

1995

Developing talent in this century through curriculum differentiation: A timeline for professional development

Sharon D. Speckhard
University of Northern Iowa

Let us know how access to this document benefits you

Copyright ©1995 Sharon D. Speckhard

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.uni.edu/grp>



Part of the [Education Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Speckhard, Sharon D., "Developing talent in this century through curriculum differentiation: A timeline for professional development" (1995). *Graduate Research Papers*. 3336.

<https://scholarworks.uni.edu/grp/3336>

This Open Access Graduate Research Paper is brought to you for free and open access by the Student Work at UNI ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Graduate Research Papers by an authorized administrator of UNI ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact scholarworks@uni.edu.

Offensive Materials Statement: Materials located in UNI ScholarWorks come from a broad range of sources and time periods. Some of these materials may contain offensive stereotypes, ideas, visuals, or language.

Developing talent in this century through curriculum differentiation: A timeline for professional development

Abstract

A 5-year model for professional development was created to offer teachers of secondary gifted and talented students in the Dubuque Community School District varied opportunities to expand their repertoire of skills in the area of curriculum differentiation. The model was based on specific concerns about curriculum differentiation expressed by respondents on a questionnaire/needs assessment form sent to all teachers with identified students in one or more classes. Major concerns were found to be: (a) sufficient time for curriculum development to permit differentiation to be incorporated into lesson plans, (b) opportunities to meet with other teachers to share differentiation ideas, (c) structural changes involving time, space, or materials that would make differentiating easier to implement.

**DEVELOPING TALENT IN *THIS* CENTURY
THROUGH CURRICULUM DIFFERENTIATION:
A TIMELINE FOR PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT**

A Graduate Project

**Submitted to the
Division of Education of the Gifted
Department of Curriculum and Instruction,
in Partial Fulfillment**

**of the
Requirements for the Degree
Master of Arts in Education
at the
UNIVERSITY OF NORTHERN IOWA**

**by
Sharon D. Speckhard**

July, 1995

This Project by: Sharon D. Speckhard

Titled: Developing Talent in *This* Century through
Curriculum Development: A Timeline for
Professional Development

has been approved as meeting the research requirement for the
Degree of Master of Arts in Education.

7/26/95

Date approved

William Waack

William Waack
Graduate Faculty Advisor

7/26/95

Date approved

Donna Schumacher

Donna Schumacher
Graduate Faculty Reader

7/26/95

Date approved

Peggy Ishler

Peggy Ishler
Head, Department of
Curriculum and Instruction

DEDICATION

To my brother Rick, whose unwillingness to conform to the standard type of instruction offered in secondary schools 25 years ago challenged me to look for another way.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank John Burgart, Instructional Facilitator for the Dubuque Community Schools, for his assistance in developing this project. He went beyond expectations to help someone who was not a regular teacher in his district, supplying ideas, materials, and information.

My family also gets a big vote of thanks. Their moral support, hard-nosed critiquing, repeated proofreading, and general willingness to pick up the slack at home made everything possible.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract	vii
Chapter I, Introduction	
Description of the Project	1
Rationale for Development	1
Purpose of the Project	3
Importance of the Project	4
Definition of Terms	5
Chapter II, Methodology	
Procedure	7
Chapter III, The Project	15
Chapter IV, Conclusions and Recommendations	
Conclusions	27
Recommendations	29
References	32
Other Related Sources	34
Appendices	
A: Questionnaire/Needs Assessment	38
B: Cover Letter	42
C: Glossary	44
D: Informed Consent Statement	46
E: Summary of Questionnaire/Needs Assessment Responses	48

F: Help Questions Summary58
G: Timeline for Professional Development 59

ABSTRACT

A 5-year model for professional development was created to offer teachers of secondary gifted and talented students in the Dubuque Community School District varied opportunities to expand their repertoire of skills in the area of curriculum differentiation. The model was based on specific concerns about curriculum differentiation expressed by respondents on a questionnaire/needs assessment form sent to all teachers with identified students in one or more classes. Major concerns were found to be: (a) sufficient time for curriculum development to permit differentiation to be incorporated into lesson plans, (b) opportunities to meet with other teachers to share differentiation ideas, (c) structural changes involving time, space, or materials that would make differentiating easier to implement.

CHAPTER I

Introduction

Description of the Project

“Appropriate” instruction for the gifted and talented is often defined as instruction that has been differentiated in its content, process, product, and learning environment (Berger, 1991; Maker, 1982, 1995). This project was designed to determine: (a) the degree to which differentiation of these four types was being accomplished in the Dubuque (Iowa) Community School District, and (b) what approaches could be developed to assist secondary teachers in learning more about how to implement a differentiated curriculum. A questionnaire/needs assessment was developed to gather information on current practice and on teachers’ need for appropriate professional development opportunities. That information was then used to create a five-year, school-based professional development model for inservice and staff development (ISD).

Rationale for Development

Although the Dubuque Community School District had provided considerable inservice in the area of gifted and talented education in the past (Dubuque Community School District, 1991) and has continued to

support attendance at conferences and workshops, the district was uncertain of the impact of such experiences on current teaching practice at the secondary level.

Offering gifted and talented children “appropriate instruction and educational services commensurate with their abilities and needs beyond those provided by the regular school program” (Iowa Administrative Code, 1989) is often difficult in the district’s traditionally-structured secondary schools, where most teachers see five or six groups of up to 30 students for 45 or 50 minutes per day for a semester or a year. Several respondents reflected their frustration with this situation through responses on the questionnaire/needs assessment (“small classes and an aide”, “keep class sizes smaller”, “four or five fewer students would help a lot”). It is not surprising, therefore, that the process of individualizing instruction for the three to five percent of students who are identified as gifted and talented is often viewed as inefficient (Pendarvis, Howley & Howley, 1990) and an additional burden which could jeopardize the ability to teach the other 95-97% well. Indeed, one responder commented that “we are robbing all the other students”. As a result, the majority of secondary teachers need to be convinced of the value of taking time to make modifications of the curriculum.

Even with time and commitment, preservice preparation often has not provided secondary teachers instruction in the modification skills

necessary for meeting the needs of gifted students. Much emphasis at the undergraduate level of preparation seems to be placed on *what* to teach; little time is spent on *how* to teach (Loras College, 1995-1997; University of Northern Iowa, 1990-1992).

If teachers are to be enabled to differentiate, then preparation for that differentiation must take place on the job, after daily contact with students has raised a teacher's awareness of what specific skills are needed. This means schools and districts must play an ongoing role in providing professional development as needs arise. Therefore the question being addressed in this project is how a school district can help teachers work within the constraints of the secondary setting to meet the needs of gifted and talented students in regular classes.

Purpose of the Project

The major purpose of this project was to prepare a plan for professional development which would address teacher needs for learning how to differentiate (or differentiate better). At the request of John Burgart, the school district instructional facilitator with responsibility for secondary talented and gifted (TAG) programs, the writer created a questionnaire/needs assessment instrument that would not only assess secondary teacher professional development needs, but encourage teachers to think about their differentiation practices. In order to

accomplish this second purpose, it was decided to contact all teachers who had identified children in any classes, not just those who teach Honors or Advanced Placement sections of classes. It was anticipated that such a widely-distributed questionnaire would reach teachers who do not see themselves primarily as educators of the gifted and talented and would hopefully stimulate them to consider what differentiated learning opportunities they were providing for such students.

