, <u>internship</u>, <u>dual enrollment</u>, <u>early graduation</u>, and others.

<u>Program Model</u>: For this study, the program model described the manner in which the program option was designed. Types of program models included <u>cluster grouping</u> in the classroom, <u>self-contained classrooms</u>, <u>individual education</u> <u>plans</u>, <u>pullout programs</u>, <u>classroom consultants</u>, and others (see model definitions below).

<u>Cluster grouping:</u> The grouping of selected students for differentiated instruction within the classroom.

<u>Self-contained classroom</u>: A separate classroom designed exclusively for selected students and providing a differentiated curriculum for all or part of the school day.

Individual education plans (IEP): An individually designed curriculum plan written to meet the unique needs of each student.

<u>Pullout programs</u>: Programs in which the student is removed from the regular classroom for a part of the school day or week and provided with differentiated instruction in another classroom.

<u>Classroom consultant</u>: The provision of personnel to the regular classroom teacher for purposes of supplying specialized expertise within the classroom. <u>Sustained Options</u>: For this study, sustained programming included all options offered at least three hours a week during the entire school year.

<u>Short-Term Options</u>: For this study, short-term programming included all options offered less than three hours a week and/or less than the entire school year.

<u>Academic Options</u>: Gifted program options that address general intellectual areas. Academic options may be either enriching or accelerated in nature.

<u>Creative Options</u>: Gifted programs whose primary focus is creative thinking.

<u>Multiple Emphasis Options</u>: Gifted programs that address more than one talent or skill area within the same program offering.

<u>Identification:</u> For this study, identification referred to the recognition of students as potential candidates for a gifted program option.

<u>Selection</u>: For this study, selection referred to the placement of students in a specific gifted program option.

<u>High-Minority Districts</u>: For this study, high minority districts were defined as those districts with a racial minority of 24 percent of higher. Michigan Educational Assessment Program (MEAP): A criterion-referenced test given to all Michigan students to assess the students' knowledge, skills, and attitudes. The test reflects Michigan State Board of Education approved objectives and is given in grades 4, 7, and 10 for math and reading and in grades 5, 8, and 11 for science.

Intermediate School District (ISD): Generally a county-wide body, the ISD is an intermediary body between the local school district and the State. ISDs offer services to local school districts in the county, such as data processing, professional development programs, consultants, and media resources.

<u>Under-/Overrepresentation</u>: Under- and over-representation figures cited in this study were calculated as the difference between the actual minority percentage in the school district and the gifted minority percentage divided by the district percentage.

<u>Overview</u>

Chapter 1 included an introduction to the study, followed by a statement of the problem, the purpose and need for the study, the main and subsidiary research questions, assumptions about the study, the procedural design, delimitations and limitations, and the definitions of key terms used in the study.

Chapter 2 contains a literature review of gifted and talented education, with a focus on racial and gender equity.

The research procedures, including a discussion of the survey design and use, identification of the population, and the methods of data analysis, are described in Chapter 3.

The results of the survey in relation to the main research question and the four subsidiary questions are presented in Chapter 4.

Finally, Chapter 5 includes the findings and conclusions, as well as recommendations for further research.

CHAPTER 2

Review of the Literature

Introduction

In an effort to determine what is already known in relation to the main and subsidiary questions asked in this study, the literature was reviewed with a focus on those questions. The literature related to the overall issue of equity was presented in Chapter 1. The following review presents the research and literature that is relevant to the four subsidiary questions of this study.

The Association for Gifted Standards

In 1989 The Association for Gifted (TAG), a division of the Council for Exceptional Children, approved the <u>Standards</u> for Programs Involving the Gifted and Talented. These same standards have been adopted by the state of Michigan. Armstrong's 1990 Ingham Intermediate School District study (see ISD definition, page 17) revealed that in Michigan both the ISD Gifted and Talented Consultants and the local district Gifted and Talented Coordinators highly endorse these standards. Therefore, the TAG standard related to each subsidiary question will be presented as a guideline for comparison with the current status in Michigan, as reported in this study.

Program Models and Options

Program Options

Regarding program options, TAG recommends that all gifted options "go beyond academics and include options in areas such as the arts, leadership, and creativity" (p. 6).

Most gifted educators agree that a variety of programming options is necessary in order to provide a quality, comprehensive program for gifted and talented students (see Taylor, 1986; Boyer, 1980; Newman, 1985). Richert (1985) says it this way:

No single program option can ever meet the multiple and diverse needs of all gifted students. Therefore, a comprehensive identification procedure requires multiple program options. (p. 72)

This point of view is supported by Parke (1989):

A great majority of gifted and talented program options serve students with high academic abilities; those focusing on creativity, the arts, and leadership are far less frequent. An array of program options must be developed, including provisions in regular classrooms, special classes, and special schools. (p. 5)

A study authorized by the Michigan State Department of Education and conducted by Armstrong (1990) produced several findings regarding gifted program options in Michigan. All schools receiving Section 47 funding (a section of the Michigan State School Aid Act), which represents 98 percent of the school districts in Michigan, were examined. Therefore, a profile of the programming trends among all districts in Michigan regardless of minority representation is provided.

The results of this study showed that general intellectual and academic options continue to be addressed by an increasing number of districts. Evidence was also found that districts are increasingly identifying students in the areas of creative and productive thinking, leadership, and visual and performing arts. Other options that were available state-wide were seminars, independent study, special clubs and career internships. Also indicated was a considerable increase in the number of options available to students at all levels. Armstrong's study concluded that Michigan school districts are making progress in broadening their identification procedures to identify students in a variety of talent areas and that districts will need to respond with comprehensive programming which meets the needs of the students in these talent areas as well as for the academically talented (K-12).

It is evident from the research and literature reviewed that an emphasis is being placed on multiple options at both the state and national level. Gifted educators support the need to expand the programming options to include programming beyond the traditional academic offerings.

Program Models

The TAG standards regarding program models recommend that programs "be determined by the needs of the students being served" (p. 7). These guidelines say:

In some instances, programs may be held before or after school or in settings other than school when the nature of the experience (not the convenience of the schedule) requires this

timing. (p. 7)

Of the literature reviewed, no one model emerged as the most beneficial for students. However, two grouping patterns--homogeneous and heterogeneous--received fairly equal support.

Williams (1988), encourages the use of in-class programs whenever possible since they provide enrichment opportunities to all students regardless of ability. Gifted students, argues Williams. can then be given special opportunities to carry a lesson beyond where the others stop. This position is supported by a number of educators who believe that homogeneous ability grouping plans do not consistently help any group of students (see Goodlad, 1984; Oakes, 1985, 1986; Persell, 1977; Swartzbaugh, 1988). In her 1988 study of tracking, Oakes concluded that "everyone usually seems to do as well (and low and average students usually better) when placed in mixed groups" (p. 194).

On the other hand, Feldhusen's 1989 synthesis of research on gifted youth contradicts the heterogeneous

grouping advocates. After reviewing the research and literature Feldhusen concluded:

Grouping of gifted and talented students in special classes with a differentiated curriculum leads to higher academic achievement and better academic attitudes for the gifted and leads to no decline in achievement or attitudes for the children who remain in the regular heterogeneous classroom. (p. 10)

Both the homogeneous and heterogeneous advocates cite considerable research to back their positions. Thus, educators seem to be left to weigh both points of view and choose the position they believe is most appropriate for their own educational settings.

Gallagher, Weiss, Ogelsby, and Thomas (1983) conducted a survey of gifted programs in the United States. This study revealed that the program model most widely used was the resource room/pullout program (41 percent), followed by self-contained classrooms (23 percent). Special classes were most popular in grades 3 through 6. In junior high and high schools, honors classes were the most popular form of instruction.

Armstrong (1990) reported that in Michigan the 1988-89 data showed that the most popular model at the elementary level was a teacher consultant for the classroom (45 percent) and pullout programs (39 percent). The majority of services at the middle school level were in the form of

counseling (70 percent). Teacher consultant services (41 percent), cluster grouping (23 percent), and self-contained classes (22 percent) were also popular at the middle school level. At the high school the predominant service was again counseling (63 percent), followed by teacher consultants (33 percent) and self-contained classes (18 percent).

Racial/Gender Distribution

The TAG standard clearly addresses equity in gifted and talented programs. The standard states:

Assessment instruments and procedures must be in place that fairly measure the capabilities of all students. Cultural heritage, economic condition, gender, handicapping condition, native language, and other factors that mitigate against fair assessment must be taken into account when procedures and instruments are chosen. (p. 13)

Racial Representation

It has repeatedly been stated that giftedness can be found in every ethnic and racial group and at all socioeconomic levels (Clark, 1983; Davis & Rimm, 1985; Gallagher, 1985; Kitano & Kirby, 1986; Marland, 1972). Research tells us, however, that despite efforts toward equity, minority students remain underrepresented in gifted programs (Frasier, 1989; Gallagher, 1983; Masten, 1985; Parke, 1989). Many educators argue that broadening the definition of giftedness and the types of program offerings will increase the minority representation (Masten, 1985). Since such expansion is just beginning to occur in Michigan and nationally, it is too soon to assess whether this prediction is accurate. Past research and literature reported racial representation only in aggregate form since programming had been limited mainly to academic offerings. None of literature or research reviewed reported racial representation by type of program option as is done in this study.

Gender Representation

The literature revealed no national data regarding gender representation in gifted and talented programming. In Michigan, however, Armstrong (1990) reported that in 1988-89, 49 percent of the gifted and talented participants were male; 51 percent were female. These percentages have remained fairly constant over the past five years. As with racial data, gender representation is reported as an aggregate number, rather than by type of program option. If the figures were reported by type of option, some educators suggest that females would be underrepresented in program options requiring high levels of creativity (Daniels, Heath, and Enns, 1985). Schwartz (1980) cites three reasons for this underrepresentation. They are (1) sex role stereotyping, (2) lack of self-confidence, and (3) fear of success. According to Schwartz:

Women have intellectual and creative potential; they have intellectual abilities. To use them effectively they need stimulation, self-confidence, and feelings of independence. Even more they need recognition, acceptance, and opportunity. (from Daniels, Heath, Enns, p. 164)

Degree of Involvement

The TAG standards regarding degree of student involvement in gifted and talented programming state:

Gifted and talented students are given the chance to become actively involved with the field they are studying. (p. 15)

School districts offer sustained as well as short-term program options for the gifted. A sustained option is defined by the Michigan State Department of Education as one that meets at least three hours a week throughout the entire school year. Armstrong's 1990 study of Michigan schools showed that "less than half of the districts offer regular intervention, sustained over time" (p. 16). Armstrong says:

While virtually all districts report students participating in programming for gifted and talented students, the views of intermediate school district gifted and talented consultants indicate that only 12 percent of the districts offer comprehensive K-12 programming and 40
percent of the districts offer little or no regular programming. (Executive Summary, p. 4) This finding reflects the national status as well. Tannenbaum's 1985 national survey (Cox, etal.) of 16,000 schools revealed a predominance of what Tannenbaum calls "provisions" (fragmentary, ad hoc offerings) rather than comprehensive, sustained programming. This finding is supported by Gold (1986).

Thus, despite recommendations for sustained, comprehensive programming, the research and literature suggest that schools in Michigan, as well as across the country, are struggling to achieve this degree of involvement for students in gifted programming.

Methods of Identification

An entire section of the TAG standards is devoted to identification. Those standards most pertinent to the issues addressed in this study are as follows:

- a. <u>Diverse abilities and intelligences</u>. Students are gifted and talented in a wide range of abilities areas. When conducting assessment for the purposes of identification, student strengths and needs are determined in as many spheres as possible. (p. 11)
- b. Qualitative and quantitative measures. A balance between qualitative and quantitative measures can be achieved by selecting among instruments

such as standardized tests; criterion-referenced tests; observations by trained teachers and other professionals; demonstrations and portfolios; self-, peer, and parent nominations; student interviews; and evaluations of students' participation in established programs. (p. 12)

c. Nondiscriminatory assessment. Assessment instruments and procedures must be in place that fairly measure the capabilities of all students. Cultural heritage, economic condition, gender, handicapping condition, native language, and other factors that mitigate against fair assessment must be taken into account when procedures and instruments are chosen. (p. 12)

Problems With Identification

A review of the literature revealed that identification processes were repeatedly cited as one of the major causes of inequity in gifted programming (Culross, 1989; McKenzie, 1986; Masten, 1985; Frasier, 1987; Johnsen, 1986; Baer, 1989; Richert, 1987). Ryan (1983) reports that research efforts have indicated that as many as half of the intellectually gifted children are not identified (Dunn, 1973; Pegnato, 1959).

The National Report on Identification (Richert, etal., 1982) revealed substantial confusion among practitioners about defining, identifying, and determining which population should be served in gifted programs. Some of the problems cited in the report include:

- 1. There is confusion about definitions of giftedness, as evidenced by conflicting definitions and identification procedures in use around the country.
- 2. Educational equity is being violated in the identification of significant subpopulations. Tests are used for populations for which they have not been normed. Minority groups are excluded systematically from gifted programs as a result of biased procedures.
- 3. Identification instruments are misused; tests are being used to measure abilities which they were not designed to determine.
- 4. Instruments and procedures are being used at inappropriate stages of the identification process. Many instruments are being used for placement that are appropriate only for placing students in a broad talent pool rather than into various <u>program options</u> [emphasis added] that require specific characteristics.

This report also revealed a distressing gap between research and its application to equitable identification. Treffinger and Renzulli (1986) concur with this finding saying:

The majority of law, policy, and practical procedures lag at least ten to fifteen years behind current research-based knowledge. (p. 151)

Need for Expanded Definition of Giftedness

Richert (1987) reports that much of the identification controversy centers around whether IQ by itself can designate or identify giftedness, whether broader definitions are more appropriate, or if characteristics beyond the cognitive are more relevant. As a result of this

controversy, many gifted educators advocate expanding the concept of giftedness beyond IQ (Feldhusen, 1986; Gardner, 1983; Gould, 1981; Guilford, 1967; Meeker, 1969; Renzulli, 1978; Richert, 1982, 1986; Tannenbaum, 1983; Taylor, 1985; Torrance, 1970; Gold, 1986). Hatch and Gardner (1986) describe Project Spectrum, a four-year project to develop a new means for assessing the intellectual propensities of preschool children. The goals of this project were "to move beyond the idea of a single intelligence to an understanding of a range of competences and to advance from tests to assessments" (p. 148). These assessment processes result in descriptive profiles of each child, which allow evaluators to consider the child's strengths and weaknesses in light of his cultural and family background. These profiles coordinate input from the evaluators' observations, as well as surveys from parents and teachers. The Project Spectrum data downplay the importance of scores and "avoid an overvaluation of particular point totals" (p. 149). Say Hatch and Gardner:

The loss of the ready precision obtained in standardized tests will be compensated for by the richness and variety of information that is obtained. (p. 150)

Treffinger and Renzulli (1986) argue that intelligence is "dynamic and multi-facted" (p. 152). These educators of the gifted believe that the tendency to quantify intellectual ability in the form of a single test score is

misleading, as it represents a "limited and unrepresentative sample of `intelligent' behavior" (p. 152).

Need for Multiple Identification Methods

An expanded definition of giftedness leads to a need for a broader identification process. The literature reflects such a change, recommending a multiple identification process. Kaufman and Harrison (1986) argue that no one method of identification is adequate. These authors found that teacher and parent nominations, group intelligence tests, and achievement tests used by themselves were even less accurate than IQ tests in identifying the gifted. Robinson and Chamrad (1986) argue that virtually all identification methods except standardized tests rely exclusively on subjective assessment, making each of them questionable methods of identification by themselves.

