

**15:294:531 The Gifted Child**  
**Summer 2014**  
**Graduate School of Education, Rutgers University**  
Instructor: Dr. Jessica Manzone  
jmanzone@usc.edu

This course is designed to provide an overview of the field of gifted education and address the core cognitive characteristics of gifted children in general and domain-specific areas, their educational needs in respect to programs, services, and curricula, the support structures necessary to facilitate their talent development from families to mentors to personality variables and the foundations of the field of gifted education itself, ranging from its theoretical and research base to its grounding in legislation and administration of programs. Course assignments will feature short papers and products to be used in practice.

**Course Objectives:**

**Students will be able to:**

- Understand the impact of the environmental influences of race and poverty on the development of talent;**
- Tailor intervention services to meet the needs of gifted learners in school, including those from poverty and culturally diverse backgrounds;**
- Use identification data to construct for classroom use that enhance gifted student learning;**
- Develop strategies for collaborating with the families of these learners on their needs;**
- Apply policies, principles, and theories of gifted education in relevant contexts;**
- Provide counseling and guidance on issues critical to these students' development: negative stereotyping, goal-setting, expectations, and underachievement among others;**
- Apply theories of creativity and strategies;**
- Apply instructional approaches that are inquiry-based, open-ended, and hands-on to stimulate interest and motivate these students to learn at advanced levels;**
- Provide personalized services to gifted learners as warranted by their profiles; and**
- Develop appropriate classroom-based programs for the gifted.**

## SYLLABUS

Class Dates	Topic	Assignment
<p><b><u>Friday, May 9<sup>th</sup> 2014</u></b> 4:00-8:30 pm</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Introductions</li> <li>▪ Goal Setting</li> <li>▪ History of gifted education</li> <li>▪ Myths &amp; Misconceptions of gifted learners</li> <li>▪ Characteristics of gifted learners</li> <li>▪ Definitions of giftedness</li> </ul>	<p><b>Course Text:</b></p> <p>Colangelo, N. &amp; Davis, G. (2006) <i>Handbook on Gifted Education</i>. Boston: Pearson</p>
<p><b><u>Saturday, May 10<sup>th</sup> 2014</u></b> 9:00-4:00 pm</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Conceptions of giftedness &amp; intelligence</li> <li>▪ Characteristics of gifted with case study</li> <li>• <b>Creativity thinking strategies:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Fluency, flexibility, elaboration, originality</li> <li>○ Creative problem-solving</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <b>Identification Plan</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Methods of identification</li> <li>○ Components of an ID plan</li> <li>○ Creating an identification plan</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	

<p><b><u>Week 1: May 12-18, 2014</u></b></p> <p>At home reading, reflecting, responding, and working on course assignments.</p>	<p>Respond to the following questions: What is your conception of giftedness and talent development? What are the key features, based on your readings?</p> <p>(This can be an extension of your philosophy statement)</p>	<p>Read <b>Chapters 5 and 9</b></p> <p><b>Gagne Plomin &amp; Price</b></p>
<p><b><u>Week 2: May 19-25, 2014</u></b></p> <p>At home reading, reflecting, responding, and working on course projects.</p>	<p>Respond to the following questions:</p> <p>Why is curriculum so central to designing a gifted program?</p> <p>How do acceleration and grouping provide necessary supportive structures for gifted program development?</p>	<p><b>Identification Plan DUE by May 25, 2014</b></p> <p>Read <b>Chapters 13, 15 and 21</b> in Part 3</p> <p><b>VanTassel-Baska Lupkowski –Shoplik et al. Kulik</b></p>
<p><b><u>Week 3: May 26-June 1, 2014</u></b></p> <p>At home reading, reflecting, and working on assignments</p>	<p>Respond to the following question and activity:</p> <p>What are the top three lessons you took away about promoting creativity in gifted learners?</p> <p>Create a Venn Diagram and discuss in your post, illustrating the similarities and differences between childhood giftedness and adult creative productivity.</p>	<p>Read <b>Chapters 24, 27, and 28</b> in Part 4</p> <p><b>Davis Walberg et al. Simonton</b></p>

<p><b><u>Week 4: June 2-8, 2014</u></b></p> <p>At home reading, reflecting, and working on course projects</p>	<p>Respond to the following questions:</p> <p>What factors in gifted underachievement might teachers be able to combat?</p> <p>Should we identify gifted children early (ie. by Age 5), based on your reading and understanding of the Robinson chapter?</p>	<p><b>Case Study DUE by June 8</b></p> <p>Read <b>Chapters 33 and 36</b> in Part 6</p> <p><b>Rimm Robinson</b></p>
<p><b><u>Week 5: June 9-15, 2014</u></b></p> <p>At home reading, reflecting, and working on projects.</p>	<p>Respond to the following questions:</p> <p>How might you develop a gifted program to ensure that culturally diverse students are included and well-served?</p> <p>How can teachers help twice exceptional students succeed in school and in gifted programs?</p>	<p>Bring DRAFT of Product #3 (lessons plans) to the in-person meeting on June 13-14.</p> <p>Read <b>Chapters 39 and 41</b> in Part 6</p> <p><b>Ford Silverman</b></p>
<p><b><u>Friday, June 13, 2013</u></b> 4:00-8:30 pm</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Special populations ppt. and activity</li> <li>▪ Teaching gifted learners (video and discussion)</li> <li>▪ Project sharing in small groups</li> </ul>	