The questionnaire format was chosen because it is a comparatively non-intrusive way to solicit information from sizable numbers of people. Also, it was hoped that minimal time commitment and guaranteed anonymity would elicit many honest responses.

Importance of the Project

Evaluation/needs assessment is an important tool for keeping both individual teacher practices and district-wide gifted and talented programs viable (Borland, 1989). Three major factors seemed to indicate that an assessment of differentiation practices in the Dubuque Community School District was advisable. First of all, it has many secondary teachers whose undergraduate training took place 20 or more years ago when differentiation practices were not as developed. Second, the original push for a district TAG program occurred in 1975 and did not emphasize differentiation. Finally, the last across-the-board

inservice which focused on TAG was over 10 years ago (Dubuque Community School District, 1991).

The instructional facilitator and the writer also felt it was important to give teachers opportunities for input into any professional development planning, as they know best what specific needs they have and what will most improve their students' learning. As "front-line" educators, teachers do not usually have the time or inclination to design training, but it behooves the support personnel in the district office to base their plans on actual needs, so as not to waste time or money. Careful analysis of the responses to a questionnaire such as the one developed for this project can provide a school district the opportunity to become aware of what the needs really are.

Definition of Terms

In order to provide a common understanding, the following definitions are provided:

Differentiation: "adapting the curriculum to meet the unique needs of learners by making modifications in complexity, depth, and pacing."
(California Association for the Gifted, 1992)

Gifted and Talented: "Gifted and talented children are those identified as possessing outstanding abilities who are capable of high performance."

(Iowa Administrative Code, 1989)

Instructional Facilitator (formerly Curriculum Supervisor) : In the Dubuque Community School District, this person is one of 12 central office employees. The facilitator for Talented and Gifted (TAG) recruits the district TAG Committee, which has responsibility for monitoring identification, recommending and planning program options, identifying in-service needs, developing parent and community public relations activities, and evaluating the district program (Dubuque Community School District, 1991).

Secondary teacher: In the Dubuque Community School District, a secondary teacher is one who teaches in grades seven through twelve.

TAG Facilitator: In the Dubuque Community School District, a teacher in each building who directs the building TAG program, provides support and advocacy for TAG students, chairs the building TAG committee, maintains TAG students' records, oversees the building TAG budget, arranges TAG field trips, communicates with TAG parents, assists in keeping staff informed on TAG issues, and cooperates with district TAG staff (Dubuque Community School District, 1991).

Appendix C, which provides additional terms relating to content

and process modifications, was distributed with the questionnaire/needs assessment. The definitions given there are also used in this paper.

CHAPTER II

Methodology

Procedure

Following the new model of a Collaborative Consultant (DeBuse, 1993), the writer's role in this project was primarily that of resource gatherer and enabler, in this case for the Dubuque Community School District rather than for individual teachers. John Burgart, the district instructional facilitator for whom this project was developed, perceived that the biggest problem in enhancing curriculum differentiation at the secondary level was convincing teachers that they could differentiate. He felt that a questionnaire/needs assessment could serve a two-fold purpose of getting teachers to think about how they might differentiate their curriculum while simultaneously gathering valuable information on what help they felt they needed to expand (or begin) this practice.

After reviewing articles on curriculum differentiation for the gifted and talented (Berger, 1991; Maker, 1982, 1995) and consulting with UNI graduate students who are teachers of the gifted and talented in other districts, several parameters became clear. First, the questionnaire had to be short enough to fill out quickly, yet sufficiently open-ended to provide opportunity for teachers to express their needs. The goal was to solicit ideas, not compile numbers or statistics. Second, the instrument needed to spark thought but not be perceived as accusatory. The

purpose was to help teachers see the benefits of differentiating curriculum, not sour them on the whole idea. Third, the terminology had to be understandable to those with no experience in differentiation without boring others who had extensive knowledge and background on the topic. A final concern was preserving anonymity. This was considered necessary in order to receive honest input.

The resulting single-sheet questionnaire which was developed is shown in Appendix A. The first question solicited general information on teachers' goals for developing student talent. Four questions (Numbers 2, 4, 6, and 8) dealt with the teacher's current practice in each of the four modification areas of content, process, product, and learning environment. They listed the means of curriculum differentiation for gifted and talented students recommended by Maker (1982) and asked if the respondent was currently modifying curriculum in any of those ways. Each of those questions was followed by another (Numbers 3, 5, 7, and 9) regarding what the respondents felt would be support services or professional development opportunities that would help faculty with the specific type of modification. The final four questions (Numbers 10, 11, 12, and 13) requested information on the respondent's formal preparation in educating the gifted and talented, on structural changes at their school which would enhance their ability to differentiate, and on the type of professional development format they preferred.

Care was taken to word the questions in the most positive way possible. TAG facilitators in each of the five secondary buildings made suggestions for both the questionnaire/needs assessment and for an accompanying cover letter which explained the project (Appendix B), based on their more detailed knowledge of the teachers in their building. Modifications terminology from Berger and Maker was used, with a glossary included on a separate sheet for those who might want clarification of the terms (Appendix C). To assure anonymity, it was decided that a separate return envelope would be provided for the signed consent form required by the University of Northern Iowa (Appendix D).

Once the questionnaire/needs assessment had been developed, the TAG facilitators were asked to provide names of teachers with students in the TAG program in their classes. Packets containing a cover letter, consent form, questionnaire/needs assessment, glossary, and two pre-addressed envelopes were sent out in mid-November, 1994, through school mail to the 133 teachers who had been identified.

Three weeks were allowed for responses to be returned to the instructional facilitator, again via school mail. That deadline was further extended, but by early January, 1995, only 12 replies had been received. A second mailing was made in mid-March, 1995, to those who had not returned a signed consent form. This time, TAG facilitators were asked to

take responsibility for distributing and collecting the forms. This doubled the number of replies, with 24 returns out of the 121 distributed in that manner, for an overall return rate from the two mailings of 27%.

The next step was to evaluate the replies. Responses (available from the writer upon request) were compiled question by question, then categorized by type, according to key words (see Appendix E, Summary of Questionnaire Responses). Finally, responses to the request-for-help questions (Numbers 3, 5, 7, 9, and 12) were grouped under three general headings, Information, Idea-Sharing, and Infrastructure, according to the kind of assistance requested, with responses within each group listed in order of frequency (Appendix F, "Help" Questions Summary). The fact that categories with five or fewer responses could all be from one respondent was considered during the analysis of the help questions.

After the teachers' needs had been determined, the literature was consulted for ideas on effective ways to meet them. Maker's text (1982) was known in advance from the writer's course work in the UNI master's program. The ERIC search done prior to development of the questionnaire/needs assessment had yielded 12 citations with the key words "curriculum differentiation". A later search with the same key words offered 28 possibilities. The writer's graduate advisor provided a list of journal articles on "Staff Development/Inservice for Gifted

Education” developed by previous master’s candidates. All sources available at the University of Northern Iowa library were collected and further promising titles from the references listed at the end of each of those articles were also added to the reading list.