As a result of the apparent weaknesses of the various single identifiers, most educators of the gifted now strongly advocate the use of a combination of evaluation methods to provide a profile of each child's strengths. Each evaluation measure in such profiles, however, is considered <u>separately</u> rather than combined into a "giftedness index." Combining the data obscures the information, creating a meaningless apples-and-oranges composite. (Borland, 1986)

Test Controversy

Many educators argue that some standardized tests used for identifying gifted students are culturally biased (Black, 1963; Davis, Gardner, and Gardner, 1941; Goolsby, 1975; Hoffman, 1962; Kamin, 1974; Klineberg, 1935; Miller, 1974; Nairn, etal., 1980); Samuda, 1975).

Recent research on identifying and testing gifted children has resulted in some recommendations regarding appropriate tests and identification processes which are less culturally biased. For example, the 1982 National Report on Identification recommends five tests: (1) The Cattell Culture-Fair Intelligence Series, (2) The Ravens Progressive Matrices, (3) The Cartoon Conservation Scales, (4) The Stallings Environmentally Based Screen, and (5) The System of Multicultural Pluralistic Assessment. These tests are designed to measure intellectual abilities in students from linguistically and culturally different backgrounds. In addition, the Structure of Intellect Tests and the Stanford-Binet Intelligence Tests have been normed for certain subpopulations (Meeker, 1978; Bruch, 1971). Frasier (1987) reviewed the literature and research on culturally fair identification and recommends several standardized instruments that examine intelligence from a broader perspective. In addition to some of those cited by the National Report on Identification, Frasier recommends the Torrance Tests of Creative Thinking, the Kaufman Battery for Children, and the Abbreviated Binet for Disadvantaged

Children. Masten (1985) has developed a useful guide for matching various tests and techniques to the particular minority group being identified. Finally, in her 1985 Identification Update for <u>Roeper Review</u>, Richert provides a "Matrix of Promising Practices for Identifying the Disadvantaged Gifted and Talented."

Michigan Status on Identification

The literature revealed little about the methods and processes used in Michigan to identify gifted and talented students. Although the 1990 Department of Education study showed that students were being identified in more talent areas than in the past, the study did not report the methods used to identify these students nor did it report the types of tests common in Michigan districts. Since Michigan embraces the TAG standards, it is assumed that the state encourages multiple, as well as culture-fair, identification practices. However, past research and literature does not indicate the extent of these practices. The information provided in this study, therefore, will give educators a better understanding of the status of identification practices in Michigan's culturally diverse schools.

CHAPTER 3

Design and Procedure

Introduction

The status of gifted programming in Michigan's culturally diverse schools was investigated through a survey mailed to the 51 districts with a minority population of 24 percent or higher. This list was acquired from the Michigan Department of Education's 1988-89 Fourth Friday file. (Fourth Friday is a pre-established date set each year by the State of Michigan for the purpose of doing a state-wide student count by district, used for purposes of funding.) This was the most recent list available giving minority representation in Michigan's school districts.

The survey was sent to the gifted and talented coordinator of each district. This survey was designed to gather data concerning the main and subsidiary questions identified in Chapter 1. The cover letter and survey that were mailed to the coordinators can be found in the Appendix, labeled items A and B.

The population, survey design and procedure, and the data analysis are described in detail in the following pages.

Population

Although some data exist regarding the status of gifted programming in Michigan and across the United States, very few reports concentrate on high-minority schools

exclusively. This study made these schools the prime focus and allowed for some comparison of these districts to the state as a whole and to the nation. Because aggregate, state-wide data can obscure important detail about specific types of schools, this study centered exclusively on culturally diverse schools in an effort to set them apart for examination.

The 51 school districts in Michigan with a minority population of 24 percent or more were identified by the Michigan Department of Education as culturally diverse and were therefore the subject population for this study. The districts represented a wide student population ranging from 21 to 184,992 students. The minority population ranged from 24 percent to 99.5 percent. Although the districts were spread geographically across the state, including the Upper Peninsula, a considerable number of the districts were concentrated in southern Michigan, especially in the southeast and southwest corners of the state. A list of the districts and a map showing their distribution across the state are labeled items C and D in the Appendix.

Survey Design

The Cover Letter

The purpose and importance of the study were described in a cover letter accompanying the survey. The Gifted and Talented Coordinator for the Michigan Department of Education co-signed this letter as an endorsement of the

study's value. Although the name of the district and the respondent's name were requested in the survey, the cover letter assured strict confidentiality in the final report.

The Survey

The complete survey, bound in booklet form, included an instruction page that reiterated the purpose and confidentiality statements. The survey itself was fourteen pages in length. All fourteen pages were used by the coordinators only if the district offered at least two program options at each of the school levels. The questions were designed to be answered with a minimum of writing. Whenever possible, checklists were provided for ease of writing.

A postage-paid, addressed envelope was provided for each respondent for mailing the survey back.

District Data. Pages 1 and 2 of the survey were used to learn about the district as a whole. In order to determine whether the district minority population had changed significantly from the 1988-89 Fourth Friday count, the racial/gender distribution of the entire school district was requested. Also requested was the gifted and talented student population by race.

The gifted and talented supervision, policies, and procedures of the district were also investigated in this section. To reduce the amount of writing required, the coordinators were asked to attach copies, rather than write, their mission statements and their program options if these documents were available. Asking for copies of these documents served two purposes. First, it established whether or not the district had a written philosophy and/or listing of program options. Second, it provided examples of the philosophy and program options for these districts.

The remaining district questions were intended to examine practices regarding the identification of gifted and talented <u>potential</u>, as well as the process for program expansion.

The first two pages of the survey provided an overview of the district as a whole in terms of philosophy, practices, and programming for gifted and talented students. It supplied the descriptive background necessary to better understand the remaining building-level data.

Building-Level Data. The remainder of the survey narrowed the scope of the study to individual buildings. Using the four subsidiary research questions as a basis, pages 3-14 concentrated on programming at the elementary, middle, and high school levels. Because it would have been unrealistic to ask the coordinators to describe all of their program options at all of their buildings, they were asked to describe two program options at each level. For districts with more than one school at each of these levels, coordinators were asked to choose one <u>typical</u> school to describe. A typical school was defined in the survey as one

that characterized the variety of programming, as well as the racial/gender representation, of the district as a whole.

The survey for each of the building levels was identical, asking the same questions for each level. The survey questions and their relationship to each of the subsidiary research questions are described below.

Survey Questions. The first subsidiary research question addressed program option and model availability in the surveyed schools. Since The Association for the Gifted standard encourages a variety of program options and models based on the needs of the students, the first six questions of the building-level portion of the survey were aimed at determining whether this variety existed in culturally diverse schools and, if not, what options and models were most predominant.

Program options are often identified by type or category. Five major categories are commonly found in schools. They are academic, performing/visual arts, leadership, creativity, and affective development or counseling. The survey was intended to determine whether all of these categories were equally common or whether there was a predominance of any one type of program option. Questions 1-5 of the building-level surveys were intended to determine the availability and frequency of the five categories in surveyed schools.

Question 6 of the building-level portion of the survey addressed program models and was used to determine the variety of program models available in the high-minority schools. Seven types of models are commonly found. They are cluster grouping, self-contained classroom, regular class with IEP (individual educational plan), pull-out program, resource center, teacher consultant, and counseling/affective development. Question 6 examined the frequency of each of these types of models.

The second subsidiary research question was concerned with the racial/gender distribution within each of the types of program options. Question 12 of the building-level portion of the survey solicited these race and gender figures. The purpose of this question was to determine whether or not the racial/gender population of the individual program options reasonably duplicated the entire district population or whether there were over- and underrepresented groups in any of the types of options.

The third subsidiary research question was related to the amount of involvement students had in individual program options. The purpose of this question was to determine the number of sustained versus short-term programs available in surveyed schools. In Michigan a sustained program is defined as one that meets at least three hours a week during the entire school year. Sustained programming, of course, is encouraged whenever possible. Question 8 of the

building-level portion of the survey determined whether a program would be defined as sustained or short-term.

The fourth and final subsidiary research question involved identification practices of surveyed schools. As discussed in Chapter 2 under "Problems With Identification," the failure to provide equitable gifted programming is frequently linked to identification practices. Therefore, a considerable portion of the survey addressed the practices of surveyed schools.

The research findings regarding equitable identification practices which resulted in the TAG standards were reviewed in Chapter 2. These recommendations encourage the use of multiple identification methods as well as empirically-proven culture-fair tests. The use of procedures that measure potential as well as demonstrated talent is also encouraged by these standards.

District-wide identification practices, as well as building-level methods used to identify students for specific program options were investigated through the survey. Questions 2 and 3 of the district portion of the survey addressed the identification of gifted and talented potential. Question 2 simply determined whether the district attempts to identify potential, while question 3 determined if any of the individual program options were specifically intended to develop potential.

Questions 8-11 on the building-level portion of the survey addressed identification practices for individual

program options. The methods used were identified in question 8. For those schools using multiple identification methods, question 9 clarified whether or not one method took precedence. It established whether one condition had to be met before the others were considered. This question is important because the district does not really utilize multiple methods if one condition must be met before the others are considered. That is, the district may say that they are using multiple identification methods when they are really including or excluding students by the first method applied. Question 9 made that distinction.

Identification for, and participation in, gifted programming are two different conditions. Students identified as gifted are not guaranteed participation in gifted programming. Questions 10 and 11 in the survey clarified how a student got from the status of identification to participation by asking about number limitations and selection processes.

Survey Procedures

The survey was mailed January 7, 1991. Respondents were asked to return the survey by February 1.

After the initial mailing of the survey, it was found that some districts were not responding because the districts had no gifted programming. Therefore, a follow-up letter was mailed on January 21, 1991, to give districts an opportunity to report that situation, if it existed. It was

felt that the lack of programming in some districts was as important to the study as was the reporting of the status of current programs. The follow-up letter gave respondents an opportunity to report the lack of gifted programming on the letter and mail it back in the enclosed addressed, postagepaid envelope.

In this letter coordinators were also encouraged to participate in the study regardless of the size of their district, as it was found that some small districts felt that their data would not significantly contribute to the study.

Finally, the follow-up letter provided an opportunity for respondents to request a new copy of the survey should the original survey have been misplaced. The follow-up letter is labeled item E in the Appendix.

Twenty-three districts (45 percent) responded to the survey by the February 1 deadline. Those coordinators who had not responded to the survey by February 4 were telephoned during that week and encouraged to return the survey by the end of February.

All surveys received through February 28, 1991, were included in the study. This allowed eight weeks from the time the survey was mailed until data analysis began. Any surveys received after February 28 were not included in the data analysis described below. Thirty-five of the 51 school districts surveyed (68.6 percent) responded to the survey.

Data Analysis

The main purpose of the study was to report the current status of gifted programming in high-minority districts. This status report was to be presented in such a way that some conclusions could be drawn regarding equity in these districts. Although many facets of the school experience affect equity, this study focused on the four areas identified in the four subsidiary questions. They were (1) program option and model availability, (2) racial/gender distribution in program options, (3) degree of student involvement in program options, and (4) identification practices. The data for the findings and conclusions have been tabulated and reported under these four headings.

Program Options and Models

The program options and models reported in the surveys were tabulated by type to determine which categories of options and models were most common. This tabulation was intended to provide evidence of variety, or lack of it, in the surveyed schools. It also revealed which grades were receiving the greatest amount of gifted programming, as well as the scope of programming school-wide and district-wide.

Racial/Gender Distribution

When speaking to issues of equity, race and gender representation within the individual program types is an important component. Therefore, the number of students in each type of program option was tabulated by race and

gender. The purpose of this tabulation was to look for evidence of equal representation of race and gender in all types of options. That is, it was intended to determine whether each race and gender was proportionally represented in all five types of program options or whether some groups were over- or underrepresented.

Race and gender distribution tables are presented in two ways. First, each program type was analyzed to determine the race and gender representation in each of the programs. Second, each race and gender group was examined individually to determine if any group tended to appear more frequently in some programs than in others. This second analysis was intended to determine whether there was any tendency toward clustering of racial groups into one or more program types.

Degree of Involvement

The number of sustained and short-term program options was tabulated by school level for comparison. The percentage of students in both sustained and short-term programs was also tabulated by race and reported in table form. The purpose of this analysis was again to look for evidence of racial clusterings--this time in sustained versus short-term programs.

Identification

Schools use many different methods to identify students for gifted and talented programming. Some of these methods

include grades, testing (aptitude, achievement, IQ, creativity), rating scales, recommendations (teacher, administrator, peer, parent), and self-nomination. As reported in Chapter 2, the TAG standards recommend the use of a variety of methods, rather than relying on one single identifier. As is also reported in Chapter 2, this recommendation has the support of most gifted educators, especially when attempting to locate gifted minorities.

In order to understand the identification methods of the surveyed schools, the number of programs using a single identification method versus the number using multiple methods was tabulated and reported in table form. The methods used for final selection and placement were also tabulated. This summary revealed how students moved from identification to participation status.

A number of different tests are used to identify children for gifted programming. Categories of tests include aptitude, achievement, intelligence, and creativity tests. Within these categories there are many tests from which schools can choose. As reviewed in Chapter 2, there are also several culture-fair tests that are widely accepted among gifted educators for identifying gifted students. In an effort to see what tests were commonly used in the surveyed schools, the different types of tests were tabulated to determine which tests were most frequently used. In order to see whether there were any predominant categories or types of tests, these tests were tabulated by

category (achievement, aptitude, intelligence, etc.) and by test name.

Summary

This study of gifted programming in high-minority schools was accomplished through a survey mailed to all districts in Michigan with a minority population of 24 percent or higher. Four specific areas of gifted programming were investigated in an effort to examine issues of equity in these school districts. The areas studied were (1) the availability of gifted program options and models, (2) the racial/gender representation within these program options, (3) the degree of student involvement, and (4) the common methods of identification.

The responses to these surveys were tabulated and are reported in the following chapter.

CHAPTER 4

Presentation of Data

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to survey high-minority school districts in Michigan in order to learn more about the status of their gifted programming. This status report was further intended to shed some light on equity within these districts.

In order to learn about the districts, answers to four questions were sought. They were:

- 1. What program options and models are available in high-minority schools?
- 2. What is the racial/gender distribution within the program options?
- 3. What is the degree of involvement of students in gifted programming in the surveyed schools?
- 4. How are students identified for various program options?

The results of the survey are presented in the following manner. First, the survey return rate and the district data are reviewed to provide a descriptive overview of the surveyed districts. Demographic data, as well as program supervision, philosophy, practices, and programming at the district level are discussed here as a backdrop for the remaining building-level data. Second, the building-level data are presented. The data regarding program model and option availability are presented, revealing the most common types of models and options. The racial/gender

representation is examined for evidence of racial clusterings in certain types of programs. Next, the degree of student involvement within program options is presented, with particular attention given to the frequency of sustained versus short-term programs. Finally, the types of identification methods are reviewed. Commonalities of practices are reflected in these tabulations.

Tables are provided in each section to clarify relationships.

Target Population/Survey Response

The survey was sent to the 51 school districts in Michigan identified in the 1988-89 State Department's Fourth Friday File as high minority; that is, it was sent to all districts with a minority population of 24 percent or higher. Thirty-five (68.6%) of the 51 districts responded to the survey.

District Data

District Demographics

District size. The sizes of the surveyed and responding districts are reviewed in Table 1. As can be seen by this table, the percentage of responding districts in each size category coincide quite closely with the surveyed districts. The responding districts are therefore quite representative of the population surveyed in terms of district size.

