1987

An Evaluation of the Altamont Community Unit #10 Gifted Program

Ann Louise McDaniel Chandler
Eastern Illinois University

An Evaluation of the

Altamont Community Unit #10 Gifted Program

(TITLE)

BY

Ann Louise McDaniel Chandler

THESIS

SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR THE DEGREE OF

Specialist in Educational Administration

IN THE GRADUATE SCHOOL, EASTERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY
CHARLESTON, ILLINOIS

1987
YEAR

I HEREBY RECOMMEND THIS THESIS BE ACCEPTED AS FULFILLING
THIS PART OF THE GRADUATE DEGREE CITED ABOVE

AN EVALUATION OF THE

THE ALTAMONT COMMUNITY UNIT #10 GIFTED PROGRAM

BY

ANN LOUISE MCDANIEL CHANDLER

B. S. in Education, Eastern Illinois University, 1972

M. S. in Education, Eastern Illinois University, 1978

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of
Specialist in Education in Educational Administration at the
Graduate School of Eastern Illinois University.

CHARLESTON, ILLINOIS

1987

Abstract

Purpose

The purpose of this field study was to research the entity of gifted education from an historical viewpoint, to review gifted education as it is today, and most importantly, to review evaluation procedures and studies connected with gifted education. A formal evaluation had never been done in the history of the Independent Study Program at Altamont Community Unit #10. The result of the evaluation procedure was to determine how to modify, revise, and re-evaluate the program in order to more effectively meet the needs of the gifted students in the school district.

Procedure

After the historical review of gifted education and research on current gifted programs was completed, many types of evaluation procedures were studied. It was decided that the evaluation design was to be formal, formative, a naturalistic inquiry, and use a qualitative questionnaire for instrumentation.

Questionnaire evaluation designs were created by the researcher, and administered to the Independent Study Program parents, students, and teachers, school board members, and administrators of Altamont Community Unit #10. This was deemed to be the most effective way to meet the purpose of the study.

Surveyed in this study were 92 students, 50 teachers, 79 parents, 3 administrators, and 7 school board members. The overall return rate

was 85.2%. Data analysis of the survey questions, tables, results, conclusions, and recommendations for each group participating are presented in Chapter IV.

Results

The study found that there were several areas of agreement and disagreement among the four groups completing the survey. Most of the four groups felt that: the Independent Study Program (ISP) was a good program, liked the organization of the program, and the ISP program was more challenging than the regular classroom.

Three of the evaluating groups -- parents, teachers and school board/administrators -- agreed that teachers working in the program can be communicated with comfortably. Parents and teachers indicated that the ISP program helped students learn new things. The school board and administrators gave a positive rating on several other items, as did the parents, teachers, and the students. The comments concerned good teachers in the program, good student attitudes, and over-all program effectiveness.

Several areas of needed improvement were clearly indicated by negative responses. The results indicated that: more areas of study needed to be offered to the students, and more time needed to be allotted to the ISP program. Several surveyed questioned the availability of good and interesting materials. Many indicated that the materials the program had were good, but that more were needed. Teachers also indicated that they needed more information relayed to them about the program.

The field study evaluation revealed opinions on key factors of the effectiveness of the Independent Study Program. Opinions of the

groups surveyed should serve as guidelines to plan future goals and objectives, to strengthen the program, to make it more effective, and to continue its success.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

My sincere appreciation to my husband Ray for enduring the long working hours of his career oriented wife, and to my family, friends, and peers for their encouragement and support in my pursuit of this study and Educational Administration Degree.

Appreciation and thank you is also extended to Dr. David Bartz, my advisor and field experience supervisor, for his guidance, direction, and time during the completion of this degree.

Also, thanks to Dr. Smitley and Dr. Blade for their time and effort spent as members of my field experience committee.

A special thank you to Sue Maupin, a good friend, who spent several long evenings away from her family, and served in the capacity of computer consultant during the printing of this field study experience.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter I

Introduction to the Study

Introduction .

"Full many a gem of purest ray serene
The dark unfathomed causes of ocean bear:
Full many a flower is born to blush unseen,
And waste its sweetness on the desert air".
(Gordon, 1968, p. 147)

Thomas Gray in his poem "Elegy in a Country Churchyard", written in 1750, aptly describes the problem with gifted education, or lack of gifted education in our society two hundred thirty-seven years later. Too many times gifted children are over-looked, or a gifted program is in place within a school system, but is never appraised for its value to the gifted participants.

As can be determined from historical documents and writings, this has been a relatively uncultivated area of education for hundreds of years. Boslough (1984) stated that: "It has been estimated that less than forty per cent of the gifted students are reached by existing programs" (p. 30). These students have special needs which continue to go undiscovered or, just as tragically, are discovered but not fostered with care. It has been realized by many educators that:

...unless his (the gifted child's) talent is recognized and

> provided for by a truly challenging program, that talent will simply deteriorate. Many bright students set adrift in the general school population that operates on an academic level lower than their capabilities just merge and become undistinguishable from their less able classmates as years go on. (Singleton, 1980, p. 12)

Statement of Purpose

This field study has multiple purposes. The first is to research the entity of gifted education from an historical viewpoint. The second is to review gifted education as it is today -- programs, student and teacher characteristics. The third purpose is to study evaluation procedures and studies connected with gifted education. After the review and research of these areas has been completed, the major purpose of this field study is to evaluate the Altamont Community Unit #10 Gifted Program. The final purpose is to determine how to modify and revise the program in order to better meet the needs of gifted students.

The researcher is presently the Gifted Program Coordinator and developer for the Altamont program that was established in 1980. A formal evaluation has never been completed in the six year history of the program. There is a need to ascertain if the program is effectively meeting the needs of the gifted children. It is important in order to continually improve the program, to formally evaluate the program on a regular basis. Thus, this study is deemed timely and relevant.

Objective of the Study

In order to achieve the main purposes of this study the following objectives were pursued:

1. To research gifted education literature from an historical viewpoint.
2. To review gifted education as it is today.
3. To develop and administer an evaluation design that would evaluate the over-all effectiveness of the gifted program.

It is hoped that as a result of this study the Altamont Community Unit #10 gifted program will be more effectively and efficiently fulfilling the needs of the community's gifted students.

Chapter II

Review of the Research

Historical Perspective of Gifted Education

Pre-1920's . Sumption (1950) noted that: "Since early times men have recognized the existence among their fellows of individual of superior intelligence" (p. 153). Over 2,300 years ago Plato speculated on ways of telling which children were gifted. Also during this time period the dispute between Athens and Sparta triggered the awareness of bright children. Athens was emphasizing the educationally gifted, philosophers, and well-versed people in order for them to reign as their leaders. Sparta, on the other hand was seeking, the physically gifted for potential leadership. Schools for tutoring these respective students were developed, honored, and respected by the communities. The Romans later adopted this strategy when their empire was being built to conquer the world. Later on, in 800 A.D., Charlemagne realized and advanced the idea of educating those conceived as the brightest of children.

Alexander (1982) believed that a large part of the problem of gifted education over the centuries was that from "...ancient times to recent centuries outstanding potential was generally overlooked or not considered" (p. 2). This was true for the masses and there were few

exceptions to this statement. Even though the cultures of the early times recognized giftedness, little was done to educate or challenge superior minds. In fact, as late as the seventeenth and eighteenth century, organized education of gifted children disappeared from the over-all schooling systems.

A glimmer of hope for the exceptional child came as our own early American leaders, such as Thomas Jefferson, recognized the need for advancing education in this area, but publicly little was accomplished during this time period. It did spark some educators such as: "Hobbes, Jacotot, and Liebinz ...(who) contended that all native intelligences were equal and differences came about by training" (Sumption, 1950, p. 154). This trend of thought, that no one was brighter than anyone else, was beginning to develop at this time. It should also be remembered that during this time period in American history, the population was basically rural and scattered over a great deal of land (in accordance with methods of transporation and techniques of communication of this time).

Based on the literature reviewed, the researcher perceived that the early and middle nineteenth century were stale as far as public gifted education was concerned. Most of the recognized bright children were being tutored at home during this time period. Of course, many bright children were not tutored due to lack of family wealth. Usually only the wealthiest could afford such a luxury for their children.

During the 1850's and 1860's, Charles Darwin published writings regarding his belief of the evolution of man. This sparked Francis Galton in the 1860's to believe that there was an inheritance of

ability, and he had many questions about human intelligence. Galton was the first scientist to study the gifted, and over a time period of many years, he attempted to produce an instrument to measure intelligence.

Not only was there private interest in the gifted and intelligent at this time, but also there was a beginning of public acknowledgement. Probably the earliest attempt of gifted education in the public schools of the United States was by William T. Harris in St. Louis, Missouri about 1867. Mr. Harris's idea was to accelerate gifted children. Another plan did not come along until 1891 for gifted children, and this was known as the Cambridge Plan, which followed the Harris plan idea.

By the opening of the twentieth century the multiple track plan was found suitable for providing an enriched program without acceleration in the public schools. It was also at this time that cities were beginning to rapidly develop, and there was a movement of rural people to city life. This had a definite effect on education systems and the need for such systems. Not only were public schools beginning to accept some responsibilty for gifted education, but (now) noted scholars became interested in giftedness and intelligence.

Alfred Binet, a Frenchman, began to develop the theory of intelligence and intelligence quotient by the late 1800's and very early 1900's. Binet, with the help of Theodore Simon, worked on the development of a standardized scale of intelligence. By 1905, they produced the measure called the Binet-Simon Intelligence Test. The basic idea was that "...intelligence involves different functions, reasoning, judgement (and) comprehension" (Alexander, 1982, p. 3).

The work of Binet and of Galton laid the groundwork for a famous educational psychologist who specialized in intelligence testing and gifted education - Lewis Terman. Terman, at the time, was a professor of psychology at Stanford University. His initial step in the field of gifted education was to revise the Binet-Simon Intelligence Test during the time period of 1910 to 1916. Also during this decade, New York City began gifted children classes known as Terman classes. Gifted education in the United States was beginning to pick up momentum.

1920's - 1940's . This momentum was accelerated by the advent of World War I (1914-1918). Even though America did not enter the war until 1917, the war carried national concern. The realization came about by the general public that it was important to have leaders who were bright and intelligent. With the world taking on a new look, it became very important to have such leadership available through the means of education. This realization, along with the mood of the early and middle 1920's -- fame, fun, flasks, flapper, and fortune -- spurred on gifted education as it never had been before this time. As can be seen in the literature though, gifted education was only being introduced, not thoroughly embellished in the American educational system.

The introduction of gifted education began in the early 1920's when special classes appeared and created a furor. Innovators in the public school systems of Cleveland, Los Angeles, Chicago, and Rochester were offering enriched programs to gifted children. Cleveland established a program that is still with us today. It was entitled the Major Works Program, and was founded by Roberta Bole.

The program was carefully structured and teachers were selected by strict criteria. Students had to have an intelligence quotient of 125 or above, and were participating by the third grade. But even with this program and others there was a "...narrow perception of childrens' academic learning" (Newland, 1976, p. 10), and "...advanced performance in the 1920's was viewed with great suspicion" (Clark, 1983, p. 25).

These views, however, did not stop the research of Lewis Terman. Terman revised the Binet-Simon Scale again and devised the concept of mental age, which became and still is very influential and important. After this revision Terman decided to begin a longitudinal study of people who had an intelligence quotient over 140, and had an average age of eleven. He began by searching for gifted children in the California public school system. In order to find these children, Terman relied on teacher nomination. The teachers were to nominate the children who they thought were the three brightest in the class and the youngest child. He also relied on group intelligence tests as screening procedures. Terman (1959) "...wanted to see what intellectually superior children are like as children, how well they turn out, and what are some of the factors that influence their later achievement" (p. 15). He began the study with 1,528 gifted children, 857 males, and 671 females. Their intelligence quotient ranged from 135 to 200. Other factors involved in the selection process were a "...home information blank, school information blank, medical exam, anthropometrical measurements, achievement tests, interest blank, a record of all books read over a two month time period, a test of play interest, and seven character tests" (Terman, 1959, p. 16). All

racial elements were also represented.

Terman continued to collect data for thirty-five years and the study continued for fifty years. From this study he defined the gifted child as "...the upper end of the normal distribution of general intelligence" (Gallagher, 1979, p. 430). Terman came to many conclusions about gifted education as a result of this study. Many of these conclusions were published in the mid 1920's. Terman felt that conditions for a viable program were: "...universal free public education, emphasis on individualization of instruction, provision for a wide range of ability, and a friendly, political atmosphere ..." (Gallagher, 1979, p. 427). He also reached general conclusions about the people in the group. People in the group were: "...better looking, became leaders, popular, viewed positively, socially more able to adjust, (and had a) record of achievement" (Clark, 1982, p. 27). Also, at the time that Terman was conducting this longitudinal study of gifted children, he designed and supervised research that led to a set of five volumes entitled Genetic Studies of Genius, 1925-1952 .

Another important man conducting research during the same time period as Terman was Spearman. Spearman, in 1921, developed the theory that intelligence is composed of two factors. The factors are general intelligence and specific intelligence. This theory has been very important to the field of gifted education. It helped to open the door of understanding the gifted child a little further.

This open door, however, became closed and seemingly stuck for the next twenty years. From 1925 to the 1940's little interest was shown in gifted education. Historically this was a time of radical

shifting for the American people, and gifted education could be seen as of prime importance by only a few people. The late 1920's brought the mood of fame, fun, flasks, flappers, and fortune to an abrupt halt. October 19, 1929, designated a new era. The "crash of Wall Street" radically changed lives, and America was in the midst of a depression. Many people felt lucky to survive, let alone worry about the education of the ablest. Just as America was slowly reviving from the depression, World War II started in 1939. With men headed for war and money directed to the production of war time necessities, schools took a back seat to the events of the time period.

One significant contribution to gifted education during this time was by Thurstone, who devised the theory that intelligence involves many factors. He belived that certain mental activities have common primary factors. To test his theories he developed the Primary Mental Abilities Test.

Another event that had an effect on American education was a statement issued by the Norwood Committee in England that became The Education Act of 1944. The Norwood Committee "...recognized there could be different kinds of intellectual giftedness...1)literary or abstract 2) mechanical or technical 3) concrete or practical" (Torrance, 1965, p. 11). This may have seemed oversimplified, but it was a better definition than there had been up to this point in time, and it got away from the concept of a single kind of giftedness.

Also throughout this time period, there was an attempt to understand intellect and mental giftedness. The early 1940's reflected a continuing interest by professionals in the social and emotional adjustment of the gifted. An example of this was in the

1942 paper by Leta S. Hollingsworth. She drew conclusions that the gifted were: "...more stable emotionally, healthy, physically fine, that surroundings influence a child's personality, and those with a high intelligence quotient have more difficulty with friendships" (p. 97). Professional interest at this time period was essential because, during World War II, most of the gifted programs were dropped by the schools.

Even though most of the programs were dropped, several important studies were done by Newland, Terman, Hildreth, and Paul Witty. Many of their findings were based on the "...belief that education programs should be based upon guided, planned experiences which in turn are based upon an analysis of the requirements of the learning task and the conditions of the child" (Torrance, 1965, p. 10). Some other conclusions from these various studies were: mothering in early years was believed to be very important; on Binet intelligence tests, performance improves with age; both heredity and environment influences interact in determining mental growth and educational development; and schooling effects are important on those who complete the most schooling -- they show the greatest increases and fewest decreases in intelligence quotient. Despite these many studies, Newland felt that there was still little being done for the gifted children in the schools in the 1940's.

Witty, through his studies in the 1940's, gave education a new definition for the gifted: "...(those) whose performance is consistently remarkable in any potentially valuable area" (Clark, 1983, p. 15). With this different definition he was foreshadowing ideas that sprang forth in the early 1960's. Witty maintained that

the "...intelligence quotient failed to reveal creativity or originality" (Gold, 1984, p. 497).

1950's - 1960's . Terman was also having a great impact on gifted education at this time. He contributed greatly to the psychological characteristics of the gifted and was a major contributor to gifted education from 1944 - 1953. Part of this major contribution was the continuation of the study he initiated in 1921. In 1947 he published as a result of this continued study, The Gifted Child Grows Up . Because of this book and study, Terman went on to say in 1954 that, " Not one of the major conclusions we drew in the 1920's regarding these traits that are typical of gifted children has been overthrown in the three decades since then" (Clark, 1983, p. 105). It was also during this time period that Terman made major revisions in the Stanford-Binet Intelligence Tests.

The development and subsequent revisions of this test was spurred on by the attempt to understand intellect and mental giftedness. This was becoming increasingly important to the United States. America engaged in the war in Korea and the meaning of "Cold War" was just beginning to be realized by our leaders. It was also at this time that educators were developing a more zealous interest in the area of gifted education. As a result, several interesting conclusions and documents were drawn at the very end of the 1940's, and during the first half of the 1950's decade.

One document developed at this time that is sill very important in gifted education today was the Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children/Adults. Wechsler believed that intelligence quotient was the capacity of the individual "...to act purposefully, think rationally,

and deal effectively with his environment" (Alexander, 1982, p. 4).

This document led Piaget, in 1952, to study the dynamic nature of intelligence. He felt intelligence was a continuous development of cognitive knowledge.

Other conclusions from studies and definitions about gifted children came from a variety of educators in the early fifties. For example, Barbe, an assistant professor of education at Kent State University, believed that: "Gifted children tend to take on one of three patterns for adjusting to the world: 1) withdraw, 2) class clown, 3) try to please others and are always underachievers" (Gold, 1984, p. 498).

DeHaan and Havighurst were also doing important work at this time. They helped broaden the definition of gifted and helped other educators realize that intelligence can have several parts. They thought that:

> Intellectual ability was composed of several parts ... verbal skill, spatial imagination, science, mechanics, art, music, special leadership, etc...(they went on to conclude that the) gifted child is one who is in the top ten per cent of this age-group in one or more of the areas listed. (Burt, 1975, p. 142)

These important ideas were just the beginning. The years 1955 through 1963 became a peak period for gifted research. Part of this was due to the fact that Americans were beginning to realize that the Russians had and were developing a space program. In October, 1957, when the Russian spaceship Sputnik was rushing through space, public interest began soaring in American gifted education and public

schools, and: "Gifted children became a prized national resource" (Whitmore, 1980, p. 6). Schools hurriedly began basic types of gifted education or expanded current programs. Three common options at this time were: classroom enrichment, grouping, and acceleration.

Not only was the concern based on gifted education and the method of such education, but also upon different types of intelligence. DeHaan and Havinghurst had already started gifted educators thinking in this direction. Guilford, in 1959, extended these theories further. He drew attention to creativity as an important function of the human mental processes. He also believed that "...the intellectual abilities can be classified, in terms of content, products, and operations" (Gallagher, 1964, p. 12). This was the basis for his Structure of Intellect design, which conceived a Learning Abilities Test that came about in the next decade.

It was also during 1959 that James J. Gallagher began cementing his place in gifted education. Gallagher studied gifted education in the public schools. Many of the gifted programs in effect had intellectual ability as a common thread. Many times the decision of who is gifted or not was made administratively. Many schools decided who qualified for the gifted program by considering an intelligence quotient of 120 or above to be the cut-off point. Or five per cent of the schools enrollment was served, no matter if some students with an intelligence quotient of 120 or above were or were not included in the program. Gallagher also drew other conclusions from his research. He believed that classroom teachers could not spot gifted students, the socio-economical class that the children came from can be misleading, and underachievement was a problem. Gallagher believed that at this

time the school programs for the gifted needed to adjust skills and interests to curriculum being offered to the gifted child, and that the teacher must be able to adapt to a wide range of ability in the class members. He researched several avenues of gifted programming that were possible to develop within the public schools. As a result of these studies and research Gallagher "...believes that there is not always one right or correct answer regarding gifted children" (Gallagher, 1964, p. 15).

Gallagher's research was published for the first time in 1959. It was also during this year that Terman studies were published for the last time. Although Terman had died in 1956, his last look at his famous studies of the 1920's was not published until 1959 in the book, The Gifted Group At Mid-Life . His general summation showed that these gifted children had had: superior parentage, many sided interests, and their characters were above average, but that there was also a wide range of variability, physical superiority, and along with general intelligence, they always had a desire to know and learn.

In addition to Terman and others discussed, many gifted education models surfaced in the late 1950's. Examples are: Bloom's Taxonomy, Parnes Creative Problem Solving, Raths' Higher Thinking Processes, Simons' Inquiry Thinking, Williams' Cognitive Affective Interaction Model, and Williams' and Renzulli's Interactive Model.

This interest in gifted education seen in the late 1950's continued into the early part of the next decade, the 1960's. Americans were beginning the development of their own space exploration facilities. People were still very concerned about the "Cold War", the methods of world destruction and survival, as could be

witnessed by the building of thousands of underground bomb shelters in America's backyards. The research indicates an attitide began to develop that gifted leaders were important so that there would be a next year. The country was looking for new leadership, as demonstrated by the election of President John F. Kennedy. In addition, the country was taking on new attitudes concerning topics such as war, civil rights, and individuality. Seeds of discontent were beginning to sprout in the young people of the time period.

Many of the historical events of the 1960's affected gifted educators. Bruner believed that intelligence was any discipline learned at any age. Havighurst (1961) believed that "...mental superiority is largely a product of social environment ...(gifted children) tend to come from urban and suburban areas" (p. 254). Boehm found in his studies that brighter children made moral judgements sooner. Underachievers also became a concern during this time period. Many studies were done by Gallagher and Rogge on this topic. Gifted educators were more rapidly moving away from Terman's idea that intelligence was fixed and innate. The emphasis turned toward creative teaching and creative thinking. This brought about many arguments in the gifted educational community.

The famous Getzels and Jackson study of 1962 accelerated these avenues of thought. In their study they found an unusually large number of gifted students. They felt that the method of teaching could make a difference. The students seemed to have high social adjustment and moral courage. Getzels and Jackson also surmised that creative thinking abilities might show their differential effects only beyond certain minimal levels of intelligence. They also came to the

conclusion that an intelligence quotient of 120 was the lowest a person could have to do truly creative thinking.

Other challenges of Terman's view of intelligence during his time period came from Suchman, who developed an inquiry method connected with creative thinking, and Torrance. Torrance became a well-known leader in the field of creativity in gifted education. Through his studies, he developed the Test of Creative Thinking in 1962, and this is still in use today in revised form. Torrance (1965) also felt that "...recent breakthroughs in research concerning the human mind and personality, and their functioning have resulted in the emergence of a new and challenging concept of giftedness" (p. 11). Guilford and Cattrell were also challengers of the fixed intelligence concept. Guilford was still pursuing this challenge through his Structure of Intellect Model, from which he derived the Learning Abilities Test.

The controversy and inquiry continued during the late 1960's. Baron felt that creative individuals were annoyed with the intelligence test, and therefore did not do as well on them. Many gifted educators and researchers did believe that: "There is no genuine creativity without an equally high degree of general intelligence" (Burt, 1975, p. 143). Educators who believed in the link between creativity and giftedness, thought that through the development of good intelligence tests a link would be realized and proved to those who did not believe in the creativity aspect of gifted education and intelligence. This was a concern of a few and progress toward the development of such tests was limited.