From those readings, Dettmer (1986) was selected as being most useful in delineating the target group by presenting characteristics of the adult learner. Her research shows that they are self-directed, experienced, in need of immediate applications and that they favor problem-centered activities.

Wood and Leadbeater (1986) presented good thought-starters regarding the various stages a multi-year plan should include. The Professional Training Committee Reports discussed by them offer a sequence of seven stages for staff development. The Awareness stage begins with basic information about definitions and characteristics of giftedness, identification, and needs. Orientation provides instruction in the goals and format of the local program, principles of differentiation, and the rationale for evaluation. Curriculum Design concentrates on scope and sequence, various models, and teaching strategies. Advanced Teacher Training is adapted to the needs of experienced teachers to offer seminars on such topics as recent curriculum developments and management techniques. The Parental Involvement stage aims to involve them as supporters of the child and the district and

as advocates for the field of Gifted Education. The Evaluation phase covers program, students, facilities, curriculum, teachers, and budget/materials. The final step is Modification of the program, based on evaluation results.

The Professional Development Standards of The Association for the Gifted (1989) detailed five groups needing various amounts of training. According to the standards, mentors, gifted child education specialists, content teachers, administrators, and general staff all need to be included.

Other articles contained specific techniques that were helpful, such as Sandra Kaplan's "coupon book", a booklet of redeemable coupons offering teachers a series of professional development options relating to the year's focus. Her "add-on newsletter" idea was also appropriate; teachers contribute ideas/suggestions/successes/questions in round-robin fashion. The compiled contributions are then distributed by district staff when the round is completed (Kaplan, 1986).

Reading these sources helped broaden the writer's awareness of factors to be considered in the creation of the final product. Many other sources were investigated regarding curriculum differentiation itself, which will be useful during the actual professional development activities conducted later by the district. These other sources are listed in "Other Related Resources"(page 34).

Since this project was initiated to help teachers, however, their responses to the questions were the primary consideration in creating the professional development program. Analysis of the five "help" questions on the questionnaire--numbers 3, 5, 7, 9, and 12 (Appendix F)--indicated that the major teacher concerns could be grouped into three areas: (a) information or training, (b) time for idea-sharing and curriculum development, and (c) infrastructure changes, whether of space or time. Some respondents also expressed a need to find time for planning interdisciplinary themes, so that was provided. Finally, concurring with Maker's statement that "evaluation is an essential part of an excellent - a defensibly excellent - program ..." (Maker, 1987), the writer built an evaluation component into the sequence as well. Altogether, then, the framework of the inservice and staff development (ISD) model was constructed around five yearly themes: Information, Idea-Sharing, Interdisciplinary Work, Infrastructure, and Improvement.

Another factor considered was the wide range of training levels among the respondents. Although some respondents indicated considerable previous preparation or experience in nature and needs of and/or programming for the talented and gifted, 10 of those who answered this question had had no instruction other than their experience in teaching (see Appendix E, Question 10). It was necessary, therefore, to provide multiple entry points and offer services on several

levels of sophistication.

The responses to Questions 2, 4, 6, and 8 contained the data on the amount of modification being done now (see Appendix E). In addition to giving the district an indication of teacher's perceptions of their current modification abilities, these sections can help the planning committee determine the thrust of summer workshops and choice of outside experts invited to speak, aiming particularly toward the types of modification least employed so that teachers will eventually have skills in all facets of differentiation.

CHAPTER III

The Project

“All the support services and professional development opportunities mean nothing if the classroom teacher does not have time to plan and integrate. I have a drawer full of good ideas that don’t get a second look, because time is at a premium. Good lessons take time! Don’t get me wrong, professional development is necessary, but to carry the ideas through, I need time. It also is a great help to meet with other teachers in the district in small groups.”

A respondent’s comment

Conceiving a professional development model that encompassed both the myriad concerns of the teachers, as expressed in their responses to the questionnaire/needs assessment, and the requirements and limitations of the district took considerable thought. The instructional facilitator had requested a 3- to 5-year sequence that was school-based. The writer was aware that additional funding for the project was unlikely; voters had voted down the latest school board proposal for an instructional support levy just a month before. Therefore, all activities would have to be financed by existing sources--primarily Allowable Growth and Phase III funds.

The 5-year timeline which resulted from the questionnaire/needs assessment data and these considerations was designed to build slowly, beginning with an emphasis on individual teacher needs in the content areas, as both the questionnaire/needs assessment responses and the literature review had already made clear that teachers are “most interested in obtaining information concerning methods and techniques ... geared to their particular grade level and/or subject content area” (Tomlinson, 1986, p. 110). It then moves on to involve the interdisciplinary team, the infrastructure of the entire school, and eventually broadens out to include parents and the wider community, incorporating the seven stages of staff development recommended by the Professional Training Committee Reports (Leadbeater & Wood, 1986). It addresses The Association for the Gifted’s Professional Development Standards which relate to schools (The Association for the Gifted, 1989). It takes into account the characteristics of adult learners (Dettmer, 1986).

The model utilizes both mini-sabbaticals during the school-year (in the form of brainstorming/planning retreats) as well as summer workshops, the two preferred modes of inservice (see Appendix E, Question 13). These were scheduled to take place without pulling teachers out of the classroom, since at least one respondent was adamantly opposed to losing more student contact time (“NO! NO! NO!

NOT OUT OF THE CLASSROOM!!), a stance with which the writer agrees. And everything except the observations in other districts takes place in Dubuque, another concern expressed by respondents (“...inservice in Dubuque, Iowa for all teachers,” one said, with the underlinings shown). As an added bonus, this proposal offers teachers the opportunity to work toward the new, 12-graduate-credit-hour state talented and gifted endorsement, if their interest goes beyond the basic Gifted Child course recommended for all teachers of identified students.

The format for each year is similar. There are no activities the first 4 weeks, to allow teachers uninterrupted time to begin the year well in their classrooms. During Years 2 through 5 the teachers would be setting into action the techniques and plans they had developed the previous summer.

On or about October 1st the instructional facilitator would begin circulation of the add-on newsletter. This is a low-cost, no-teaching-time-lost way to share information and ideas. Teachers would be asked what they want to see included in the workshop the following summer and which types of speaker would be most valuable to hear in order to learn targeted techniques that could then be put to use in their curriculum planning. After the first year they might also be asked to share comments on what was most useful from the previous summer’s speakers and workshop.

The routing of the newsletter would differ each year, depending on the focus: within content areas in Years 1 and 2, and in interdisciplinary clusters for Year 3. The completed newsletter would be duplicated through the office of the instructional facilitator and sent out at the beginning of the next semester.