10010 1	Ta	b	1	e	1
---------	----	---	---	---	---

	Surveyed	Districts	Responding	Districts
District Size*	Number of Districts	Percent of Total	Number of Districts	Percent of Total
SMALL	13	25.5	8	23
MEDIUM	22	43.1	14	40
LARGE	16	31.4	12	34
UNKNOWN (anon)			1	3
TOTALS	51	100.0%	35	100%
*Small Districts = 999 students or less *Medium Districts = 1,000-4,999 students *Large Districts = 5,000 students or more				

SIZES OF SURVEYED AND RESPONDING DISTRICTS

Student Population. Table 2 provides a detailed enrollment profile of the 35 responding districts. This table includes the total enrollment figures for each responding district, as well as the percentage of minority students in each of the districts. One district (labeled as District No. 35 in the table) responded anonymously, providing no population figures. Therefore, the total enrollment figure reflects the total for the remaining 34 districts.

Table 2

ENROLLMENT PROFILE OF RESPONDING DISTRICTS*

N = 35 Districts

Distr	ict		Total Enrollment	Percent Minority
			SMALL DISTRICTS	
District	No.	1	90	71
District	No.	2	797	63
District	No.	3	814	56
District	No.	4	26	46
District	No.	5	102	35
District	No.	6	661	29
District	No.	7	177	28
District	No.	8	320	24
			MEDIUM-SIZED DISTRICTS	
District	No.	9	4,569	99
District	No.	10	2,303	97
District	No.	11	1,847	91
District	No.	12	1,800	60
District	No.	13	2,365	56
District	No.	14	2,446	44
District	No.	15	2,295	44
District	No.	16	3,416	38
District	No.	17	4,696	29
District	No.	18	1,144	28
District	No.	19	1,582	28
District	No.	20	3,299	28
District	No.	21	2,440	27
District	No.	22	1,800	25
			LARGE DISTRICTS	
District	No.	23	7,223	83
District	No.	24	29,179	69
District	No.	25	15,464	68
District	No.	26	8,520	48
District	No.	27	25,730	47
District	No.	28	7,324	46
District	No.	29	21,951	43
District	No.	30	12,692	41
District	No.	31	8,895	34
District	No.	32	7,826	29
District	No.	33	5,037	29
District	No.	34	13,885	25
District	No.	35	(Anon.) Unknown	Unknown

TOTAL = 202,715

*Extracted from the Michigan Department of Education 1988-89 Fourth Friday File. District Make-up. The 35 responding districts represented a combined total in excess of 40 high schools, 50 middle schools, and 250 elementary schools. The minority representation within the 35 responding districts ranged from 24 percent to 99.5 percent. Responding districts were well distributed geographically, including both the Upper and Lower Peninsulas of Michigan.

Racial Profile. A racial profile of all of the students in the responding districts is provided in Table 3. The data for this table were extracted from the Michigan Department of Education Special Report from the 1988-89 Fourth Friday File. (See definition of Michigan's Fourth Friday process on page 34, Chapter 3.) This file includes a breakdown of the state's student enrollment by district and by racial group.

Of the 35 responding districts, 20 provided updated 1990-91 Fourth Friday figures, as requested. Of those who provided Fourth Friday data, all remained in the high minority category of 24 percent minority population or higher. In fact, all but three districts providing Fourth Friday data showed an <u>increase</u> in minority representation during 1990-91 over the 1988-89 count provided by the State Department of Education. One large district and one mediumsized district had a one percent minority decrease; one very small district had a 10 percent drop, but this 10 percent represented only 18 students. Seventeen of the 20 districts also showed a <u>decrease</u> in total student population.

Table 3

STUDENTS IN RESPONDING DISTRICTS BY RACE*

N = 34 Districts

Race	Number	<u>Percent</u>
Indian	2,191	1.0
Asian	3,114	1.5
Hispanic	11,672	6.0
Black	84,199	41.5
Caucasian	101.539	50.0
TOTAL	202,715	100.0%

*Extracted from the Michigan Department of Education Special Report from the 1988-89 Fourth Friday File.

<u>Note</u>. Although 35 districts responded, one district did so anonymously; the student count for this district could not be included in the table.

Gifted Demographics

The availability of gifted programming in the surveyed schools is reported in Table 4. Six districts, or 17 percent, of the 35 responding districts had no programming at all. At least one of these districts fell into the large district category (over 5,000 students) and at least two other districts fell into the medium-sized category (1,000-4,999 students).

The 29 districts with gifted programming offered a total of 121 different program options at the elementary level, 61 at the middle school level, and 62 at the high school level. The surveys provided descriptions of 44 elementary programs (36 percent of the total program offerings); 27 middle school programs (44 percent of the total); and 26 high school programs (42 percent of the total).

Table 4

GIFTED OPTION AVAILABILITY IN RESPONDING DISTRICTS N = 29 Districts

	Total O in All D	ptions Averag <u>istricts Options</u>	e Number of Per District
ELEMENTARY	12	1	4.2
MIDDLE	6	1	2.1
HIGH	_6	2	2.1
то	TAL 24	4	

Note. Six additional districts had no gifted programming.

Twelve of the 29 districts with gifted programming reported both Fourth Friday student counts and gifted program student counts. Therefore, comparisons could be made in these districts between total minority representation and gifted minority representation. The total student population by race and the gifted population by race of the 12 districts that provided these data are reported in Table 5.

An examination of Table 5 will show that Blacks and Hispanics were underrepresented in gifted programming by 49 and 43 percent respectively, while white students were overrepresented by 44 percent (see explanation of under/overrepresentation, page 17).

Table 5

1990-91 TOTAL AND GIFTED POPULATION BY RACE

```
N = 12 Districts
```

	Total <u>Students</u>	Percent <u>of Total</u>	Total <u>Gifted</u>	Percent of <u>Total Gifted</u>
Caucasian	28,836	50.0	3,636	72
Black	21,417	37.0	953	19
Hispanic	6,041	10.5	320	6
Asian	886	1.5	93	2
Indian	545	1.0	31	1_
TOTALS	57,726	100.0%	5,033	100%

<u>Note</u>. Although 35 districts responded to the survey, only 12 provided <u>both</u> Fourth Friday and gifted population figures.

Programming

Surveyed schools were asked whether their districts had a written list of available program options. Seven of the 29 districts with gifted programming (24 percent) indicated that their districts did have printed lists. Four of the seven included the list of offerings, as requested. Three of the four were professionally printed brochures. Coordinators were also asked whether other program offerings were under consideration for their districts. Twelve of the 29 districts indicated that additional program offerings were under consideration. The most frequent change indicated was a total or partial revision of all program options. The most frequent addition under consideration was mentorships. Finally, coordinators were asked to list the major criterion for the addition of a program offering. Table 6 details all of the responses. "Student needs" emerged as the most common criterion. ("Student needs" generally refers to student skills or talents that have been identified through testing or other methods and have been deemed worthy of further development through a differentiated curriculum.) "Teacher availability" and "resource availability" were also common responses to this survey question.

Table 6

DISTRICT CRITERIA FOR GIFTED PROGRAM EXPANSION

N = 29 Districts

Criterion	Number of <u>Districts</u>	Percent <u>of Total</u>
Student needs	16	40.0
Teacher availability	10	25.0
Resource availability	8	20.0
Funding	1	2.5
Parental requests	1	2.5
Racial integration	1	2.5
District review	1	2.5
Reorganization	1	2.5
Research - current practice	_1	_2.5
TOTALS	40	100.0

Note. Some districts listed more than one criterion; therefore, the total exceeds the number of districts.

Gifted Supervision

The titles held by the persons in charge of gifted programming are summarized in Table 7. The surveys asked for the name of the person in charge of gifted and talented programming in the district and the title held by that person. Although some districts had a full-time gifted and talented coordinator, many districts combined gifted and talented coordination with other duties. Gifted and talented coordination was often the responsibility of the state and federal program director, the principal, the superintendent, or combined with some other title, such as gifted and talented teacher. Two district coordinators did not indicate their title.

Gifted Philosophy

The status of philosophy statements in the surveyed districts is summarized in Table 8. Of the 29 responding districts with gifted programming, 18 districts, or 62 percent, had a written mission statement or philosophy. Respondents were asked to include a copy of their philosophy in the survey. Eight districts complied with this request. One of the philosophies specifically mentions equality of treatment, regardless of race, gender, or socioeconomic status, as a goal of the district's gifted and talented program. Some of the others make a reference to all children being unique with special talents, but do not directly refer to race or gender.

Table 7

TITLES OF GIFTED AND TALENTED SUPERVISORS

N = 35 Districts

Title	Number of Districts	Percent
Gifted/Enrichment/Able Learner Coord.	12	34.2
Two Titles: G/T Coordinator/2nd Title	5	14.2
Director, State and Federal Programs	4	11.4
Principal	3	8.6
Gifted and Talented Teacher	2	5.7
Superintendent	2	5.7
Assistant Superintendent [.]	1	2.9
Reading Consultant	1	2.9
Director, Special Education	1	2.9
Administrative Services Assistant	1	2.9
Human Resources Coordinator	1	2.9
No title given	2	5.7
TOTALS	35	100.0

Table 8

STATUS OF DISTRICT PHILOSOPHY STATEMENTS

N = 29 Districts

Districts With Written Philosophy:	18	Percent of Total:	62
Districts Without Written Philosophy:	11	Percent of Total:	_38_
TOTALS	29		100%

Gifted Potential

Of the 29 responding districts that had gifted programming, 20 (69 percent) indicated that they attempt to identify gifted potential as well as demonstrated talents. All of the methods used to identify potential in the surveyed districts are reviewed in Table 9. The use of a multiple method was the most common identification practice for locating gifted potential. Other practices listed included testing, teacher recommendations, self-nomination, and teacher/parent checklists.

Twelve of the 20 districts indicated that testing was used exclusively or in combination with other identification methods to identify potential. The most common tests used to identify potential were the Cognitive Abilities Test and the California Test of Cognitive Skills, each representing 19 percent of the tests used. Other tests mentioned included the IOWA, the California Test of Basic Skills, Woodcock Johnson, Wechsler, and Otis Lennon.

In addition, two districts indicated that their teachers have received training to identify gifted potential.

A majority of the coordinators indicated that one or more program options in the district were designed specifically to develop the child's potential. Twenty-three of the 29 districts (79 percent) indicated that options were available for this purpose.

Table 9

METHODS USED TO IDENTIFY GIFTED POTENTIAL

N = 29 Districts

Method	Number of <u>Districts</u>	Percent <u>of Total</u>
No method used	9	31
Multiple	8	28
Testing	5	17
Teacher recommendation	4	14
Self-nomination	2	7
Teacher/parent checklist	_1	3
TOTALS	29	100%

Building-Level Data

Program Options

The program options described by the surveyed districts are reviewed in Table 10. At the building level, 97 different program descriptions were provided--44 elementary, 27 middle school, and 26 high school programs. Academic options (see definition, page 16) were most popular, representing 52 percent of the elementary programs, 48 percent of the middle school programs, and 61 percent of the high school programs.

The second most popular option was a multiple option; that is, a program designed to address a combination of areas, such as academic enrichment/creativity. Multiple options were generally magnet schools or self-contained classrooms, where several areas could be emphasized.

Table 10

GIFTED OPTION TYPES IN RESPONDING DISTRICTS

ELEMENTARY	l Program Type	Number of Programs	Percent of Elementary
	Academic Multiple Creativity Performing/Visual Arts Other Leadership Affective Development Counseling	23 13 4 2 2 0 0 0	52.0 30.0 9.0 4.5 4.5 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0
J	Cotal Elementary Programs	= 44	100.0%
MIDDLE	Program Type	Number of Programs	Percent of Middle Sch.
	Academic Multiple Creativity Performing /Visual Arts Leadership Affective Dev. Counseling Other	13 10 2 2 0 0 0 0	48.0 37.0 7.5 7.5 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0
1	otal Middle School Progra	ms = 27	100.0%
HIGH	Program Type	Number of Programs	Percent of High School
	Academic Multiple Creativity Leadership Performing/Visual Arts Affective Development Counseling Other	16 8 1 0 0 0 0	$ \begin{array}{r} 61.0\\ 31.0\\ 4.0\\ 0.0\\ 0.0\\ 0.0\\ 0.0\\ 0.0\\ 0.0\\ 0$
1	otal High School Programs	= 26	100.0%

N = 29 Districts

TOTAL PROGRAMS (ALL LEVELS) = 97

In order to get a sense of the extent to which each type of option was available school-wide, the coordinators were asked to indicate the number of sections that were available within the school chosen. Twenty-three of the 44 elementary options had more than one section available at the school. In many cases, the same option was available to several different grades. The number of sections available in one school ranged from one to 31.

At the middle school level, 16 of the 27 options described had more than one section available at the school. The number of middle school sections available at one school ranged from one to 12.

At the high school level, 10 of the 26 options described had more than one section available. The number of sections ranged from one to 21 at the schools described.

In order to get a sense of district-wide availability of options, coordinators were asked whether the program options described were available at more than one school. Twenty-two districts had more than one elementary school; eighteen of the districts offered some or all of the options at other schools. Eleven districts had more than one middle school; nine of these districts offered options at other schools. Six districts had more than one high school, three of which offered options at other schools.

Table 11 reveals that there are more program options at the elementary level than at the middle and high school level, with grades three through six having the most options.

AVAILABILITY OF PROGRAMMING BY GRADE LEVEL

N = 29 Districts

Grade	Number of Programs	Percent of Grand Total*
]	ELEMENTARY PROGRAMS	
Kindergarten	12	3.6
1st Grade	16	4.7
2nd Grade	21	6.3
3rd Grade	36	10.7
5th Grade	<u>40</u> <u>41</u>	12.2
TOTAL ELEMEN	TARY = 166	49.4%
M	IDDLE SCHOOL PROGRAMS	
6th Grade	37	11.0
7th Grade	25	7.5
8th Grade	22	<u> 6.6</u>
TOTAL MIDDLE	SCHOOL = 84	25.1%
]	HIGH SCHOOL PROGRAMS	
9th Grade	22	6.6
10th Grade	20	6.0
11th Grade	21	6.3
12th Grade	22	<u> </u>
TOTAL HIGH SC	CHOOL = 85	25.5%
*GRAND TOTAL (ALL PRO	GRAMS) = 335	100.0%
The scope of programming by level is reported in Table 12. Of the 35 districts, 16 (46 percent) had at least two program options at the elementary level. Six more districts had elementary magnet schools, with extensive programming. Of the remaining 13 districts, five had one option at the elementary level. Eight districts had no elementary gifted programming.

At the middle school level, 5 (14 percent) of the 35 districts had at least two program options. Three other districts had magnet schools with extensive programming. Of the remaining 27 districts, 14 had one gifted program and 13 had no gifted programming at the middle school level.

At the high school level, 8 (23 percent) of the 35 districts had at least two program options. In addition, 3 districts had magnet schools with extensive programming. Of the remaining 24 districts, 9 had one program option and 15 had no programming at the high school level.

The maximum number of students that can be accommodated within a program option is reported in Table 13 (page 65). Coordinators were asked whether the district set a maximum number for program options. Approximately half (49 percent) of the program options do have a student limit. The most frequent number reported was 20 students, but the limit ranged from a low of 7 (mainly competitive teams) to a high of 700 (a magnet school).