1970's - 1980's . Gifted education research in the late 1960's and early 1970's was minimal. There seemed to be a drought in this

area. Many believed this was due to a lack of funding and a need for a national organization. Historically this was a time of social upheaval within the United States. The war in Vietnam created great strife in and out of the country. The young people in the country were protesting on and off college campuses. Identity and individuality seemed to be a problem of this time period. By the early 1970's the Vietnam War had subsided, but America's concerns were with the men returning home, the question of who had won the war, and a new look at the economic status of the country. Also, educators as a whole became more concerned about other target areas in education.

Gifted education was not a high priority or one of the target areas. As Whitmore (1980) stated in her book: "History has shown the gifted to be sociopolitical pawns, in periods of stress, creating an awareness of the need for leadership, etc" (p. 69). In 1979 Gallagher expressed his concern about this lack of serious interest in gifted education when he wrote:

> Indeed it seems as though the American public responds favorably to the needs of its gifted members only when the nation is under stress, and we realize that the talented and gifted are a potential national resource or a defense against threats from the outside. (p. 87)

The research shows that the middle and late 1970's did produce some research, and a more intense interest began in the area of gifted program styles. In 1974, Gallagher and Kenny became concerned about how programs were dealing with the culturally different and underachievers. They also came to the conclusion that programs dealing with creativity needed extensive evaluation. Gallagher also

suggested that gifted education needed a more sophisticated curriculum construction.

Another researcher who was concerned about program style was Treffinger. In 1975, he developed a model which showed a sequential development of skills in the student for managing the students own learning. He felt that this would serve as a guide to help students become self directed learners.

As can be seen by Treffinger the concern was moving away from defining intelligence to concern about programs and students themselves. Newland felt that there was room for a great deal of improvement in this area. He was feeling that "...sensitivity to the educational needs of the gifted is at a disturbingly low level among educators in general" (Clark, 1983, p. 118). Newland also voiced concern about the gifted child's social interaction with others, not just to others. This was the continuation of many studies done by Newland in gifted education.

Another prominent researcher who surfaced in the late 1970's was Joseph Renzulli. In 1976 he developed his now famous Enrichment Triad Model. He felt that there were three types of enrichment. The first step of the model dealt with general exploratory activities and group training activities. The second step was concerned with individual investigations of real problems. The third step suggested that the student focus on real work methods of inquiry. He and several others interested in gifted education at the time felt that: "Enrichment was any experience that replaces, supplements or extends instruction, normally offered by the school" (Johnson, 1978, p. 19).

Along with Renzulli's concern about types of programs for the

gifted, by 1978 he was suggesting an even more liberal concept of giftedness. He thought of giftedness as a student having above average ability, task commitments, and creativity. He also felt that more instruments and identification processes were important to help define gifted children.

In addition to Renzulli, others who designed models for programs were Williams, and Gowan and Torrance in 1979. This increase in research was due to a slight increase in federal funding. Much more research needed to be done. Another boost to the gifted educators was the Council For Exceptional Children, which assumed a strong advocacy position. This council was formed in part because of a revival of public awareness of the social value of the gifted. The Council For Exceptional Children was just one group. There were several other groups at the local and national level that were pressuring for more consistent gifted programming in schools. Many educators were feeling that: "Gifted and talented children were still facing the problem of educational neglect on the part of those who plan programs and dispense funds" (Johnson, 1978, p. 14). The feeling was, that because of this concern, more goals needed to be set for gifted education.

Historically, during the late 1970's and mid-1980's, there was an increased educational interest in the needs of gifted students. Many exciting events were occurring that stirred a need for gifted people. China was becoming a more open culture, and beginning renewed relations with the United States. The political climate was destabilized during the Nixon, Ford, Carter, and Reagan era. Serious questions arose about the quality of our national leadership. Negotiations on arms and trade were being renewed between the United

States and the Union of the Soviet Socialist Republic, and progress was being made in that area. With the second oil embargo and terrorism, the Middle East became a threat. Many Americans were being held captive in hostage situations, terrorism was posing a threat abroad, and many felt that the United States was heading for another Vietnam-like war. Micro-computers also had a great influence on the United States during this time period. This had a great impact on the need for gifted people. Socially, the hippies and rebellious groups of the 1960's were turning into the Yuppies of the 1980's. Ambitious, gifted, profitable, and hard working people were being sought by many industrial areas of our nation. This also helped educators and researchers realize that there was an important need for gifted education in the late 1970's and early 1980's.

As a result of these trends and the concerns of local and national groups, gifted education turned into a political issue during this time period. People were challenging program methodology and by 1980, the American Association For Gifted Children was also challenging a still narrow view of giftedness.

These concerns brought about a variety of research. In 1980 for example, Clark, who has gained national reputation in gifted education, felt that there were basically three types of gifted programs. They were in the classroom, semi-separated -- which meant away from the regular class for a short period of time, or a third type of program in which the gifted child was totally separated from others. Goldberg and Passow in 1980 showed that it was not harmful to separate the gifted from the slower learners. In 1982 Sternberg sought to identify components of cognitive giftedness for improving

differentiated curricular planning. Besides this research in programs, creativity was not forgotten. In 1981 Gowan observed that creative people have a great supply of free energy that seems to result from a high degree of psychological health.

New views of definitions of giftedness were also being presented by researchers. Gowan felt that "...the term gifted refers to individuals who are functioning at ... a high level of intelligence" (Clark, 1983, p. 49). Intelligence is defined as advanced or accelerated development of brain function. The literature was also pointing out that "...researchers are becoming increasingly convinced that giftedness is not a stable condition" (Singleton, 1980, p. 11). They felt that if giftedness was not used it would be lost by a person.

Another view by Clark (1983) about giftedness is that:

> It is not only the genetic endowment that results in giftedness, it is also the opportunities the environment provides to develop those genetic programs that will allow some children to enhance their abilities to the point of giftedness, while others will be inhibited in their development, some even to the level of retardation. (p. 11)

Not only were researchers redefining giftedness during the early 1980's, but many gifted programs were beginning in the schools. The interest in gifted education was spreading throughout the ranks of education. One such innovator, who was helping the spread of gifted education, was John Feldheusen. He helped develop a program for gifted at Purdue University, a Saturday College, plus many programs in the summer for gifted children. His concerns have also been in

training teachers to teach gifted children. Purdue University is one of a few colleges that not only offers a masters degree in gifted education, but also a PH.D. Feldheusen has, along with others, become involved in excellence in gifted education.

Excellence not only in gifted education, but also education in general, became an issue in the middle of the 1980's. As Gold (1984) states:

> It seems that contemporary educators have lost the clarity of purpose that guided educators in the 1920's and 1930's. Many educators today seem paralyzed by the ambiguities that confront them. They seem uncertain about the mission of the schools. The primary purpose of schooling is to encourage the intellectual development of students. Programs for the gifted succeed in doing just that. In our pursuit of equality in American education have we forgotten the pursuit of excellence? (p.499)

Excellence has always seemed important to gifted educators and researchers. This can be seen in the more than fifty years that research has been going on in gifted education. But as Webb (1982) says: "Despite more than fifty years of research, the system has few answers to offer" (p.221). He is expressing the reality that although important research has been done, much, much, more needs to be done in order to adequately help give our gifted students the best education possible.

Development of Gifted Education At the National Level

Lack of public support and lack of money have been drawbacks to great advancements and research. Much of this has been due to a lack of continual and stable monetary support at the national level. A look at the history at the national level of gifted education reveals a roller coaster of support.

Attention to gifted education at the national level began as late as 1968. There had been very little gifted education funding up to this point. In 1968, President Lyndon Johnson, a supporter of education, had a White House Task Force interview groups of people who were successful. The consensus was: "They all said that some individual had shed his rank and status, and built an intimate one-to-one human relationship encouraging them to take risks and try new things they would not have tried without that kind of encouragement" (Vail, 1979, p. 59). This sparked the idea that the gifted did need some financial support. The Elementary and Secondary Amendments of 1969, passed under Richard Nixon's administration, granted some money for gifted education. Following this was an act of Congress in 1970 entitled "Provisions Related to Gifted and Talented, Section 806". Long needed recognition of gifted education was beginning to happen at government levels. During the 1970's, federal support increased. This was due in large part to a report by Commissioner Marland, from the United States Department of Education, in 1971.

The data for the report by Marland was collected from four major sources. The first source was an advocate survey of two hundred thirty-nine experts in the field. The second source was a school

staffing survey of principals. The third was from a 1960 longitudinal survey of gifted and talented called Project Talent. The fourth source was a survey of the states. The report revealed many interesting and thought provoking facts. In Marland's report, he categorized two million children as gifted and talented. He stated that state services were poor, and that special programs for the gifted were a low priority at most support levels. The report also revealed that the majority of gifted children were insufficiently challenged and worked two to four grade levels below their potential. Many gifted go undiscovered as: "One study revealed that 57% of administrators in United States schools believed they had no gifted students" (Eberle, 1984, p.11). Marland, through his study, also discovered many interesting traits about gifted individuals,

> Of all human groups, the gifted and talented are the least likely to form stereotypes. Their traits, interests, capacities and alternatives present limitless possibilities for expression; the chief impression one draws from studying groups at either the child or adult level is their versatility, multiple talents, and countless ways of effective expression at their command. (Newland, 1976, p. 33)

These findings in Marland's report created new thinking about gifted education throughout the country. One other part of the report which had an impact, and still is used extensively today, was his definition of gifted and talented children. This definition made its mark in the history of gifted education, and was a needed point of reference at that time. The published edition of the report, in 1972, stated:

> Gifted and talented children are those identified by professionally qualified persons, who by virtue of outstanding abilities are capable of high performance. These are children who require differentiated educational programs and services beyond those normally provided by the regular program in order to realize their contribution to self and society. Children capable of high performance include those with achievement and/or potential ability in any of the following areas: 1. General Intellectual Ability, 2. Specific Academic Aptitude, 3. Creative or Productive Things, 4. Leadership Ability 5. Visual and Performing Arts. (Gallagher, 1986, pp. 71-72)

Due to this report, the United States Office of Gifted and Talented was created. Also, ten Regional Offices of Education were set up throughout the United States. A section of each of these Regional Offices helped work with gifted education. In 1974, Special Projects Act Public Law 93-380 allocated special projects money for the gifted. Also in 1975, two and a half million dollars was spent to improve gifted programs. At this time a Presidential Scholars Program was designed. One hundred twenty-five gifted and talented students were selected by President Gerald Ford.

Both the programs and money allocated helped gifted education. A report by Dorothy Sisk, Director of the Office of the Gifted and Talented, revealed that only about 12% of gifted and talented students were receiving services. The report by Sisk was instrumental in the Gifted and Talented Children's Act of 1978. A majority of these funds were to be allocated to the states, and only 25% would go to the Office of Gifted and Talented. This placed a great deal of

responsibility on state agencies.

Still, the money for gifted education did not seem fair or equitable. Webb relates in his studies that in "...1975-1980 the federal expenditure for the handicapped were two hundred times greater than those for gifted children. In the 1979 budget $1000 was allocated for each learning disabilities child versus $2.42 per gifted and talented child" (Webb, 1982, p. 1).

This was the beginning of a trend away from national support for gifted and talented children. In the 1980's the federal government all but abolished its role. Public Law 97-55, the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act, placed gifted and talented programs in a block grant. This changed departments, reduced the position of consultants, and abolished the Office of Gifted and Talented at the national level. With this change, no money from Washington was directly designated to meet the educational needs of gifted children of public school age. All of this came about under President Ronald Reagan's administration.

Gifted education, as a result of this act, was left up to state legislatures and state educational agencies. Fortunately, some states had already accepted this responsibility. Top states in gifted money appropriations as of 1982 were: California, Illinois, Mississippi, Pennsylvania, North Carolina, Georgia, and Florida.

Development of Gifted Education - State Level - Illinois

Illinois is an excellent example of a state accepting responsibility for gifted and talented children's education. As early as 1959, at the recommendation of the Illinois School Problems

Commission, the General Assembly established a Special Study Project for Gifted Children. This money came under the Illinois State Program for Research and Development and continued for four years. The appropriation of $150,000 supported a total of forty-four study projects. The projects' goal was to secure data, information and recommendations to assist districts in providing for gifted children. After the study was completed, five recommendations were presented to the School Problems Commission at hearings in September and December of 1962. The five parts of the Illinois Plan (as it became known) were: 1) Reimbursment for services and materials, 2) Demonstration Centers, 3) Experimental Projects, 4) State department programs for gifted children, and 5) a training program for those involved with gifted children. The Commission went on to approve these recommendations. On April 18, 1963, Senator Edward Eberspacher introduced Senate Bill 749. Ray Page, Superintendent of Public Instruction supported the bill. This bill, appropriating 6.75 millions dollars for gifted education, was passed unanimously by both houses of the General Assembly. Governor Otto Kerner gave final approval of this bill August 5, 1963. The money appropriations were as follows: "...4.9 million of the bill was for local school support, 1.2 million for demonstraton centers, $550,000 toward research, and $750,000 for summer workshops" (Newland, 1976, p. 17).

Appropriations for this plan continued from 1963 - 1974. A total of $40,000,000 was allotted for gifted education during this time period. By 1969 demonstration centers were being set up in Illinois, and 1970 statistics showed that thirty-four districts had chosen to receive state funding for two or more years in order to provide for

gifted education. By 1973, there were twenty demonstration centers in Illinois; nine of these were in Chicago. As can be seen, there was a great deal of local interest in gifted education in Illinois at this time. The least successful part of the entire plan was the evaluation procedure.

Support from the state continued at different levels into the 1980's. The 1982 statistics showed that the state provided 39% of the funding for local district gifted education, and the local contribution was 61%. Local interest has continued over the years.

By 1986-1987, the Illinois Plan was basically the same, but there were a few changes. The most distressing change for gifted educators came when the state abolished the nine gifted education service centers and meshed them with eighteeen Educational Service Centers. This was not good for local districts. Gifted services were cut down in some areas due to the fact that employees of the service centers had more than just gifted educators to serve. There is still a local education reimbursement formula with state funding which was $9,039,100 for fiscal year 1987. School districts apply annually through one of two methods. The formula method calculates reimbursements based on a maximum five per cent of the average daily attendance for the school district. The personnel method is $5000 for a full-time and $2,500 for each part-time gifted educator. A seven member statutory Advisory Council on Education of Gifted Children is still active. They are appointed to serve four year terms, and advise the Illinois State Board of Education. Also at the state level there are two and a half full-time professional staff members and one full-time support staff member.

A major step forward for gifted education occurred when the Illinois Math and Science Academy was established and began operation in 1986. The drawback at this writing is lack of allocated funds to keep it in operation another full year.

Another important note over the years has been the increase of school districts participating in gifted education. Eighty-five per cent of 846 Illinois school districts were participating in a gifted education program during the 1986-1987 school year. This served in excess of 86,000 students. These results indicated that: "The number of identified students has been increasing by approximately 2000 annually since 1980" (Lund, 1986, p. 2).

Various types of gifted programs are provided for these students throughout Illinois. They can vary from general intellectual to specific aptitudes and talent. Also provided by the state are talent searches, writing contests, computer contests, fellowship and traineeship programs, conferences, and summer school programs. Various gifted organizations are also being developed throughout the state for parents, and teachers.

The state of Illinois has demonstrated an impressive amount of interest, and some funding. Gifted educators are continually pushing for increased funding in order to lend more support to the districts, and their vital gifted programs. Over the years the emphasis of the gifted education reimbursement program has changed as needed. The current emphasis is on early identification, K-12 articulated programs, increased local educational agency participation, identification of the highly gifted, facilitation of services for the highly gifted, and regional linkage of districts and students. These

are important goals for the gifted educators of Illinois and are continually being worked on, changed, and improved throughout the state.

Illinois is just one state of fifty. There are only seven or eight states that spend several million dollars on gifted education. Many spend little or none on the gifted children in their state. Too many times the leaders in these states do not consider the consequences of leaving the gifted children unchallenged. It is no wonder that a statement in the 1920's about the overall gifted education systems in the United States seems as accurate today as it did then: "Gifted children are the most misunderstood and educationally neglected group in American schools today" (Whitmore, 1980, p. 3).

Not only is it essential to review the gifted research and know who the prominent researchers were and are, and be aware of research development, but it is also vital to know what has happened on national and state levels as well in regard to gifted education and support. Once these areas have been perused, it is important to know about the definitions of giftedness being used, the types of programs available to students, characteristics of gifted children, and characteristics of good teachers for the gifted in 1987.

Definitions of Gifted

Early definitions of giftedness were tied to a child's performance on the Stanford Binet Intelligence Scale. An intelligence quotient of 130 or above deemed giftedness. Over the period of time from the early 1900's to now, intelligence definitions have swayed

from intelligence being genetically determined to intelligence is genetically influenced, but also shaped by environment. Giftedness has many meanings and interpretations for children and adults. Usually it is connected with a wide range of abilities and characteristics revealed in any population labeled as gifted.

Examples of this wide range of definitions are: Terman, 1925 - "Gifted are the two per cent who scored highest on a test of intelligence" (Clark, 1983, p. 5). Witty, 1940 - "...(gifted are) children whose performance is consistently remarkable in a potentially valuable area" (Clark, 1983, p. 5). NSSE, 1958 - "The gifted is one who has a high order of ability to handle ideas, to produce creatively, and to demonstrate social leadership" (Alexander, 1982, p. 10). Luciot, 1968 - "The gifted are those students whose potential intellectual powers are at such a high ideational level in both productive and evaluative thinking, that it can be reasonably assumed they could be the future problem solvers, innovators, and evaluators of the culture if adequate educational experiences are provided" (Alexander, 1982, p. 11) . Dr. Gowan, 1970 - "Giftedness is a mere potentiality" (Gallagher, 1983, p. 10). Dr. James T. Webb, 1982:

> Picture a spectrum that goes from the palest, lightest, whitest blue to the darkest, deepest, blackest blue. Somewhere along that spectrum is going to be a point where you can say "Now that's navy!" Giftedness is the 'navy blue' of human intelligence -- clearly an arbitrary desigination - but just as clearly significantly different from pale shades, and as everyone who has ever tried to match one knows here are a dozen shades of navy, which is to say degrees of giftedness from extreme bright to the

midnight blue of genius. (Eberle, 1984, p. 26)

As can be seen by the variety of definitions, nothing is clear cut and much is left to the opinion of the writer. In order to create a program, it is important to have an operational definition that has some practical educational sense. A recent survey showed that twenty-eight states are using some version of the 1971 Marland definition (stated earlier in this paper) for their state definition.

Many are following the definition established by Public Law 37-35, The Education Consolidation and Improvement Act, 1982:

> Gifted and talented children are now referred to as children who give evidence of high performance capability in areas such as intellectual, creative, artistic, leadership capacity or specific academic fields and who require services or activities ordinarily provided by the school in order to fully develop such capabilities. (Clark, 1983, p. 6)

The United States Department of Education has recently attempted to give a clearer and more concise definition of gifted. In actuality, it is Marland's definition summarized: "Gifted and talented children are those capable of high performance in any of five areas: general intellectual ability, specific academic aptitude, creative or productive thinking, leadership ability, or talent in the visual and performing arts" (Eberle, 1984, p. 15).

Illinois legislature has defined gifted and talented as:

> Those children with mental development which is accelerated beyond the average or who have demonstrated a specific aptitude or talent and can profit from specially planned educational services to the extent they need them. Included are children

> with exceptional ability in academic subjects, high level thought processes, divergent thinking, creativity and the arts. (Lund, 1986, p. 3)

The director of gifted education in Illinois, Wilma Lund, also adds to this definition that:

> Gifted and talented students are persons of exceptional promise whose capabilities predict contributions of lasting merit in widely varying fields. They come from all backgrounds with special abilities and talents ranging across a wide spectrum of human achievement. (Lund, 1986, p. 3)

These definitions have given school districts a more workable meaning of gifted and talented. Also involved in the Illinois definition, for reimbursement purposes, the student must have an intelligence quotient of 120 or above, be above level on achievement tests, and have a nomination from a variety of possible sources. The district may add other qualifications or definitions as desired, and the state is flexible with these add-ons. These sets of standards or definition may not seem fair, may cause some students to be overlooked, or included that should not be, but it is necessary to have this set-up and these definitions for districts to operate an accountable program.

Characteristics of Gifted Children

Once a workable and useful definition of gifted has been derived and accepted for a program, it is also essential that characteristics of the gifted child are reviewed and known before identification procedures begin taking place.

It needs to be realized by educators and parents who are concerned with gifted children that:

> Gifted and talented is something you can not take up lightly on free weekends. It's something that's going to affect everything about your life, twenty-four hours a day, 365 1/4 days a year. It's something that can force you into being mature, before you might be ready, it's something that can go all wrong on you and leave you torn apart. (Krueger, 1978, p. 141)

This is why the literature stresses and this researcher believes that it is vitally important that the characteristics of gifted children are recognized and programs be provided so that the child's world is not torn apart due to neglect by our educational systems.

Social and emotional adjustment by gifted and talented children has two definite schools of thought according to researchers. One school of thought maintains that: "The research literature over the past 60 years has repeatedly confirmed the tendency of gifted children to have to struggle with social and emotional problems" (Whitmore, 1980, p. 162). Torrance in 1963 and Darin in 1965 felt that "...the roots of emotional difficulty in the gifted child stems from the inevitable pressures that are exerted against the expression of creative needs and abilities" (Whitmore, 1980, p. 144). Many times it is felt that those gifted children who do have social and emotional problems, also have problems in other segments of their life that contribute to these problems, such as their socio-economic background.

Many gifted children feel that part of the problem is connected with this thought: "...to relate to others is impossible without first understanding yourself" (Krueger, 1978, p. 33). Researchers seem to

feel that the recognition of the individuality of the child is a factor in this development.

The other school of thought is that gifted and talented children seem to adjust socially and emotionally with no extreme problem. "Psychologists and psychiatrists note that studies show that the intellectually gifted and specially talented child have no more trouble adjusting to life than anyone else" (Kaercher, 1984, p. 59).

The degree of acceptance by peers and the people around the gifted child seem to have little direct relationship to intelligence. Gifted children seem to be somewhat superior to others in social perception. Terman's gifted study pointed out that there was "...no major difference in social and emotional adjustment" (Gallagher, 1966, p. 66). He did feel that the family had a bearing on the adjustment, and that the gifted perhaps had a lower rate of maladjustment.

Many researchers agree with this train of thought. It is important to recognize the social and emotional needs of the gifted child. As one author states: "The most important thing the world can give to gifted children is a welcome and an acknowledgement of their human needs as well as their intellectual capacities" (Vail, 1979, p. 62).

Social and emotional traits that educators need to be aware of in order to acknowledge these needs are many and varied. Several of the emotional traits that kept re-appearing in the review of the literature were: unusual sensitivity to expectations, keen sense of humor, heightened sense of awareness, okay to be different, idealism, sense of justice, perfectionism, strong need for consistency, a fear of failure, and advanced levels of moral judgment. Several of the

social traits that kept re-appearing were: motivated by self-actualization needs, advanced cognitive and affective capacity, involvement with the needs of society, seems to choose companions older than themselves, likes to spend time alone, and resists pressure toward conformity.