This first-semester newsletter would also be used to collect information on: human and material resources on hand (Year 1), mentors needed (Year 2), business/community resources needed (Year 3), and parent resources needed (Year 4). In Year 1 the collected list of available resources would also be distributed to all teachers with identified students. In subsequent years the instructional facilitator, or someone else designated by the District TAG Committee, would use the gathered information to recruit the needed human resources specified above. Then they would train those people in basic nature and needs of the gifted and talented and make the names available to teachers.

Sometime during the second semester a Saturday planning retreat or a series of shorter meetings during the monthly 2-hour early release/late-arrival inservice slots would be set up to organize for the summer. This planning committee would be composed primarily of teachers, but its exact makeup would be likely to change according to the focus of each coming summer. For instance, the teachers most interested in learning how to differentiate within content areas would hopefully

desire a role in determining the outside speakers and workshop format for Year 1. On the other hand, those more drawn to working up differentiated curricula based on interdisciplinary themes would gravitate toward Year 2. In this way, the people to be served each year have primary ownership of the process for providing the services they need.

The planning committee would also be responsible for developing the coupon book of professional development opportunities for the summer and following school year. Coupons would be redeemable for such items as Phase III money to attend a course leading to the TAG endorsement, stipends (if possible) for attending the summer workshop, and substitute time while the teacher goes to another building or out of district during the school year to observe demonstration lessons using upcoming modes of differentiation. The teachers' ability to choose which coupon/s to redeem each year gives them control over their own professional development and emphasizes the voluntary nature of the model. If teachers using the coupons the first year consider their experiences helpful in their classrooms, word of mouth hopefully will increase utilization in the following years.

The instructional facilitator and building administrators need to be consulted by the planning committee at this point to discuss the financial questions that will arise. If this professional development sequence has been incorporated into the TAG budget, however, amounts available will

be known in advance. Then teachers can be accommodated first-come, first-served up to the limit established by the budget for each option.

Others interested in attending any facet of the professional development should be encouraged to do so at their own expense, however.

In the second semester another add-on newsletter should be circulated. During Year 1 this edition of the newsletter would be used to gather information about what works best with the students of teachers who are already differentiating. In Years 2 through 5 teachers would have a chance to discuss the successes, problems, and questions that might arise after they have had some experience with their new approaches to differentiation. As before, the collected newsletter input would be printed by the district office and distributed to all teachers with identified students. If the district goes on-line sometime during this period, the newsletters could be routed and disseminated electronically, and ongoing idea-sharing would be much easier.

The circulating time in the second semester will need to be shorter, because the planning committee will use the information provided to select master teachers to videotape before school ends. However, this should be the only activity during the last four weeks, to allow teachers to concentrate on ending the year well with their students. The best tapes can then be shown during the summer workshops and also can be valuable in building a visual library of differentiation in action, that would

be available to anyone thereafter.

Next comes summer, when freedom from daily classroom needs should allow everyone time to concentrate more intently on professional development. The first priority is to make basic information about the gifted and talented available to all who touch their lives. The completion of an Iowa Communications Network (ICN) site adjacent to the district office early in 1996 will make this imperative immeasurably easier.

The University of Northern Iowa is already offering The Gifted Child, its introductory course in the Education of the Gifted program, via ICN during the first summer session of even-numbered years. Discussion between the writer and the professor currently teaching that course confirmed that adding Dubuque as a site would be very feasible, given sufficient enrollment. This means that all teachers with identified students could receive a thorough grounding in the field within 2 years of joining the district. More senior teachers without formal training, those interested in the TAG endorsement, administrators, support staff, parents, and providers of mentorships/internships from the community should also be urged to attend, either for credit or audit. The credit hours earned would be valuable for those in need of recertification. Tuition perhaps could come from Phase III funds provided the professional development project meets the requirements of district school improvement plans.

In the odd-numbered summers the same professor offers

Educational Strategies for the Gifted via ICN, another course required for TAG endorsement. Provisions for completing the two remaining classes in Dubuque could also be made, he felt. For instance, teachers could easily make connections with the University of Dubuque's summer program for the gifted and talented, UD for Kids, to fulfill the Practicum requirement, as the writer did in 1994. Because of the alternating schedule of summer courses, new (or newly interested) teachers could begin on the endorsement route every other year.

If a core of people interested in TAG education will be at the district office for 2 hours each day during the 4 weeks of each summer's course, it makes sense to the writer that the presentations by experts be offered at that time. Depending on the ICN broadcast time each year this activity may need to be scheduled either before or after class. The number and type of presenters will depend on the needs teachers have expressed to the planning committee through the fall newsletters and upon the budget constraints. Some presenters may well be the master teachers who were videotaped during the school year.

Big-name educators should be used sparingly. The most useful presentations, according to responses on the questionnaire/needs assessment, will be master teachers in the Dubuque or other districts who can share the specific skills and strategies for differentiation most directly related to the focus of that summer's workshop. The presentation

schedule should be made available to the entire community before the school year ends, and sessions should be open to all who are interested.

After using June primarily for learning, July becomes the time for application. The summer workshops should be structured to meet the strong need expressed in the questionnaire/needs assessment for curriculum development time. This activity was identified by 24 responders to the questionnaire/needs assessment, the most of any single item (see Appendix F). As with the planning committee membership, the workshop participants will likely differ from year to year according to the focus, so the workshop format should reflect the needs of each year's group.

Some groups may want to work intensively for one week; other groups may feel the need to spread the workshop over a longer time to allow space between meetings to develop each stage of the differentiated curriculum. By the end of the month, however, each year's participants will hopefully come away with a clear idea about how they plan to implement a more differentiated curriculum that fall. These workshops can be led by the instructional facilitator, the AEA TAG consultant, a master teacher in the district, or cooperatively by the members themselves.

Thought should also be given to meeting sites. The first year, when people in various buildings are becoming better acquainted and

the focus is on content areas, it might be wise to meet in each of the five secondary buildings sometime during the workshop. Then everyone will understand the constraints under which colleagues in their own content area must work. This will help the group develop a plan that takes those limitations into consideration. Seeing how the faculty of one building has adapted to or compensated for its site may also provide ideas useful to others.

Familiarity with the various places of learning also will be crucial for the workshop participants in Year 3 (planning for Infrastructure), if there is to be progress in making form follow function in both the learning environment and the school day. Teachers may ask that building administrators and district personnel with oversight for facilities be involved to some extent in this year's workshop.

The size of the working groups is another factor to consider in planning. Much will depend on enrollment, of course, but several small groups will probably accomplish more than one large one. For Year 1, for instance, groups of 10 in each content area would be ideal. Since some respondents felt a unified 7-12 scope-and-sequence had been lost with recent innovations, that will need to precede differentiation within content areas. A group composed of two teachers from each building in each subject area would be large enough to supply needed information and input but not too large to work efficiently. If more than 10 sign up for

one content area, that workshop could be split into various subgroups once the differentiation work begins, each focusing on a particular course or unit.

Different groupings will be necessary when the focus is on developing differentiation through interdisciplinary themes or on broadening differentiation possibilities by involving the wider community, so subsequent planning committees should not blindly duplicate the structure set up the first year. If this professional development model is to remain needs-based, it must be re-invented, or at least re-examined, every year.