**Formative and Summative Course Evaluation Strategies:**

All student evaluation is based on accuracy, clarity, and creativity of thought. Accuracy addresses the comprehensiveness and accuracy of the material; clarity addresses the writing style, organization, and flow of ideas; and creativity speaks to the uniqueness of the ideas and degree of insight. Writing will be assessed using a standard assessment rubric for gifted program papers. Two rubrics are included to guide you in developing your assignments. The case study rubric is specific to that assignment. The general rubric provides guidance for all other assignments. **Papers will be assessed using a modified rubric, based on the following template. Use this as a general guide to organization for each assignment.**

<b>Criteria</b>	<b>A</b>		<b>B</b>		<b>Other</b>
<b>Organizational Soundness</b>	Paper is well organized, clear, and easy to follow; includes all segments.		Paper is adequately organized, but lacks clarity or coherence in sections; all segments addressed but some may be not fully complete.		Paper lacks clarity and coherence.
<b>Conceptual soundness/ quality of ideas</b>	Ideas are insightful, coherent, and supported by examples and class info. well.		Ideas are sound; supported adequately by examples/info.		Paper lacks clear-cut presentation of sound ideas and/or is loosely supported by examples.
<b>Discussion/ Synthesis</b>	Strong synthesis that links observations clearly and logically to implications across student, class, context, teacher.		Synthesis links observations to implications adequately; may not address all areas of implication.		Weak connections between observations and implications; major implications missing.
<b>Observations</b>	Observations focus specifically on details as outlined in assignment and create a clear picture.		Observations are adequate but somewhat unfocused; some questions remain for reader.		Weak, limited observations.
<b>Presentation and Mechanics</b>	Paper has a professional appearance and is essentially error-free.		Paper has a professional appearance with limited mechanical errors.		Paper is unprofessional in appearance and/or has mechanical errors that detract from the reading.

## Assignments

There are three major products expected of participants in the course. Each is described below, along with a rubric for judging the project quality.

### Product #1

The first product that participants will develop is an intervention plan for a given student, based on available information from a written case study. Students may choose among cases provided. This product will be 4-5 pages in length and be accompanied by a chart that outlines the major suggestions included in the plan (see below). The plan will address a) characteristics and needs of the learner based on data provided, b) draw implications for classroom-based differentiation, c) provide direction for acceleration strategies, grouping, curriculum emphases across years, creative projects, and competition involvement, and d) make other observations as appropriate. In the affective area, counseling, mentoring, and leadership should be addressed as well.

### Case Study Intervention Plan

---

	Key Characteristics and Needs	Implications for Classroom Differentiation	Programmatic Implications Beyond the Classroom	Other Observations
Cognitive			Acceleration: Grouping: Curriculum emphases : Creative projects: Competitions:	
Affective (S-E)			Counseling: Mentoring: Leadership	

## **Rubric for Intervention Plan**

### **Dimensions**

Chart completion 4 3 2 1

Description of cognitive interventions 4 3 2 1

Description of affective dimensions 4 3 2 1

Appropriate inferences drawn from data 4 3 2 1

### **Scale**

**4**—The dimension is complete and appropriate, given the case study data.

**3**—The dimension is mostly complete and appropriate.

**2**—The dimension is complete but only somewhat appropriate.

**1**—The dimension is not complete nor appropriate, based on the data available.

### **Product #2**

The second course product is an identification plan. This product will take the form of a short paper of 4-5 pages that contains the following key sections: 1) rationale for the identification approach recommended, citing relevant research; 2) the population(s) you wish to find through the approach, 3) the instrumentation to be used (both tests and other types of criteria should be noted and described here), 4) the process for use of the instruments and criteria for student selection, and 5) the process for validating the identification model.

## **Rubric for Identification Plan**

### **Dimensions**

Components of the plan are complete 4 3 2 1

Components of the plan are appropriate, given the research. 4 3 2 1

Components of the plan are logically consistent with each other. 4 3 2 1

Components of the plan employ best practices in identification of the gifted. 4 3 2 1

### **Scale**

**4**—All components meet the dimension standard.

**3**—Most components meet the dimension standard.

**2**---Several components do not meet the dimension standard.

**1**---Most components do not meet the dimension standard.

### Product #3

The final course product is a set of three interrelated lesson plans that address the needs of a core group of gifted learners clustered in the regular classroom. The lesson plans may be organized in reading/language arts, math, science, or history at elementary or secondary levels. They must each and taken together demonstrate differentiated curriculum, instruction and assessment protocols. Lesson plan outlines will include the following:

Overall set of plans:

- curriculum area and level of gifted learners
- differentiation approaches used
- goals/outcomes,
- materials needed, and
- extension ideas.