In addition to social and emotional traits, characteristic physical traits of gifted children have also become apparent over the years of research. The gifted child physically: tends to be stronger, healthier, frequently walked and talked earlier, usually has high energy levels, needs less sleep or needs more sleep, has vision problems, good stamina, keen alertness, and good visual perception.

These traits are important to the knowledge of gifted education researchers. But probably considered the most important traits for educators to know are intellectual: "One factor that youngsters labeled 'gifted' have in common is the ability to absorb abstract concepts, to organize them more effectively, and apply them more appropriately than does the average youngster" (Gallagher, 1964, p. 14). Other intellectual traits commonly found in this research were: curiosity, increased vocabulary, good reasoning ability, high powers of concentration, crave to learn, like challenges, wide and varied interests, set unreasonably high standards for themselves, competitive, quick rate of learning, good thinkers, will question, good verbal comprehension, good memory, originality, open to experiences, does not like unanswerable questions, task commitment when motivated, problem solving skills, power of critical thinking, and early reading abilities. These traits are very interesting and can help an educator to recognize gifted children. It is important to

note that most gifted children will not have all of these characteristics but will have several of them.

Something else that has been noted in the literature are characteristics of the parents of gifted children. Researchers have found that in many cases: "Fathers are professional, or semi-professional, and middle class..." (Burt, 1975, p. 151), and "...a lively intelligent mother is more likely to produce a lively intelligent child" (Gallagher, 1979, p. 266).

Cultures also effect the world of gifted education. "Jewish cultures have proportionally twice the number of gifted children,...the number of gifted children with Scottish origin is also unexpectedly high" (Burt, 1975, p. 15).

As can be seen, there are many factors affecting the traits of gifted children. One area, which has become an increasing concern to educators and researchers in the 1960's, 1970's and 1980's, is the gifted child who is classified as an underachiever. "Some tallies indicate that every second pupil in American classrooms today is not performing up to his abilities" (Fine, 1967, p. 10). This is a serious problem, because the writer was describing youngsters who rank in the top one-third of their class intellectually, and surmised that "...when a child won't achieve, answers usually can be found, but you often have to dig and dig for the answers" (Fine, 1967, p. 97).

Terman felt that personality was a key or answer to the underachiever. Newland "...describes the sporadic attention of professional and continuous neglect of the society regarding underachievers" (Whitmore, 1980, p. 165). He believes that if more attention had been paid to children with this problem, great

accomplishments could have been made. In 1966 Gallagher and Rogge talked and wrote dissertations about underachievers. Benjamin Fine wrote a book on this topic in 1976. Joanne Whitmore dedicated a book to this subject in 1980.

The consensus among these researchers seems to indicate that underachievement is closely related to family attitudes and values. There may be trouble socially or within family relationships. The researchers also have categorized underachievers in three classes: the underachiever is unknown, is recognized by high aptitude, or has high standardized achievement test scores. These three classes help educators to recognize the underachievement problem.

One author defines underachieving in the following quote:

> What is an underachiever made of? A scorned imagination, an unused memory, tabooed sensations, an interrupted thought, a rejected question, a forbidden daydream, an unexpressed idea, an unsought judgment, an unpainted picture, an unsung song, a safely hidden poem, unused talents... These make an underachiever. (Fine, 1967, p. 98)

Special projects in Port Chester, New York, and Cupertino, California have successfully worked with underachievers. Some common traits discovered were: aggressive, withdrawn, erractic, little trust, lack of friendship, confusion of fact and fantasy, rationalization, more social than academic problems, parental problems, lack of motivation and culturally deprived.

It is felt that the schools and teachers are the hope of children with these traits. An understanding teacher may get the child to respond, and become motivated. The major problem for the educator is

a lack of knowledge on how to help the underachieving child. The increased interest in this problem will hopefully help answers surface that will be beneficial to the teachers and underachieving child.

Approaches Used In Gifted Education

The Identification Process

As can be surmised there are many characteristics of giftedness, but there are also many types and classifications of identification processes that are used to help define the child as gifted. It is important to remember:

> Identification of gifted and talented youth is a process through which we attempt to become aware of students whose abilities, motivational patterns, self-concepts and creative capabilities are so far above average that differentiated educational services are needed if they are to make full educational progress indicated by their potential. (Feldheusen,1985, p. 69)

In order for an accurate identification process to be initiated, it must be decided what category of program will be made available to the student. Three basic classifications of programs are widely used around the country. The first type is that of general intelligence. Generally, in this type of program, the child must have at least a specified intelligence, certain levels of achievement, plus nominations from another source. In this type of program study may be done in a wide variety of areas. The second type of classification is that of specific aptitude(s). The identification may require a certain level of intelligence and definite levels of achievement in

certain subject areas. The program using specific aptitude may center around language arts, mathematics, science and/or social studies. Usually one subject area is chosen, and achievement levels must be high in that area in order to be identified. A third type of classification is creativity. Usually some type of creative abilities thinking test is used for identification. Methods used for other types of classifications of programs are not suitable in the area of creativity. Fourth and fifth types of classifications for programs are the visual/performing arts, and leadership abilities. These two areas are not commonly used in the average school district's gifted program.

Once the classification has been decided the identification process may begin. An "...accurate identification depends on understanding a human being, while operating a large program that must depend on checklists, test scores and figures" (Vail, 1979, p. 18). This is a definite problem, but at this point in time and research little can be done about the method.

One point of agreement by identification researchers is to begin the identification process as early as possible, preferably in first grade, kindergarten or sooner. Researchers generally believe that: "Without early identification the possibility exists that children may lose some of their potential and not realize all that they could have had if their gifts and talents had been identified early in their lives" (Ingram, 1983, p. 15). This early identification is important not only because of ability, but a great deal of pertinent information can be obtained at an early age, habits and attitudes are at optimal development, and a very important reason is that knowing the child is

gifted helps in the instructional program.

There are several ways of collecting information in order to identify the gifted child. They are: peer nomination, parent nomination, teacher nomination, counselor/psychologist recommendation, achievement tests, individual intelligence tests, group intelligence tests, and others. Briefly each method of collecting information will be discussed. In Appendix A, a bibliographical sampling of some tests used can be found. Also one sample of a form of the first three nominations discussed is located in Appendix B.

The first nomination is peer. This is used every two to four years in a program, or done at certain levels every year. This allows, through certain types of questions, students to reveal who they feel are bright or gifted. The child is asked to identify students who appear to have certain traits. If a student's name appears a certain number of times he/she is a good candidate. Many times peers can be very accurate in pin-pointing a gifted student.

The second nomination is parent nomination. Usually a form is sent home to the parents asking specific information about their child. The information on such a form can reveal if the child is a potential candidate for the gifted program. The co-ordinator of the program must be very careful to let the parent know that this is a nomination, and does not mean that the child automatically qualifies for the gifted program.

The third system of nominating, teacher nomination, is controversial among researchers, but often used. Various types of forms or matrixes may be used. An easier way is to provide a list of characteristics of gifted children and ask the teacher to nominate any

child who has any of the listed characteristics. Many researchers such as Torrance and Gallagher, have written and believe that teacher nomination is ineffective. In many cases it is a source that the gifted program planner cannot over look.

A fourth nomination or recommendation may come from a counselor or psychologist. Many times these professionals will spot gifted children who would not be nominated from any other source. A form is rarely used in this type of nomination, usually verbal recommendation suffices.

Once the nomination has been made the testing will begin. As has been noted a wide variety of tests may be used. For general intellectual and specific ability the following types of tests are conducted. Group intelligence testing may be done as screening, but it is not considered as accurate as giving the child an individual intelligence test. Achievement tests, usually given yearly in school districts, may be referred to and scores may be used as one indicator of giftedness. A problem with these is: "Standard achievement tests in most instances usually test for knowledge of facts rather than ability to apply these facts" (Gallagher, 1966, p. 33). Diagnostic tests also provide useful data to help determine giftedness. The diagnostic test or tests given might depend upon the type of program qualifications.

The preceding tests are fairly good for identification for some types of programs. Achievement tests, teacher nominations, and peer nominations have been found unproductive for identification of students with creative ability. Intelligence quotient tests are also under scrutiny in regard to creativity. Many times a creative

thinking abilities test is used in identifying creative students. There are many different abilities associated with creative thinking and identification. Some are: fluency of ideas, orginality of interpretation, analysis, and synthesis. The problem with this type of attempted identification is that it lends itself to subjective rather than objective testing. Many types of testing are available for all areas of identification. Some other types of identification procedures used are: school records, interest inventories, interviews, and case studies.

Even with the variety of identification procedures, there is concern that the atypically gifted are overlooked. Children who may fall in this category are culturally different, handicapped, learning disabled, underachievers, and girls. More and more research has been done in these areas in the 1980's in order to help develop identification techniques to assure that these children are not overlooked by our gifted programs.

Once the child has been identified by a matrix technique or by meeting qualifying criteria, the child is placed in the gifted program. Once the children have been identified and placed in the program it is important that the school has a gifted program that will meet the needs of its children.

Types of Gifted Programs

There are many ways in which gifted programs are conducted throughout the country. As Gallagher (1986) states though, no matter what type of program is advocated the results need to lean toward the same three objectives:

> Educators would agree on three general educational objectives for special programs for gifted and talented students. Gifted children should master important conceptual systems that are at the level of their abilities in various content fields. Gifted children should develop skills and strategies that enable them to become more independent, creative, and self-sufficient. Gifted children should develop a pleasure in and excitement about learning that will carry them through the drudgery and routine that are an inevitable part of the process. (p. 94)

Many different types of settings for gifted education have been devised to help meet these objectives. Various types include: summer programs, groups within the regular classroom, ability grouping in and out of the classroom, pull-out programs, Saturday programs, various high school programs, college - part time, segregated classes, independent study, enrichment, and acceleration.

No matter which type of program is chosen qualitatively different programs are a must. Qualitatively different "...implies that the program be designed to enhance or take into account what is special about these children" (Maker, 1982, p. 13). Besides qualitatively different programs one also has to consider that: "Many different variables may influence students to react differently to a particular treatment program" (Gallagher, 1966, p. 115).

There are four treatment programs that are widely used throughout the country in the elementary school setting. The selection of the style of program has to do with many variables. A few of the variables are: time, money, staff, and the mastermind behind the gifted program.

Ability grouping is one of the popular programs that has been used for many years. Ability grouping attempts to group children together with those of similar abilities. Such grouping may take place within a subject area or as a homogeneous gifted grouping. The setting in which ability grouping takes place may be within a regular class, a pull-out program, a full or part time segregated classroom setting, summer classes or weekend schools. Many times with ability grouping we "...assume greater homogeneity than has been warranted" (Torrance, 1965, p. 39). This can be a problem. There are disadvantages and advantages to any style of program. The advantages for this type would be that the gifted are with other gifted students with a high level of abilities. This enables the teacher to proceed at a faster rate, and provide more challenging experiences. The children are provided the opportunity to socially and emotionally interact with people of similar abilities. The major disadvantage is that the gifted child has little chance to interact with learners of varying levels. There may be a social effects because of this, or an elitist group problem. The social or elitist group problem should be of a lesser concern when it has been pointed out that: "A gifted youngster in a class of average pupils is likely to be harmful, not only to himself, but to other students" (Fine, 1964, p. 44).

Acceleration is a second type of program that is used and it is controversial. Acceleration in its many forms is opposed by many professional educators, but believed in by others. Clark (1983) states that: "Acceleration in some form should be available in every gifted program, both at elementary and secondary levels" (p. 154). Acceleration may be presented in many different styles of program such

as: pull-out, segregated classes, classes within ability grouping, or independent study programs. Acceleration may fall into four classifications. These include grade telescoping, continuous progress, advanced placement, or increased academic load. Grade telescoping is a means by which subject matter may be covered more quickly than occurs at the normal grade level. Continuous progress is usually in a non-graded situation where the child proceeds quickly at his/her own rate, but this may be in selected subject areas. Advanced placement is moving the child ahead a grade level or more or placing the child ahead in select subject areas. The last type of acceleration increases the academic load of the student. It gives the student a wider array of subject matter. Many times this type is used at the high school level.

Acceleration in any of the types of settings mentioned also has many advantages. It allows the student to work at appropriate academic levels. Junior high and high school students tend to favor this because they may enter a career or study in an interesting, more select area sooner. Parents and school districts may see this as an advantage monetarily.

Some researchers feel that a disadvantage to acceleration is that a sequence of skills and patterns may be disrupted. Also, a perceived disadvantage, especially considered at the elementary level, is that acceleration is a threat to social-emotional well being. One author supports and qualifies this by saying that "...if socializing is of such great importance that adjustment is impossible, the advantages of acceleration are outweighed" (Krueger, 1978, p. 82). Another researcher has proclaimed that: "Studies indicate that social and

emotional maturity correlate more closely with the mental age than chronological age" (Singleton, 1980, p. 65).

In the long run, many researchers feel that the advantages of acceleration outweigh the disadvantages if the program is orchestrated properly. It has been said that:

> Acceleration should be viewed as a means of assisting learners of all ages in developing their intellectual potential to the greatest degree...(the) concept requires strong leadership, a caring attitude, and a desire to provide a positive match between the learner and the curriculum. (Singleton, 1980, p. 70)

A third controversial style of conducting a gifted program is labeled enrichment. Enrichment has been used since the beginning of a time when greater intelligence was realized by all types of educators. The purpose of enrichment education is: "To provide plenty of opportunities with unlimited possibilities and the challenge of potentialities of different kinds of gifted children" (Torrance, 1965, p. 40). A definition of enrichment is that: "Enrichment is usually the addition of disciplines or areas of learning not normally found in the regular curriculum, and is used both at the elementary and secondary levels" (Clark, 1983, p. 154). Many schools use some type of enrichment approach in a variety of settings, such as the regular classsroom, ability groupings, pull-out programs or summer programs. The overall purpose of this type of program is to provide additional educational experiences beyond the scope of the class. It is also an excellent type of program for those students who might be gifted in one area, but not in others. Other advantages of enrichment are that it broadens the experiences and challenges of the student. It may

stimulate other students in the class, and may provide some individualization. It is a flexible method of gifted education. When the child is effectively motivated it may stimulate other individuals, and satisfy some of their learning needs.

Some researchers feel that enrichment does not meet the needs of the learner. It is also considered, in the literature reviewed, a disadvantage to have effective enrichment programs in a regular classroom. Instead, it needs to be in a specially planned program. Other disadvantages are the limits of teacher time, individual planning, and knowledge. Many educators are afraid that enrichment activities will not necessarily stimulate a qualitative program. Another disadvantage could be a lack of logical organization and a lack of training the student to do independent thinking. The biggest disadvantage to enrichment programs is lack of resources. Many times this is due to the empty reservoir of school district monies or different priorities of the leadership of the school. Enrichment programs, good or bad, have been a vehicle of providing gifted services to students over many decades.

Another type of program that has been used and brought to the limelight in recent years is the independent study program. This type of program may include enrichment and acceleration. It may be in a regular class, a pull-out program, or on an individual basis. Not a great deal of research has been done on this type of gifted program. An independent study program has been defined as a class "...in which individuals define and undertake a project enabling them to explore in-depth and breadth some special problem or process, to develop deeper insights and understandings or extend their skills, and to

exercise creativity and productive behavior" (Gallagher, 1979, p. 42). Community resources and mentors are an asset to this type of program because of the wide and varied curriculum needs. The community resources, if available, may act as an advisor and provide motivation and stimulation for the student in an area of interest.

The advantages of this type of program are that the student is generally allowed the freedom to study what he/she wishes at a desirable speed. This type of program helps encourage independent thinking and in many cases, self-motivation, self-discipline, and goal setting. Another advantage is the variety of curriculum the study has available to it. In 1965 Congreve found that high achievers choose areas requiring the greatest amount of independent behavior. Another advantage to independent study is that the "...outcome of independent study should be a self-directed learner who can investigate real problems" (Clark, 1983, p. 158). Many times gifted students enjoy the outcomes of independent study programs and the independence associated with this type of program. It was shown that:

> In a recent study directed by Bloom (1981) it was found that of those persons studied who had achieved exceptional accomplishments of international note, their early instructional, and a large part of their later instruction in the field of their accomplishment was individualized. (Clark, 1983, p. 215)

Although there have been many advantages found in an independent study program, there are also disadvantages. Many times our low achieving gifted children do not fare well when independent behavior is required. Disadvantaged children also do not seem to perform as well in this type of program. Another disadvantage is teacher time.

It requires a great deal of time to plan for this type of program. Many times there is not enough time to meet with the children on an individual basis to help or guide them. The teacher can also be a disadvantage to the program if he/she is not resourceful, or open-minded, and is afraid of the unknown. As one researcher said about such a program: "There is especially no place for mechanical teaching or rote learning" (Krueger, 1978, p. 72). Another disasterous disadvantage to this type of program is lack of resources. Without money or time to develop resources, the program may not have a chance to be successful.

At the high school level many of these types of programs are used. Also there are other types of programs used in the high school setting. Many times the programs for gifted are concerned with getting the required courses out of the way so that the student has time for a wider exposure to other subject areas. Many high schools use advanced placement in order to meet required courses, yet give the student a more advanced curriculum. Some high schools combine college courses into the curriculum. Others have such programs as: early high school admission, honors classes, The International Baccalaureate Program, governors school, and mini courses. These all can be excellent add-ons for the gifted high school student. They are basically a mixture of ability grouping, acceleration, enrichment, and independent study programs.

Urban Versus Rural Gifted Programs

There are not only concerns about the style of gifted programs, but debates about geographical setting among educators. Unfortunately

there are "...practically no research (studies) and almost no guidelines relevant to the provisional special education programs for youth in geographical areas characterized by great spaces, and few people" (Plowman, 1971, p. 54). Urban versus rural gifted programs has been a concern of educators and potential researchers. Urban, in this paper, is defined as any area that has a population of 50,000 or more. Rural is considered to be those areas less populated. Rural even encompasses school districts with fewer than 200 students. In this regard it must be remembered that: "No matter how small it is, every school district has students of outstanding potential and abilities" (Lupkowski, 1985, p. 59). A program must be developed that is specially designed for small rural schools, and does not choke out the exploration of ideas, intellectual activity or creative thinking. With a little imagination every school can develop a program suited to the needs of the gifted students.

Rural areas can have disadvantages due to size, staff members, and money. School leaders need to also be reminded that "...perhaps half the gifted children of our nation live in the small cities, towns, and rural districts" (Fine, 1964, p. 203).

This statement emphasizes the need for such programs and that just because it is a rural area, does not mean that it cannot have an excellent gifted program. One author suggests that: "The advantages of a rural setting are that one can establish a personal relationship with faculty and students, because of the size of the school involved" (Krueger, 1978, p. 129). Another advantage of rural gifted education could be the set-up and style of program used. Due to less gifted population, style could be varied according to the needs of the

students. At the very least enrichment can take place. Also, many times the elementary is a non-graded situation. For many rural high school students seminars have been suggested, perhaps at the county seat.

A distinct advantage for the rural gifted youth in the 1980's has been the advance in technology. Many programs and special classes can be brought to the gifted child by telephone lines via a computer and a modem.

Urban gifted programs are also making use of the technology of the 1980's. This is one advantage. Many times urban areas have segregated schools for gifted students with full time teachers directing their energies toward gifted education. These types of programs offer the student many advantages, because a wide variety of programs can be made available to the child. Usually in the urban setting college and cultural resources are nearby. Another advantage is that a wider range of ethnic groups are served in this type of program.

Although there are many advantages in the urban setting, there are disadvantages as well. Many times due to size of classes there is less individualization and guidance for the child. In segregated classes, the situation is much the same as in regular classrooms. Also this type of program can exert a great deal of pressure on the child, due to grades, competition, and peer pressure.

Characteristics of Teachers of the Gifted

Not only does the type of program affect the gifted child, but also the teacher has a major impact. The teacher is a decisive factor

in the success of the gifted program: "The success of the program depends on the teacher. This cannot be said too often or too loudly" (Vail, 1979, p. 79). The students know and recognize the teacher that inspires them and makes a difference in the program.

Two viewpoints by students clearly accentuate the quality of teaching that can occur in gifted programs. One student said: "I am frustrated so many times with the element of boredom, the lack of evident caring on the teacher's part" (Krueger, 1978, p. 23). Another student said: "What I like is when teachers are glad you're gifted and are willing to stick up for you" (Krueger, 1978, p. 25). These two opposing viewpoints are heard a great number of times. Unfortunately, the negative comment is heard louder and as a cry for help from our gifted students.

There are three categories of teachers that are educating our gifted students. There are those who impede the program, those who do not interfere or are almost neutral but also fail to provide guidance for the student, and those who can maximize development of the gifted and talented.

Much research has been done on the traits that help maximize this development. A variety of this research has been completed in the last three decades. Examples of studies done in each decade are: Havighurst and DeHaan, 1963, Bishop, 1968 and 1975, and Clark, 1983. The characteristics that these and other researchers seem to agree on have changed little over the decades. Some of the outstanding characteristics of excellent teachers of gifted education are: flexible, creative, sense of humor, desire to teach, make learning fun, do not pretend to know everything, concern with individuals,

command of subject matter, motivate, curious, stable, personal drive, a will to learn, sincere, healthy, a versatility of interest, hard working, consistent, good mental ability, well-organized, and open-minded. One author summarizes many of these characteristics well. The teacher "...must be friendly (and) must have a genuine respect for and forth in each individual, should be genuinely eager to understand the students and must possess adequate knowledge of his subject and source of information relating to it" (Fine, 1964, p. 163).

A reflection of the characteristics of gifted teachers' characteristics shows a parallel to the gifted child's characteristics in many aspects. Also, in Bishop's 1975 study, he discovered that many good teachers of the gifted were in their forties, and had anywhere from ten to nineteen years of gifted teaching experience.

Teacher characteristics are important for a good education of gifted students. Another grave concern in the area of teachers of the gifted is teacher training. There are few training programs devoted exclusively to the education of gifted children. Few states have gifted teaching requirements, besides the regular teaching certificate. In 1979, only ten states reported any certification requirements. Due to this factor, in 1981, a set of professional standards for training programs in gifted education was recommended by the Association For Gifted, and The National Association for Gifted Children. This suggests a definite need for certification, coursework, and degree programs at the college and state level for teachers in gifted education.

Essential Requirements For A Gifted Program

Much of the success of any style and type of location of gifted programs is due to the teacher, and much of the responsibility for the success of such a program also rests with the individual districts, and the co-ordinator of the program. As Clark stated: "...it has been found that in states where the total time of at least one person is devoted to gifted education far more students have been adequately served" (Clark, 1983, p. 145).

Once a co-ordinator is in place, a successful program requires thinking, careful planning, and hard work. The three key players, as suggested by the review of the literature, in the program are the teachers, the students, and the curriculum.

In addition to the key players, there are five essential requirements that a school system must meet before the professional staff can adequately meet the needs of the gifted students. They are: "...commitment, coordination, inservice teacher preparation, early identification of gifted students, and careful placement" (Whitmore, 1980, p. 405). Other considerations must be the financial situation, structure, physical setting, staffing requirements, and gifted children being treated as individuals.