SCOPE OF PROGRAMMING BY SCHOOL LEVEL

N = 35 Districts

ELEMENTARY	Scope of Programming	Number of Districts	Percent of Elementary
	Magnet schools Two or more options One program option No programming	6 16 5 <u>8</u>	17 46 14 _23
	TOTALS	35	100%
MIDDLE	Scope of Programming	Number of Districts	Percent of Middle Sch.
	Magnet schools Two or more options One program option No programming	3 5 14 <u>13</u>	9 14 40 <u>37</u>
	TOTALS	35	100%
HIGH	Scope of Programming	Number of Districts	Percent of High School
in tom	Magnet schools Two or more options One program option No programming	3 8 9 <u>15</u>	9 23 25 43
	TOTALS	35	100%

MAXIMUM NUMBER OF STUDENTS PER PROGRAM OPTION

N = 29 Districts

Maximum Students

Frequency

7								•		3	
9			•							1	
12-15										1	
15										2	
16	-									2	
18				•						1	
20										5	
20-25									•	2	
24										2	
25										2	
25-30										2	
26-28										1	
29						•				1	
30										4	
30-32										1	
60									•	1	
70							•			1	
140										1	
150		•	•	•	•					2	
170								•		1	Magnet
300										1	Schools
600										1	
700				•				•		1	

Program Models

The program models are reported in Table 14 by school level. At the elementary level, the most common model was the pullout program (28 percent), followed by before/after school programs (24 percent). Cluster groups accounted for 14 percent, while self-contained classrooms and magnet schools represented 12 percent each. Pullout and before/after school programs were also the most popular models at the middle school level, each accounting for 22 percent, followed by self-contained classrooms (20 percent).

PROGRAM MODELS BY SCHOOL LEVEL

N = 29 Districts

ELEMENTARY	Model	Number of Programs	Percent of Elementary
	Pullout Program Before/After School Cluster	14 12 7	28 24
	Self-contained	6	12
	Magnet	6	12
	Other	2	4
	Regular Class - IEP	_1	_2
	TOTAL	44	100%
MIDDLE	Model	Number of Programs	Percent of Middle Sch.
	Pullout	9	22
	Before/After School	9	22
	Self-contained	8	20
	Cluster	5	12
	Regource Center	2	5
	Regular Class - IEP	2	5
	Other	2	5
	Teacher Consultant	_1	_2
	TOTAL	41	100%
HIGH	Model	Number of Programs	Percent of High School
	Before/After School	10	29
	Self-contained	9	26
	Other	5	15
	Magnet	3	9
	Cluster	3	9
	Teacher Consultant	_1	3
	TOTAL	34	100%

At the high school level, the most common model was the before/after school program (29 percent), followed by selfcontained classrooms (26 percent). Other popular models were mentorships and advanced placement. Specially designed models, tailored to meet individual district needs, were more common at the high school level than at the middle and elementary level.

Racial/Gender Distribution

Not all of the responding schools were able to provide the race/gender distribution within individual program options. In many cases this was because the distribution changed each semester or marking period. However, student distributions were provided for 21 elementary programs, 18 middle school programs, and 14 high school programs.

The race/gender representation in academic options is reported in Table 15. In these options, 75 percent of the students were white and 25 percent were minority. Since it was known that 50 percent of the population in the responding districts was minority, these figures revealed that minorities were underrepresented in academic options by 50 percent. (See explanation of under/overrepresentation, page 17). The gender representation was most equal among the white students, with 48 percent male and 52 percent female. The greatest gender disparity was in the Black population, with 39 percent male and 61 percent female.

RACE/GENDER REPRESENTATION IN ACADEMIC OPTIONS

N = 29 Districts

Race	Number of	Students	Percent of Race	Percent All Races
WHITE	Male Female	627 684	48 52	36 39
TOTALS		1,311	100%	75
BLACK	Male Female	89 139	39 _61	5 8
TOTALS		228	100%	13
INDIAN	Male Female	49 61	45 _ <u>55</u>	3
TOTALS		110	100%	6
HISPANIC	Male Female	36 <u>31</u>	54 _46	2
TOTALS		67	100%	4
ASIAN	Male Female	22 17	56 44	1 1
TOTALS		39	100%	2
PROGRAM	TOTALS	1,755		100%

The race and gender representation in multiple emphasis options, which were mainly magnet schools and all-day selfcontained classrooms, is reported in Table 16. In these options, 69 percent of the students were white, while 31 percent were minority, indicating a 38 percent underrepresentation of minorities. The females outnumbered the males in these programs in all racial groups, but the disparity between males and females was not as great as in the academic options. The greatest gender disparities in multiple emphasis options were in the Black and Asian populations, where females outnumbered males by 14 and 16 percentage points respectively. Both the Indian and white population had a gender separation of 4 percent.

The race and gender representation in creative options is reported in Table 17 (page 71). In these options, 80 percent of the students were white, indicating a 60 percent minority underrepresentation. The remaining 20 percent were Black and Hispanic students. There were no Asian or Indian students in creative programs. Again, the greatest gender disparity was in the Black population, with 38 percent males and 62 percent females. The Hispanic population was 50 percent male and 50 percent female, while the white population had 44 percent males and 56 percent females.

Although three visual and performing arts programs were described, no racial or gender distributions were provided for these options.

RACE/GENDER REPRESENTATION IN MULTIPLE OPTIONS

N = 29 Districts

Race	Number of	Students	Percent of Race	Percent All Races
WHITE	Male	1,029	48	33.0
TOTALS	remare	2,155	100%	<u> </u>
BLACK	Male Female :	327 430	43 57	10.0
TOTALS		757	100%	24.0
HISPANIC	Male Female	57 66	46 54	2.0 2.0
TOTALS		123	100%	4.0
INDIAN	Male Female	34 37	48 52	1.0
TOTALS		7 <u>1</u>	100%	2.0
ASIAN	Male Female	18 25	42 58	. 5 5
TOTALS		43	100%	1.0
PROGRAM	TOTALS	3,149		100.0%

RACE/GENDER REPRESENTATION IN CREATIVE OPTIONS

N = 29 Districts

Race	Number of	1 Students	Percent of Race	Percent All Races
511 T T T T	Mala	50		35
WHILE	Female	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	45
TOTALS		133	100%	80
BLACK	Male	11	38	7
	Female		_62	_11
TOTALS		29	100%	18
HISPANIC	Male	2	50	1
	remale	<u></u>	_50	
TOTALS	- <u></u>	4	100%	2
INDIAN	Male Female	0	0	0
TOTALS	100010		<u>×_</u>	
			0.%	
ASIAN	Male Female	0	0	0
TOTALS	1011010	0	0%	0
PROGRAM	FOTALS	166		100%

One program listed under the "other" category as "problem solving" had only seven students enrolled. Racial analysis was not done on this program because of its small numbers.

The clustering of racial groups is reported in Table 18. As revealed by this table, 63 percent of the Hispanics were placed in a multiple emphasis program; that is, a program designed to address more than one talent or skill area in a single offering. Most of the remaining Hispanic students were in an academic program; that is, a program that addresses general intellectual areas.

The Asian students were about evenly divided between academic programs (48 percent) and multiple emphasis options (52 percent).

The Black students showed the greatest evidence of clustering tendencies, with 74 percent of the Black students placed in multiple emphasis options. Twenty-three percent of the Black students were in academic areas.

Sixty percent of the Indian students were placed in academic programs, while 39 percent were in multiple emphasis areas.

Sixty percent of the white students were in multiple emphasis areas, with 36 percent in academic areas and 4 percent in creativity development programs; that is, programs whose primary focus is creative thinking.

REPRESENTATION IN OPTIONS BY RACE/GENDER

N = 29 Districts

Race	Program	Numbe Stude	Percent of Race	
HISPANIC	Academic	Male Female	36 31	19 16 35
	Multiple	Male Female	57 66	29 34 - 63
	Creativity	Male Female	2 2	$1 \\ 1 \\ 2$
	TOTAL HISPANIC		194	100%
ASIAN	Academic	Male Female	22 17	$27 \\ 21 \\ 48$
	Multiple	Male Female	18 25	22 30 52
	TOTAL ASIAN		82	100%
BLACK	Academic Multiple	Male Female Male	89 139 327	$9 \\ 14 \\ 23 \\ 32 \\ 32 \\ 32 \\ 32 \\ 32 \\ 32 \\ 3$
	Creativity	Female Male Female	430 11 18	$\begin{array}{c} 42 \\ 1 \\ 2 \\ 3 \end{array}$
	TOTAL BLACK		1,014	100%
INDIAN	Academic	Male Female	49 61	$27 \\ 33 \\ 60$
	Other	Hale Female Male Female	34 37 2 0	$ \begin{array}{ccc} 19\\ 20\\ 39\\ 1\\ 0\\ 1 \end{array} $
	TOTAL INDIAN		183	100%
WHITE	Academic	Male Female	627 684	$\begin{array}{c}17\\19 \hline 36\end{array}$
	Multiple Creativity	Male Female Male Female	1,029 1,126 59 74	$\begin{array}{c}29\\31 \\ 2\\2 \\ 4\end{array}$
	TOTAL WHITE		3,599	100%

Degree of Involvement

To determine the degree of involvement students had in gifted programming, coordinators were asked whether the program met regularly all year. They were also asked the number of hours that the program met each week. Programs that met regularly throughout the year for at least three hours a week were labeled "sustained." Those that did not meet all year or that met for less than three hours each week were labeled "short-term." As Table 19 shows, there were more short-term programs than sustained programs at the elementary level. However, at the middle and high school level, sustained programming outnumbered short-term programming. Magnet schools accounted for six of the elementary and three of the middle and high school sustained programs.

Table 19

SUSTAINED VERSUS SHORT-TERM PROGRAMS

N = 29 Districts

NUMBER OF PROGRAMS

School Level	Sustained	<u>Short-Term</u>
Elementary Schools	19	23
Middle Schools	16	11
High Schools	<u>14</u>	12
TOTALS	49	46

<u>Note</u>. Two program descriptions did not include length of time and therefore could not be assigned a status.

In terms of numbers of students, far more students were placed in sustained programs than in short-term programs, mainly because of the large numbers of students that can be accommodated in magnet schools and self-contained classes. Eighty-seven percent of the students were in sustained programming; 13 percent in short-term programs. Among the minority population, 89 percent were in sustained programs; 11 percent in short-term programs. Table 20 shows the racial breakdown of students in sustained and short-term programs.

Table 20

RACIAL GROUPS IN SUSTAINED VS. SHORT-TERM OPTIONS

Race	Program Type	Number of Students	Percent of Race	
HISPANIC	Sustained Short-Term	Male 90 Female 96 Male 8 Female 3	186 11	94- 6-]100%
ASIAN	Sustained Short-Term	Male 35 Female 37 Male 3 Female 3	72 6	92- 8-]100%
BLACK	Sustained Short-Term	Male 404 Female 542 Male 34 Female 55	946 89	91- 9-]100%
WHITE	Sustained Short-Term	Male 1437 Female 15542, Male 218 Female 273	991 491	86- 14-]100%
INDIAN	Sustained Short-Term	Male 48 Female 55 Male 28 Female 32	103 60	63- 37-]100%

N = 29 Districts

Sustained and short-term programming are reported in Table 21 to display racial breakdown by program type (sustained versus short-term).

Table 21

TOTAL STUDENTS IN SUSTAINED AND SHORT-TERM PROGRAMS N = 29 Districts

	SUSTA	INED	SHORT-TERM		
Race	Number of Students	Percent	Number of Students	Percent	
Indian Asian Black Hispanic	103 72 946 186	2 2 22 4	60 6 89 11	9 1 13 2	
TOTAL MINORITY	1,307	30	166	25	
Caucasian	2,991	_70_	<u>491</u>	_75_	
TOTAL STUDENTS	4,298	100%	657	100%	

The sustained offerings common to the surveyed districts are characterized in Table 22. Magnet schools represented 24 percent of the total offerings. Other sustained programs included enrichment classes (24 percent), cluster groups (16 percent), acceleration/advanced placement (12 percent) and self-contained classes (10 percent). The remaining programs were made up of pull-out, after-school, and special withinclass options.

KINDS OF SUSTAINED PROGRAMMING

N = 29 Districts

Program	Number of <u>Programs</u>	Percent <u>of Total</u>
Magnet Schools	12	24.5
Enrichment Classes	12	24.5
Cluster Groups	8	16.3
Acceleration/Adv. Placement	6	12.2
Self-contained Classes	5	10.2
After-School Programs	3	6.1
Within Class Programs	2	4.1
Pullout Programs	1	2.1
TOTAL	49	100.0%

The short-term offerings common to the surveyed districts are characterized in Table 23. Competitive teams that run during a portion of the school year represented 28 percent of the short-term offerings. Common competitive programs included Future Problem Solving, Odyssey of the Mind, Science Olympiad, and Young Authors. Intermittent enrichment programs represented another 26 percent of the short-term programs.

After-school programs represented 13 percent of shortterm programs, while mentorships and Junior Great Books accounted for another 4 percent each. The remaining programs were miscellaneous special options such as Youth in Government, Artist in Residence, Junior R.O.T.C., and independent studies.

Table 23

KINDS OF SHORT-TERM PROGRAMMING

N = 29 Districts

Program	Number of <u>Programs</u>	Percent <u>of Total</u>
Competitions	13	28.3
Enrichment Offerings	12	26.1
Misc. Special Programs	11	23.9
After-School Programs	6	13.1
Mentorships	2	4.3
Junior Great Books	_2	4.3
TOTAL	46	100.0%

Identification Methods

Coordinators indicated that they use multiple methods to identify students for most of their programs. However, 36 percent of those citing the use of multiple methods also stated that one identification method takes precedence; that is, one condition must be met before the others are considered. Another 4 percent of this group did not state whether one method takes precedence or not. The identification methods used by the surveyed districts are reported in Table 24. Those programs that indicated a multiple identification method, but further indicated that one method takes precedence are <u>not</u> listed in the multiple category, but rather by the method that is considered first. As this table shows, 58 percent of the programs described used a multiple method of identification, while 42 percent used a single identifier.

Table 24

IDENTIFICATION METHODS USED IN DISTRICTS

N = 29 Districts

Method	Number of Programs	Percent of Total
Multiple identifier	51	58
Single identifier:		
Achievement tests	15	17
Grades	7	8
Self-nomination	6	7
Teacher recommendation	5	6
Behavioral rating scale	3	3
Peer recommendation	1	1
TOTALS	88	100%

<u>Note</u>. For some program options, all students were placed and no identification methods were used. Data from these options are not included in this table.

All of the identification methods that the districts indicated might be used are listed in Table 25. This table includes all items checked, regardless of whether one method takes precedence or not.

IDENTIFICATION METHODS BY SCHOOL LEVEL

	NUMBER OF PROGRAMS											
Method	Elementary	Middle	High	Total								
Teacher/Adm. Recom.	32	18	21	71								
Achievement tests	30	16	9	55								
Parent nomination	24	12	15	51								
Self-nomination	14	10	19	43								
Grades	· 14	10	18	42								
Peer recommendation	5	3	9	17								
Aptitude tests	6	5	4	15								
Creativity tests	6	3	4	13								
Intelligence tests	5	4	2	11								
Behavioral rating	5	3	2	10								
Other	1	1	4	6								

N = 29 Districts

Coordinators were also asked whether other methods of identification were under consideration. Eighty percent of the responses indicated that no further identification methods were being considered. Of the 20 percent who responded positively to this question, the methods under consideration included intelligence and creativity tests, portfolios, and product development. One district was considering multiple methods. Qualifying for a program, of course, does not guarantee that a student will be placed in an option. Therefore, coordinators were asked how the final decision was made to place a student. The responses to this question are reviewed in Table 26. The most common response was that all identified students were placed; 44 percent responded in this manner. Another 16 percent indicated that a committee made the decision.