In the fifth year of the timeline, the focus should be evaluation of the professional development sequence. Did it accomplish its objective? That is, are teachers more capable differentiators than they were five years ago?

Some Year 4 workshop groups will need to spend time developing an evaluation plan, while other groups that year will be working on expanding differentiation abilities by involving the wider community. If the evaluation can be completed during the first semester of Year 5, the results will be useful to the planning committee during the second semester to decide on format changes before the following summer. If differentiation is found to be at a level where its use will continue from the momentum gained when teachers see that it does actually improve the

educational experiences of gifted and talented students, then the focus of the professional development activities can be shifted to another facet of TAG education.

This professional development model should be usable with a variety of other topics. The general format of newsletters, teacher-led planning committees, and summer workshops is applicable to many inservice situations.

CHAPTER IV

Conclusions and Recommendations

Conclusions

Developing this project provided the writer with new insights into the workings of both school districts and people's minds. The first insight came with the instructional facilitator's identification of differentiation as the greatest need for the TAG program at the secondary level. After two years of graduate work in Education of the Gifted, it was clear to the writer that a differentiated curriculum is the very foundation of programming for such students. It was a jolt, therefore, when the instructional facilitator's choice sparked a mental review of 10 years of personal and parental experience in the district which revealed not one instance of in-class differentiation. Whole-class differentiation such as Honors and Advanced Placement sections of courses, and concurrent enrollment at local colleges were the only options recalled.

That forced renewed consideration of the various factors which make it difficult for teachers at this level to differentiate in regular classes, as discussed in the rationale section of this project. Some of the negative comments on the questionnaires, one angry phone call, and perhaps the low return rate of questionnaires itself all were reminders that not everyone would embrace the changes this professional development sequence might initiate as eagerly as the writer. This

insight helped to determine the open-ended, multiple-entry, totally-voluntary nature of the proposal. The coupon books and the frequent offering of the graduate course *The Gifted Child* as a basic introduction to the nature and needs of TAG students will hopefully send the message that this professional development program is available whenever teachers are ready to take advantage of it.

Responder comments offered further revelations in the area of structural limitations. The constraining effects of short, unchangeable periods, also noted in the rationale, was a concern of some teachers at the high school level and was well known to the writer. The three junior high schools, which have moved toward the middle-school concept in the last three years, also had structural problems, however. Although the time flexibility and opportunity for developing interdisciplinary themes now possible in these buildings was mentioned as factors favorable to differentiation, the loss of contact with other teachers in the same content area was a factor that which some junior high responders felt limited their ability to differentiate. One person even suggested abolishing the new house system altogether. To accommodate these conflicting needs, the summer workshops were set up to offer communication both ways: in content areas first and then in interdisciplinary themes. Infrastructure changes are then the focus for another whole year.

Perhaps the most surprising insight gained from reading

questionnaire/needs assessment responses was how much differentiation teachers felt was already taking place, in contrast to the instructional facilitator's and the writer's perceptions. Much of what the teachers listed was either whole-class differentiation or independent study, which are easier to implement than cluster grouping, but many of the teachers who chose to return the questionnaire/needs assessments apparently are modifying the curriculum in some manner. This should provide the district with a good core group of teachers who are likely to be favorable to efforts to refine and perhaps expand their differentiation skills.

These same teachers may also be helpful in providing models for others who are just starting along the path of differentiation. If the timeline is implemented as envisioned, the more proficient differentiators will be videotaped in action in their classrooms to use in demonstration films during the summer workshops. That would keep the programs more school-based than the typical outside-expert-for-a-day inservice, on which some responders commented in a negative manner.

Recommendations

Several recommendations for future development of the project can be made, but they must be viewed cautiously due to the limitations of this study. A 27% return rate may be higher than many voluntary, mail-

in surveys of this type usually receive, but it is not necessarily representative of the whole population, nor is it a random sample.

Nevertheless it was felt to be a usable sample, based on the assumption that the people who cared enough about differentiation or gifted education in general to return the questionnaire would be the same ones who will take advantage of the ISD. There will be some changeover of the overall population each year due to retirements and new hires, however, so an annual or biennial repeat of the questionnaire/needs assessment is recommended, both to keep the proposal responsive to changing needs and to recheck the validity.

The next recommendation is to present the proposed timeline to the board of education once the instructional facilitator has reviewed and approved or revised it. The support of that body for the general concept will be crucial to getting funding allocated, which in turn will determine how much of the program can be carried out. The very bare framework presented here can then be fleshed out as much or as little as the budget allows.

A third recommendation, however, is not to set the proposal in stone, no matter how much funding it receives. In order to provide the training which teachers truly need, this program will need to remain in an uncomfortable state of uncertainty from year to year. Each round of training and the successes and failures of each year's implementation

efforts will greatly affect the needs to be addressed the following summer.

The final recommendation is to start somewhere to work toward better and more widespread differentiation. A small group of interested learners can be very effective change agents, supplied only with a few photocopied articles and the time to talk and plan together. We cannot wait for the millennium to see which of the educational reforms now being debated in our district and throughout the country will prevail. Gifted and talented students need an appropriate education now, in this century.

REFERENCES

- Berger, S. L. (1991). Differentiating curriculum for gifted students. Reston, VA: The Council for Exceptional Children. (ERIC Document Reproduction Services No. ED 342 175)
- Borland, J. (1989). Planning and implementing programs for the gifted. New York City, NY: Teachers College Press.
- California Association for the Gifted .(1992, April). CAG position Statements: A glossary. Canoga Park, CA.
- DeBuse, M. , & Shoemaker, B. J. E. (1993). The changing role of TAG teachers: An Oregon case study. Roeper Review, 16 (1), 58-61.
- Dettmer, P. (1986). Characteristics and needs of adult learners in gifted program inservice and staff development. Gifted Child Quarterly, 30 (3), 131.
- Dubuque Community School District (1991).K-12 talented and gifted program (available from Dubuque Community School District, 2300 Chaney Road, Dubuque, Iowa 52001).
- Iowa Administrative Code (1989).Chapter 59, Section 44, 257.44.
GIFTED AND TALENTED CHILDREN DEFINED,
DesMoines, IA: State of Iowa
- Kaplan, S. N. (1986). Alternatives for the design of gifted program inservice and staff development. Gifted Child Quarterly, 30 (3), 138-139.

- Loras College (1995-97). Loras College Undergraduate Bulletin, 77
(available from Loras College, 1450 Alta Vista Street, Dubuque,
Iowa 52001).
- Maker, C. J. (1982). Teaching models in education of the gifted Austin,
TX: Pro-Ed, Inc.
- Maker, C. J. (1987) Critical issues in gifted education: Defensible
programs for the gifted . Aspen, CO: Aspen Press.
- Maker, C. J. (1995). Teaching models in education of the gifted Austin,
TX: Pro-Ed, Inc.
- Pendarvis, E. D., Howley, A. A., & Howley, C. B. (1990). The Abilities of
Gifted Children, Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, 321-356.
- The Association for the Gifted. (1989). Standards for programs involving
the gifted and talented. Reston, VA: Council for Exceptional
Children.
- Tomlinson, S. (1986). A survey of participant expectations for inservice in
education of the gifted. Gifted Child Quarterly 30 (3), 110-1113.
- University of Northern Iowa (1990-1992). The University of Northern Iowa
Catalog, 36 (available from the University Northern Iowa, Cedar
Falls, IA 50614).
- Wood, S., & Leadbeater, J. (1986). Stages of entry for target groups
participation in gifted program inservice and staff development.
Gifted Child Quarterly 30 (3), 127-130.