One area of great importance in gifted education that has received little attention, little research, and little priority is evaluation of the program once it is functioning.

Chapter III

Criteria and Design for Evaluating Altamont's Gifted Program

Review of Evaluation Research

A definition and review of evaluation research methodology and instrumentation is an important part of developing a questionnaire for an effective evaluation. Once the program to be evaluated is reviewed and decisions about the evaluation design and purpose are finalized, the researcher may then adequately complete the evaluation process. Before the process, it is important for the researcher to understand the definition of evaluation

Definition of Evaluation . In the researcher's opinion, evaluation should be an important part of the process of gifted education programs. In order to effectively use evaluation research and procedures, it is important to understand its definition. A more formal definition of evaluation is: "Evaluation is the science of providing information for decision making -- the process of delineating, obtaining, and providing useful information for judging decision alternatives" (Wiersma, 1976, p. 4). A less formal definition is: "Evaluation . . . implies considering both the right and wrong or good and bad aspects of an idea. Evaluation also involves constructive rather than destructive criticism" (Maker, 1982, p. 101). It is important to remember that the general purpose of

evaluation is to focus attention on a program, and to make effective instructional and administrative decisions about an educational program.

Unfortunately, evaluation in gifted education has received a lack of attention by most researchers. There are many "...shortcomings in evaluation research that hinder advancement in our understanding of educational process" (Evans, 1982, p. 131).

There was a little concern beginning to peak through the darkness of this area by 1959. Gallagher, in his work during the late 1950's and 1960's with the State Board of Education in Illinois and the University of Illinois, became concerned about methods of evaluating gifted programs. Three possible alternatives he considered for evaluation were the use of a questionnaire, to compare the gifted child's accomplishments to his class or age norms, and to compare gifted children who are in a program with a group of equally intelligent children who are not in a program. He concluded at this time, though, that the researcher did not have the adequate tools he needed to evaluate gifted programs.

Simpson and Martinson also began in California, in 1961, evaluating administration and instructional provisions in education. Bruner and Guilford influenced efforts being made to evaluate the effects of curriculum adaptation during this decade.

A boost toward the field of education evaluation came in 1965 with the passage of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. This act called for federal monitoring and evaluation of Title I (now Chapter I). This helped pave the way in showing a need for evaluation in special programs. Up to this point "...negligible amounts of money

had been expended for evaluation development in gifted education" (Archambault, 1984, p. 13), or in any type of education.

By the late 1960's evaluation research in education began to change because of the act passed in 1965. Many of these researchers devised basic evaluation models that could be easily adapted to gifted education evaluation. Leaders who began exploring the concept of evaluation as the process of gathering data for the purpose of decision making were Scriven and Stake in 1967, and Stufflebeam in 1968. Stake developed a countenance evaluation model during this time period. In this model he characterized evaluation as description and judgment, and thought that these ideas should be completely followed through in evaluation. Scrivens came up with the idea of summative evaluation, which is the consideration of a program after all or much of the work has been finished in it. He also believed in direct comparisons of programs for evaluation. Stufflebeam, during this time, researched administrative evaluation of a project.

An attempt was made in 1969 by Renzulli and Ward to apply work done in the field of evaluation to gifted education. Several of these innovations were credited to Newland, who, throughout his research, generated many ideas in gifted education. Renzulli and Ward developed The Diagnostic and Evaluative Scales for Differential Education for the Gifted. It was abbreviated DESDEG. The model consisted of five parts: the manual, evaluative scales, basic information forms, the evaluator's workbook, and the summary report. This was considered by educators to be a great breakthrough for evaluation procedures in gifted education.

In 1970 Stufflebeam continued with his evaluation work. He went

on to define evaluation and identified four parts of the evaluation process that could be used in educational settings. His four parts of the evaluation process were context, input, process, and product evaluation. Context identified need and defined problems in the program. The input part primarily described resources. The process provided information about defects and assisted in making decisions about the program. The product judged the overall effectiveness of the project. This became known as his CIPP evaluation model, which was completed in 1971.

Because of the work of Stufflebeam, Scrivens, Stake, and Renzulli and Ward, many people concerned with evaluation believed that:

> The work of the late 1960's and the 1970's began a trend in evaluation directed toward asking questions, and providing information which are of greater utility to the program being evaluated, to increasing communication and to addressing those issues fundamental to program planning. (Callahan, 1986, p. 39)

The evaluation research continued in the 1970's. In 1972 Guilford favored self-evaluation as did Witchell in 1973. Self-evaluation is when evaluation is done by the people who are an integral part of the program. Stake, in 1973, favored informal evaluation. Treffinger, in 1975, felt that criteria needed to be developed for effective evaluation. This criteria would need to be used by various audiences in evaluating.

Joseph Renzulli, already a leader in gifted evaluation plans revised and modified his earlier DESDEG model. He described it as a Key Features System, with four essential steps. He believed there should be a front end analysis, a synthesis of input information, data

collection and analysis, and file evaluation reports. He went on to note "...that both evaluation designs and the kinds of data generating factors have a distinct relationship" (Khatena, 1982, p. 342).

Renzulli and Smith collaborated in 1979 to describe the different types of evaluation questions that may be asked by the evaluator. The three categories of the questions were product, process, and presage. Product was regarded as the assessment of observable, and measurable student outcomes arising from exposure to program elements. Process is the assessment of what goes on in the learning situation, involving student and teacher behaviors rather than learning outcomes. Presage evaluation focuses on factors assumed to have significant impact on outcomes or product factors that relate directly to the materials of the program.

By this time in the late 1970's more attention was given "...to finding methods which attempted to document more natural happenings in the education setting, and to use these to describe and interpret program effects" (Barnette, 1984, p. 26). A common thread ran among researchers and their discoveries about evaluation. They felt evaluation was a basis for decision making, and a process dependent on information and a collaborative effort.

The 1980's continued to bring about researchers interested in evaluation. Very important to this progress was that many were interested in gifted evaluation, and were defining and developing methods of evaluation procedure. Many evaluation researchers throughout this decade had four major classifications and decisions that had to be made in program evaluations. They were: context of evaluation, audience for the evaluation, classes of decisions (how

many involved in the process), usefulness of evaluation information, timeliness, and ethical consideration. An excellent book which had just been published before the beginning of this decade was A Guidebook For Evaluating Programs of the Gifted and Talented by Joseph Renzulli. It was filled wth models, examples, and how-to's of evaluation. Renzulli continued to work on gifted evaluation in the early 1980's and to present many varied evaluation examples for gifted educators.

Another key factor in research and gifted evaluations of the 1980's that has opened many doors has been The Journal of Education For The Gifted . Not only was an issue exclusively devoted to evaluation of gifted programs in the winter of 1984, but it also publishes many articles on gifted evaluation in other editions.

Two other excellent leaders in this field have been Carolyn Callahan and June Maker. They have both written many articles on the value of gifted evaluation. They have suggested ways of carrying out evaluation and continually stress that this is an area in gifted education that is in need of pursuit. Evaluation will undoubtedly open many doors to the improvement of gifted education programs, and services to the gifted child. Gifted educators are becoming more interested in evaluation, and the work being done in that area. As Callahan states: "The evaluation of programs for the gifted is an area receiving increased attention, and becoming vitally important at the local, state, and national level" (Callahan, 1983, p. 3).

Gifted Evaluation Procedures in the State of Illinois

Evaluation has been a part of the State of Illinois gifted education program since its inception. But as an article written by Marland (1972) stated: "The least successful effort has been to incorporate evaluation procedures in all phases of the program. Only 15% of the districts have minimally adequate evaluation" (p. 208).

The state has continued to require evaluation of the over-all gifted program processes, descriptions, and personal student gains throughout the years. This has been in addition to a formal evaluation done by the State Office of Education every four or five years. (See Appendix C). The local district, in the evaluation procedure, states types of programs, number of pupils, and teachers involved, plus the expenditure of funds. The district is also required to report by grade level student contact hours by hours per week, weeks per year, and area(s) of content studied by the students. In addition, the district is to state whether evaluation procedures of the objectives listed in the gifted proposal were implemented. The last part of the Illinois evaluation requires a descriptive summary of group and/or individual gains that were a result of the gifted program. These evaluations are sent to districts at the end of the school year.

The evaluations are then returned to the Illinois State Board of Education, Program Evaluation and Assessment Section. A statistical analysis is made of these reports and summarized for the individual districts.

In 1985, the State of Illinois also selected districts for the purpose of beginning a longitudinal data base study and it published

the descriptive self-evaluation reports from these districts. The state said that: "It is intended that this information will lead to an increased understanding of the effects of gifted education programs, and will serve to illustrate and improve the evaluative practices of such programs" (Illinois State Board of Education,1986, p. 1).

Additional Evaluation Methodologies Used In Gifted Education

The State of Illinois evaluation is one way an evaluation can be conducted on gifted programs. Many times this procedure produces quantitative information instead of qualitative information. The quantitative generally states facts and figures, while the qualitative delves into the substances and content of the program, and is more appropriate for use when the evaluator desires to make positive changes within a program.

There are many types of evaluations. It is important that the evaluator chooses one which is flexible, and productive for the individual gifted project. It is important to consider that: "Evaluation is the tool by which the information required to state one's case can be effectively and efficiently accumulated" (Alexander, 1982, p. 273).

One type of evaluation process used is formative. The purpose of "...formative evaluation is to identify strengths, and weaknesses in developing instructional programs" (Wiersma, 1982, p. 148). Its purpose is to collect information that would help improve the existing program. The formative method helps to revise and refine programs. It is important that gifted and talented programs use exhaustive formative evaluations. By using this method, judgments may be made

involving teacher characteristics and content emphasis. It also allows the evaluator to make changes in either the explicit goals or the content. Many researchers believe that there can be a consistent analysis with this method, if the data is collected systematically. The purpose of this type of evaluation is to help improve, maintain, or modify programs.

Another type of evaluation, whose purpose is not to solely help improve programs, is summative. Summative is usually used in order to "...collect information that would be provided to a decision maker" (Gallagher, 1985, p. 370). Many times this type of evaluation could cause fear or apprehension among individuals involved with the program. If the results of the summative evaluation are positive, the program or parts of the program remain intact, but if the evaluation is negative, the program or parts of the program are eliminated or modified.

Another consideration in evaluation is to decide if the evaluation will be formal or informal. The formal evaluation is more objective and the informal is more subjective. The informal type of evaluation is fine as long as the results are judged with that type of basis in mind. Program decision and improvements should not be made based exclusively upon this type of evaluation. Most researchers generally agree that "...without formal evaluation there is little opportunity for program developers to identify those aspects of their respective projects that have been most beneficial to the educational growth of the gifted" (Alexander, 1982, p. 276).

Another evaluation methodology is called naturalistic inquiry. The naturalistic inquiry evaluator is seeking a broader approach to

evaluation, and does not have a great number of pre-determined outcomes. No particular aspect of the curriculum is isolated or taken out of the instructional context in which it occurs. The goal of the evaluator "...would be to describe as accurately and objectively as possible what is occurring in the gifted program, and how it reflects positively or negatively to what program developers had anticipated" (Alexander, 1982, p. 277). This type of evaluation is usually broader, less judgmental, and lends itself to why things happened, and what can be done to maintain or improve programs. This method does require a great amount of observation time and objectivity.

The next evaluation methodology to be considered is the experimental approach. This approach is most widely implemented and generally focuses upon a particular aspect of instruction that would be valuable to investigate. The experimental design may have two sets of criteria. The first type would be to use random experimental and control groups. The difficult part of this procedure for evaluators is being able to control extraneous influences that can render findings invalid. When using a control group, there is a need for adequate measuring instruments and sampling procedures. The second type of experimental design is to use comparison. Usually in this procedure a baseline comparison is made of two or more programs. The comparison aspect may or may not be of help to the program formatters.

Two other types of evaluation are concerned with program objectives. The objectives of the program are usually identified at the conception of the program. In order to evaluate, a formal measurement is done to see if the program objectives have been met effectively. Usually the program's basic objectives are considered.

The usual question posed is: "Are the objectives set forth in the gifted program evidenced in the behavior of those learners who participate" (Alexander, 1982, p. 282)? This is the general question that leads to others in the evaluation. This type of evaluation is more objective than the second type.

The second type of evaluation, centered around objectives, is impressionistic. This should include students, parents, teachers, and administrative reactions to the program. Impressions are recorded and evaluation results are gleaned from these records. This approach is more subjective and must be noted as such if program changes are to be made as a result of this method of evaluation.

One other type of methodology that receives negative comments, in the review of the literature, is the use of achievement tests as a method of evaluation. Many variables support these opinions and findings. Achievement tests, generally are not written with the gifted child in mind, so the results are many times considered invalid. The tests are generally given to one class or more at a time by people who are not professional test administrators. Many times the exact times and directions of these tests are not followed precisely. Other reasons to question the validity of achievement test are expressed in an article authored by Carolyn Callahan (1983). She stated that:

> The goals and objectives of the test are based on basic curriculum; (the assumption is that) gifted and talented students are studying or learning the same thing; (the tests) emphasize particular content skills not often taught as part of gifted and talented programs; (And there is) a standardized regression

toward the mean. (p. 4)

Also, as always, the human element enters the picture. The child may not feel well, may be disrupted during testing, may not want to do well, may be tired, or may not like the test administrator. Also, there are some gifted children who do not perform up to their potential on tests. These are many good reasons not to consider achievement tests as evaluation instruments or indicators.

Evaluator Considerations

In addition to methodology, another consideration is to decide if the program evaluation will be conducted by an inside evaluator or an outside evaluator. The advantages of an outsider would be objectivity. The outside evaluator would also have time and could use a more extensive methodology, in order to gain information, than an inside evaluator. In all likelihood, the outside evaluator would be a professional with a great deal of knowledge about the concepts and procedures of effective evaluation. The disadvantages of an outsider could be a lack of knowledge about gifted education. They may unintentionally dampen the creative spirit of the program leaders, or may not fully understand the gifted program and how it is weaved in and around the regular programs in the district. The biggest disadvantage, which is a concern to almost every district, is the expense of paying an evaluation consultant.

Generally, the inside evaluator does not receive any additional funds in order to complete the process. The inside evaluator might be more subjective, but should try to be as objective as possible. The inside evaluator would have a full knowledge of the aspects of the

gifted program and its relation to the regular program in the district. This type of evaluator might also have clear-cut goals and objectives that the district wishes to obtain from the evaluation. The people involved in the evaluation might respond better to an inside evaluator than an outside evaluator.

The greatest disadvantage of an inside evaluator, unless, of course they are doing a study such as this researcher has done, would be a lack of knowledge of evaluation methodologies and instrumentation. A second disadvantage, unless time is given, would be the time factor.

A third evaluator consideration, which might be the most effective, would be to collaborate the efforts of an inside evaluator and an outside evaluator. The only disadvantage that clearly and ideally remains is that there would be additional expense involved in the evaluation procedure, thus making this union of evaluators impractical or unfeasible for the school district.

Evaluation Instrumentation

Once the evaluator is chosen and the methodology suitable for the program has been decided, the next step is to select the appropriate evaluation instrument. It is agreed by researchers that "...perhaps the most important issue in program evaluation is the issue of measurement and/or instrumentation used to assess program effectiveness. In fact the instrumentation which has been used for the gifted has often been invalid, unreliable or simply related" (Aylesworth, 1984, p. 38).

Discovery of the instrument which will assess the goals of the

evaluation of a gifted program is very difficult because the desired outcome of the evaluation often has not been well defined by the gifted program evaluator. It has been recognized that: "The basic problem lies in the invalid nature of the instrument" (Callahan, 1983, p. 4).

When selecting or creating an instrument to use in program evaluation, two considerations are: the appropriateness of the instrument and how the data will be interpreted and presented at the outcome of the evaluation instrumentation. It needs to be remembered that the instrument chosen is merely a structured method for gathering information. Also, when considering or devising an instrument, the group to whom the instrument is being administrated is a prime consideration. The instrument chosen also depends on which method is used to collect the information. Information may be collected through questionnaires, interviews, observations, or existing records. The choice may depend upon the nature or specific items being evaluated, time available to collect the information, financial considerations, and staff availability.

Questionnaire Design Consideration

The questionnaire approach seemed appropriate for this study. Before beginning the design, it is important to look at evaluation research concerning questionnaires, their advantages and disadvantages.

Several points of concern when constructing a questionnaire design were pointed out by Yavorsky in 1984. His helpful hints included:

> To construct and give priority to questions of concern to internal and external audiences...to attend to questions relating to areas of the program that are of central functioning importance...identification of questions that are suggestive of problems...(and) identify those questions where information is needed soon. (Callahan, 1986, p. 39)

It is also suggested in the research of the literature, that questions generated be specific to the individual project, its goals, objectives, and activities. Questionnaires should also present each individual in the sample with some type of information, and require some manner of written response. Questionnaires should be short, logical, each question limited to one idea, and questions stated clearly for the respondent. It is important that "...more serious attention must be directed toward framing evaluation questions that address the relevant, useful and important issues facing programs" (Callahan, 1986, 58).

Not only is it important to be concerned with question structure, it is also important to look at the advantages and disadvantages of the use of the questionnaire as an evaluation procedure. The advantages discussed here are general and some depend upon the design of the evaluation. One advantage of a questionnaire is that it allows for simultaneous administration. Questionnaires may be mailed and respondents can take as much time as necessary to think about the responses. Another advantage is that the respondents may remain anonymous, which may bring about more valid results. The questionnaire format ensures a greater level of uniformity than do other methods of collecting information. The last advantage is that

data is more easily summarized and interpreted with the use of the questionnaire.

With any type of questionnaire design there are also disadvantages. One of which is no flexibility. The question is being asked, and there is not room for change. Another disadvantage is that many people have difficulty in reading or expressing ideas in writing. There is also a lack of rapport with the individual responding, and because of the impersonalness of the questionnaire, there may be a lower return. One other disadvantage is that those who do not respond may be considered a bias group.

Evaluation Design for Altamont Community Unit #10 Gifted Program

Once the literature on evaluation, methods, instruments, and ways of evaluation has been considered, it is important to look at the individual program to be evaluated. The program to be evaluated is the Altamont Community Unit #10 Independent Study Program (Gifted Program). Before a specific design could be decided upon or created, it was important to review the background of the program, and the current format of the program.

Background of the Program . The current gifted program of Altamont Community Unit #10 was designed and implemented during the 1980-1981 school year. Due to time and staff limitations the program design was that of an Independent Study Program (ISP).

The program began its first year at the junior high level. Grades 8, 7, and 6 respectively were allowed to choose areas of interest, within a limited range, that they would like to pursue. This was primarily done during independent time in a reading class at

the junior high level. Materials were supplied to the students, and they advanced at their rate and motivation with little teacher contact time.

During the next school year, 1981-1982, the first state funded year, grade level five was introduced to the program. This was a mixture of an independent study program and a pull-out program. Students in grade five were pulled out of their classroom for approximately forty-five minutes a week. The students had a choice of subject areas to choose from depending upon grade and age level. The students were also provided with materials in which to pursue their interest, plus they had an additional bonus of meeting with the teacher once a week to have questions answered and encouragement rendered as needed.

It was during this same year the Independent Study Program at the high school level was developed in the science and English areaa. Students met with the instructor anywhere from three to five times a week. A variety of materials were provided to the student. The students chose an area of science they would like to study and set up a contract with the teacher. The contract was approved by the program coordinator. The student set up a list of goals, in contract form, to accomplish each week for nine weeks. The student would then be given a pass/fail or letter grade for credit, or the student could simply take the class for enrichment. Before the class was begun the coordinator sought and gained the Board of Education's approval for the class, plus established a credit program for the students.

After this eventful year, the Gifted Program continued to grow and build. In the 1982-83 school year, the Independent Study Program

(ISP) Science program was firmly in place. The ISP English was dropped due to lack of enrollment and extra large classes in the standard English classes. The junior high program was provided with more materials. The program continued as an Independent Study/Pull-Out Program for grade five. Grades three and four were also added to the time period the teacher met with grade five. They too were given limited subject choice areas. Also at the end of this school year the gifted program was begun at grade two. The program at this level was strictly for that grade level of student and was a pull-out program. Various topics of reading, math and writing were covered. Very few materials were sent home with the students of this level, except for challenging and enrichment activities on a sporadic basis.

The gifted program continued to grow and thrive during the 1983-84 school year. A proposal was sent to the Board of Education for modification, and expansion of the program. The support of the administration and the board for the program continued. The Board of Education granted a request that the grade school program, in order to improve service to the students, needed involvement of additional personnel. A junior high teacher volunteered and became the gifted teacher for grade levels 6 - 8. She met with the students, provided materials for the students, and acted as a resource person. The high school ISP Science continued on in the same manner as did the program in grades 2,3,4, and 5. The high school ISP English was not scheduled due to insufficient numbers. The other growth in the program during that year was to have an experimental Algebra I class for one student. The student received grades and was set up to take Geometry her

freshman year. Also planned during the spring of the year was an ISP Math program at the high school.

Growth, revision, and improvement continued during the 1984-85 school year. The ISP Science at the high school was dropped due to an administrative decision, but ISP Math was added. At the junior high level, a time period was set aside for the ISP students. The students began writing contracts on what they wished to accomplish during a nine weeks period or a semester. They met with the teacher at least two times a week. The plan in grades 2-5 was the same. Something new this year at all grade levels in the grade school was an evaluation of all ISP students every nine weeks. The Algebra I for eighth graders continued, only this school year it was with a regular math teacher and in place of their eighth grade math. It was still experimental with five students carefully tested and chosen for the program. Spring also brought a pull-out program for the first grade. This was designed the same as the second grade program, meeting with just first graders, one time a week for thirty minutes and working in various subject areas, such as reading, math and geography.

The year of 1985-1986 served as a pulling together year. ISP Math, Algebra I for eighth grade, junior high, middle grades, and primary grades remained under the same format. Accomplishments for the year included high school credit for the Algebra I students. Finally kindergarten students were served in the gifted program. They were also under a pull-out program system, meeting once a week. Altamont could proudly say that its program served all gifted students in grades K-12.

In the summer of 1986, a four week gifted summer school was held.

Three classes held were K-3, 4-6, 6-8. The main theme of the summer school program was problem solving in all subject areas. This was continued in a similar fashion during the summer of 1987.

Testing of students for the program is done each year and was more specifically done before each grade level was added. Students are recommended by the teachers for a November testing each year, plus the previous spring's Iowa Basic Skills Test results are screened for potentials. Students who move into the district after November are given an opportunity to be tested in May of that school year. Teachers, parents, and/or students may request testing and all such requests are honored.

After testing, the student must meet the following qualifications in order to be part of the program: 120 intelligence quotient or above, 2 years or more above level on a reading test (1.5 for grade K - 1), 2 years or more above level on the reading and/or math achievement test given by the school on a yearly basis, and teacher recommendation. Students must meet three of the four criteria.

During the 1986-1987 school year the gifted program at Altamont Community Unit #10 served students in K - 12. Something new to the program this year was a Pre-Algebra program for seventh graders. This took the place of their regular seventh grade math class. Qualifications were similar to those for Algebra I, and students were carefully chosen for the class. The program has a total of four teachers involved in the program, including the Gifted Coordinator. The program has grown, stretched, changed and flourished over the last six years. Now it is time to step back and look at the program to see wat can be done to polish and improve the program.