In some districts, more than one method was used to make the final decision regarding the placement of students. In others, methods were combined. Districts using more than one method or those combining methods are listed under the multiple category in the table.

Table 26

METHOD USED FOR FINAL PLACEMENT

N = 29 Districts

Method	Number of <u>Programs</u>	Percent <u>of Total</u>
All identified placed	39	44
Committee decision	14	16
Multiple method	12	14
Test cut-off scores	11	12
Other (tryouts, self-selection)	9	10
Interviews	3	3
Random selection	1	1
TOTALS	89	100%

Identification Tests

The tests used by surveyed districts to identify students for gifted programming are reviewed in Table 27. As previously noted, achievement tests were used for identification more than any other type of test. The most frequent test listed by coordinators under the achievement category was the Michigan Educational Assessment Program (see description of MEAP, page 16). It was followed closely by the California Achievement Test (CAT). Forty-two percent of the achievement tests listed by coordinators were either the Michigan Educational Assessment Program or the California Achievement Test. Two other common achievement tests listed by coordinators were the Iowa Test of Basic Skills (ITBS) and the California Test of Basic Skills (CTBS).

Although 15 districts indicated that aptitude tests were used in their districts to identify gifted students, only four districts specified which test was used. Of those who did identify the test, no one test was mentioned more than once.

Thirteen districts used a creativity test; however, only three districts identified the test used. Of these three, two indicated that they have developed their own test; one district used the Sylvia Rimm test.

TESTS USED TO IDENTIFY GIFTED STUDENTS

N = 29 Districts

Test

Frequency

ACHIEVEMENT TESTS

Michigan Educational Assessment	Program		•							10
California Achievement Test										9
Iowa Test of Basic Skills						•				6
California Test of Basic Skills			•		•			•	•	4
Metropolitan Achievement Test .				•						4
Stanford Achievement Test		•					•			3
Test of Cognitive Skills							•			2
SRA Achievement Series		•						•		1
Preliminary Scholastic Aptitude	Test .			•	•		•		•	1
American College Testing		•		•	•	•	•	•		1
PACT		•	•	•			•	•	•	1
IOWA Algebra		•	•	•	•	•		•	•	1

APTITUDE TESTS

KAMSC		•						1
Cognitive Abilities	•	•			•			1
School and College Ability Test	;.		 •			•	•	1
ATYP Options	•	•		 •				1

INTELLIGENCE TESTS

Wechsler (WISC-R)	2
-------------------	---

CREATIVITY TESTS

School	's own							•			•			2
Sylvia	Rimm	•			•					•				1

Summary

The status of gifted programming in high-minority Michigan schools, based on a survey returned by 35 of those districts, has been summarized in this chapter. The district data provided an overview of gifted programming in the responding districts. The building-level data provided more detailed information regarding program models and options, racial/gender representation, degree of student involvement, and identification methods used in individual schools.

These data are analyzed in Chapter 5, particularly as they relate to equity. The results of this study are also compared to other state and national studies.

In addition, some suggestions regarding additional research are offered in Chapter 5 that might enhance the results of this study and increase the likelihood of equitable gifted programming for all students.

CHAPTER 5

Findings and Conclusions

Introduction

Using survey methodology, this study examined four aspects of gifted programming in high-minority schools in Michigan. The areas studied were (1) the program models and options available, (2) the racial/gender distribution in program options, (3), the degree of student involvement, and (4) the practices and procedures of identification. It is believed that the data from this study will augment existing data and provide educators with more information about gifted programming, especially in relation to racial and gender equity.

This chapter will consist of four parts. First, the status of Michigan's gifted programming in high-minority schools will be described, based on the data presented in Chapter 4. General district findings will be described first, followed by building-level descriptions. Second, this data will be interpreted. Comparisons will be made between the findings of this study and the findings of related state and national studies. Third, some conclusions will be offered regarding equity, based on the descriptions and comparisons made in the first two parts. Finally, some recommendations will be made regarding further research on this subject.

The review that follows will address equity <u>only</u> in relation to the four areas studied. It is recognized that equity encompasses much more than these four areas. Therefore, it would be inappropriate to extend the conclusions offered in this chapter beyond the four areas identified without additional information. For example, quality of programming is a very important component that was not examined in this study. The existence of a program alone does not ensure a particular level of quality. It was not the intention of this study to evaluate the quality of the programming in high-minority schools and no assumptions regarding quality should be made solely on the basis of the findings in this study.

The information that follows is intentionally descriptive, not evaluative. It should be read with that understanding.

The Population

The 51 school districts in Michigan with a minority population of 24 percent or higher were the population for this study. Thirty-five districts (68.6 percent) responded to the survey. Among the responding districts, 8 were small districts, 14 were medium-sized districts, and 12 were large districts. The size of one anonymous district could not be determined. The responding districts covered a wide geographic region across both the Upper and Lower Peninsula.

The total population of the responding school districts exceeded 200,000 students. The combined minority population of these districts was approximately 50 percent, or over 100,000 students. These figures were extracted from the Michigan Department of Education's 1988-89 Fourth Friday file, which lists district student counts by race.

District Findings

Student Representation

Six of the 35 responding districts (17 percent) had no gifted programming at all in their school districts. These districts did not complete the survey and therefore did not provide updated population figures. The remaining 29 districts did complete the survey. Twenty of the 29 districts reported their 1990-91 district population by race; 12 of these districts also provided their gifted population by race. Seventeen of the 20 districts reporting their total district population showed an <u>increase</u> in minority representation from the 1988-89 Fourth Friday report as well as a <u>decrease</u> in total student population.

With the 12 districts that provided both total student population and gifted population by race, a racial comparison was made between the total population and the gifted population. This comparison showed that for these 12 districts, Blacks and Hispanics were underrepresented in gifted programming by 49 and 43 percent respectively. Asian and Indian students were fairly proportionately represented, while white students were overrepresented by 44 percent (see explanation of under/overrepresentation, page 17).

Programming

The 29 districts with gifted programming offered a total of 121 different program options at the elementary level, or an average of four different elementary options per district. At the middle and high school level, 61 and 62 different options were available respectively in the 29 districts, or an average of two different options per district. Six of the 29 districts (about 20 percent of the districts) had magnet schools for gifted students at the elementary level; three districts (about 10 percent) had magnet schools for middle and high school gifted students.

Of the districts with gifted programming, about onefourth indicated that they had printed lists of the district's program options. About half of those with printed lists complied with the request to include the list in the survey. About half of those who complied had professionally printed brochures promoting magnet schools or specialized cluster programs.

The most common district-wide change under consideration in the surveyed districts was a partial or total revision of all gifted program options. The most common addition under consideration was a mentorship program. According to district coordinators, the major criterion for the addition of a program option was "student

needs" (40 percent), followed by "teacher availability" (25 percent) and "resource availability" (20 percent).

Sixty-two percent of the coordinators indicated that their districts had a written mission statement or philosophy for their gifted program. Less than half of those districts included a copy of this statement in the survey as requested. Most mission statements addressed the issue of meeting the needs of all students regardless of ability. One mission statement specifically referred to race and gender equity.

Gifted Supervision

About one-third of the responding districts employed a full-time gifted coordinator for the district. The remaining two-thirds combined gifted supervision with other responsibilities. Gifted supervision was often the responsibility of a gifted program teacher, the district's state and federal program director, or an administrator (principal, superintendent, assistant superintendent).

Identification of Gifted Potential

Well over half of the districts indicated that they attempt to identify gifted potential as well as demonstrated abilities. About one-third of these districts use multiple methods to do this. Teacher, parent, and administrator recommendations were also quite common and were often used in combination with a test to identify potentially gifted students. Two districts indicated that their teachers had

received training for the identification of gifted potential. Other districts used teacher and/or parent checklists to identify characteristics of giftedness. Over three-fourths of the districts indicated that at least one program option in the district was specifically designed to develop the student's potential.

Building-Level Findings

Program Options

The surveys provided descriptions of 97 different building-level program options. About half of the options described were academic offerings. Another one-third of the options had a multiple emphasis, with academics representing part of that multiple focus. Multiple emphasis options were generally magnet schools or all-day self-contained classrooms where a variety of emphasis areas could be addressed. Creativity development was the third most common type of program; however, creative programs represented less than 7 percent of the total options. Visual and performing arts programs represented 3 percent, while leadership programs accounted for 1 percent. There were no programs identified exclusively as affective development or counseling. The remaining options were miscellaneous special programs, which were listed in the "other" category of the survey.

About half of the program options available at the building level had more than one section available in that

building. In many cases the same program option was offered to several different grades.

About half of the elementary options described were available at other elementary schools in the district; at the middle school level, less than 20 percent were available in other buildings in the district. At the high school level, this figure dropped to 15 percent.

The most comprehensive programming was at the elementary level, where over 60 percent of the buildings described in the surveys had a magnet school or two more program options available to students. Twenty-three percent of the elementary schools had no programming.

At the middle school level, less than 25 percent of the buildings described in the surveys had a magnet school or two or more program options. Thirty-seven percent of the middle schools described had no gifted programming.

At the high school level, just over 30 percent of the buildings described in the survey had a magnet school or two or more program options. Over 40 percent of the high schools had no programming at the high school level.

There were more programs available at the third, fourth, fifth, and sixth grade levels than at any other grade level. Nearly half of the program options were offered at one or more of these four grades.

About half of the buildings described in the surveys set a maximum number of students for individual program

options. The most common maximums set ranged from 20 to 30 students.

Program Models

The most common program model at the elementary level in the surveyed schools was the pullout program (see definition, page 15), which accounted for 28 percent of the program offerings. It was followed closely by before/after school programs, which accounted for 24 percent of the programs. Other relatively common models at the elementary school were cluster groups (see definition, page 15) and magnet schools, which occurred more frequently at the elementary level than at other levels.

At the middle school level, pullout programs and before/after school programs were most popular, each representing 22 percent of the total middle school offerings. They were followed closely by self-contained classrooms (see definition, page 15), which accounted for 20 percent of the middle school models.

Before/after school programs were the most common high school programs. They represented 29 percent of the total offerings, followed by self-contained classrooms, which accounted for 26 percent. There were more uniquely designed models tailored to meet individual needs at the high school level than at the other levels. Mentorships, work incentive programs, and lunch-hour programs were a few examples.

Racial/Gender Distribution

It was more difficult for coordinators to provide race and gender figures at the building level than at the district level. There were two reasons for this. First, in some cases race and gender records for gifted programming were simply not kept at the building level. Second, for short-term programs, the distribution changed every marking period or semester, making it difficult to maintain accurate records. However, building-level figures were provided for 21 elementary programs, 18 middle school programs, and 14 high school programs.

The race and gender distributions were examined by type of program. As previously indicated, the most popular type of option in the surveyed schools was the academic option, followed by a multiple option, and finally creative development options. Visual/performing arts and leadership options combined represented less than 5 percent of the total offerings; there were no affective development or counseling options in these districts. Therefore, racial/gender distributions were examined only in the academic, multiple, and creative options, since the distributions in the other programs would have been too small to be meaningful.

It was known that the school districts that responded to this survey had minority populations ranging from 24 to 99.5 percent (see District Demographics, page 51). It was also known that the average minority population for these

districts was approximately 50 percent (see Tables 3 and 5). The minority representation in the academic, multiple, and creative programs was found to be 25, 31, and 20 percent respectively, indicating an underrepresentation of minorities in all three types of programs. Blacks and Hispanics accounted for the greatest disparity. Although Blacks represented approximately 37 percent of the total student population, the Black population in academic, multiple, and creative programs was 13, 24, and 18 percent respectively. Likewise, Hispanics represented 10.5 percent of the total student population, but only 4 percent of the academic and multiple options and 2 percent of the creative options.

In terms of gender, females outnumbered males in all three types of programs. This disparity resulted in some measure from a larger number of females than males in the Black and white populations. In the Hispanic, Asian, and Indian population, males and females were about evenly represented in all types of programs. The greatest gender disparity was in the Black population, where females outnumbered males in academic, creative, and multiple programs by 22, 24, and 14 percentage points respectively.

To determine whether racial groups tended to be clustered into one type of program, the percentage of students in each race that were placed in each type of option was analyzed. This analysis showed that 74 percent of the Blacks, 63 percent of the Hispanics, and 60 percent

of the white students were in multiple emphasis programs (mainly magnet schools and self-contained classes). The remainder of the students in these three races were mostly in academic programs. Asian students were about evenly divided between academic and multiple emphasis areas. Sixty percent of the Indian students were in academic programs; 39 percent in multiple emphasis areas.

Degree of Involvement

The majority of students in the surveyed districts were in sustained programs; that is, programs that met regularly throughout the year for at least three hours a week. Although only about half of the programs were sustained programs, 87 percent of the students were in these programs. This was mainly because of the large numbers of students that could be accommodated in magnet schools.

Among the minority population, 89 percent of the students were in sustained programming. Again, this was because minorities were represented in greater numbers in multiple emphasis programs (mainly magnet schools) than in other types of programs. However, even though the vast majority of minority students who were in gifted programming were in sustained rather than short-term programs, all minority groups combined represented only 30 percent of the total number of students in sustained programming.

Although the number of sustained and short-term programs was about equal overall, short-term programs

outnumbered sustained programs at the elementary level. The reverse was true at the middle and high school level, where sustained programming outnumbered short-term programs. The most common sustained programs were magnet schools and enrichment classes. The most common short-term programs were competitions, such as Odyssey of the Mind and Science Olympiad, and intermittent enrichment programs.

Identification Methods

In a little more than half of the programs described in the surveys students were identified using multiple methods. Among the most popular methods of identification were teacher recommendations, achievement tests, parent and selfnomination, and grades.

In the programs where a single identifier was used, the most popular method of identification was the achievement test. The most common achievement tests were the Michigan Educational Assessment Program (MEAP), the California Achievement Test (CAT), and the Iowa Test of Basic Skills (ITBS). Achievement tests were much more common than aptitude, intelligence, or creativity tests.

Eighty percent of the districts were not considering the addition of any new identification methods. For 44 percent of the described programs all identified students were placed. For programs that could not accommodate all identified students, 16 percent indicated that a committee made the final decision on who would participate; 14 percent

used a multiple method. Many of the others used a cut-off score or tryouts to select the final participants.

Comparisons With Other Studies

In order to put the findings of this study in perspective with other related studies, a comparison was made of the findings of this study with two national and two state studies. Since these national and state studies focused on all schools, rather than high-minority schools, some comparisons could be made between the status of schools in general and high-minority schools. Such comparison should increase our understanding of the status of Michigan's high-minority schools, especially in relation to equity.

National Studies

In 1982 the United States Department of Education commissioned research that resulted in The National Report on Identification, Assessment and Recommendations for Comprehensive Identification of Gifted and Talented Youth (Richert). Identification practices and services offered to gifted youth across the country were examined in this national study. Several of the findings from this study were discussed in Chapter 2.

In 1985 O'Connell surveyed the Council of State Directors of Programs for the Gifted in order to learn about gifted program characteristics, including program offerings and identification practices across the country. The

findings of this study, as well as the Richert study, were reviewed in order to gain a national perspective on the issues related to this present study.

State Studies

The two state-wide studies on gifted programming were both completed during the last five years. Both were intended to examine the status of gifted programming in their respective states.

The first study, done in New Jersey in 1986 by Jamieson A. McKenzie, looked at the influence of identification practices, race, and socioeconomic status on the identification of gifted students. This study examined both identification methods and equity in New Jersey schools and is cited under these topics in Chapter 2.