OTHER RELATED SOURCES

- Burns, D. E., & Reis, S. M.. (1991). Developing a thinking skills component in the gifted education program. Roeper Review, 14 (2), 72-79.
- Carr, J., McGuinness, S., Oatey, J., & Holder, A. (1992). Individual programmes using IT. British Journal of Special Education, 19 (1), 35-41.
- Crump, W. D, Schlichter, C. L., & Palk, B. E. (1988). Teaching HOTS in the middle and high school: A district-level initiative in developing higher order thinking skills. Roeper Review, 10 (4), 205-211.
- Dettmer, P., (1986). Gifted program inservice and staff development: Pragmatics and possibilities. Gifted Child Quarterly, 30 (3), 99-102.
- Ganapole, S. J. (1989). Designing an integrated curriculum for gifted learners: An organizational framework. Roeper Review, 12 (2), 81-85.
- Jellen, H. G., & Verduin, Jr., J. R. (1986). Handbook for Differential Education of the Gifted Carbondale and Edwardsville: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Kulieke, M. J. (1986). The role of evaluation in inservice and staff development for educators of the gifted. Gifted Child Quarterly, 30 (3), 140-144.

- Maker, C. J. (1982). Curriculum Development in Gifted Education. Aspen, CO:Aspen Press.
- Monaco, T. M., & Georgiades, W. D. (1986). Preparing teachers of gifted students to solve problems. Roeper Review, 9 (2), 85-87.
- North Carolina State Department of Public Instruction (1988, April). Excellence for the future: Program options for the academically gifted. Raleigh, NC: Division for Exceptional Children. (ERIC Document Reproduction Services No. ED 300 966)
- Ohio State Department of Education (1992). Models for providing a continuum of services to: Gifted students. Columbus, OH: Columbus Division of Special Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Services No. ED350 803)
- Page, R. N., & Valli, L. (Eds.). (1990). Curriculum differentiation: Interpretative studies in U.S. secondary schools Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Passow, A. H. (1986). Reflections on three decades of education of the gifted. Roeper Review, 8 (4), 223-226.
- Renzulli, J. S.(Ed.). (1986). Systems and models for developing programs for gifted and talented. Mansfield Center, CT: Creative Learning Press.

- Renzulli, J. S. (1988). The multiple menu model for developing differentiated curriculum for the gifted and talented. Gifted Child Quarterly, 32 (3), 298-308.
- Renzulli, J. S. (1994/5, December/January) Teachers as talent scouts. Educational Leadership, 52 (4), 75-81.
- Roberts, J. L., & Roberts, R. A. (1986) Differentiating inservice through teacher concerns about education for the gifted. Gifted Child Quarterly, 30 (3), 107-109.
- Rogers, K. B. (1989). Training teachers of the gifted: What do they know? Roeper Review, 11 (3), 145-150.
- Schlichter, C. L. (1986). Talents unlimited: An inservice education model for teaching thinking skills. Gifted Child Quarterly, 30 (3), 119-123.
- Smith-Westberry, J. S., & Job, R. L. (1986). How to be a prophet in your own land: Providing gifted program inservice for the local district. Gifted Child Quarterly, 30 (3), 135-137.
- VanTassel-Baska, J. (1986). Lessons from the history of teacher inservice in Illinois: Effective staff development in the education of gifted students. Gifted Child Quarterly, 30 (3), 124-126.
- VanTassel-Baska, J. (1989, March). Appropriate curriculum for gifted learners. Educational Leadership, 46 (6), 13-15.

Weiss, P., & Gallagher, J. (1986). Project TARGET: A needs assessment approach to gifted education inservice. Gifted Child Quarterly, 30 (3), 114-118.

Willard-Holt, C. (1994). Strategies for individualizing instruction in regular classrooms. Roeper Review, 17 (1), 43-45.

Appendix A

**DEVELOPING TALENT IN *THIS* CENTURY
THROUGH CURRICULUM DIFFERENTIATION**

Directions: Please complete the questions below and return to Sharon D. Speckhard, c/o John Burgart, at the Forum in the envelope marked Questionnaire. Use additional paper as necessary for further comment. You should have a form for each course you teach that contains identified talented and gifted students. A glossary of terms used in the questions is enclosed.

1. What are your goals for developing the talent of your most able learners in this course?

Content Modifications

2. Course content can be modified through acceleration, compacting, variety, re-organization, flexible pacing, or the use of more advanced/complex concepts, abstractions and materials. Do you currently modify **content** for your most able students in any of these ways?

3. What support services or professional development opportunities would help you go further in modifying content?

Process Modifications

4. Restructuring, use of higher-level or more open-ended questions, and encouragement of self-directed learning are ways to alter the way we teach. How do you modify **process** for your most able students?

5. Which support services or professional development opportunities would help here?

Product Modifications

6. Are the **products**--the visible results--of this course currently different from a regular class in any of the following ways: dealing with real problems/concerns/audiences, synthesizing rather than summarizing, doing self-evaluations ?

7. If not, what would make such differentiation a possibility? If yes, what more do you need to expand the scope of your adaptations?

Learning Environment Modifications

8. Small changes in **learning environment** can have a big effect on student achievement. A receptive, non-judgmental, student-centered classroom which encourages inquiry and independence, includes a variety of materials, and allows some physical movement (including movement beyond the classroom) has been shown to establish the climate essential for these students. How are you moving to meet needs in this realm?

9. Again, what assistance would make this easier?

Background Information

10. What training have you received in the characteristics and needs of the gifted? Please specify source of training, e.g., college classes, inservices, workshops or conferences, reading, etc.

11. What additional training would you like to have?

12. What structural changes in your building (in daily schedule, possibilities for interdisciplinary courses, physical space, etc.) would help you better meet the different educational needs of these students?

13. In which professional development opportunities would you be most likely to participate?

- _____ school-based inservice programs
- _____ optional mini-sabbaticals scheduled during the school year
- _____ evening graduate or recertification courses
- _____ summer courses or workshops

Appendix B

November, 1994

Dear Teacher of Gifted Students,

Studies of able learners indicate that modifications of content, process, product, and learning environment are important for providing such students with an appropriate curriculum. The enclosed questionnaire was constructed as a project for the Spring, 1994 Educational Strategies for the Gifted class at UNI, in cooperation with TAG Supervisor John Burgart, to gather information on the current status of secondary curriculum differentiation in the Dubuque Community Schools. The results will be used by the district to assist in planning future professional development opportunities.

If you are willing to contribute to this project, please read and sign the enclosed informed consent statement (as required by the Human Subjects Review Board at UNI), and return it in the envelope marked CONSENT FORM. Then take a few minutes to complete thoughtfully the accompanying questionnaire/s. This will help us determine what your needs are, so that we can plan inservices or mini-sabbaticals that are

most useful to you. A glossary has been included to clarify the terms mentioned in the questions.