Evaluation Design Considerations

During the previous years a brief, informal questionnaire was completed by the students. The results were contemplated by the individual teacher and the gifted program coordinator. They were then placed in a folder and put in a file drawer. The gifted coordinator completed the state evaluation form, which was also put in a folder, and filed in a drawer, with additional copies sent to respective state offices.

It was decided by the gifted coordinator (this researcher) that a formal evaluation was imperative in order to truly see in what ways to improve the Independent Study Program (ISP) and better meet the needs of our gifted students. It was deemed timely and relevant because formal evaluation had never been done in the history of the program.

The gifted coordinator would be the inside evaluator of the project, with no involvement from an outside evaluator. The cost to the district would be minimal. Time for research and design would be donated by the coordinator. Two or three preparation times would be the greatest salary expense to the district. The other expense would be the cost of using a copy machine, in order to have enough questionnaires for each respondent. This, too, was considered a very minor expense. The district was very cooperative in supporting the evaluation of the gifted program.

The coordinator decided after much study and research that the evaluation would need to be formal (as stated), formative, and a naturalistic inquiry, using a qualitative questionnaire for instrumentation. In order to be thorough, valid, and objective, a

questionnaire would be needed for the school board and administrators, teachers, gifted student parents, and for gifted students in K - 12 who were or were not in the program. A review of available instruments showed that very few were available and/or suitable for the needs of the evaluator.

It was the conclusion of the coordinator that the evaluation design of the questionnaire would need to be devised, in order for it to be suitable, and get the most valid results from the evaluation project. Thus, the Chandler Model For Evaluating Independent Study Programs was originated in April of 1987.

In order to create this model or design, it was important, after the background review of the program, to specify the purposes of the evaluation. The following are the stated purposes of the evaluation of the Altamont Community Unit #10 Independent Study Program (ISP).

Purpose of Questionnaire

The researcher felt many areas of concern could be evaluated in this questionnaire. Six purposes were determined to be essential. They are:

A) To determine if all qualified students are satisfied with the ISP program as it is at this time.

B) To determine if the contract system is effective and helps students attain goals in grade 6 - 12.

C) To determine if the ISP and pull-out part of the program need more teacher contact time.

D) To determine if the ISP program is effectively meeting the needs of the students.

E) To give parents, students, teachers, administrators, and school board members a chance to comment on the program, look at the program from different perspectives, and to see if the opinions, and comments are feasible.

F) To determine if other areas of study or types of programs need to be added to the existing program.

Possible Decisions From the Evaluation Design

A review and listing of the purpose of the evaluation study suggested many possible decisions that could be derived from an evaluation questionnaire.

Possible decisions that could be made are:

1) There is satisfaction with the program.

2) A revision is needed in the contract system.

3) More teacher contact time is needed with the students.

4) Within time limitations, ISP is effective.

5) Overall most students in the program are happy with it.

6) Administrators, teachers, parents, and the school board are happy with the structure of the program.

7) Several areas of study need to be added to the program and would be desirable, if feasible, due to time, staff, and resource limitations.

Question Bank

The next step in the evaluation design was to create and pose questions that would meet the purpose and intentions of the evaluation. Areas the evaluator wished to cover were attitude about

the program, objectives being met, enough areas of study, and other questions that might pertain to each separate group completing the evaluation. It is important to have a bank or pool of questions to draw from when finalizing the evaluation design.

Examples of questions devised from the stated purpose are as follows:

Purpose A) Are students satisfied with the program?
Do they like areas of study available?
Do they like the teachers?
Are questions answered satisfactorily by the teachers?
Is a satisfactory amount of materials made available?

Purpose B) Grades 6 - 12
Do students like the contract system?
Does it help students to set up schedules and attain goals?
Does the ISP contract system help the student zero in on the area of study?

Purpose C) Are students satisfied with the ISP time allotments?
Are students satisfied with the time allowed to meet with the teacher?
Are the students in K - 2 happy with the pull-out program?

Purpose D) Do students like areas of study available to them?
Do students feel like they gain from their studies in ISP?

Purpose E) What are the parents', administrators', school board,

teachers', and students' opinion of the program?

Do they feel that children are benefiting from the program?

Is ISP worthwhile as it is currently set-up?

Purpose F) What areas of study would people like to see added to the ISP program that do not already exist?

In addition to questions, a comment section was to be added to each of the questionnaires. This would enable the respondents to express their opinion, and not be stifled by limited questions. This would add flexibility to the evaluation design, and would hopefully lend itself to a more informative evaluation.

Questionnaire Design

Much time was spent in the creation of the four evaluation designs. Many questions were discarded as not being to the point, or they would not help gain useful information. One purpose was discarded as not practical for a K - 12 survey. Advantages of questionnaires were remembered, and an attempt was made to turn disadvantages of questionnaires into advantages by the creator of the evaluations. Much of the research reviewed aided the designer with the formulation of the evaluation designs. The final product of the four designs may be read and referred to in Appendix D.

An element of these designs, which are important to the results of the evaluation are core questions. Core questions are those questions which are asked to each group participating in the evaluation. These evaluation designs have seven core questions. They are questions numbered 1, 2, 4, 8, 11, 13, and 14.

There are also questions that pertained to three groups of respondents, but not to the fourth respondent group. In two cases this happened in the parent, student, and teacher questionnaires. They are questions 3, 7, and 12. This also happened in one case on the school board and administrator, parent and teacher questionnnaire, question number 10.

In some cases there were questions that applied to two groups of respondents. In the parent and student questionnaires, questions 5 and 9 were identical. In the school board and adminstrator, and teacher questionnaires questions 5 and 9 were also identical. On the school board and adminstrator, and parent questionnaires question number 17 was identical.

Independent questions, which were on specific evaluations, on the school board and administrator questionnaire were numbers 3, 6, 7, 12, 15, 16, and 18. On the parent questionnaire independent questions were 6, 15, 16. Independent student questionnaire questions were 6 and 10. The teacher questionnaire had one independent question, number 6.

Once the questions were established and finalized, a comment section was added to the evaluations. The comment sections varied on each evaluation. The school board and administrator evaluation comment section asked for opinions on strengths and weaknesses of the ISP program. The teacher evaluation comment section asked for opinions on how the ISP program could be improved, and for their general impressions of the ISP program. The student and parent evaluation had opinion questions. The students were asked what they liked most about ISP, what they did not like about ISP,

recommendations they thought would help make the program better, plus any other comments they wished to express. The parents were also asked to give opinions on strengths and weaknesses, plus suggestions that would help improve the program.

A special section was added to the student and parent questionnaire for high school students who did not participate in the program, and for parents of these students. These questions pertained to why the student did not participate in the program, opinions on how the program could be improved so that the student would participate, any other comments they wished to make, or other subject areas the students would like to see offered at the high shool level.

It was felt that the inclusion of these questions were important and relevant to the evaluation. This was due to the distressing fact that in the 1985-1986 school year, there was a 42.5% participation rate by the ISP students. In the 1986-1987 school year this fell drastically to a 16.2% partcipation rate.

Once the questions and the comment sections were finalized, it was important to make decisions about the questionnaire format. It was decided by the evaluator that on all four designs the introductory statements would basically relay the same message. It was felt by the designer that first the purpose would be stated in the first short paragraph. In a second concise paragraph, respondents were urged to answer questions honestly, were assured of anonymity, and were informed on the response process. They were also informed about the meaning of the responses available to them. The students and parents were asked to mark the general grade level and program status of the child. Teachers were also asked to mark general grade level. Parents

were also given the additional set of directions that if they had more than one child participating in the program, they did not have to complete the evaluation more than one time.

On the questionnaire, the teachers, parents, and school board and administrators were asked to respond in terms of strongly agree (SA), generally agree (A), undecided or neutral (U), disagree (D), or strongly disagree (SD) with the questions. Due to the wide range of students' ages, this process was simplified on the students' evaluation. If the student agreed with the question, Yes was to be circled, if they disagreed, No was to be circled, and if they were undecided or neutral Not Sure was marked. In every case, every respondent was thanked for taking the time to complete the questionnaire. The designer felt that this was a good psychological approach and lent itself to a more personal approach.

Evaluation Process

The design was now complete and the evaluation model referred to as the Chandler Model For Evaluating Independent Study Programs was ready for the first step of the evaluation process, which was the planning stage. It was important that the information be collected in a reasonable amount of time, efficiently, validly, and as painlessly as possible.

The evaluation procedure was to be completed for parents, students, and teachers during the week of May 18, 1987. The evaluator would be administering and gathering the evaluations from all students, except those in grades six through eight. The gifted teacher for the junior high level administered the evaluation in the

same way as the evaluation designer. A set of directions was devised and all administrators of the evaluation were to adhere to them (See Appendix E).

Students from grades 1 - 5 were collectively called out of their classrooms to a quiet classroom setting. An aide, borrowed from the kindergarten, was also present to help any students who had questions. The directions were read to the students, the purpose stated, and the questions were read to the students. The evaluator stood away from the students, in such a manner, so that the students would not feel uncomfortable or inhibited. The aide later gave the evaluation to the kindergarten ISP student and to two others who were absent that day.

Once the student questionnaires were collected, the parent questionnaires were handed out, explained and sent home via the students. They were requested to be returned to school as soon as possible or by the latest, Friday, May 22, 1987.

The classroom teachers were very cooperative in the collection of these questionnaires. The teachers were given a list of students in their rooms who were to return the questionnaires, so that names could be checked off. The questionnaires were never marked, thus keeping them anonymous. Teachers were excellent about reminding students about the importance of returning their parents' opinions.

The ISP teacher for grades six through eight conducted the evaluation at those grade levels in much the same manner. The exception was that parent evaluations were returned to her room, and placed in a box.

Formally evaluating the high school students, who were qualified, was also conducted in much the same fashion. High school ISP

qualified students were all called to the cafeteria during the evaluation week. The high school principal was very cooperative when this request was presented. Students were spread out around the cafeteria, in order to assure privacy of comments, read the directions and asked to respond to the evaluation. They were also given the parent evaluation forms, and asked to return them as promptly as possible to the office upon completion. This was the most efficient way possible for this age level.

During the same time period the teachers received the ISP evaluation forms in their mailboxes, and were asked to return them to the office by May 22, 1987. The thought behind returning them to the office was to secure prompt replies and a better rate of return.

The school board and administrator evaluation forms were more difficult to administer. The end of the year is an extremely hectic time for these people. The evaluator decided to wait until June to ask for a response on these forms. The administrators forms were personally delivered, with a self-addressed stamped envelope, in order to encourage completion. The school board members were sent their evaluation via the mail, with a note from the evaluator explaining the evaluation, requesting completion and return, and included was a self-addressed stamped envelope.

The student, teacher, and parent evaluations were considered completed by May 26, 1987. The administrator and school board member response was also considered completed by the first part of July. The evaluator (this researcher) was very anxious to analyze the results

of the evaluation, examine the percentages of returns, and the percentages of how the respondents answered each evaluation question.

Chapter IV

Results

Introduction

The study identified factors related to gifted education that were common to the school board/administrators, students, parents, and teachers. The results for each of the seven questions common to the group evaluations are presented in Table 2 through Table 8. In Table 9 through Table 12 are evaluation questions that were common to three of the four groups. The results of questions common to two of the four groups are presented on Table 13 through 17. Questions that were asked to the individual group being surveyed are shown in Table 18 through Table 21. Conclusions and recommendations follow each table.

Each table presents the data on specific questions for each evaluation group. The data includes the number responding from each group and their response percentages in each category of yes, no, not sure and invalid responses.

The Rate of Returned Group Evaluation Questionnaires

The rate of return of the questionnaires has been broken down into many categories, and then processed by group evaluation return and the total evaluation return. The results pertaining to the rate of return for each group are presented in Table 1.

Table 1

Evaluation Rate of Return

Group	Total Possible	Total Returned	Per Cent Responding
Administrators	3	3	100 %
School Board	7	4	57.1%
Total Administrator/School Board	10	7	70.0%
K - 5 Students	28	27	96.4%
6 - 8 Students	27	26	96.2%
Total Grade School Students	55	53	96.3%
9 - 12 Students (Participating)	6	6	100 %
9 - 12 Students (Nonparticipating)	31	29	93.5%
Total High School Students	37	35	94.5%
Total Student Evaluation	92	88*	95.7%
Grade School Teachers	32	32	100 %
High School Teachers	18	11	61.1%
Total Teacher Evaluation	50	43**	86.0%
K - 5 Parents	28	23	82.1%
6 - 8 Parents	27	24	88.8%
9 - 12 Parents	37	12	32.4%
9 - 12 Participating	6	2	33.3%
9 - 12 Non-Participating	31	10	32.2%
Total Parent Evaluation	79***	59****	74.7%
Total Evaluation Response	231	197	85.2%

* The number 59 will be used in the tabulation of percentages for the student question response, because this is the number of participating students.

** The number 38 will be used in the tabulation of percentages for the teacher question responses, because this is the number who felt they could validly complete the questionnaire.

*** The parents were requested to answer only once, even if they had more than one child in the survey. This made the number of returns 13 less than the total number of students parents.

****The number 49 will be used in the tabulation of percentages for the parent question responses, because this is the number of parent who had students' participating in the program.

Question 1: Results, Conclusions, and Recommendations

The following sections will present the results, conclusions, and recommendations for Question 1.

Results and Conclusions . Table 2 presents the data for Question 1. Question 1 was: I feel that ISP is a good program.

There appeared to be a general consensus that the Independent Study Program (ISP) is a good program. Parents and school board/administrators expressed 100% agreement, students 96.9% agreement, and teachers 89.5% agreement. It is possible that the teachers, who were not sure, 10.5%, were not fully aware of the rationale of the program's construction. Students may not have been sure due to many human elements.

Recommendations . Although all four groups responded in a positive manner, the lower positive response by the teachers need to be examined by the coordinator. The recommendation is to attempt to further open communication lines with the teachers and inform them about the ISP program, its construction, and objectives.

Question 2: Results, Conclusions, and Recommendations

The following sections present the results, conclusions, and recommendations for Question 2.

Results and Conclusions . Table 3 presents data for question 2. Question 2 was: I like the way ISP is organized as an independent study program.

Table 2

Question 1: I feel that ISP is a good program.

Evaluation	** Yes	*** No	**** Not Sure	***** Invalid Response
Students	96.9%	0 %	8.5%	0 %
	54 (N)*	0 (N)	5 (N)	0 (N)
Parents	100 %	0 %	0 %	0 %
	49 (N)	0 (N)	0 (N)	0 (N)
Teachers	89.5%	0 %	10.5%	0 %
	34 (N)	0 (N)	4 (N)	0 (N)
School Board/ Administrators	100 %	0 %	0 %	0 %
	7 (N)	0 (N)	0 (N)	0 (N)

* (N) This represents the number of respondents.

** For the School Board and administration, parents, and teachers, the strongly agree and agree response were combined and listed here.

*** For the School Board and administration, parents, and teachers, the disagree or strongly disagree response were combined and listed here.

**** For the School Board and administration, parents, and teachers, the undecided or neutral was listed here.

***** An invalid response and/or an unanswered question was listed here.

93.9% of the parents, and 85.7% of the school board/ administrators responded that they liked the way the ISP program was organized as an independent study program. There was a lower positive percentage from the students, 67.8%, and the teachers, 63.2%. The negative response had very low percentages, but the not sure response showed higher percentages for students and teachers. Students may not be sure due to the variety of format in K - 12 for the ISP program. Some students may have difficulty in disciplining themselves to do the work on this type of basis, and therefore are not as comfortable with this type of program.

Teachers who were not sure may not be as well-informed about the programs intent or, dependent upon the grade level, may not be sure of the students adjustment to the program.

Recommendations . There appears to be a need to discuss with the students the problems or discomforts they have with the program format. The teachers of the program need to devise ways to help students adjust to the ISP format, perhaps by guidance in disciplining themselves and goal setting. Also, teachers need to be informed of the ISP process. Other types of programs may also need to be explored by the coordinator.

Question 4: Results, Conclusions, and Recommendations

The following sections will present the results, conclusions and recommendations for Question 4.

Results and Conclusions . Table 4 presents the data for question 4. Question 4 was: The number of areas offered for study is the ISP program seem adequate.

Table 3

Question 2: I like the way ISP is organized as an independent study program.

Evaluation	** Yes	*** No	**** Not Sure	***** Invalid Response
Students	67.8%	6.8%	25.4%	0 %
	40 (N)*	4 (N)	15 (N)	0 (N)
Parents	93.9%	0 %	6.1%	0 %
	46 (N)	0 (N)	3 (N)	0 (N)
Teachers	63.2%	5.3%	31.6%	0 %
	24 (N)	2 (N)	12 (N)	0 (N)
School Board/ Administrators	85.7 %	0 %	14.3%	0 %
	6 (N)	0 (N)	1 (N)	0 (N)

* (N) This represents the number of respondents.

** For the School Board and administration, parents, and teachers, the strongly agree and agree response were combined and listed here.

*** For the School Board and administration, parents, and teachers, the disagree or strongly disagree response were combined and listed here.

**** For the School Board and administration, parents, and teachers, the undecided or neutral was listed here.

***** An invalid response and/or an unanswered question was listed here.

School board/administrators unanimously felt that the number of areas of study seemed adequate in ISP. The positive response percentage went down from there. Parents, 77.6%, felt there were enough areas, 20.4% were not sure. Teacher response was a borderline 50.0% positive, 10.5% were negative, and 36.8% were not sure. The students also gave mixed reviews. The response leaned toward no, 30.5%, and not sure 28.9% . The school board/administrators may not be fully informed about the number of areas of study, and they were responding to the program as a whole. Parents were aware of subject areas in K - 5, but may not be aware of the students wishes in this area. Teachers were split on the issue. Students seem to feel a definite need for more subject areas.

Recommendations . Although there was a mixed reaction to the statement, the coordinator needs to see if new subject areas can be developed in K - 12 for the students. It may be necessary to start slowly, and work into new subject areas as time, money, and materials are made available. It is important in this area to look seriously at the student response.

Question 8: Results, Conclusions, and Recommendations

The following sections will present the results, conclusions, and recommendations for Question 8.

Results and Conclusions . Table 5 presents the data for Question 8. Question 8 was: ISP is more challenging than the regular classroom.

The percentages in this response, that ISP is more challenging than the regular classroom, were positive. The most positive response

Table 4

Question 4: The numbers of areas offered for study in the ISP program seem adequate.

Evaluation	** Yes	*** No	**** Not Sure	***** Invalid Response
Students	40.7% 24 (N)*	30.5% 18 (N)	28.9% 17 (N)	0 % 0 (N)
Parents	77.6% 38 (N)	2.0% 1 (N)	20.4% 10 (N)	0 % 0 (N)
Teachers	50.0% 19 (N)	10.5% 4 (N)	36.8% 14 (N)	2.6% 1 (N)
School Board/ Administrators	100 % 7 (N)	0 % 0 (N)	0 % 0 (N)	0 % 0 (N)

* (N) This represents the number of respondents.

** For the School Board and administration, parents, and teachers, the strongly agree and agree response were combined and listed here.

*** For the School Board and administration, parents, and teachers, the disagree or strongly disagree response were combined and listed here.

**** For the School Board and administration, parents, and teachers, the undecided or neutral was listed here.

***** An invalid response and/or an unanswered question was listed here.

came from parents, 89.8%, and the schoolboard/administrator response, 71.4%. Students, 67.8%, and teachers, 60.5%, were less positive. There was also a large percentage in the not sure column. It is important that the coordinator and gifted teachers take a look at the materials, contracts, and goals of the students. A higher percentage need to feel that ISP is more challenging. Teachers may have reacted in this manner due to lack of program knowledge or to a student response.

Recommendations . The gifted coordinator and gifted teachers need to find ways to continually challenge the students. A look at the subject areas and materials available may help to improve the weakness in this area. Improvement will also depend on communication with individual students about the subject areas they would like to see implemented in the ISP program.

Question 11: Results, Conclusions, and Recommendations

The following sections will present the results, conclusions, and recommendations for Question 11.

Results and Conclusions . Table 6 presents the data for Questions 11. Question 11 was: Students in the gifted program do not have social problems because they are part of the program.

Students, overall, do not feel that they have social problems, 91.5%, due to their involvement in the ISP program. Parents, 65.3% positive, and teachers, 55.3% positive, were less favorable. School board/administrators were split basically between no, 42.8%, and not sure 42.8%. The school board/administrators response may have been in part related to a lack of contact with students in the program or

Table 5

Question 8: ISP is more challenging than the regular classroom.

Evaluation	** Yes	*** No	**** Not Sure	***** Invalid Response
Students	67.8% 40 (N)*	18.6% 11 (N)	13.6% 8 (N)	0 % 0 (N)
Parents	89.8% 44 (N)	2.0% 1 (N)	8.2% 4 (N)	0 % 0 (N)
Teachers	60.5% 23 (N)	2.6% 1 (N)	34.2% 13 (N)	2.6% 1 (N)
School Board/ Administrators	71.4% 5 (N)	0 % 0 (N)	28.6% 2 (N)	0 % 0 (N)

* (N) This represents the number of respondents.

** For the School Board and administration, parents, and teachers, the strongly agree and agree response were combined and listed here.

*** For the School Board and administration, parents, and teachers, the disagree or strongly disagree response were combined and listed here.

**** For the School Board and administration, parents, and teachers, the undecided or neutral was listed here.

***** An invalid response and/or an unanswered question was listed here.

they felt that giftedness could create a possibility of some social problems. Parents and teachers view this question from a different perspective than the students and were more aware of social cycles in the classroom and outside the classroom. Students may not be aware of problems or were not willing to admit a difficulty in this area. They also may not perceive any problems in this area and indeed may not have any. The social problems may be from the students who did not qualify for the program instead of the ones that did qualify.

Recommendations . Parents and teachers are extremely important in this area. How these people handle childrens' social reactions is extremely important. Parents and teachers need to make the gifted coordinator and the gifted teachers aware of such problems, and they need to work together to help the situation. Students also need to know that if there are social problems, there are people available to talk to about the problems. This responsibility lies in all three adult responding groups.

Questions 13: Results, Conclusions, and Recommendations

The following sections will present the results, conclusions, and recommendations for Question 13.

Results and Conclusions . Table 7 presents the data for Question 13. Question 13 was: I feel that enough time is allotted in the ISP program for the students.

This question had a mixed response with a strong percentage of no and not sure. School board/administrators were positive, a 71.4% response. They may have been considering an economic status in

Table 6

Question 11: Students in the gifted program do not have social problems, because they are part of the program.

Evaluation	** Yes	*** No	**** Not Sure	***** Invalid Response
Students	91.5% 54 (N)*	3.4% 2 (N)	5.1% 3 (N)	0 % 0 (N)
Parents	65.3% 32 (N)	6.1% 3 (N)	22.4% 11 (N)	6.1% 3 (N)
Teachers	55.3% 21 (N)	10.5% 4 (N)	26.3% 10 (N)	10.1% 3 (N)
School Board/ Administrators	14.3% 1 (N)	42.8% 3 (N)	42.8% 3 (N)	0 % 0 (N)

* (N) This represents the number of respondents.