The second study, done in Michigan in 1990 by Armstrong and the Ingham Intermediate School District, was supported by a grant by the Michigan Department of Education. It was designed to evaluate Michigan gifted programming. Programming, practices, and methods of identification were examined in some detail in this study. Several of the findings from this study were discussed in Chapter 2.

A detailed summary of this comparative analysis of state and national studies is labeled Item F in the Appendix. Where appropriate, the conclusions that follow will draw from this analysis.
Conclusions

The main research question for this study was: What is the current status of gifted and talented programming in relation to equity in high-minority schools in Michigan? In order to answer the main research question, four subsidiary questions were asked. The conclusions that follow will be presented in four sections to coincide with those four subsidiary questions. These questions are restated at the beginning of each section. In addition, the pertinent findings which led to the conclusions are restated in each section.

Subsidiary Question 1: What program <u>options</u> and <u>models</u> are available in high-minority schools?

- FINDING: Program Option Availability. Program types were not equally represented in the surveyed schools. Like the state and nation as a whole, high-minority districts in Michigan had more academic options than any other type of program (see study comparison, Appendix F, page 2). Except as part of a magnet program, leadership, visual/performing arts, and creative offerings were not common in the high-minority districts. Affective development as a separate offering was not available in any district.
- FINDING: <u>Program Option Scope</u>. High-minority districts in Michigan had twice as many gifted program options at the elementary level than at the middle or high school

level. This concentration of programming at the elementary level coincides with the state as a whole (see Appendix F, page 1). Seventy-seven percent of the high-minority districts had one or no program options at the middle school level; 68 percent of the districts had one or no programs at the high school level.

FINDING: <u>Program Model Availability</u>. Although highminority districts in Michigan utilized all seven types of the common models, these model types were not represented equally. This condition coincides with the state and nation as a whole (see study comparison, Appendix F, page 2). Pullout, before/after school, and self-contained models were most predominant.

CONCLUSION 1: Gifted students in Michigan's high-minority school districts received program option and model availability and variety comparable to their counterparts across the state and nation as a whole.

Subsidiary Question 2: What is the racial/gender distribution within the program options?

FINDING: District Racial Representation. District-wide, minorities were underrepresented in gifted programming in Michigan's high-minority schools by 44 percent (see explanation of under/overrepresentation, page 17). This compares to a 30-70 percent underrepresentation figure reported by Richert in her 1982 national study. (See study comparison, Appendix F, page 4). Blacks and Hispanics accounted for most of this underrepresentation. Indian and Asian students were fairly proportionately represented district-wide. This differs only slightly from the New Jersey study which showed an underrepresentation of Blacks, Hispanics, and Indians (see study comparison, Appendix F, page 4).

- FINDING: <u>Program Racial Representation</u>. Within individual types of programs, minorities were found to be underrepresented in creative, academic, and multiple emphasis options by 60, 50, and 38 percent respectively.
- FINDING: <u>Racial Clustering in Program Options</u>. There was some evidence of clustering of Blacks into multiple emphasis areas. That is, a proportionately larger number of Blacks were found in multiple emphasis options (mainly magnet schools) than in other types of programs.

FINDING: <u>Gender Representation</u>. In terms of gender, Michigan's high-minority schools had a slightly higher female representation in gifted programming than the state average. The disproportionately larger number of Black females compared to Black males in gifted programming accounts for some of this difference.

CONCLUSION 2: Minorities were represented in gifted programming in Michigan's high-minority school districts at a rate higher than the national average; however, Blacks and Hispanics remained underrepresented in all program types.

Subsidiary Question 3: What is the degree of involvement of students in gifted programming in the surveyed schools?

FINDING: Sustained Versus Short-term Programming.

Sustained and short-term programming were equally represented in Michigan's high-minority districts. This is consistent with the state as a whole (see study comparison, Appendix F, page 5).

FINDING: <u>Student Representation</u>. Since sustained programs tended to accommodate larger numbers of students than short-term programs, the vast majority of students in gifted programming in Michigan's high-minority schools were found to be in sustained programs.

CONCLUSION 3: Gifted students in Michigan's high-minority school districts were involved in gifted programming to a degree comparable with their counterparts across the state.

Subsidiary Question 4: How are students identified for the various program options?

- FINDING: <u>Multiple Versus Single Identifiers</u>. Multiple and single identification methods were found about equally in the surveyed schools. This finding is consistent with the state and nation as a whole (see study comparison, Appendix F, page 5).
- FINDING: <u>Common Methods Used</u>. The most common methods of identification in Michigan's high-minority schools (teacher recommendations and achievement tests) coincided with the most common methods used state-wide

and across the country (see study comparison, Appendix F, page 5).

FINDING: <u>Common Tests</u>. The popularity of achievement tests in high-minority schools coincided with state and national practices (see study comparison, Appendix F, page 5). Tests recognized to be sensitive to minority populations were not common in the surveyed schools.

CONCLUSION 4: The practices used to identify students for gifted programming in Michigan's high-minority school districts were comparable to the state and nation, but many districts did not fully comply with The Association for Gifted guidelines adopted by the Michigan Department of Education.

Recommendations for Further Research

As a result of this study, it has become apparent that research is needed on the racial distributions of students who are <u>identified</u> for gifted programming (rather than those who are <u>selected</u>). For approximately 50 percent of the gifted programs in Michigan's high-minority schools, there was a limit on the number of students who could be accommodated within the program. Consequently, for those programs, the students who were identified for programming were not guaranteed placement in that program. A selection process followed to determine who would ultimately be placed in gifted programming. Therefore, the students who were <u>selected</u> for gifted programming (and were the focus of this study) were not necessarily representative of the students who were <u>identified</u>.

The literature has generally focused on identification methods to explain minority underrepresentation, while selection processes have been virtually ignored. The assumption seems to be made that students in gifted programming represent all identified students. In Michigan's high-minority schools, at least, this is not the case. A study that examined the racial distribution of identified students, rather than selected students, would help to clarify whether those two distributions are similar.

Other possible causes for minority underrepresentation also deserve more research attention. For example, since participation in gifted programming is often voluntary, do minority students opt out of programming more often than white students? Or, is it possible that minorities drop out of, or are removed from, programming more often than white students?

Another topic of research that would enhance the findings of this study is an investigation of program types. Explanations regarding the lack of program variety deserves more attention. In spite of countless recommendations by gifted educators that programming should be expanded into areas such as visual/performing arts, leadership, and creativity, academic offerings continue to dominate in most schools. A study that explored the reasons for this phenomenon might aid educators in changing that trend.

A closer examination of magnet schools also warrants more attention. Explanations for the higher rate of minority involvement in magnet schools than in individual gifted program options in regular schools need to be pursued. In addition, a closer look at how magnet schools are designed and operated, as well as the content of individual course offerings, deserves attention.

Finally, replication of this study in other states would reveal whether Michigan's high-minority schools are typical of high-minority schools nation-wide.

Reflections

One generally goes into a study such as this one with some preconceived ideas about how the study will "turn out." I was no different. As I planned this study, I anticipated two findings.

First, I expected to find that minority involvement in gifted programming would be on the rise. This expectation was somewhat accurate, but to a lesser degree than I had expected. Since educators have known about and studied minority underrepresentation in gifted programming for decades, I expected to see a considerably higher minority representation in gifted programming than was found. Although I am disappointed by the numbers, I am encouraged that progress continues to be made toward more equitable representation. My second expectation reflected a concern expressed by some educators that racial groups might be found to be clustered into visual/performing arts and creative options (rather than academic options) and/or into short-term options (rather than sustained options). This expectation was not confirmed by the study. First, visual/performing arts and creative programs were rarely available to <u>anv</u> students. They were not popular options in spite of efforts by educators of the gifted to change that trend. Second, in regard to degree of involvement, most minority students were in sustained, not short-term programs. This finding should reassure educators that minorities who are placed in gifted programming receive consistent, regular programming.

There were, of course, 16 districts that did not respond to the survey. Although the 35 districts that did respond were quite representative of all 51 high-minority districts in terms of size and minority representation, I will always wonder if the findings would have changed significantly had there been a 100 percent response rate.

I am certainly more appreciative of the role of magnet schools now that I see their effectiveness in integrating minorities into gifted programming.

I am, however, concerned about small school districts and rural districts where magnet schools are unlikely solutions to gifted programming needs. These districts seemed to be struggling to provide equitable programming. Based on the comments on the surveys, it is evident that

coordinators know that their programming falls short in some areas. Most seemed to want to do better, but for a variety of reasons, they could not. Though not solicited, many coordinators expressed their frustrations with not being able to provide the equitable programming that they know their students deserve.

This study has shown that total equity has not yet been achieved in high-minority districts. This will come as no surprise to most of the coordinators and supervisors who are struggling in these districts to change this condition. Most seem eager for a listening ear and ready for any kind of assistance that might help them to make equity a reality. LIST OF REFERENCES

LIST OF REFERENCES

- Armstrong, D. (1990). An evaluation of Section 47 Gifted and Talented programming, Mason, MI: Ingham Intermediate School District.
- Association for the Gifted (1989). Standards for programs involving the gifted and talented. Reston, VA: The Council for Exceptional Children.
- Baer, N. A. (1989). Programs for the gifted: A present or a paradox? <u>Phi Delta Kappan.</u> 61, 621-623.
- Baldwin, A. Y. (1987). I'm black, but look at me, I am also gifted. <u>Gifted Child Quarterly</u>, 31(4), 180-185.
- Berezine, G. & Foteyeva, A. (1972). Educational work and extracurricular educational establishments. In N. Kugin et al., <u>Education in the U.S.S.R.</u>, Moscow Progress Publishers.
- Black, H. (1963). They shall not pass. New York: W. W. Morrow.
- Borland, J. H. (1986). IQ tests: Throwing out the bathwater, saving the baby. <u>Roeper Review.</u> 8(3), 163-167.
- Boyer, E. (1980). Problem finders needed. Boyer assails lack of creativity by `tried´ universities. <u>Higher</u> <u>Education & National Affairs</u>, 29(1), 4.
- Bruch, C B. (1971). Modification of procedures for identification of the disadvantaged gifted. <u>Gifted</u> <u>Child Quarterly.</u> 15, 267-272.
- Chambers, J. A., F. Barron, and J. W. Sprecher (1980). Identifying gifted Mexican-American students. <u>Gifted</u> <u>Child Quarterly</u>, 24(3), 123-128.
- Clark B. (1983). Growing up gifted (2nd ed.). Columbus: Charles E. Merrill.
- Cox, J., Daniel, N. & Boston, B. O. (1985). Educating able learners: Programs and promising practices. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.

- Culross, R. (1989). Measurement issues in the screening and selection of the gifted. <u>Roeper Review.</u> 12(2), 76-78.
- Daniels, R., Heath, R. & Enns, K. (1985). Fostering creative behavior among university women. <u>Roeper</u> <u>Review.</u> 7(3), 164-166.
- Davis, A., Gardner, B., & Gardner, M. R. (1941). Deep south. Chicago Press.
- Davis, G. & Rimm, S. (1985). Education of the gifted and talented. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Dunn, L. M. (1973). Exceptional children in the schools. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.
- Dunstan, J. (1983). Attitudes to provision for gifted children: The case of the U.S.S.R. In B. Shore, F. Gagne, S. Larivee, R. Tali, and R. Tremblay (Eds.) <u>Face to Face With Giftedness</u> (pp. 290-327). New York: Trillium Press.
- Feldhusen, J. F. (1986). A new conception of giftedness and programming for the gifted. <u>Illinois Council for the</u> <u>Gifted Journal</u>, 5, 2-6.
- Feldhusen, J. F. (1989). Synthesis of research on gifted youth, Educational Leadership, 46(6), 6-11.
- Frasier, M. M. (1987). The identification of gifted black students: Developing new perspectives. <u>Journal for</u> <u>the Education of the Gifted</u>, 10(3), 155-180.
- Frasier, M. M. (1989). Poor and minority students can be gifted, too! <u>Educational Leadership</u>, 46(6), 16-18.
- Gallagher, J. (1985). Teaching the gifted child (3rd ed.), Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Gallagher, J. F., Weiss, P. Oglesby, K. & Thomas, T. (1983). The status of gifted/talented education: United States survey of needs, practices, and policies. Los Angeles: Leadership Training Institute.
- Gallagher, J. J. (1986). Equity vs. excellence: An educational drama. <u>Roeper Review.</u> 9(4), 233-235.
- Gallagher, J. J. (1984). Excellence and equity--A worldwide conflict. <u>Gifted International.</u> 2(2), 1-11.
- Gardner, H. (1983). Frames of mind. New York: Basic Books. Gardner, J. W. (1961). Excellence: Can we be equal and excellent too? New York: Harper & Row.

- Gold, M. J. (1986). Gifted: Not "the same the world over." Roeper Review. 8(4), 252-256.
- Goldberg, M. L. (1986). Issues in the education of gifted and talented children, part I. <u>Roeper Review</u>, 8(4), 226-233.
- Goodlad, J. (1984). A place called school. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company.
- Goolsby, T. M. (1975). Alternative admissions criteria for college. Nontraditional approaches to assess the academic potential of black students. Atlanta, GA: Southern Regional Education Board.
- Gould, S. J. (1981). The mismeasure of man. New York: W. W. Norton.
- Guilford, J. P. (1967). The nature of human intelligence. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Hatch, T. C. and Gardner, H. (1986). From testing intelligence to assessing competences: A pluralistic view of intellect. <u>Roeper Review.</u> 8(3), 147-150.
- Hoffman, B. (1962). The tyranny of testing. New York: Crowell-Collier.
- Johnsen, S. (1986). Who are the gifted? A dilemma in search of a solution. <u>Education of the Visually</u> <u>Handicapped.</u> 18(2), 54-70.
- Kamin, L. J. (1974). The science and politics of IQ. New York: Wiley and Sons.
- Kaufman, A. S. and Harrison, P. L. (1986). Intelligence tests and gifted assessment: What are the positives? <u>Roeper Review</u>, 8(3), 154-159.
- Kitano, M. & Kirby, D. (1986). Gifted education: A comprehensive view. Boston: Little, Brown.
- Klineberg, O. (1935). Race differences. New York: Harper & Row.
- Marland, S. (1972). Education of the gifted and talented. Report to the Congress of the United States by the U.S. Commissioner of Education. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Masten, W. G. (1985). Identification of gifted minority. Roeper Review, 8(2), 83-85.

- McKenzie, J. A. (1986). The influence of identification practices, race, and SES on the identification of gifted students. <u>Gifted Child Quarterly.</u> 30(2), 93-95.
- Meeker, M. (1978). Nondiscriminatory testing procedure to assess giftedness in Black, Chicano, Navajo, and Anglos. In A. Y. Baldwin, et al. (Eds.). Educational Planning for the gifted: Overcoming cultural. geographic. and socioeconomic barriers. Reston, VA: The Council for Exceptional Children.
- Meeker, M. (1969). The structure of intellect: Its interpretation and uses. Columbus, OH: Charles E. Merrill.
- Michigan Department of Education (1983). Position paper on gifted and talented education in Michigan schools. Lansing, Michigan.
- Miller, L. P. (Ed.) (1974). The testing of black students: A symposium. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Nairn, A. & Associates (1980). The reign of ETS. The Ralph Nader Report on the Educational Testing Service. Ralph Nader.
- Newman, F. (1985). Higher education and the American resurgence. Princeton, NJ: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.
- Oakes, J. (1985). Keeping track: How schools structure inequality. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Oakes, J. (1986). Keeping track, Fart I: The policy and practice of curriculum inequality. <u>Phi Delta Kappan.</u> 68 (1), 12-17.
- O'Connell, P. (1985). The state of the states' gifted and talented education: The council of state directors of programs of the gifted. Augusta, ME: Maine Department of Education and Cultural Services.
- Office of Civil Rights Report (1979). Washington, DC: U. S. Government Printing Office.
- Pegnato, C. W. & Birch, J. W. (1959). Locating gifted children in junior high schools: A comparison of methods. <u>Exceptional Children</u>, 25, 300-304.
- Parke, B. (1989). Educating the gifted and talented: An agenda for the future. <u>Educational Leadership</u>, 46(6), 4-5.