When you have finished with the questionnaire/s, please seal and return in the envelope labeled QUESTIONNAIRE by December 9th.. Results will be compiled and a summary will be available for interested staff from John's office after January 5, 1995.

Thank you for contributing to my master's project and to the district curriculum planning process in this way.

Sharon D. Speckhard

Appendix C

GLOSSARY

(adapted from ERIC Digest document EDO-EC-91-15,
"Differentiating Curriculum for Gifted Students" by Sandra L. Berger)

Content terms

Acceleration - moving through material at the student's pace, eliminating review and repetition if mastery is shown after one exposure

Advanced/Complex abstractions - opportunities to generalize, to integrate and apply concepts learned

Advanced/Complex concepts - using the facts learned to go beyond the obvious, offering students the opportunity to ask and answer "What if..." questions

Advanced/Complex Materials - finding or creating materials keyed to the level of the student's ability

Compacting - reducing time spent on the required curriculum by pretesting for knowledge already acquired, to allow the student to go further or deeper into the field

Flexible pacing - making it possible for individual students to move ahead where compacting allows them time to do additional work in their area of interest

Reorganization - integrating content into broad-based themes for more coherent presentation

Variety - presenting materials in several different ways, to match students' differing learning styles

Process Terms

Higher-level/open-ended questions - develop and capitalize on students' ability to abstract and apply concepts, move them upward in Bloom's taxonomy

Restructuring - integrating materials within courses or even whole courses with each other to make them more intellectually demanding

Self-directed learning - move steadily toward the goal of creating independent learners

Appendix D

INFORMED CONSENT STATEMENT

The **purposes** of this research are: 1) to gather information about the amount of curriculum differentiation occurring in classes containing talented and gifted students and about teachers' perceived need for more information on and practice in adapting curricula and 2) to design appropriate professional development opportunities to meet the needs articulated. Teachers will be exposed to a questionnaire and, if they choose, to some form of inservice on curriculum differentiation.

The **foreseeable risks** or discomforts teachers may experience are related to their evaluation of the current extent of their instructional strategies for meeting the needs of talented and gifted students in their classes and to the stress of learning new techniques, if they participate in professional development.

The **potential benefits** to teachers are the curriculum modification abilities to be acquired. Potential benefits to students are the changes in their curriculum which allow them to learn in the most efficient and productive way possible.

To maintain **confidentiality**, questionnaires will not identify the respondents.

Participation in this project is **voluntary**.

This project is being carried out by Sharon D. Speckhard, 1339 Mount Pleasant, Dubuque, Iowa 52001-6143, 319/588-3379, under the advisement of Dr. William Waack, Director of Teacher Education, Department of Curriculum and Instruction, 159A Schindler Education Center, UNI, Cedar Falls, Iowa 50614, 319/273-2265.

Subjects may contact the office of the Human Subjects Coordinator at UNI, 319/273-2748, for answers to questions about the research and about the rights of research subjects.

I am fully aware of the nature and extent of my participation in this project as stated above and of the possible risks arising from it. I hereby agree to participate in this project. I acknowledge that I have received a copy of this consent statement.

(Signature of subject)

(Date)

(Printed name of subject)

(Signature of investigator)

Appendix E

SUMMARY OF QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSES

Question #1 (goals)

[33 responses]

-answers related primarily to content:	8
-answers related primarily to process: (including thinking skills)	10
-answers related primarily to product: (including performances)	6
-answers related primarily to learning environment:	11

Question #2 (types of content differentiation being done)

[32 responses]

-acceleration	17
-compacting	8
-variety	8
-reorganization (integration)	5
-flexible pacing	3
-advanced/complex concepts	14
-abstractions	5
-materials	9

Question #3 (help needed for modifying content)**[30 responses]**

-outside experts	2
-facilitator assistance	1
-training in TAG	1
-criteria for placement	1
-materials (books, curriculum package)	2
-none	4
-inservices	5
-time for curriculum development	8
-meet with other subject teachers	7
-small classes	1
-professional conferences	1
-any	2

Question #4 (types of process modification being done)**[34 responses]**

-restructuring	10
-higher-level thinking	20
-open-ended questions	8
-self-directed learning	13
-none	1

Question #5 (help needed for modifying process)**[19 responses]**

-facilitator assistance	1
-training in TAG	1
-materials	3
-none	5
-meeting with other subject teachers	2
-training in techniques	3
-inservices	4
-reduced class size	1
-time	4

Question #6 (types of product modification being done)**[32 responses]**

-real problems/concerns/audiences	14
-synthesizing	7
-self-evaluations	10
-none	3
-all	2

Question #7 (help needed for modifying product)**[21 responses]**

-class size	1
-none	1
-teacher self-evaluation	2
-criteria for placement	2
-materials	3
-time	8
-slower pacing	1
-more student contact time	1
-training	2
-meet with other subject teachers	2
-motivate students	1
-curriculum guide	1

Question #8 (types of learning environment mod. being done)**[26 responses]**

-receptive (included physical set-up)	4
-non-judgmental	3
-student-centered (including group work)	12
-inquiry	2
-independence	3
-variety of materials	4
-movement	3
-movement beyond the classroom	9
-none	3

Question #9 (help needed for modifying learning environment)

[26 responses]

-class size	3
-space	4
-facilitator assistance	1
-materials	5
-nothing	1
-transportation budget	2
-flexible schedule	2
-technology	3
-training	3
-time	4
-slower pacing	1
-meet with other subject teachers	2

Question #10 (formal training)

[35 responses]

-college courses	11
-inservices	10
-workshops/conferences	19
-reading	5
-none	10
-parts of courses	2
-student teaching	2

Question #11 (training wanted)

[24 responses]

-inservices	5
-conferences	5
-worthwhile local meetings	1
-practical strategies	2
-how to challenge gifted and talented	1
-writing training	1
-none	2
-meeting with other subject teachers	1
-information on integrated curriculum	1
-team to design synthesis-type problems	1
-share projects with other TAG teachers	1
-observe other classes	1
-information on guidance needs	1
-H.O.T.S.	1
-information on curriculum modification	1

Question #12 (structural changes needed)

[31 responses]

-flexible/longer/block scheduling	10
-changes already in place	3
-expeditionary learning	1
-restructure placement criteria	1
-no change possible	1
-all honors in one cluster	1
-larger room/physical space	6
-space in schedule for optional courses	1
-computers/computer room	5
-interdisciplinary planning	6
-end house system	1
-larger LRC	3
-none	1
-phone in classroom	1
-fewer TAG classes	1
-additional science lab	1
-team with an elementary	1

Question #13 (preferred professional development).