** For the School Board and administration, parents, and teachers, the strongly agree and agree response were combined and listed here.

*** For the School Board and administration, parents, and teachers, the disagree or strongly disagree response were combined and listed here.

**** For the School Board and administration, parents, and teachers, the undecided or neutral was listed here.

***** An invalid response and/or an unanswered question was listed here.

reaction to this question. More time would mean more salary expense devoted to this program. Parents, 59.2%, were a less positive response. Students, 39.0%, and teachers, 36.8%, were not sure if enough time was allotted. A strong expression of no was registered; students 44.1% and teachers 20.4%.

Recommendations . The school board/administration, gifted coordinator, and gifted teachers need to see if it is feasible to allow the students more time in ISP. There seems to be a pressing need to do this time appraisal.

Question 14: Results, Conclusions and Recommendations

The following sections will present the results, conclusions, and recommendations for Question 14.

Results and Conclusions . Table 8 presents the data for Question 14. Question 14 was: Students seem to enjoy the ISP program.

The question had a large positive response from all four groups. All groups responded above 77.0%, with a positive response. There were no negative responses and a small percentage of not sure responses. The not sure could relate to human elements in the program or a student who has been in the program a short time. The teachers, 15.8% not sure, may have felt that they were not knowledgeable in this question area.

Recommendations . The school board/administration, gifted coordinator, and gifted teachers need to continue on in the same manner and continually look for ways to improve the program in a

Table 7

Question 13: I feel that enough time is allotted in the ISP program for the students.

Evaluation	** Yes	*** No	**** Not Sure	***** Invalid Response
Students	39.0% 23 (N)*	44.1% 26 (N)	15.3% 9 (N)	1.7% 1 (N)
Parents	59.2% 29 (N)	20.4% 10 (N)	28.6% 14 (N)	2.0% 1 (N)
Teachers	36.8% 14 (N)	21.1% 8 (N)	36.8% 14 (N)	5.3% 2 (N)
School Board/ Administrators	71.4% 5 (N)	0 % 0 (N)	28.6% 2 (N)	0 % 0 (N)

* (N) This represents the number of respondents.

** For the School Board and administration, parents, and teachers, the strongly agree and agree response were combined and listed here.

*** For the School Board and administration, parents, and teachers, the disagree or strongly disagree response were combined and listed here.

**** For the School Board and administration, parents, and teachers, the undecided or neutral was listed here.

***** An invalid response and/or an unanswered question was listed here.

Table 8

Question 14: Students seem to enjoy the ISP program.

Evaluation	** Yes	*** No	**** Not Sure	***** Invalid Response
Students	84.7% 50 (N)*	0 % 0 (N)	15.3% 9 (N)	0 % 0 (N)
Parents	98.0% 48 (N)	0 % 0 (N)	2.0% 1 (N)	0 % 0 (N)
Teachers	78.9% 30 (N)	0 % 0 (N)	15.8% 6 (N)	5.3% 2 (N)
School Board/ Administrators	85.7% 6 (N)	0 % 0 (N)	14.3% 1 (N)	0 % 0 (N)

* (N) This represents the number of respondents.

** For the School Board and administration, parents, and teachers, the strongly agree and agree response were combined and listed here.

*** For the School Board and administration, parents, and teachers, the disagree or strongly disagree response were combined and listed here.

**** For the School Board and administration, parents, and teachers, the undecided or neutral was listed here.

***** An invalid response and/or an unanswered question was listed here.

positive manner. Another important element will be to keep teachers informed on aspects of the program.

Question 3: Results, Conclusions, and Recommendations

The following sections will present the results, conclusions, and recommendations for Question 3.

Results and Conclusions . Table 9 presents the data for Question 3. Question 3 was: A lot of good and interesting material is available for the students in the ISP program.

This question was on three group evaluations, the students, parents, and teachers. Parents were very positive, 85.7%, students and teachers 55.9%, and 57.9% respectively, were less positive. Students, 27.1%, and teachers, 36.8%, marked not sure as a response. Students, 15.3%, had the highest percentage of totally negative response. Students and teachers felt that a wider variety and better quality of material needs to be available to them. They appear not to be as satisfied, as is desirable, with the material they have that is available to them. Parents seem to feel that the material is fine, but they may not be aware of their children's feelings about this area.

Recommendations . As it is feasible, the gifted coordinator and gifted teachers need to continually search for good and interesting materials. Part of the selection process may need to take place after conferences with students, in order to find out the interest of students in areas where material is not available. Due to funding, this can not be a rapid process, but one that can continually be worked on and improved in the program.

Table 9

Question 3: A lot of good and interesting material is available for the students in the ISP program.

Evaluation	** Yes	*** No	**** Not Sure	***** Invalid Response
Students	55.9% 33 (N)*	15.3% 9 (N)	27.1% 16 (N)	1.7% 1 (N)
Parents	85.7% 42 (N)	2.0% 1 (N)	12.2% 6 (N)	0 % 0 (N)
Teachers	57.9% 22 (N)	2.6% 1 (N)	36.8% 14 (N)	2.6% 1 (N)

* (N) This represents the number of respondents.

** For the School Board and administration, parents, and teachers, the strongly agree and agree response were combined and listed here.

*** For the School Board and administration, parents, and teachers, the disagree or strongly disagree response were combined and listed here.

**** For the School Board and administration, parents, and teachers, the undecided or neutral was listed here.

***** An invalid response and/or an unanswered question was listed here.

Question 7: Results, Conclusions, and Recommendations

The following sections will present the results, conclusions, and recommendations for Question 7.

Results and Conclusions . Table 10 presents the data for Question 7. Question 7 was: ISP has helped the students learn how to use independent study time and has improved his/her study skills.

Three groups were polled on this question. The statistics on the question leaned toward positive, but a large percentage were not sure of the impact of this question. Students, 57.6% positive, and 33.9% not sure, indicates that some feel it has visibly helped them and others are not sure if it has or has not helped them. Parents, 79.6% positive, 14.3% not sure, apparently feel that it has helped their child in this area. Teachers were the most hesitant, 52.6% positive and 39.5% not sure. They may have been thinking about our underachieving ISP students or those with emotional or social problems. The teacher not sure response could also have been due to the fact that the teacher saw no change in study skills because of the program. The students may or may not have had good study skills before entering the program.

Recommendations . The gifted coordinator and gifted teachers need to guide the students as needed, in order to help them gain good study habits. Part of this may be done through the use of shorter term contracts and/or goals, and then gradually expanding them to longer term contracts and/or goals. Much of this will need to be done on an individual basis. Also, helpful, useable study hints are invaluable to the students. This is the responsibility of the teachers in all areas.

Table 10

Question 7: ISP has helped the students learn how to use independent study time and has improved his/her study skills.

Evaluation	** Yes	*** No	**** Not Sure	***** Invalid Response
Students	57.6% 34 (N)*	8.5% 5 (N)	33.9% 20 (N)	0 % 0 (N)
Parents	79.6% 39 (N)	2.0% 1 (N)	14.3% 7 (N)	4.1% 2 (N)
Teachers	52.6% 20 (N)	2.6% 1 (N)	39.5% 15 (N)	2.6% 1 (N)

* (N) This represents the number of respondents.

** For the School Board and administration, parents, and teachers, the strongly agree and agree response were combined and listed here.

*** For the School Board and administration, parents, and teachers, the disagree or strongly disagree response were combined and listed here.

**** For the School Board and administration, parents, and teachers, the undecided or neutral was listed here.

***** An invalid response and/or an unanswered question was listed here.

Question 12: Results, Conclusions, and Recommendations

The following sections will present the results, conclusions, and recommendations for Question 12.

Results and Conclusions . Table 11 presents the data for Question 12. Question 12 was: ISP has helped the students gain confidence in their abilities.

The three groups given this question were students, teachers, and parents. Parents, 81.6% and teachers, 68.4%, were most positive in their response, with 0% negative response in both cases. Teachers, 26.3%, had the largest not sure of the two groups. Parents and teachers can many times see the positive results of an aspect of the student's life better than the student. The high percentage of not sure on the part of the students, 35.6% and teachers may have been due to the fact that the students already had confidence in their abilities before entering the program. The students, 50.9%, felt that it had helped them, and 13.6% gave a negative response. The student's negative response may also be part of the not sure conclusion, or may be a portion of those uncomfortable with the challenge because they are used to grasping everything easily. This may have shaken their confidence.

Recommendations . The gifted coordinator and gifted teachers need to find ways in which to build the student's confidence. One way may be to start with material and study that are a little easier for the student. The next step would be to provide bigger challenges via harder materials and teacher instruction. The confidence built at first will help the student with the more difficult times. Also, the coordinator and teachers need to let the student know (which can be a

Table 11

Question 12: ISP has helped the students gain confidence in their abilities.

Evaluation	** Yes	*** No	**** Not Sure	***** Invalid Response
Students	50.9% 30 (N)*	13.6% 8 (N)	35.6% 21 (N)	0 % 0 (N)
Parents	81.6% 40 (N)	0 % 0 (N)	14.3% 7 (N)	4.1% 2 (N)
Teachers	68.4% 26 (N)	0 % 0 (N)	26.3% 10 (N)	5.3% 2 (N)

* (N) This represents the number of respondents.

** For the School Board and administration, parents, and teachers, the strongly agree and agree response were combined and listed here.

*** For the School Board and administration, parents, and teachers, the disagree or strongly disagree response were combined and listed here.

**** For the School Board and administration, parents, and teachers, the undecided or neutral was listed here.

***** An invalid response and/or an unanswered question was listed here.

difficult task) that it is okay to be wrong and that just because mistakes are made does not mean that the student cannot satisfactorily understand what is being studied. Parents and regular classroom teachers also need to be informed of this procedure and think in these terms.

Question 10: Results, Conclusions, and Recommendations

The following sections will present the results, conclusions, and recommendations for Question 10.

Results and Conclusions . Table 12 presents the data for Question 10. Question 10 was: I feel that I can communicate (written or spoken) with the ISP teacher in order to find out needed information about students in the program.

Parents, teachers, school board/administrators all viewed this question with a favorable response. Parents, 91.9%, school board/administrators, 100%, and less favorable were teachers with a 71.1%. Teachers also had a 15.8% not sure response. Teachers may not feel that they have enough knowledge of the program or human elements may also have entered in the response.

Recommendations . A clear recommendation is that teachers need to be better informed about the ISP program. This is mostly the responsibility of the gifted coordinator, but is also important for the gifted teachers to help with this problem. Although positive response was high with the parents, better communication about the ISP program could be improved in this area as well.

Table 12

Question 10: I feel that I can communicate (written or spoken) with the ISP teacher in order to find out needed information about students in the program.

Evaluation	** Yes	*** No	**** Not Sure	***** Invalid Response
Parents	91.9% 45 (N)	4.1% 2 (N)	4.1% 2 (N)	0 % 0 (N)
Teachers	71.1% 27 (N)	5.3% 2 (N)	15.8% 6 (N)	7.9% 3 (N)
School Board/ Administrators	100 % 7 (N)	0 % 0 (N)	0 % 0 (N)	0 % 0 (N)

* (N) This represents the number of respondents.

** For the School Board and administration, parents, and teachers, the strongly agree and agree response were combined and listed here.

*** For the School Board and administration, parents, and teachers, the disagree or strongly disagree response were combined and listed here.

**** For the School Board and administration, parents, and teachers, the undecided or neutral was listed here.

***** An invalid response and/or an unanswered question was listed here.

Question 5: Results, Conclusions, and Recommendations

The following sections will present the results, conclusions, and recommendations for Question 5.

Results and Conclusions . Table 13 presents the data for Question 5. Question 5 was: ISP has helped the student become interested in learning more things.

Two groups asked this question were the students and the parents. The response was favorable, 78.0% students and 83.7% parents. The students were 10.2% not sure and parents were 12.2% not sure. The students did have an 11.9% negative response. Most parents felt their children were becoming interested in learning new things as did the students. The negative and not sure responses may have been due to a lack of subject areas and materials in an area of student interest.

Recommendations . It is important for the coordinator and teachers to continually try to find new ideas for helping the children become interested in learning new areas of knowledge. Material and subject areas should be carefully scrutinized. Individual conferences with students will help in this area. Other areas not currently being utilized in the ISP program are: community mentors, field trips, and guest lecturers. These may all spark a child's interest in learning new things, and would be different than areas covered in ISP and the regular classroom.

Question 9: Results, Conclusions, and Recommendations

The following sections will present the results, conclusions, and recommendations for Question 9.

Table 13

Question 5: ISP has helped the student become interested in learning new things.

Evaluation	** Yes	*** No	**** Not Sure	***** Invalid Response
Students	78.0% 46 (N)*	11.9% 7 (N)	10.2% 6 (N)	0 % 0 (N)
Parents	83.7% 41 (N)	4.1% 2 (N)	12.2% 6 (N)	0 % 0 (N)

* (N) This represents the number of respondents.

** For the School Board and administration, parents, and teachers, the strongly agree and agree response were combined and listed here.

*** For the School Board and administration, parents, and teachers, the disagree or strongly disagree response were combined and listed here.

**** For the School Board and administration, parents, and teachers, the undecided or neutral was listed here.

***** An invalid response and/or an unanswered question was listed here.

Results and Conclusions . Table 14 presents the data for Question 9. Question 9 was: I like the evaluation system (reports in the report card, credit system 9 - 12) that is used in ISP.

Parents and students responded to this question. Parents were 87.8% positive with 10.2% not sure. Students were 55.9% positive and

Table 14

Question 9: I like the evaluation system (reports in the report card K-8, credit system 9-12) that is used in ISP.

Evaluation	** Yes	*** No	**** Not Sure	***** Invalid Response
Students	55.9% 33 (N)*	6.8% 4 (N)	37.3% 22 (N)	0 % 0 (N)
Parents	87.8% 43 (N)	2.0% 1 (N)	10.2% 5 (N)	0 % 0 (N)

* (N) This represents the number of respondents.

** For the School Board and administration, parents, and teachers, the strongly agree and agree response were combined and listed here.

*** For the School Board and administration, parents, and teachers, the disagree or strongly disagree response were combined and listed here.

**** For the School Board and administration, parents, and teachers, the undecided or neutral was listed here.

***** An invalid response and/or an unanswered question was listed here.

37.3% not sure. The not sure and no student responses came from the grade school K - 8 level. The high school students have a choice in their evaluation system. Grade school students are used to grades and not being judged on the basis of 4 - excellent, 3 - very satisfactory,

2 - satsifactory, and 1 - needs improvement. The students may not feel they know how they are progressing because these reports are on a quarterly basis. Many may feel it is okay, but it may rank with their feelings about report cards. Parents appear to be satisfied with this system.

Recommendations . A review of this evaluation system is warranted by the coordinator and teachers. One recommendation would be to put all four quarters on one sheet, thus enabling parents and students to see if progress or improvement, as needed, has been made. Another recommendation would be that, at the beginning of the year, the evaluation system is gone over with the students and the teacher explains how the student will be judged or evaluated in each category. The use of the number system also needs to be explained.

Question 5: Results, Conclusions, and Recommendations

The following sections will present the results, conclusions, and recommendations for Question 5.

Results and Conclusions . Table 15 presents the data for Question 5. Question 5 was: More students should be in the ISP program than at present.

Teachers and school board/administrators reacted unfavorably when asked if more students should be in the program than at present. Teachers were 15.8% yes, 26.3% no and 55.3% not sure. The school board/administrators were 28.6% yes, 28.6% no and 42.8% not sure. The conclusion is that most are not sure about the question. There could be several reasons for this response. One, the respondents may not

Table 15

Question 5: More students should be in the ISP program than at present.

Evaluation	** Yes	*** No	**** Not Sure	***** Invalid Response
Teachers	15.8% 6 (N)	26.3% 10 (N)	55.3% 21 (N)	2.6% 1 (N)
School Board/ Administrators	28.6% 2 (N)	28.6% 2 (N)	42.8% 3 (N)	0 % 0 (N)

* (N) This represents the number of respondents.

** For the School Board and administration, parents, and teachers, the strongly agree and agree response were combined and listed here.

*** For the School Board and administration, parents, and teachers, the disagree or strongly disagree response were combined and listed here.

**** For the School Board and administration, parents, and teachers, the undecided or neutral was listed here.

***** An invalid response and/or an unanswered question was listed here.

Know if the identification process is working, either positively or negatively. They also may question the fact that they feel that some students should be in the program that are not and some students should not be in the program that are currently in the program. The negative response indicates that the evaluators are satisfied with the

identificaton procedures.

Recommendations . The identification process seems to be working fairly accurately but continually needs to be improved. Tests need to be used that seem to produce the most valid results and the search for new testing procedures should also be continuous. This is important for the best accuracy possible in the identification of gifted students. The gifted coordinator also needs to be sure to pass on any information possible that will help them identify the gifted students in their classrooms.

Question 9: Results, Conclusions, and Recommendations

The following sections will present the results, conclusions, and recommendations for Question 9.

Results and Conclusions . Table 16 presents the data for Question 9. Question 9 was: I feel that this school does a good job with the gifted students.

The teachers with a 78.9% response and the school board/administrator with an 85.7% response feel that Altamont does a good job with the gifted students. The negative response by teachers was 2.6%, the not sure was 13.2% by teachers, and 14.3% by school board/administrators. The not sure response may be due to a lack of knowledge about the program, or a reserved feeling about the set-up.

Recommendations . The people involved with the program need to continue in the same manner, plus continually revise and create a better learning environment for the gifted student. Again, informing the teachers about the program is an important recommendation.

Table 16

Question 9: I feel that this school does a good job with the gifted students.

Evaluation	** Yes	*** No	**** Not Sure	***** Invalid Response
Teachers	78.9% 30 (N)	2.6% 1 (N)	13.2% 5 (N)	5.3% 2 (N)
School Board/ Administrators	85.7% 6 (N)	0 % 0 (N)	14.3% 1 (N)	0 % 0 (N)

* (N) This represents the number of respondents.

** For the School Board and administration, parents, and teachers, the strongly agree and agree response were combined and listed here.

*** For the School Board and administration, parents, and teachers, the disagree or strongly disagree response were combined and listed here.

**** For the School Board and administration, parents, and teachers, the undecided or neutral was listed here.

***** An invalid response and/or an unanswered question was listed here.

Question 17: Results, Conclusions, and Recommendations

The following sections will present the results, conclusions and recommendations for Question 17.

Results and Conclusions . Table 17 presents the data for Question 17. Question 17 was that: I feel that I am well-informed about the ISP program.

The parents and school board/administrators are positive in that they feel they are well-informed about the ISP program. Parents were 75.5% positive and school board/administrators were 71.4% positive. The negative response was a low 8.2% of the parents, the not sure response was 10.2% by the parents, and 28.6% by the school board/administrators. The not sure response may indicate that they know something about the ISP program, but wonder if there is more that they need to know.

Recommendations . The recommendation for this evaluation outcome would be for the gifted coordinator, administrators, and gifted teachers to be aware of the need for better communication about the program. This would be largely the responsibility of the gifted coordinator.

School Board and Administrator Questionnaire Independent Question Results, Conclusions, and Recommendations

The following sections will present the results, conclusions, and recommendations for the independent questions on the School Board and Administrator Questionnaire.

Results and Conclusions . Table 18 presents the data for the School Board and Administrative Independent Questions. The questions involved were 3, 6, 9, 12, 15, 16 and 18. Question 3 was: Most parents feel that the ISP program is good. Question 6 was: Most teachers are doing a good job in the ISP program. Question 7 was: We spend too much time working with our gifted students. Question 12

Table 17

Question 17: I feel that I am well-informed about the ISP program.

Evaluation	** Yes	*** No	**** Not Sure	***** Invalid Response
Parents	75.5% 37 (N)	8.2% 4 (N)	10.2% 5 (N)	6.1% 3 (N)
School Board/ Administrators	71.4% 5 (N)	0 % 0 (N)	28.6% 2 (N)	0 % 0 (N)

* (N) This represents the number of respondents.

** For the School Board and administration, parents, and teachers, the strongly agree and agree response were combined and listed here.

*** For the School Board and administration, parents, and teachers, the disagree or strongly disagree response were combined and listed here.

**** For the School Board and administration, parents, and teachers, the undecided or neutral was listed here.

***** An invalid response and/or an unanswered question was listed here.

was: We have good extra-curricular activities that provide for the gifted students. Question 15 was: We need to expand the program at the high school level. Question 16 was: We need to expand the program at the grade school level. Question 18 was: It would be nice

if more state funding were available for the gifted program.

This table is made up of seven questions that were asked only to the school board/administrators. The school board/administrators felt that in most cases the parents felt that ISP is a good program - 71.4% positive and 28.6% not sure. The basis for this would be parent reaction verbalized through these evaluations.

85.7% felt that yes, most teachers are doing a good job in the ISP program. There was no negative response and 14.3% were not sure if most teachers were doing a good job. The respondents would base this opinion on comments of administrators, parents, other teachers, and in some cases, students.

The majority, 57.1%, felt that we do not spend too much time working with our gifted students. 14.3% felt that we did, and 28.6% were not sure. The no response indicates that the time we spend is adequate, or more needs to be spent with the gifted child. The yes and not sure response may indicate a need for more knowledge about gifted children and the ISP program.

Question 12 elicited a 100% positive response that we do have good extra-curricular activities, if the gifted student wishes to take part in these programs.

Question 15 had a mixed reaction. 42.8% were yes, 28.6% were no, and 28.6% were not sure in their response. The majority felt that we need to expand the high school level program. The no and not sure responses indicate a lack of knowledge about the program or a concern of staff availability and economic conditions in the event of expansion.

Table 18

School Board and Administrator Questionnaire
Independent Question Results.

Question	** Yes	*** No	**** Not Sure	***** Invalid Response
Question 3:				
Most parents feel that the ISP program is good.	71.4% 5 (N)*	0 % 0 (N)	28.6% 2 (N)	0 % 0 (N)
Question 6:				
Most teachers are doing a good job in the ISP program.	85.7% 6 (N)	0 % 0 (N)	14.3% 1 (N)	0 % 0 (N)
Question 7:				
We spend too much time working with our gifted students.	14.3% 1 (N)	57.1% 4 (N)	28.6% 2 (N)	0 % 0 (N)
Question 12:				
We have good extra-curricular activities that provide for the gifted students.	100 % 7 (N)	0 % 0 (N)	0 % 0 (N)	0 % 0 (N)
Question 15:				
We need to expand the program at the high school level.	42.8% 3 (N)	28.6% 2 (N)	28.6% 2 (N)	0 % 0 (N)

Question 16:

We need to expand the program at the grade school level.	28.6% 2 (N)	14.3% 1 (N)	57.1% 4 (N)	0 % 0 (N)

Question 18:

It would be nice if more state funding were available for use in the gifted program.	85.7% 6 (N)	0 % 0 (N)	14.3% 1 (N)	0 % 0 (N)

---

* (N) This represents the number of respondents.

** For the School Board and administration, parents, and teachers, the strongly agree and agree response were combined and listed here.