- Persell, C. (1977). Education and inequality: A theoretical and empirical synthesis. New York: The Free Press.
- Renzulli, J. S. (1978). What makes giftedness: Reexamining a definition. <u>Phi Delta Kappan</u>, 60, 108-184.
- Richert, E. S. (1985). Identification of gifted students: An update. <u>Roeper Review.</u> 8(2), 68-72.
- Richert, E. S. (1987). Rampant problems and promising practices in the identification of disadvantaged gifted students. <u>Gifted Child Quarterly.</u> 31(4), 149-154.
- Richert, E. S. (1986). Toward the Tao of giftedness. Roeper Review, 8, 197-204.
- Richert, E. S., Alvino, J., McDonnel, R. (1982). The national report on identification: Assessment and recommendations for comprehensive identification of gifted and talented youth. Sewell, NJ: Educational Improvement Center-South.
- Robinson, N. M., and Chamrad, D. L. (1986). Appropriate uses of intelligence tests with gifted children. <u>Roeper Review.</u> 8(3), 160-163.
- Ryan, J. (1983). Identifying intellectually superior black children. <u>Journal of Educational Research.</u> 76(3), 153-156.
- Samuda, R. J. (1975). Alternatives to traditional standardized tests, introduction. In R. J. Samuda, Psychological testing of American minorities. New York: Dodd, Mead.
- Schwartz, L. (1980). Advocacy for the neglected gifted: Females. <u>Gifted Child Quarterly.</u> 24(3), 113-117.
- Swartzbaugh, P. (1988). Eliminating tracking successfully. Educational Leadership, 45(5), 20.
- Tannenbaum, A. J. (1983). Gifted children: Psychological and educational perspectives. New York: Macmillan.
- Tannenbaum, A. J. (1979). Pre-sputnik to post Watergate concern about the gifted. In A. H. Passow (ed.), The gifted and talented: Their education and development, 78th Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1979.

Tannenbaum, A. J. (1986). Reflection and refraction of light on the gifted. <u>Roeper Review.</u> 8(4), 212-218.

- Taylor, C. W. (1986). The growing importance of creativity and leadership in spreading gifted and talented programs world-wide, <u>Roeper Review</u>, 8(4), 256-263.
- Taylor, C. W., Albo, D., Holland, J., & Brandt, G. (1985). Attributes of excellence in various professions: Their relevance to the selection of gifted/talented persons. <u>Gifted Child Quarterly.</u> 29, 29-34.
- Torrance, E. P. (1970). Creative learning and teaching. New York: Dodd, Mead.
- Treffinger, D. and Renzulli, J. (1986). Giftedness as potential for creative productivity: Transcending IQ scores. <u>Roeper Review.</u> 8(3), 150-154.
- Williams, F. E. (1988). A magic circle. <u>Gifted Child</u> <u>Quarterly.</u> 11(1), 2-5.

APPENDIX

.

.

APPENDIX A

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION + DEPARTMENT OF FEACHER EDUCATION

EAST LANSING + MICHIGAN + 10024-1044

January 7, 1991

Dear Gifted and Talented Coordinator:

The enclosed survey is being conducted for a dissertation at Michigan State University on the subject of gifted and talented programming. Your district is one of fifty-one districts chosen for this survey.

The purpose of the survey is to describe the current status of gifted and talented programming in culturally diverse schools. Particular attention is being given to the types of programming options available to students, the program models used, the racial/gender distribution of students, and the identification methods most common in the surveyed schools.

The information provided in this survey will be kept <u>strictly</u> <u>confidential</u>. Neither you nor your district will be <u>identified</u> by name anywhere in the final report. Readers of the dissertation will not be able to associate districts with specific responses or findings and no district will be singled out for examination. Most of the data will be reported in aggregate form.

As you can see, Nancy Mincemoyer, Gifted and Talented Coordinator for the Michigan Department of Education, is supporting this study and has co-signed this letter. Ms. Mincemoyer believes, as I do, that the data collected in this survey will enhance the State Department data and give educators a clearer understanding of the status of gifted education. I hope it will also benefit your own district by stimulating some discussion regarding the services offered to your gifted and talented students.

In order to make the results of this study meaningful, your input is needed. I hope you will take the time to fill out the survey and return it in the self-addressed, postage-paid envelope.

Feel free to call me collect at the phone number given below if you have any questions regarding the survey. Thanks for helping to make this dissertation possible.

Sincerely,

(Mrs.) Nancy M. Lewis

(Mrs.) Nancy M. Lewis 532 Rustic Drive Saginaw, MI 48604

Ganece Minchnorger Nancy Mincemoyer

Coordinator, Gifted and Talented Michigan Department of Education

Telephone: (517) 755-6382

APPENDIX B

A STUDY OF THE STATUS OF GIFTED AND TALENTED PROGRAMMING IN CULTURALLY DIVERSE SCHOOLS IN MICHIGAN

> Nancy M. Lewis 532 Rustic Drive Saginaw, MI 48604

•

.

•

A Study for the Completion of a Dissertation at

Michigan State University East Lansing, Michigan

GIFTED AND TALENTED PROGRAM SURVEY

INSTRUCTIONS:

The purpose of this survey is to describe the current status of gifted programming in culturally diverse schools in Michigan. Because it would be unrealistic to ask you to describe every program option in every school in your district, the survey asks you to describe two program options at each of your school levels (elementary, middle/junior high, and high school).

Pages 1 and 2 of the survey ask for information regarding your entire school district and your district's gifted and talented student population. Pages 3-6 ask for a description of two elementary programs. Pages 7-10 ask about middle/ junior high programs, and pages 11-14 ask about your high school programs.

If you have more than one school at any of these levels, please choose <u>one</u> <u>typical school</u> at each level to describe. A typical school should be one that characterizes the variety of programming, as well as the racial/gender representation of the district as a whole.

The questions are designed to be answered by a simple check mark or a few words or numbers to make it as easy as possible to complete. All information reported in this survey will be kept <u>strictly confidential</u>.

The results of this survey should make a contribution to our knowledge of gifted and talented programming in Michigan. I hope you will take the time to fill it out. Thanks for your help.

Nancy M. Lewis 532 Rustic Saginaw, MI 48604

Telephone: (517) 755-6382

GIFTED AND TALENTED PROGRAM SURVEY

DISTRICT DATA

1.	Name of School District:
2.	Name of person completing this form:
3.	Title: Phone: ()
4.	Number of schools in the district: Elementary Middle High
5.	Racial/Gender profile of <u>entire</u> K-12 student population (as reported for the 1990-91 Fourth Friday):
	Race Number of Students
	American Indian or Alaskan Native:MaleFemaleAsian or Pacific Islanders:MaleFemaleBlack (not Hispanic):MaleFemaleHispanic:MaleFemaleCaucasian:MaleFemale
	GIFTED AND TALENTED DATA
1.	Does your district have a written mission statement or philosophy for your gifted and talented programming? Yes No IF YES, PLEASE ATTACH A COPY OF THE DISTRICT MISSION/PHILOSOPHY.
2.	Does your district attempt to identify <u>potential</u> as well as demonstrated talents? That is, are efforts made to find students who are not currently demonstrating high ability, but who may have the potential for outstanding performance with special programming? Yes <u>No</u>
	IF YES, PLEASE DESCRIBE HOW THIS IS DONE:
3.	How many <u>different</u> gifted and talented program offerings are available at the following school levels?
	Elementary Middle High
	Do any of these offerings address the development of the child's potential? Yes No
	Does your district have a written list of the available program offerings at each level? Yes No
	IF YES, PLEASE ATTACH A COPY OF THIS LIST.

•

4.	Are other program offerings under consideration	for your district? Yes No
	If yes, what offerings are under consideration?	

2

5.	What is the <u>major</u> criterion for the addition of a program offering? (check one	:)
	Student needs Teacher availabilityResource availability	
	School recommendation Parental requests	
	Other (explain)	

RACIAL/GENDER PROFILE OF DISTRICT IDENTIFIED GIFTED (K-12)

NOTE: If the racial/gender data is available by school level, please complete Section A. If not, please skip to Section B, which asks for the same racial/ gender data that is reported annually to the Michigan Department of Education, if your district receives Section 47 funding.

SECTION A.	ELEMENTARY SCHOOL(S)		
	Race	Number	of Students
	American Indian or Alaskan Native:	Male	Female
	Asian or Pacific Islanders:	Male	Female
	Black (not Hispanic):	Male	Female
	Hispanic:	Male	Female
	Caucasian:	Male	Female
	MIDDLE SCHOOL	L(S)	
	American Indian or Alaskan Native:	Male	Female
	Asian or Pacific Islanders:	Male	Female
	Black (not Hispanic):	Male	Female
	Hispanic:	Male	Female
	Caucasian:	Male	Female
	HIGH SCHOOL(S	5)	*****
	American Indian or Alaskan Native:	Male	Female
	Asian or Pacific Islanders:	Male	Female
	Black (not Hispanic):	Male	Female
	Hispanic:	Male	Female
	Caucasian:	Male	Female
NOTE: Complete	Section B <u>only</u> if the data for Sect	ion A is not	available.
SECTION B.	K-12 <u>GIFTED</u> STUDENTS ()	ALL LEVELS)	

I		
	Race	Number of Students
	American Indian or Alaskan Native: Asian or Pacific Islanders: Black (not Hispanic): Hispanic: Caucasian:	Male Female Male Female Male Female Male Female Male Female

ELEMENTARY SCHOOL PROFILE

PROGRAM OPTION 1

•

Which of the following best describes the type of program this option represen
Accelerated Academic program
Academic Enrichment program
Performing/Visual Arts program
Leadership program
Creativity Development program
Affective Development program
Counseling program (specify type of counseling)
Other (specify)
Is this option available at more than one school in your district?
Yes No If yes, how many?
What grade level(s) does this option serve? K23456
How many sections of it are offered at this school?
What program model is used for this option? (check one)
Cluster grouping in regular classroom
Self-contained class
Regular class with IEP
Pullout program
Resource center
Teacher consultant services to classroom teacher
Before/After-school program
Other (specify)
Is this program offered throughout the entire school year? Yes No
If yes, how many hours per week does it meet?
If no, when is it offered?
How are students identified for this program option? (check <u>all</u> methods used)
Grades (CPA)
Aptitude test (specify)
Achievement test (specify)
Intelligence (IQ) test (specify)
Creativity test (specify)
Behavioral rating scale (specify)
Teacher/administrator recommendation
Peer recommendation
Self-nomination
Parent nomination
Other (creation)

CONTINUE ON BACK:

9. If more than one method of identification is checked in Question 8, does any one method take precedence? (Does one condition have to be met before the others are considered?) Yes _____ No ____ If yes, explain: _____

4

10. How is the final decision made regarding who will participate in this program option?

Interviews Cut-off scores (identify test and cut-off) Committee Random selection All identified students are placed Other (identify)

- 11. Is there a maximum number of students that this program option can accommodate? Yes ____ No ____ If yes, what is the maximum number of students? _____
- 12. Racial/Gender profile of students in this program option in the <u>one</u> school chosen as typical:

Race	Number of Students
American Indian or Alaskan Native:	MaleFemale
Asian or Pacific Islander:	Male Female
Black (not Hispanic):	Male Female
Hispanic:	Male Female
Caucasian:	Male Female

ELEMENTARY SCHOOL PROFILE

PROGRAM OPTION 2

.

1. Program Name or Description of Program:

Which of the following best describes the type of program this option represent
Accelerated Academic program
Academic Enrichment program
Performing/Visual Arts program
Leadership program
Creativity Development program
Affective Development program
Counseling program (specify type of counseling)
Other (specify)
Is this option available at more than one school in your district? YesNo If yes, how many?
What grade level(s) does this option serve? K_ 1_ 2_ 3_ 4_ 5_ 6_
How many sections of it are offered at this school?
What program model is used for this option? (check one)
Cluster grouping in regular classroom
Self-contained class
Regular class with IEP
Pullout program
Resource center
Teacher consultant services to classroom teacher
Betore/After-school program
Other (specify)
Is this program offered throughout the entire school year? Yes No
If yes, how many hours per week does it meet?
If no, when is it offered?
How are students identified for this program option? (check <u>all</u> methods used
Grades (GPA)
Aptitude test (specify)
Achievement test (specify)
Intelligence (IQ) test (specify)
Creativity test (specify)
Behavioral rating scale (specify)
Teacher/administrator recommendation
reer recommendation
Self-nomination
Other (specify)

5

CONTINUE ON BACK:

- 12. Racial/Gender profile of students in this program option in the <u>one</u> school chosen as typical:

Ruce	Number of Students
American Indian or Alaskan Native: Asian or Pacific Islander: Black (not Hispanic): Hispanic: Caucasian:	Male Female Male Female Male Female Male Female Male Female

Are any other identification methods under consideration for elementary students in your district? Yes ____ No ____ If yes, which method(s)? _____

MIDDLE SCHOOL PROFILE

.

•

•

PRO	GRAM OPTION 1
1.	Program Name or Description of Program:
2.	Which of the following best describes the type of program this option represents:
	Accelerated academic program
	Academic enficience program
	Creativity Development program
	Affective Development program
	Counseling program (specify type of counseling)
	Other (specify)
•	
3.	Is this option available at more than one school in your district?
	tes No If yes, now many?
4.	What grade level(s) does this option serve? 6789
5.	How many sections of it are offered at this school?
6.	What program model is used for this option? (check one)
	Cluster grouping in regular classroom
	Self-contained class
	Regular class with IEP
	Pullout program
	Resource center
	Teacher consultant services to classroom teacher
	Before/After-school program
	Other (specify)
7	To this program offered throughout the entire school year? Yes No
· •	If ves, how many hours per week does it meet?
	If no. when is it offered?
8.	How are students identified for this program option? (check <u>all</u> methods used)
	Crades (CDA)
	Grades (GRA)
	Achievement test (specify)
	Intelligence (IO) test (specify)
	Creativity test (specify)
	Behavioral rating scale (specify)
	Teacher/administrator recommendation
	Peer recommendation
	Self-nomination
	Parent nomination
	Other (specify)

CONTINUE ON BACK:

- 9. If more than one method of identification is checked in Question 8, does any one method take precedence? (Does one condition have to be met before the others are considered?) Yes _____ No ____ If yes, explain: _____
- 10. How is the final decision made regarding who will participate in this program option?