-school-based inservice	17
-mini-sabbaticals during school year	17
-evening courses	3
-summer courses/ workshops	11
-any	2
-none	3

Appendix F
“HELP” QUESTIONS SUMMARY

69	<u>Type of Help</u>	<u>Content (#3)</u>	<u>Process (#5)</u>	<u>Product (#7)</u>	<u>Learning Environment (#9)</u>	<u>Building (#12)</u>	<u>Total</u>
	<i>Information</i>						
	Inservices	5	4	-	-	-	9
	Training	-	3	2	3	-	8
	Facilitator Assist.	1	1	-	1	-	3
	Outside Experts	2	-	-	-	-	2
	TAG Training	1	1	-	-	-	2
	Conferences	1	-	-	-	-	1
	Curriculum Guide	-	-	1	-	-	1
	Motivate Students	-	-	<u>1</u>	-	-	<u>1</u>
	Total	10	9	4	4	0	27
	<i>Idea-sharing</i>						
	Curriculum Dev. Time	8	4	8	4	-	24
	Meet w/ Other Subj. Teach.	7	2	2	2	-	13
	Interdisciplinary Planning	-	-	-	-	<u>6</u>	<u>6</u>
	Total	15	6	10	6	6	43
	<i>Infrastructure</i>						
	Materials	2	3	3	5	-	13
	Flexible scheduling	-	-	-	2	10	12
	Space	-	-	-	4	6	10
	Technology (Computers)	-	-	-	3	5	8
	Small classes	1	1	1	3	-	6
	Placement criteria	1	-	2	-	1	4
	Larger LRC	-	-	-	-	3	3
	Transportation budget	-	-	-	2	-	2
	More contact time	-	-	1	-	-	1
	Additional science lab	-	-	-	-	1	1
	Phone in classroom	-	-	-	-	1	1
	Expeditionary Learning	-	-	-	-	1	1
	Fewer TAG classes	-	-	-	-	1	1
	All honors in 1 cluster	-	-	-	-	1	1
	Team with an elem.	-	-	-	-	1	1
	Room in sched. for opt.s	-	-	-	-	1	1
	End house system	-	-	-	-	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>
	Total	4	4	7	19	33	68

Appendix G

TIMELINE FOR PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Year 1

Focus:

Information

Planning Goals:

- to build identity among educators of the talent and gifted
- to foster communication within content areas

First Semester:

- circulate add-on newsletter among 7-12 teachers, within content areas, to determine needs
- compile list of all professional development resources on hand (books, a-v, etc.) in each building and at Forum (district office)

Second Semester:

- distribute compiled newsletter ideas and resources list
- begin 2nd semester newsletter to collect info from those now differentiating
- meet with planning committee to brainstorm plans for summer workshop and develop coupon book of professional development options for summer and next year
- videotape master teachers already differentiating for summer viewing

June:

- offer The Gifted Child at Forum/Keystone ICN site as basic training in Education of the Gifted or for those who want state TAG endorsement
- invite differentiation experts in different subject areas for one-day presentations

July:

- offer workshop for teachers to develop scope and sequence in content areas, work on differentiation strategies, view master teacher tapes in each subject area, with multiple groups if enrollment warrants.
- compile list of mentorships/internships needed

Year 2

Focus: Idea-Sharing

Implementation Goal: -to begin classroom differentiation within subject areas

Planning Goal: -to foster communication between subjects

First Semester:

- circulate add-on newsletter, again by content areas, to collect input on successes and problems of the summer workshops and suggestions of possible mentors/internship sites in various fields
- teachers use coupons for visiting demonstration lessons within district or observations of differentiation in other districts, according to interest

Second Semester:

- distribute compiled newsletters
- 2nd newsletter round, about successes/problems/questions with content differentiation
- contact suggested mentors , compile list of those willing to be trained and work with students
- offer mentors basic training in nature and needs of gifted students before school begins in the fall
- meet within grade levels to brainstorm format for summer workshop and determine expert speakers needed
- develop coupon book again
- videotape successful subject-area differentiations

June:

- offer Educational Strategies for the Gifted at Forum/Keystone ICN site for state TAG endorsement
- invite experts on interdisciplinary planning for one-day presentations

July:

- offer another teacher workshop on differentiation, with groups constructed on interdisciplinary basis

Year 3

Focus:

Interdisciplinary Work

Implementation Goal: -to begin interdisciplinary differentiation

Planning Goal: -to foster communication with administrators and district personnel regarding structural changes needed to improve delivery to gifted and talented

First Semester:

- circulate add-on newsletter by interdisciplinary themes, again reviewing workshop and gathering info on needs for next summer's focus
- use coupons for observation of interdisciplinary techniques, in and beyond district
- distribute list of trained mentors/internship sites
- solicit list of needed community resources , by theme

Second Semester:

- distribute compiled 1st semester newsletter
- begin 2nd semester newsletter, on success of interdisciplinary differentiation
- contact suppliers of community resources and train in nature and needs before fall
- brainstorming day for summer workshop on infrastructure, plan to involve administrators and district office employees
- videotape successful interdisciplinary implementations

June:

- offer "Coordinating and Directing Gifted Programs" for those seeking endorsement
- offer *The Gifted Child* again for new teachers and those starting 2nd round of endorsement sequence
- invite expert speakers on infrastructure changes

July:

- offer workshop on infrastructure changes needed to improve TAG program
- compile list of parent resources needed

Year 4

Focus: Infrastructure

Implementation Goal: -to begin infrastructure changes needed to improve ability to differentiate

Planning Goals: -to foster communication with wider community
-to plan for evaluating model

First Semester:

- circulate add-on newsletter (perhaps via electronic bulletin board?) within levels (jr./sr. high) to comment on last and next workshops
- use coupons for observations between buildings and out-of-district infrastructure/schedule changes
- solicit info from teachers on parent resources available

Second Semester:

- distribute compiled newsletter
- begin second round newsletter
- contact parents to determine training needs/desires and resources they have to offer
- brainstorm summer workshop to include parent training and set up evaluation program
- videotape successful structural change implementations

June:

- coordinate with University of Dubuque and UNI to offer Practicum in conjunction with UD for Kids program for teachers finishing endorsement
- offer "Educational Strategies for the Gifted" via ICN again for second-round endorsement group
- provide expert speakers on a) involving parents and community in gifted programs, and b) evaluation/program change

July:

- offer workshop on a) planning to involve wider community, and b) evaluation/program change

Year 5

Focus: Improvement

Implementation Goals: -to involve the wider community in the gifted program at all levels and to assess the program

Planning Goal: -to make needed changes in professional development sequence, based on evaluation, or to change topic

First Semester:

- ask parents and community to contribute to add-on newsletter with comments about perceptions/assessment of overall program and summer workshop
- implement evaluation plan developed at summer workshop, with teacher observations between content areas/ themes/ building levels
- implement any parent education programs not carried out in summer (or repeat for another group of parents)

Second Semester:

- distribute compiled newsletter
- brainstorm summer speakers/workshop on program change or new topic, depending on evaluation results
- videotape best overall examples of involvement with wider community and differentiation successes revealed by evaluation teams

June:

- begin third round of endorsement strand with "The Gifted Child" via ICN, also available to parents for audit or credit
- offer second-round endorsers Coordinating and Directing course locally
- hear expert speakers on implementing program changes or new topic

July :

- offer workshop on new topic