*** For the School Board and administration, parents, and teachers, the disagree or strongly disagree response were combined and listed here.

**** For the School Board and administration, parents, and teachers, the undecided or neutral was listed here.

***** An invalid response and/or an unanswered question was listed here.

Also receiving mixed reaction was question 16. 28.6% were yes, 14.3% were no, and 57.1% were not sure in their response. The majority being not sure indicates a lack of information or again staff and economic concerns.

The last question stating that more state funding be available for use in the program was 85.7% positive. Only 14.3% were not sure in their response. More state aid to districts is almost always received favorably, unless of course increased taxes are an immediate concern. The not sure response might also indicate that it is not known what the state funding level is for the district's gifted

program.

Recommendations . It is recommended from this range of questions that more information be provided to the school board/administrators about the ISP program. Then it would be important to see if expansion of the ISP program could be made at the grade school, and especially the high school level. This would effect the time spent working with the gifted students. It is also important that the school board/administrators carefully choose the staff working in the ISP program.

Parent Questionnaire Independent Question Results, Conclusions, and Recommendations

The following sections will present the results, conclusions, and recommendations to the independent questions of the Parent Questionnaire.

Results and Conclusions . Table 19 presents the data for the Parent Questionnaire Independent Questions. Questions involved were 6, 15, and 16. Question 6 was: I know what areas of study or activities my child participates in ISP. Question 15 was: The ISP program has favorably affected my child's behavior and attitude toward school. Question 16 was: My child has not had a problem doing his regular classroom work in addition to ISP.

The answers to these questions were very positive, 85.7% of the parents feel they know the areas of study or activities their child participates in in ISP. 2.0% were no and 12.2% had a not sure response to this question. This indicated good communication in this aspect of the program.

Table 19

Parent Questionnaire Independent Question Results.

Question	** Yes	*** No	**** Not Sure	***** Invalid Response
Question 6:				
I know what areas of study or activities my child participates in ISP.	85.7% 42 (N)*	2.0% 1 (N)	12.2% 6 (N)	0 % 0 (N)
Question 15:				
The ISP program has favorably affected my child's behavior and attitude toward school.	85.7% 42 (N)	0 % 0 (N)	12.2% 6 (N)	2.0% 1 (N)
Question 16:				
My child has not had a problem doing his regular classroom work in addition to ISP.	91.8% 45 (N)	2.0% 1 (N)	6.1% 3 (N)	0 % 0 (N)

* (N) This represents the number of respondents.

** For the School Board and administration, parents, and teachers, the strongly agree and agree response were combined and listed here.

*** For the School Board and administration, parents, and teachers, the disagree or strongly disagree response were combined and listed here.

**** For the School Board and administration, parents, and teachers, the undecided or neutral was listed here.

***** An invalid response and/or an unanswered question was listed here.

85.7% felt that the ISP program had favorably affected their child's behavior and attitude toward school. There were no negative responses and 12.2% of the parents were not sure of the result of the question. The response (according to the parents) indicated that the ISP program is favorably affecting most of the children.

Another very positive response came with Question 16. 91.8% of the response by the parents were positive, 2.0% negative, and 6.1% were not sure. This is a good indicator that ISP is contributing to the child's school program, not detracting from the program.

Recommendations . These evaluation results imply that the ISP program should continue as it has been. Work should always continue in order to keep this positive response and to continually improve these aspects of the program.

Student Questionnaire Independent Question Results, Conclusions and Recommendations

The following sections will present the results, conclusions, and recommendations for the independent questions on the Student Questionnaire.

Results and Conclusions . Table 20 presents the data for the Student Questionnaire Independent Question Results. Questions involved were 6 and 10. Question 6 was: I have learned about new subject areas in ISP. Question 10 was: The teacher in ISP treats me as an individual and challenges me.

This table is made up of two questions that were asked only to the students. An 81.4% positive response was respresented in the

Table 20

Student Questionnaire Independent Question Results.

Question	** Yes	*** No	**** Not Sure	***** Invalid Response
Question 6:				
I have learned about new subject areas in ISP.	81.4% 48 (N)*	6.8% 4 (N)	11.9% 7 (N)	0 % 0 (N)
Question 10:				
The teacher in ISP treats me as an individual and challenges me.	81.4% 48 (N)	5.1% 3 (N)	13.6% 8 (N)	0 % 0 (N)

* (N) This represents the number of respondents.

** For the School Board and administration, parents, and teachers, the strongly agree and agree response were combined and listed here.

*** For the School Board and administration, parents, and teachers, the disagree or strongly disagree response were combined and listed here.

**** For the School Board and administration, parents, and teachers, the undecided or neutral was listed here.

***** An invalid response and/or an unanswered question was listed here.

statement about new subject areas learned in ISP. 6.4% were no and 11.9% of the responses were not sure. Many of the students did learn about new subject areas.

Another important evaluation question that received an 81.4% yes response was Question 10. The no response was 5.1% and 13.6% were not sure. This indicates that the teachers do treat their students as individuals and challenge them. The no and not sures could be from students who do not feel challenged, do not like subject areas or material, or could be caused by human elements.

Recommendations . New subject areas still need to be provided to ISP students. What has been done so far in the program is fine, but efforts in this direction need to continue. Another recommendation is that the teachers continue to work hard to treat each student individually and challenge them. The positive percentage result shows that important work in this area has been done and needs to continue.

Teacher Questionnaire Independent Question Results, Conclusions, and Recommendations

The following sections will present the results, conclusion, and recommendations for the independent question on the Teacher Questionnaire.

Results and Conclusions . Table 21 presents the data for the Teacher Questionnaire Independent Question. The question involved was 6. Question 6 was: Generally the ones in the gifted (ISP) program are the ones who should be in the program.

Only one question was asked just to the teachers. 73.7% of the

teachers answered this with a positive response. 10.5% answered no and 10.5% answered not sure. Some of the teachers may feel that they have some students who are not in the program that should be, and may feel they have others who should be in the program that are not. Most thought the appropriate students are in the program.

Recommendations. The response indicates the identification process is fairly accurate. It is important (as has been stated previously) that the identification process is continually improved, or at least attempted to be improved. This is the responsibility of the gifted coordinator. Objective identification processes are also essential.

Table 21

Teacher Questionnaire Independent Question Results.

Question	** Yes	*** No	**** Not Sure	***** Invalid Response
Question 6:				
Generally the ones in the gifted (ISP) program are the ones who should be in the program.	73.7% 28 (N)*	10.5% 4 (N)	10.5% 4 (N)	2.6% 1 (N)

* (N) This represents the number of respondents.

** For the School Board and administration, parents, and teachers, the strongly agree and agree response were combined and listed here.

*** For the School Board and administration, parents, and teachers, the disagree or strongly disagree response were combined and listed here.

**** For the School Board and administration, parents, and teachers, the undecided or neutral was listed here.

***** An invalid response and/or an unanswered question was listed here.

Chapter V

Summary and Recommendations

Summary of This Study

This study did a review of the literature in the field of gifted education from an historical viewpoint. After this, research was done in the area of gifted evaluation and evaluation design. A design was created to evaluate the Altamont Community Unit #10 Independent Study (Gifted) Program. The gifted program had been in existence for six years and had never been formally evaluated.

An evaluation design was made for each of four groups: teachers, students, parents, and school board/administrators. The evaluations were given to a total of 231 people, and 85.2% or 197 of these people responded to the evaluation.

The study examined seven issues common to all four groups: four questions common to three groups and five questions common to two groups. The rest of the questions related to a specific group.

Results of the study produced areas of agreement and disagreement among the groups. Approximately 94.1% of the four groups felt that the ISP program is a good program. Almost 75.8% liked the organization of the program, 73.5% felt that ISP is more challenging than the regular classroom. The students enjoy the program, which was indicated by a 93% positive response.

Three groups agreed that there can comfortably be written or spoken communication with the ISP teachers. This had a 84.0% positive response. An 80.5% return of two groups indicated that the ISP program helped the student learn new things. The teachers and school board/administrators also had an 80% positive response by indicating that the school did a good job with the gifted students. 75% of two groups also felt that they were well informed about the ISP program.

School board/administrators were positive with a rating, 70% to 100%, on several items: most parents feel good about the program, most teachers are doing a good job in ISP, good extra-curricular activities are provided for the ISP students, and it would be desirable to have more state funding.

Parents were also positive, 85% to 100% on several items: they know areas of study their child is involved in, the ISP program has favorably affected the child's attitude about school, and the child has no problem doing regular classwork in addition to ISP.

Students were also positive, with a range of 80% to 100%, that they learned new subject areas and the teacher treated them as an individual and challenged them.

The teachers felt at a rate of 73.7%, that generally the students in the program were the ones that should be in the program.

Along with the many positive comments, there were some areas of disagreement or negative comments. Of the four groups, 20% were not sure that they like the ISP program organized as an independent study program. The numbers of areas of study offered in ISP being adequate received a 41.8% no or not sure response. The reaction to students not having social problems, the yes response ranged from 14.3% to

91.5%. The no and not sure response to this question ranged from 5.1% to 42.8% Many also felt that not enough time is allotted to the program. 54.2% of the respondents answered this question no or not sure. The larger percentage answered no to this statement. Over 30% questioned the availability of good and interesting materials. Also, in two groups, 41.5% questioned the evaluation system. Parents reacted with a very positive response to this statement.

School board/administrators said by 57.1% that we do not spend too much time with our gifted students. Also expansion at the high school and grade school level ISP program received a very mixed response.

The major findings of this evaluation are that Altamont is doing a good job in the Independent Study Program. It is a good program offering new subject areas and it has for the most part good teachers. The program individualizes and challenges the students. The adults associated with the program favor the evaluation system and believe that the children in the program are benefitted as a result of the program.

Four areas of concern that have been discovered as a result of this study are: time allotted for the program, more subject areas available to study, material availability for study, and relaying more information about the program to the teachers.

The evaluation results provide the school board/administrators, gifted coordinator, and gifted teachers the opinions of the good and bad aspects of the Independent Study Program. This study serves as a guide and basis for what should occur in the Independent Study Program in the future. This type of evaluation is good for the continuing

success of the ISP program.

Recommendations

Based upon the results of this field experience, the following recommendations are offered:

1. There is evidence that more time needs to be allotted to the teachers who work in the Independent Study Program. Time to meet with the students, on a more individual basis seems to have a high priority.

2. More subject areas (especially ones not already in the school curriculum) need to be made available to the students at all levels. Conferences with students will help indicate the areas of study that are desired.

3. With the addition of more subject areas, a third recommendation is that additional material needs to be added to the program as soon as possible. New and interesting materials will help achieve the child's continuing interest and motivation within the program.

4. Study and consideration should be given to expansion of the program at all levels. The high school level should receive first consideration, and then the grade school level should be considered.

5. The gifted coordinator needs to provide more information about the ISP program to the teachers. This was a weakness. Not only did the teachers feel that they needed to know about the program, but also the study areas of each child. The general information should also be sent to the parents involved

with the program.

6. The ISP evaluation results should be made available to the school board/administrators, parents, and teachers.

7. The Independent Study Program is a good program and well-received by most who have a part in it, or who are concerned about the school system. It is important that the gifted coordinator and gifted teachers continue to strive to maintain this excellence.

References

Abraham, W. (1958). Common sense about gifted children . New York: Harper and Brothers.

Alexander, P.A., & Muira, J.A. (1982). Gifted education: A comprehensive roadmap. Rockville, MD: Aspen.

Archambault. F. S. (1984). Measurement and evaluation concerns in evaluating programs for the gifted and talented. Journal for the Education of the Gifted , 7 , 26-37.

Aylesworth, M. (1984). Guidelines for selecting instruments in evaluating programs for the gifted. Journal for the Education of the Gifted , 7 , 38-48.

Barbe, W. B. (1955). Evaluation of special classes for gifted children. In J. Gowan & E. P. Torrance (Eds.). Educating the Ablest . Itasca, IL: F. E. Peacock.

Barnette, J. J. (1984). Naturalistic approaches to gifted and talented program evaluation. Journal for the Education of the Gifted , 7 , 26-37.

Bartz, David E. (1978). The teacher performance profile . Kalamazoo, MI: Kalamazoo Public Schools.

Bishop, W.E. (1975). Characteristics of teachers judged successful by intellectually gifted, high achieving high school students. In W. Dennis & M. W. Dennis (Eds.). The intellectually gifted: An overview . (pp. 141-152). New York: Grune & Stratton.

Boslough, J. (1984, June). Challenging the brightest. Psychology Today , pp. 28-33.

Buescher, T. M. (Ed.). (1984). Thinking through the evaluation process: An interview with Dr. Joseph Renzuilli. Journal for the Education of the Gifted , 7 , 3-11.

Burt, C. (1975). The gifted child . London: Hodder & Stoughton.

Callahan, C. C. (1986, Winter). Asking the right questions: The central issue in evaluating programs for the gifted and talented. Gifted Child Quarterly , pp. 38-42.

Callahan, C. M. (1985). Evaluation of programs for the gifted and talented. Gifted Child Quarterly - 1985 Digest , pp. 3-7.

Callahan, C. M. (1983, Winter). Issues in evaluating programs for the gifted. Gifted Child Quarterly , pp. 3-7.

Callahan, C. M., & Caldwell, M. (1984). Using evaluation results to improve programs for the gifted and talented. Journal for the Education of the Gifted , 7 , 60-74.

Carter, E. (1984, June). A teachers view: Learning to be wrong. Psychology Today , p. 35.

Clark, B. (1983). Growing up gifted . (2nd ed.). Columbus, OH: Merrill.

Conyaley, D. (1984, December 10). The blessings of brother Brian. Newsweek , pp. 15-16.

Cox, J., Daniel, N. & Boston, B. (1986, January). Helpful practices for educating able learners. Education Digest , pp. 40-43.

Cox, C. M. (1926). The early mental traits of three hundred genuises. In W. Dennis & M.W. Dennis (Eds.). The intellectually gifted: An overview . (pp. 17-24). New York: Grune & Stratton.

DeHaan, R. E., & Havighurst, R. J. (1961). Educating gifted children . Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Drews, E. (1968). Beyond curriculum. In J. Gown & E. P. Torrance Educating the ablest . (pp. 110-126). Itasca, IL: F. E. Peacock.

Eberle, N. (1984, February). Could your child be gifted? Redbook , pp. 118-120.

Eberle, N. (1984, July). The plight of our brightest children. McCalls , p. 26.

Ellison, J. (1984, June). The seven frames of mind. Psychology Today , pp. 19-26.

Evans, E. (1982, Summer). Multiple outcomes assessment of a special class placement for gifted studnets: A comparative study. Gifted Child Quarterly , pp. 126-132.

Feldheusen, J. (Ed.). (1985). Toward excellence in gifted education . Denver: Love Publishing.

Feldheusen, J. (1978). Using the Purdue three stage model for curriculum development in gifted education. In H. W. Singleton (Ed.). The gifted/talented among us. (pp. 37-44). Toledo, OH: The University of Toledo, College of Education.

Fine, B. (1964). Stretching their minds . New York: E. P. Dutton.

Fine, B. (1967). Underachievers: How they can be helped . New York: E. P. Dutton

Galbraith, J. (1983). The gifted kids survival guide for ages 11-18 . Minneapolis, MN: Free Spirit.

Galbraith, J. (1984). The gifted kids survival guide for kids age 10 and under . Minneapolis, MN: Free Spirit.

Gallagher, J. J. (1986, Winter). A proposed federal role: Education of gifted children. Gifted Child Quarterly , pp. 43-46.

Gallagher, J. J., & Kirk, S. A. (1986). Educating exceptional children . Boston: Houghton-Mifflin.

Gallagher, J. J. (Ed.). (1979). Gifted children reaching their potential . Jerusalem, Israel: Kolleck & Son.

Gallagher, J. J., Gowan, J. C., Passow, A. H., & Torrance, E. P. (1979). Issues in gifted education . Ventura, CA: Ventura County Superintendent of Schools.

Gallagher, J. J. (1966). Research summary on gifted child education . State of Illinois: Department of Program Development for Gifted Children.

Gallagher, J. J. (1964). Teaching the gifted child . Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Gallagher, J. J. (1985). Teaching the gifted child . (3rd ed.) Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Gallagher, J. J. (1959). The gifted child in elementary school. In W. Dennis & M. W. Dennis. (Eds.). The intellectually gifted: An overview . (pp. 119-139). New York: Grune & Stratton.

Gold, S. (1984, March). Sixty years of programming for the gifted in Cleveland. Phi Delta Kappan , pp. 497-499.

Gordon, W. K. (Ed.) (1968). Literature in Critical Perspectives: An Anthology . New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.

Gowan, J. C. (1965). The California criteria scorecard for evaluation of gifted children. In J. Gowan & E. P. Torrance (Eds.). Educating the ablest . (pp. 155-160). Itasca, Il: F. E. Peacock.

Gowan, J. C., & Torrance, E. P. (Eds.). (1971). Educating the Ablest . Itasca, IL: F. E. Peacock.

Havighurst, R. I. (1961). Conditions productive of superior children. In W. Dennis & M. W. Dennis (Eds.) The intellectually gifted: An overview . (pp. 251-262). New York: Grune & Stratton.

Heller, S. Z. (1979). What makes you so special? Phoenix: Thinking Caps.

Hollingsworth, L. S. (1942). The development of personality in highly intelligent children. In W. Dennis & M. W. Dennis (Eds.) The Intellectually gifted: An overview . (pp. 89-90). New York: Grune & Stratton.

Illinois State Board of Education. (1982). FY82 Statewide LEA Gifted Education Program Evaluation Data Summary . Springfield, IL: Illinois State Board of Education.

Jackson, D. M. (1980). Reading in curriculum development for the gifted . Guilford, CT: Special Learning Corporation.

Johnson. J. R. (1980). Creating programs for gifted and talented youth. In H. W. Singleton (Ed.). The gifted/talented among us . (pp. 10-27). Toledo OH: University of Toledo, College of Education.

Kaercher, D. (1984, March). Are we being fair to gifted children? Better Homes and Garden , pp. 19-28.

Maker, J. C. (1982). Curriculum development for the gifted . Rockville, MD: Aspen.

Kough, J. (1960). Practical programs for the gifted . Chicago: Science Research Associates.

Krueger, M. L. (1978). On being gifted . New York: Walker.

Lund, W. (1986). Illinois Gifted Education Program - 1986 . Springfield, IL: Illinois State Board of Education.

Lupkowski, A. E. (1985, April). Gifted students in small rural schools. Education Digest , pp. 57-59.

MacLeish, R. (1984, March). Gifted by nature: Prodigies are still mysteries to man. Smithsonian , pp. 70-79.

Maddus, C. D. (1985, Fall). Preferences of gifted students for selected teacher characteristics. Gifted Child Quarterly , pp. 160-163.

Maker, J. C. (1982). Curriculum development for the gifted . Rockville: MD: Aspen.

McCleary, I., & Hines, S. (1983, May). Expanding horizons: University professors serve as mentors for gifted middle graders. Phi Delta Kappan , pp. 661-662.

Moore, L. P. (1981). Does this mean my kid's a genius ? St. Louis: McGraw-Hill.

Mulhern, J. D., & Morris, R. C. (1985, Spring). Some guideposts for educating the gifted. Education , pp. 274-278.

Newland, T. E. (1972). The gifted in the socioeducational perspective . Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Perrone, P. A., & Male, R. A. (1981). The developmental education and guidance of talented learners . Rockville, MD: Aspen Systems.

Plowman, P. D. (1968). What can be done for rural gifted children and youth? In J. Gowan & E. P. Torrance (Eds.). Educating the ablest . (pp. 54-59). Itasca, IL: F. E. Peacock.

Povey, R. M. (Ed.). (1980). Educating the gifted child . Boston: Harper & Row.

Program Evaluation and Assessment Section (1986). Summary of Selected gifted education reimbursement program descriptive self-evaluation reports, FY, 1985 . Springfield, IL: Illinois State Board of Education.

Renzulli, J., & Smith, L. H. (1979). A guidebook for developing individualized programs (IEP) for gifted and talented students . Mansfield, CT: Creative Learning Press.

Renzulli, J. S. & Smith L. H. (1977). Developing defensible programs for gifted and talented. In H. W. Singleton (Ed.). The gifted/talented among us . (pp. 28-36). Toledo, OH: The University of Toledo, College of Education.

Renzulli, J. (1980). Non-test measure of student growth and performance. In D. M. Jackson. Readings in curriculum development for the gifted . (pp. 30-40). Guilford, CT: Special Learning Corporation.

Renzulli, J. S. (1977). The enrichment triad model: A guide for developing defensible programs for the gifted and talented . Mansfield Center, CT: Creative Learning Press.

Sawyer, R. N. (1984, June). Advice for parents: Open doors, show love, relax. Psychology Today , p. 36.

Singleton, H. W. Acceleration: A process model for curriculum. In H. W. Singleton (Ed.). The gifted/talented among us . (pp.62-72). Toeldo, OH: The University of Toledo, College of Education.

Singleton, H. W. & Aldinger, L. E. Formative and summative evaluation of gifted/talented programs: The need for a unique approach. In H. W. Singleton (Ed.). The gifted/talented among us . (pp. 98-106). Toledo, OH: The University of Toledo,

College of Education.

Singleton, H. W. (Ed.). (1980). The gifted/talented among us . Toledo, OH: The University of Toledo, College of Education.

Stanley, J. C. (1973). Accelerating the educational progress of intellectually gifted children. In W. Dennis & M. W. Dennis (Eds.). The intellectually gifted: An overview . (pp.179-196). New York: Grune & Stratton.

Stedman, D. J., & Paul, J. L. (Eds.). (1981). The developmental education and guidance of talented learners . Rockville, MD: Aspen.

Stufflebeam, D. L. (1971). Educational evaluation and decision making . Itasca, IL: F. E. Peacock.

Sumption, M. R., Norris, D., & Terman, L. M. (1950). Special education for the gifted child. In W. Dennis & M. W. Dennis (Eds.). The intellectually gifted: An overview . (pp. 153-164). New York: Grune & Stratton.

The Kiplinger Magazine. (1983, January). Programs that help bright kids shine. Changing Times , pp. 58-61.

Terman, L. M., & Oden, M. H. (1959). The Terman study of intellectually gifted children. In W. Dennis & M. W. Dennis (Eds.). The intellectually gifted: An overview . (pp. 51-68). New York: Grune & Stratton.

Thumasathit, T. (1984, June). A students view: Becoming one of us. Psychology Today , p. 34.

Torrance, E. P. (1965). Gifted children in the classroom. New York: Macmillan.

Treffinger, D. J., & Perez, G. S. (1980). Self-description of

instructional style for encouraging self-directed learning. In H. W. Singleton (Ed.). The gifted/talented among us. (pp. 45-50). Toledo, OH: The University of Toledo, College of Education.

U. S. Commissioner of Education (1972). Educational programs for the gifted and talented in four states. In W. Dennis & M. W. Dennis (Eds.). The intellectually gifted: An overview . (pp. 197-208). New York: Grune & Stratton.

Vail, P. L. (1979). The world of the gifted child . New York: Walker.

Wasserman, S. (1982, May). The gifted can't weigh that giraffe . Phi Delta Kappan , p. 621.