Interviews Cut-off scores (identify test and cut-off) Committee Random selection All identified students are placed Other (identify)

- 11. Is there a maximum number of students that this program option can accommodate? Yes No If yes, what is the maximum number of students?
- 12. Racial/Gender profile of students in this program option in the <u>one</u> school chosen as typical:

Race	Numb	er of Students
American Indian or Alaskan Native:	Male	Female
Asian or Pacific Islanders:	Male	Female
Black (not Hispanic):	Male 🗌	Female
Hispanic:	Male	Female
Caucasian:	Male	Female

MIDDLE SCHOOL PROFILE

PRO	ROGRAM OPTION 2		
1.	Program Name or Description of Program:		
ŋ			
۷.	Accelerated Academic program		
	Academic Enrichment program		
	Performing/Visual Arts program		
	Leadership program		
	Affective Development program		
	Counseling program (specify type of counseling)		
	Other (specify)		
3.	Is this option available at more than one school in your district?		
	Yes No If yes, how many?		
4.	What grade level(s) does this option serve? 6 7 8 9		
5.	How many sections of it are offered at this school?		
6.	What program model is used for this option? (check one)		
	Cluster grouping in regular classroom		
	Self-contained class		
	Regular class with itr Publout program		
	Resource center		
	Teacher consultant services to classroom teacher		
	Before/After-school program		
	Other (specify)		
7.	Is this program offered throughout the entire school year? Yes No		
	If yes, how many hours per week does it meet?		
	If no, when is it offered?		
8.	How are students identified for this program option? (check <u>all</u> methods used)		
	Grades (GPA)		
	Aptitude test (specify)		
	Achievement test (specify)		
	Creativity test (specify)		
	Behavioral rating scale (specify)		
	Teacher/administrator recommendation		
	Peer recommendation		
	Self-nomination		
	Parent nomination		
	Other (specify)		

CONTINUE ON BACK:

9. If more than one method of identification is checked in Question 8, does any one method take precedence? (Does one condition have to be met before the others are considered?) Yes ____ No ___ If yes, explain: _____

0.	How is the final decision made regarding who will participate in this program option?
	Interviews
	Committee
	Random selection
	All identified students are placed

- 11. Is there a maximum number of students that this program option can accommodate? Yes No If yes, what is the maximum number of students?
- 12. Racial/Gender profile of students in this program option in the <u>one</u> school chosen as typical:

Race	Number of Students	
American Indian or Alaskan Native:	Male	Female
Asian or Pacific Islander:	Male	Female
Black (not Hispanic):	Male	Female
Hispanic:	Male	Female
Caucasian:	Male	Female

Are any other identification methods under consideration for middle school students in your district? Yes _____ No ____ If yes, which method(s)? ______

HIGH SCHOOL PROFILE

01	GRAM OPTION 1
	Program Name or Description of Program:
	Which of the following best describes the type of program this option represen
	Accelerated academic program
	Academic enrichment program
	Performing/Visual Arts program
	Leadership program
	Creativity Development program
	Affective Development program
	Other (specify)
	Is this option available at more than one school in your district? Yes No If yes, how many?
	What grade level(s) does this option serve? 9101112
	How many sections of it are offered at this school?
	What program model is used for this option? (check one)
	Cluster grouping in regular classroom
	Self-contained class
	Regular class with IEP
	Pullout program
	Resource center
	Before/After-school program
	Other (specify)
	Is this program offered throughout the entire school year? Yes <u>No</u>
	If yes, how many hours per week does it meet? If no, when is it offered?
	How are students identified for this program option? (check all methods used)
	Grades (GPA)
	Aptitude test (specify)
	Achievement test (specify)
	Intelligence (IQ) test (specify)
	Greativity test (specify)
	Teacher/administrator recommendation
	Peer recommendation
	Self-nomination
	Parent nomination
	Other (specify)

•

CONTINUE ON BACK:

- 9. If more than one method of identification is checked in Question 8, does any one method take precedence? (Does one condition have to be met before the others are considered?) Yes No If yes, explain:
- 10. How is the final decision made regarding who will participate in this program option?

Interviews Cut-off scores (identify test and cut-off) Committee Random selection All identified students are placed Other (specify)

- 11. Is there a maximum number of students that this program option can accommodate? Yes _____ No ____ If yes, what is the maximum number of students? ______
- 12. Racial/Gender profile of students in this program option in the <u>one</u> school chosen as typical:

Race	Number of Students	
American Indian or Alaskan Native:	Male	Female
Asian or Pacific Islanders:	Male	Female
Black (not Hispanic):	Male	Female
Hispanic:	Male	Female
Caucasian:	Male	Female

HIGH SCHOOL PROFILE

129

PRO	GRAM OPTION 2
1.	Program Name or Description of Program:
2.	Which of the following best describes the type of program this option represents:
	Accelerated Academic program Academic Enrichment program
	Performing/Visual Arts program
	Leadership program
	Greativity Development program
	Counseling program (specify type of counseling)
	Other (specify)
3.	Is this option available at more than one school in your district? Yes No If yes, how many?
4.	What grade level(s) does this option serve? 9 10 11 12
5.	How many sections of it are offered at this school?
6.	What program model is used for this option? (check one)
	Cluster grouping in regular classroom Self-contained class Regular class with IEP Pullout program
	Resource center
	Teacher consultant services to classroom teacher
	Before/After-school program
	Other (specify)
7.	Is this program offered throughout the entire school year? Yes No If yes, how many hours per week does it meet? If no, when is it offered?
8.	How are students identified for this program option (check <u>all</u> methods used)
	Grades (GPA) Aptitude test (specify)
	Achievement test (specify)
	Intelligence (IQ) test (specify)
	Creativity test (specify)
	Behavioral rating scale (specify)
	Teacher/administrator recommendation
	Self-nomination
	Parent nomination
	Other (specify)

.

13

CONTINUE ON BACK:

9. If more than one method of identification is checked in Question 8, does any one method take precedence? (Does one condition have to be met before the others are considered?) Yes ____ No ___ If yes, explain: _____

<u></u>	
How prog	is the final decision made regarding who will participate in this ram option?
	Interviews
	Cut-off scores (identify test and cut-off)
	Committee
	Random selection
	All identified students are placed
	Other (identify)

- 11. Is there a maximum number of students that this program option can accommodate? Yes No If yes, what is the maximum number of students?
- 12. Racial/Gender profile of students in this program option in the <u>one</u> school chosen as typical:

Race	Number of Studen
American Indian or Alaskan Native:	Male Female
sian or Pacific Islander:	Male Female
lack (not Hispanic):	Male Female
ispanic:	Male Female
laucasian:	Male Female

Are any other identification methods under consideration for high school students in your district? Yes ____ No ____ If yes, which method(s) _____

APPENDIX C

MICHIGAN'S HIGH MINORITY SCHOOL DISTRICTS*

<u>District</u>

Percent Minority

•

1.	Highland Park City Schools	99.5
2.	Inkster City School District	97.4
3.	Detroit City School District	91.6
4.	Buena Vista School District	90.7
5.	City of Muskegon Heights School District	89.9
6.	Benton Harbor Area Schools	83.2
7.	Beecher Community School District	75.5
8.	Mackinac Island Public Schools	71.1
9.	Flint City School District	69.4
10.	Oak Park City School District	69.4
11.	Saginaw City School District	67.7
12.	Covert Public Schools	63.4
13.	Pontiac City School District	62.6
14.	Ecorse Public School District	59.9
15.	Westwood Community Schools	56.5
16.	St. Ignace Area School District	56.1
17.	Southfield Public School District	48.5
18.	Grand Rapids City School District	46.8
19.	Muskegon City School District	46.5
20.	Cross Village School District	46.2
21.	Eau Claire Public Schools	45.1
22.	River Rouge City Schools	44.2
23.	Albion Public Schools	43.8
24.	Lansing Public School District	43.1
25.	Brimley Area Schools	42.2
26. 27. 28. 29. 30.	School District of Ypsilanti Kalamazoo City School District Mt. Clemens Community Schools Willow Run Community Schools Sodus Twp. School District 5	$\begin{array}{r} 41.5 \\ 41.3 \\ 37.9 \\ 37.3 \\ 36.5 \end{array}$
31.	Baldwin Community Schools	36.0
32.	Westwood Heights School District	35.3
33.	Moran Township School District	35.3
34.	Battle Creek Public Schools	33.8
35.	Cassopolis Public Schools	33.4

MICHIGAN'S HIGH MINORITY SCHOOL DISTRICTS - Page 2

	District	Percent Minority
36.	Baraga Area School District	29.3
37.	Jackson Public Schools	29.2
38.	Madison School District	29.1
39.	Romulus Community Schools	28.8
40.	Holland City School District	28.8
41.	Carrollton School District	28.3
42.	Fennville Public Schools	28.3
43.	Watersmeet Twp. School District	28.3
44.	Bridgeport-Spaulding Community Schools	27.9
45.	Sault Ste. Marie Area Schools	27.8
46.	Coloma Community Schools	27.1
47.	Hamtramck Public Schools	26.8
48.	Ann Arbor Public Schools	26.1
49.	South Haven Public Schools	24.9
50.	Berrien Springs Public Schools	24.8
51.	Detour Area Schools	23.8

*Extracted from the Michigan Department of Education Special Report from the 1988-89 School Fourth Friday file.


•

· .

134

APPENDIX E

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION • DEPARTMENT OF TEACHER EDUCATION

EAST LANSING + MICHIGAN + 48824-1044

January 21, 1991

Dear Gifted and Talented Coordinator:

Approximately two weeks ago I sent you a gifted and talented program survey for my dissertation at Michigan State University.

Since sending out the survey, I have found that some were not returned because the districts are not currently offering any gifted programming. If this is the case in your district, please indicate that fact at the bottom of this letter, sign your name and title, as well as your district name, and return the letter in the enclosed self-addressed, postage-paid envelope. The reporting of this information is just as important as filling out a survey. It is also just as important to hear from small districts as it is from medium- and large-sized districts. No district is too small.

If you have already returned the survey, I would like to thank you for your participation. If you have gifted programming and have not yet returned the survey, I would encourage you to do so by February 1 so that I can include your data in the final tally. As stated in my previous letter, all data will be kept strictly confidential and no district will be singled out for examination.

If you did not receive the original survey or if you need another copy of the survey, feel free to request one right on this letter. Be sure to include the name and address of the person to whom the survey should be sent.

Should you have any questions or concerns, feel free to call me collect at the number given below. Once again, I would like to thank you for participating in this important study.

Sincerely.

(Mrs.) Nancy Lewis

532 Rustic		Saginaw, MI	48604
Telephone:	(517) 755-6382		

My district does not currently offer gifted programming

Name of District:	
My Name:	Title:
Please send another copy of the survey	to:
Name:	Title:
Address:	

MSU is an Affirmative Action/Equal Opportunity Institution

APPENDIX F

COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF RELATED STATE AND NATIONAL STUDIES

The following pages compare the findings of this Michigan high-minority study to two national and two state studies as they relate to one another. It should be understood, however, that even though the all four studies looked at some similar issues, the questions were not always identical. Therefore, exact comparisons cannot always be made between the results of this study and the others. However, the results reviewed below are similar enough to get some ideas about the similarities and/or differences between high-minority schools and all schools in general.

The complete reference for each study is available at the end of this document.

Program Option Findings

1. INGHAM STUDY (all Michigan schools):

The most comprehensive programming was at the elementary level.

CURRENT STUDY (high-minority schools in Michigan):

The most comprehensive programming was at the elementary level.

135

2. 1985 NATIONAL STUDY (all schools):

The intellectual option was the dominant option in 97 percent of the states.

INGHAM STUDY (all Michigan schools):

Most programming fell into general intellectual and academic areas.

CURRENT STUDY (high-minority schools in Michigan):

Most programming fell into academic areas.

3. INGHAM STUDY (all Michigan schools):

The least frequent program option was leadership development.

CURRENT STUDY (high-minority schools in Michigan):

The least frequent program option was leadership development.

Program Model Findings

1. 1985 NATIONAL STUDY (all schools):

Pullout programs were considerably more popular than inclass programs.

INGHAM STUDY (all Michigan schools):

At the elementary level the most common models were teacher consultant, cluster, and pullout respectively.

CURRENT STUDY (high-minority schools in Michigan):

At the elementary school level the most common models were pullout, before/after school, and cluster respectively.

3. INGHAM STUDY (all Michigan schools):

At the middle school level the most common models were teacher consultant, cluster, and self-contained respectively. CURRENT STUDY (high-minority schools in Michigan):

At the middle school level the most common models were pullout, before/after school, and self-contained respectively.

4. INGHAM STUDY (all Michigan schools):

At the high school level the most common models were teacher consultant, self-contained, and cluster.

CURRENT STUDY (high-minority schools in Michigan):

At the high school level the most common models were before/after school, self-contained, and specialized programs.

Supervision Findings

1. INGHAM STUDY (all Michigan schools):

49 percent of the districts had a district gifted and talented coordinator.

CURRENT STUDY (high-minority schools in Michigan):

34 percent of the districts had a district gifted and talented coordinator.

2. INGHAM STUDY (all Michigan schools):

14 percent of the supervisors held some other title (principal, teacher, superintendent, etc.)

CURRENT STUDY (high-minority schools in Michigan):

48 percent of the supervisors held some other title (principal, teacher, superintendent, etc.)

Racial/Gender Findings

1. 1982 NATIONAL STUDY (all schools):

Minority groups were underrepresented in gifted programming by 30-70 percent.

CURRENT STUDY (high-minority schools):

Minority groups were underrepresented in gifted programming by 44 percent.

2. NEW JERSEY STUDY (all schools in New Jersey):

Blacks, Hispanics, and Indians were proportionately underrepresented in gifted programming.

CURRENT STUDY (high-minority schools in Michigan):

Blacks and Hispanics were proportionately underrepresented in gifted programming.

3. INGHAM STUDY (all Michigan schools):

49 percent of the gifted students were male; 51 percent were female.

CURRENT STUDY (high-minority schools in Michigan):

46 percent of the gifted students were male; 54 percent were female.

Degree of Involvement Findings

1. INGHAM STUDY (all Michigan schools):

Regular sustained programs were more frequent at the middle school level.

CURRENT STUDY (high-minority schools in Michigan):

Regular sustained programs were more frequent at the middle school level.

2. INGHAM STUDY (all Michigan schools):

Less than half of the schools had regular sustained programming.

CURRENT STUDY (high-minority schools in Michigan):

About half of the programs in the districts were sustained programs.

Identification Findings

1. 1982 NATIONAL STUDY (all schools):

The most common methods of identification were achievement tests, grades, and teacher recommendations.

NEW JERSEY STUDY (all New Jersey schools):

The most common methods of identification were teacher nomination, achievement tests, and IQ tests.

INGHAM STUDY (all Michigan schools):

The most common methods of identification were achievement and aptitude tests.

CURRENT STUDY (high-minority schools in Michigan):

The most common methods of identification were teacher recommendations and achievement tests.

2. 1985 NATIONAL STUDY (all schools):

64 percent of the states reported using multiple methods of identification.

INGHAM STUDY (all Michigan schools):

41 percent of the districts use multiple identification methods in most of their schools.

CURRENT STUDY (high-minority schools in Michigan):

58 percent of the programs used multiple methods of identification to identify students for the program.

STUDIES USED FOR COMPARISON

INGHAM STUDY: Armstrong. D. (1990). An Evaluation of Section 47 Gifted and Talented Programming, Mason, MI: Ingham Intermediate School District.

NEW JERSEY STUDY: McKenzie, J. A. (1986). The Influence of Identification Practices, Race, and SES on the Identification of Gifted Students. <u>Gifted Child Quarterly</u>, 30(2), 93-95.

1985 NATIONAL STUDY: O'Connell, P. (1985). The State of the States' Gifted and Talented Education: The Council of State Directors of Programs of the Gifted. Augusta, ME: Maine Department of Education and Cultural Services.

1982 NATIONAL STUDY: Richert, E. S. Alvina, J., McDonnell, R. (1982). The National Report on Identification: Assessment and Recommendations for Comprehensive Identification of Gifted and Talented Youth. Sewell, NJ: Educational Improvement Center-South.