Webb. J. T., Meckstroth, E. A., & Tolan, S. S. (1982). Guiding the gifted child; A practical sources for parents and teachers . Columbus, OH: Ohio Psychology Publishing.

Whitmore, J. R. (1980). Giftedness, conflict and underachievement . Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Wiersma, W. & Juro, S. G. (1976). Evaluation of instruction in individually guided education . Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Williams, F. E. Williams strategies to orchestrate Renzulli's triad. In H. W. Singleton (Ed.). The gifted/talented among us . (pp. 51-61). Toledo, OH: The University of Toledo, College of Education.

Wolfle, D. (1960). Diversity of talent. In W. Dennis & M. W. Dennis (Eds.). The intellectually gifted: An overview . (pp. 263-282). New York: Grune & Stratton.

Appendix A

Bibliography of Test Materials

Intelligence Quotient Tests

American Guidance Service (AGS)
Publishers Building
Circle Pines, Minnesota 55014

Kaufman Assessment Battery For Children, 1981, Individual I. Q. Test

Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test - Form L, 1981, Individual I. Q. Test

Western Psychological Service
Publishers and Distributors
12031 Wilshire Boulevard
Los Angeles, Calif. 90025

Slosson Intelligence Test For Children and Adults, 1981, Individual I. Q. Test

Jastek Associates, Inc.
1526 Gilpin Avenue
Wilmington, Delware 19806

Wide Range Intelligence Personality Test, 1978, Individual or Group I. Q. test

Scholastic Testing Service, Inc.
480 Meyer Rd.
Bensenville, Ill

Kuhlmann-Anderson Tests, Eighth Edition, 1981, Individual or Group I.Q. Test

Diagnostic Tests

AGS

Woodcock Reading Mastery Tests, Form A, 1973 --- Form H, 1987, Individual Test

Riverside Publishing Co.
8420 Bryn Mawr Avenue
Chicago, Illinois 60631

Gates- MacGinitie Reading Test, 1978, Group or Individual Test

Psychological Corporation

Harcourt Brace, Jovanovich. Publishers

Stanford Achievement Test, 1982, Group or Individual --Reading, Language Arts, Math, Social Studies, Science

Jastek

WRAT -- Wide Range Achievement Test, 1984, Group of Individual, Reading, Spelling, Math

AGS

Key Math Diagnostic Arithmetic Test, 1976, Individual, Math

Pro-Ed
5341 Industrial Oaks Boulevard
Austin, Texas 78735

TOMA - Test of Mathematical Abilities, 1984, Individual or ?Group

Other Types of Tests Used for Specific Identification Areas

Psychological Corporation

Orleans Hanna Algebra Prognosis, 1982, Algebra Pre-requisite when grouping

Watson- Glaser Critical Thinking Appraisal, 1980, Individual or Group, Reading, Language Arts

Scholastic Testing Service

Thinking Creatively With Words, 1966, Individual or Group
(Part of Torrances Test of Creative Thinking)

Appendix B

PEER IDENTIFICATION

Think about the students in your class. Answer the following questions as completely as possible.

Which three students are: the most curious about many things?

1. _____ 2. _____
3. _____

have the most ideas and solutions to problems?

1. _____ 2. _____
3. _____

don't seem to care what others think about them?

1. _____ 2. _____
3. _____

like to take chances?

1. _____ 2. _____
3. _____

have the most fun imagining about situations and things?

1. _____ 2. _____
3. _____

most sensitive to the feelings and concerns of others?

1. _____ 2. _____
3. _____

have the best sense of humor?

1. _____ 2. _____
3. _____

are aware of and enjoy beautiful things?

1. _____ 2. _____
3. _____

are not concerned with details?

1. _____ 2. _____
3. _____

do not care if others think of them as being different?

1. _____ 2. _____
3. _____

are real individuals?

1. _____ 2. _____
3. _____

are apt to question authority?

1. _____ 2. _____
3. _____

ILLINOIS STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION
Department of Planning, Research and Evaluation
Program Evaluation and Assessment Section
100 North First Street
Springfield, Illinois 62777

FY 86 GIFTED EDUCATION REIMBURSEMENT PROGRAM EVALUATION REPORT

INSTRUCTIONS: Complete and submit one copy by June 15 to the Regional Superintendent, who will forward the report to the above address by July1.

REGION-COUNTY-DISTRICT NUMBER	DISTRICT NAME

DISTRICT ADDRESS

PERSON COMPLETING FORM	AREA CODE - PHONE NUMBER

INSTRUCTIONS:

Each of the instructional settings below describes the arrangement in which instruction for gifted students is provided. If a student is served in more than one setting, count the student in the setting in which services are provided the majority of the time. These settings are used for Parts I, IV, and V of the form.

Resource Center (K-12):

Differentiated/instructional services orovided on an ongoing basis for gifted students by a gifted education resource person in a designated school area equipped with gifted education materials and supplies.

Pull-Out Class (K-12):

Differentiated instructional services for gifted students provided by a gifted education teacher on a regular basis.

Self-Contained Class (K-12):

Differentiated instructional services for gifted students provided full time by gifted education teachers, i.e., special school, special school within a school.

Regular Classroom/Consultant (K-8):

Differentiated instructional services for gifted students provided in the regular classroom by either the regular classroom teacher or a consultant to the regular classroom teacher.

Regular Class (7-12):

Differentiated instructional services for gifted students are not served in one of the previously mentioned instructional settings provided through the regular class, e.g., advanced placement, mentor.

PART I — PROFESSIONAL STAFF TRAINED

INSTRUCTIONS: If state gifted education reimbursement funds have been utilized to provide training services or to release staff from its regular duties to attend training meetings or workshops, complete the following table indicating the number of professional staff trained by the provider of the training. Classify teachers according to the setting in which they serve most of the time. (Refer to definitions above.)

TRAINING PROVIDER	TEACHERS					ADMINISTRATIVE OR SUPPORT PERSONNEL (Librarian/Counselor)
	Resource Center (K-12)	Pull-Out Class (K-12)	Self-Contained Class (K-12)	Regular Classroom/ Consultant (K-8)	Regular Class (7-12)	
Our School District	12-14	15-17	18-20	21-23	24-26	27-29
Other School District(s)	30-32	33-35	36-38	39-41	42-44	45-47
Gifted Area Service Center(s)	48-50	51-53	54-56	57-59	60-62	63-65 (01)
State Sponsored Conferences/ Workshops	12-14	15-17	18-20	21-23	24-26	27-29
Other	30-32	33-35	36-38	39-41	42-44	45-47
Total Number Trained (Unduplicated)	48-50	51-53	54-56	57-59	60-62	63-65

PART II — LOCAL FISCAL CONTRIBUTION

INSTRUCTIONS: Enter the total expenditure of LEA funds for gifted education in your district. This total should include local expenditures for instruction, improvement of instruction, and administration. (See Page 5 of your FY 86 Application for Gifted Education Reimbursement Program.)

$ _____ 66-72 (02)

I certify that the information contained in this report is accurate and true to the best of my knowledge.	*I have reviewed this report of the school district named above and recommend it for filing.*
Date *Signature of District Superintendent*	*Date* *Signature of Regional Superintendent*

ISBE 41-61 (3/86)

PART III – STUDENTS IDENTIFIED

INSTRUCTIONS: Enter an unduplicated count of students identified for service in your gifted program. Report the data by grade level and category of giftedness.

CATEGORY OF GIFTEDNESS	GRADE LEVEL													
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	U
General Intellectual Ability	12-15	16-19	20-23	24-27	28-31	32-34	35-38	39-42	43-46	47-50	51-54	55-58	59-62	63-66 (03)
Specific Aptitude(s)/ Talent(s)														(04)

PART IV – STUDENTS SERVED

What is the unduplicated number of students receiving services from the program by racial/ethnic group?

AMERICAN INDIAN OR ALASKAN NATIVE	ASIAN OR PACIFIC ISLANDER	BLACK, NOT HISPANIC	HISPANIC	WHITE, NOT HISPANIC
12-16	17-21	22-26	27-31	32-36

What is the unduplicated number of students receiving services from the program by gender? . . . . . .

MALE	FEMALE
37-41	42-46

(05)

Enter an unduplicated count of students. In the Reimbursement column report only students for whom reimbursement is claimed. Report all gifted program students in the Total column. Report students in the setting where they are served most of the time.

NOTE: **The number of students served (total) should not exceed the number of students identified in Part III above.**

GRADE	INSTRUCTIONAL SETTING										
	RESOURCE CENTER (K-12)		PULL-OUT CLASS (K-12)		SELF-CONTAINED CLASS (K-12)		REGULAR CLASSROOM/ CONSULTANT (K-8)		REGULAR CLASS (7-12)		
	Reimb	Total	Reimb	Total	Reimb	Total	Reimb	Total	Reimb	Total	
K	12-15	16-19	20-23	24-27	28-31	32-34	35-38	39-42			
1											
2											
3											
4											
5											
6											
7									43-46	47-50	(13)
8											(14)
9											(15)
10											(16)
11											(17)
12											(18)
U											(19)

PART V - GIFTED PROGRAM SUMMARY

INSTRUCTIONS: Complete a separate line for each combination of specific content area, instructional setting and program type. Do not combine grade levels. Use the columns below to generate the proper coded response. This may be a duplicated count.

Grade Level (Use Only One)	**STUDENTS**	**Specific Content Area** (Use All Necessary)	**Instructional Setting** (Use Only One)	**Program Type** (Use Only One)	**CONTACT TIME**
K - Kindergarten 1 - 1st Grade 2 - 2nd Grade 3 - 3rd Grade 4 - 4th Grade 5 - 5th Grade 6 - 6th Grade 7 - 7th Grade 8 - 8th Grade 9 - 9th Grade A - 10th Grade B - 11th Grade C - 12th Grade U - Ungraded	REPORT THE NUMBER OF STUDENTS FOR EACH GROUP PER GRADE LEVEL	A - Art B - Creative/Expository Writing C - Foreign Languages D - Literature E - Mathematics F - Reading G - Science H - Social Sciences I - Speech J - Thinking Skills K - Computer Literacy L - Music M - Drama N - Other	1. Resource Center (K-12) 2. Pull-out Class (K-12) 3. Self-contained Class (K-12) 4. Regular Classroom/ Consultant (K-8) 5. Regular Class (7-12)	1. Acceleration-Curriculum provided for a student at an earlier age at a more advanced level and at a faster pace than the traditional sequence, e.g., advanced class 2. Enrichment-Study of special themes/topics in-depth and in greater intensity usually within the regular curriculum, e.g., in-depth unit requiring higher level thinking skills	REPORT TIME TO THE NEAREST WHOLE HOURS PER WEEK AND WEEKS PER YEAR

GRADE LEVEL	NUMBER OF STUDENTS SERVED	SPECIFIC CONTENT AREA (Use All Necessary)	INSTRUCTIONAL SETTING (Use Only One)	PROGRAM TYPE (Use Only One)	AVERAGE CONTACT TIME	
					Hours/ Week	Weeks/ Year
12	13-16	17-30	31	32	33-34	35-36 (19)

(Duplicate this page as necessary.)

PART VI — DESCRIPTIVE EVALUATION

A. LONGITUDINAL IMPACT OF GIFTED PROGRAM SERVICES

Where possible, report examples of student benefits which may be directly attributed to the district gifted program of previous years. Choose examples of specific student growth and accomplishments on which to base district program data for succeeding years of this report. Include grade level, specific growth/accomplishments on an ongoing basis.

1. General Student Benefits

2. Individual Student(s) Growth/Accomplishments

PART VI – (Continued)

J. CURRENT PROGRAM

In the space provided below, enter the title of each objective in the order stated in your gifted program application. Indicate the status of the objective and the activities implemented during the year. Describe the evaluation procedures including any instruments and techniques, and report the evaluation results for each objective.

TITLE OF OBJECTIVE	STATUS OF OBJECTIVE ☐ Accomplished ☐ Not Accomplished ☐ Not Implemented

ACTIVITIES (Report only additions, deletions, or modifications)

EVALUATION PROCEDURES

EVALUATION RESULTS

TITLE OF OBJECTIVE	STATUS OF OBJECTIVE ☐ Accomplished ☐ Not Accomplished ☐ Not Implemented

ACTIVITIES (Report only additions, deletions, or modifications)

EVALUATION PROCEDURES

EVALUATION RESULTS

(Duplicate this page as necessary.)

Appendix D

SCHOOL BOARD AND ADMINISTRATOR EVALUATION

The purpose of this questionnaire is to evaluate the Independent Study Program (ISP- Gifted Program). We are sincerely interested in finding out ways in which we can improve the program, and are interested in your comments.

Please answer each question honestly, and do not put your name on the questionnaire unless you wish to do so. Please circle your responses, and return the evaluation to Mr. May.

On the questionnaire:

SA = Strongly agree with the statement
A = Generally agree with the statement
U = Undecided or neutral on the statement
D = Generally disagree with the statement
SD = Strongly disagree with the statement

1.	Altamont has a good gifted program.	SA	A	U	D	SD
2.	I like the way ISP is organized as an independent study program.	SA	A	U	D	SD
3.	Most parents feel that the ISP program is good.	SA	A	U	D	SD
4.	The numbers of areas offered for study in the ISP program seem adequate.	SA	A	U	D	SD
5.	More students should be in the ISP program than at present.	SA	A	U	D	SD
6.	Most teachers are doing a good job in the ISP program.	SA	A	U	D	SD
7.	We spend too much time working with our gifted students.	SA	A	U	D	SD
8.	ISP is more challenging for the children than the regular classroom.	SA	A	U	D	SD
9.	I feel that this school does a good job with the gifted students.	SA	A	U	D	SD
10.	I feel that I can communicate (written or spoken) with the ISP teachers when needed.	SA	A	U	D	SD

11. Students in the gifted program do not have social problems, because they are part of the program.	SA	A	U	D	SD
12. We have good extra-curricular activities that provide for the gifted students.	SA	A	U	D	SD
13. I feel that enough time is allotted in the ISP program for the students.	SA	A	U	D	SD
14. I feel students enjoy being part of this program.	SA	A	U	D	SD
15. We need to expand the program at the high school level.	SA	A	U	D	SD
16. We need to expand the program at the grade school level.	SA	A	U	D	SD
17. I feel that I am well-informed about the ISP program.	SA	A	U	D	SD
18. It would be nice if more state funding were available for use in the gifted program.	SA	A	U	D	SD

Comments:

19. What do you feel are the strengths of the ISP program?

20. What do you feel are the weaknesses of the ISP program?

THANK YOU FOR TAKING THE TIME TO COMPLETE THIS QUESTIONNAIRE.

STUDENT EVALUATION

The purpose of this questionnaire is to see in what ways the Independent Study Program (ISP) can be improved for you.

Please answer all questions honestly. Circle your response. Do not sign your name to the questionnaire. When you have completed your questionnaire, please fold it and place it in the designated box.

On the questionnaire:

YES = agree with statement
NO = disagree with statement
NOT SURE = undecided or neutral on the statement

Grade level you are in:

K - 2 _____ 3 - 5 _____ 6 - 8 _____ 9 - 12 _____
Algebra I _____ Pre-Algebra _____
Do not participate in the high school program _____
(If you do not participate in the high school program, go to question 19.)

1. ISP is a good program.	YES	NO	NOT SURE
2. I like the way ISP is organized as an independent study program.	YES	NO	NOT SURE
3. A lot of good and interesting material is available for me in order to pursue my area of interest.	YES	NO	NOT SURE
4. There are enough areas of study, that interest me, to choose from in ISP.	YES	NO	NOT SURE
5. ISP has made me interested in learning new things.	YES	NO	NOT SURE
6. I have learned about new subject areas in ISP.	YES	NO	NOT SURE
7. ISP has taught me how to use independent study time, and has improved my study skills.	YES	NO	NOT SURE

8. ISP is more challenging than the regular classroom.	YES	NO	NOT SURE
9. I like the evaluation system (reports in the report card K-8, credit system 9-12) that is used in ISP.	YES	NO	NOT SURE
10. The teacher in ISP treats me as an individual and challenges me.	YES	NO	NOT SURE
11. I am friends with students in the ISP program, and students who are not in the program.	YES	NO	NOT SURE
12. ISP has helped me to gain confidence in my abilities.	YES	NO	NOT SURE
13. I like the amount of time we have for ISP.	YES	NO	NOT SURE
14. I enjoy being part of the program.	YES	NO	NOT SURE

General Comments About the ISP Program:

15. What I like most about ISP is:

16. What I do not like about ISP is:

17. Some things that I think would make the ISP program better are:

18. Any other comments you wish to make about the program:

HIGH SCHOOL ONLY

19. For those of you who do not participate in the ISP program, please state why you do not participate.

20. How could we improve the program so that if scheduling permitted, you would participate?

21. Other subject areas you would like to see offered in the high school ISP program:

THANK YOU FOR COMPLETING THIS QUESTIONNAIRE.

TEACHER EVALUATION

The purpose of this questionnaire is to evaluate the Independent Study Program (ISP-Gifted). We are sincerely interested in finding out ways in which we can improve the program for the students. We are very interested in your comments.

Please answer all questions honestly and do not put your name on the questionnaire, unless you wish to do so. Please circle your response.

Please return this to the office by May 22, 1987. The evaluations will be place in a box with the other teachers evaluations.

On the questionnaire:

SA = Strongly agree with statement
A = Generally agree with the statement
U = Undecided or neutral about the statement
D = Generally disagree with the statement
SD = Strongly disagree with the statement.

Please indicate the grade level in which you teach:

K - 2 _____ 3-5 _____ 6-8_____ 9-12_____

1. I feel that the ISP program is a good program.	SA	A	U	D	SD
2. I like the way ISP is organized as an independent study program.	SA	A	U	D	SD
3. A lot of good and interesting material is available to the students in the program.	SA	A	U	D	SD
4. The number of areas offered for study in ISP seem adequate.	SA	A	U	D	SD
5. More students should be in the ISP program than at present.	SA	A	U	D	SD
6. Generally the ones in the gifted (ISP) program are the ones who should be in the program.	SA	A	U	D	SD

7. ISP has helped the students learn how to use independent study time and has improved his/her study skills.	SA	A	U	D	SD
8. ISP is more challenging for the students then the regular classroom.	SA	A	U	D	SD
9. I feel this school does a good job with the gifted students.	SA	A	U	D	SD
10. I feel that I can communicate (written or spoken) with the ISP teacher in order to find out needed information about students in the program.	SA	A	U	D	SD
11. Students in the ISP program do not have social problems with the students who are not in the program.	SA	A	U	D	SD
12. ISP has helped the students gain confidence in their abilities.	SA	A	U	D	SD
13. I feel that enough time is allotted in the ISP program for the students.	SA	A	U	D	SD
14. Students seem to enjoy the ISP program.	SA	A	U	D	SD

Comments:

15. How do you feel that the ISP program could be improved?

16. What are your general impressions of the ISP program?

THANK YOU FOR TAKING THE TIME TO COMPLETE THIS QUESTIONNAIRE.

PARENT EVALUATION

The Independent Study Program (ISP) has been in existence since the spring of 1980. Each year we have attempted to improve the program for your child.

The purpose of this questionnaire is to give the parents a chance to tell us how you feel about the program. We are sincerely interested in finding out ways that we can make the Independent Study Program (ISP) better for your child or children.

Please answer all questions honestly. Circle your responses. Do not sign you name to the questionnaire, unless you want to sign your name. Please have your child bring the questionnaire back to school. The questionnaire will be placed in a box with all the other parent evaluations.

If you have more than one child in the program please make a generalization based on all of their experiences.

On the questionnaire:

SA = Strongly agree with statement
A = Generally agree with statement
U = Undecided or neutral on the statement
D = Generally disagree with the statement
SD = Strongly disagree with the statement

Grade level your child is in:

K-2 _____ 3-5 _____ 6-8 _____ 9 - 12 _____
Algebra I (8th grade) _____ Pre-Algebra _____
Does not participate at the high school level._____
(If your child does not participate in the high school program please go to question 21.)

1. I feel that the ISP program is a good program.	SA	A	U	D	SD
2. I like the way ISP is organized as an independent study program.	SA	A	U	D	SD
3. The ISP program provides good and interesting material in my child's area of interest.	SA	A	U	D	SD

4. The areas of study offered in ISP are adequate for my child.	SA	A	U	D	SD
5. ISP has helped my child become interested in learning new things.	SA	A	U	D	SD
6. I know what areas of study or activities my child participates in in ISP.	SA	A	U	D	SD
7. ISP has helped my child learn how to use independent study time and has improved his/her study skills.	SA	A	U	D	SD
8. ISP is more challenging for my child than the regular classroom.	SA	A	U	D	SD
9. I like the evaluation system (reports in the report card K-8, credit system 9-12) that is used in ISP.	SA	A	U	D	SD
10. I feel that I can communicate (written or spoken) with the ISP teacher when needed.	SA	A	U	D	SD
11. My child does not have any social problems, because he/she is part of the ISP program.	SA	A	U	D	SD
12. ISP has helped my child gain confidence in his abilities.	SA	A	U	D	SD
13. I feel that enough time is allotted in the ISP program for my child.	SA	A	U	D	SD
14. My child enjoys ISP.	SA	A	U	D	SD
15. The ISP program has favorably affected my child's behavior and attitude toward school.	SA	A	U	D	SD
16. My child has not had a problem doing his regular classroom work in addition to ISP.	SA	A	U	D	SD
17. I feel that I am well-informed about the ISP program.	SA	A	U	D	SD

GENERAL COMMENTS:

18. What I like best about the ISP program or regard as its strengths are:

19. What I dislike about the ISP program or regard as weaknesses are:

20. Suggestions and/or recommendations that I feel will help or strengthen the ISP program:

HIGH SCHOOL PARENTS ONLY:

21. Please state why your child does not participate in the ISP program at the high school.

22. How can we improve the program, so that if scheduling permitted, your child would participate?

23. Any other comments about the high school ISP program.

THANK YOU FOR TAKING THE TIME TO COMPLETE THIS QUESTIONNAIRE.

Appendix E

DIRECTIONS FOR ADMINISTRATING THE STUDENT INDEPENDENT STUDY PROGRAM EVALUATION

1. The person in charge should read the following to the students:

"This is not a test. We want to know how you feel about the Independent Study Program. Think about what you have done in ISP during the school year when you answer. Do not put your name on this paper."

"I am going to read the directions and it is important that you listen carefully and follow the directions."

2. Read the directions on the evaluation form.

Please explain to the students that Yes means that they think the statement is true, or that they believe the statement.

No means that the statement is false or that they believe the statement is not true.

Not Sure means that the student can not decide if the statement is true or false. The student is undecided or neutral about the question, or the question does not apply to them.

FOR EXAMPLE:

Today is a nice day. Yes No Not Sure

3. Please assure the students that the evaluation is anonymous, and that it is important for them to be honest.

4. Have the students complete the questionnaire. Ask them to fold the questionnaire in half and put it in the box.

5. Please hand out the parent evaluations, explain to the students that they are to be returned as soon as possible, and no later than May 22, 1987. Please assure them they too will be anonymous. They are to return the evaluation to the teacher, and they will be put in the evaluation box with all the other parent evaluations.