Within each lesson plan:

- instructional purpose
- student activities,
- questions to ask,
- instructional approaches employed, and
- assessment.

Each set of lesson plans will include the following completed menu of options for differentiation in these areas.

Curriculum differentiation: (check all that apply)

- Creativity
- Higher level thinking and problem solving
- Advanced skills and concepts
- Complexity
- Depth

Instructional differentiation:

- Creative problem solving model
- Problem-based learning
- Question-asking model
- Socratic Seminar
- Use of Bloom or other critical thinking model
- Compacting/preassessment
- Other

Assessment differentiation:

- Product
- Performance-based (pre-post)

\_\_Portfolio of work

## **Rubric for Lesson Plans**

### **Dimensions**

The lesson plans are complete, based on the outline provided. 4 3 2 1

The lesson plans are appropriately differentiated, given the options used. 4 3 2 1

The lesson plans are logically related to each other and build toward student competence.

4 3 2 1

The lesson plans demonstrate understanding of the integration of instructional design principles. 4 3 2 1

### **Scale**

**4**—The lesson plans meet or exceed the dimension standard.

**3**—The lesson plans mostly meet the dimension standard.

**2**—The lesson plans inconsistently or rarely meet the dimension standard.

**1**—The lesson plans fail to meet the dimension standard.

## **Course Evaluation**

The grade for The Gifted Child course will be based on the following criteria and weighting of each:

--Participation in onsite class discussion: 10%

--Participation in online discussions and appropriate responses to assignments: 20 %

--Intervention plan: 15%

--Identification project: 15%

--Lesson plans: 20%

--Exam: 20%

**Total: 100%**

## References

- Clinkenbeard, P. R., Kolloff, P. B., & Lord, E. W. (2007) *A guide to state policies in gifted education*. Washington, DC: NAGC.
- Coleman, L. J. (2004). Is consensus on a definition in the field possible, desirable, necessary? *Roeper Review*, 27, 10–11.
- Coleman, L. J. & Cross, T. L. (2005) *Being gifted in school* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). Waco, TX: Prufrock Press.
- \*Colangelo and G. A. Davis (Eds) (2006) *Handbook of gifted education*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Ford, D., & Harmon, D. (2001) Providing access to gifted education for culturally diverse students. *Journal of Secondary Gifted Education*, 3, 141-143.
- Gagné, F. (2004). Transforming gifts into talents: The DMGT as a developmental theory. *High Ability Studies*, 15, 119–147.
- Gross, M. (2003). *Exceptionally gifted children*. UK: Routledge Falmer.
- Hansen, J. B., & Feldhusen, J. F. (1994). Comparison of trained and untrained teachers of gifted students. *Gifted Child Quarterly*, 38, 115-121.
- Harmon, D. (2002). They won't teach me: The voices of gifted African American inner-city students. *Roeper Review*, 24, 68-75.
- Hébert, T. (2002). Educating gifted children from low socioeconomic backgrounds: Creating visions of a hopeful future. *Exceptionality*, 10, 127-138.
- Hong, E., & Aqai, Y. (2004). Cognitive and motivational characteristics of adolescents gifted in mathematics: Comparisons among students with different types of giftedness. *Gifted Child Quarterly*, 48, 191-201.
- Johnsen, S. K. (Ed.). (2004). *Identifying gifted students: A practical guide*. Waco, TX: Prufrock Press.
- Kitano, M. K., & Pedersen, K. S. (2002a). Action research and practical inquiry: Multicultural content integration in gifted education: Lessons from the field. *Journal for the Education of the Gifted*, 25(3), 269-289.

Piirto, J. (2006). *Talented children and adults: Their development and education*. New York: Macmillan.

Renzulli, J. S. (2002). Emerging conceptions of giftedness: Building a bridge to the new century. *Exceptionality*, 10(2), 67–75

Rogers, K. B. (2002). *Re-forming gifted education: Matching the program to the child*. Scottsdale, AZ: Great Potential Press.

Sternberg, R. J., & Davidson, J. E. (Ed.). (2006). *Conceptions of giftedness*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Sternberg, R. J. (2008) Increasing academic excellence and enhancing diversity are compatible goals. *Education Policy*, 22 (4), 487-514.

U.S. Department of Education. (1993) *National excellence: A case for developing America's talent*. Washington, DC: Author.

VanTassel-Baska, J. & Brown, E. (2007) Toward best practice: An analysis of the efficacy of curriculum models in gifted education. *Gifted Child Quarterly*, 51 (4), 342-358.

VanTassel-Baska, J. & Johnsen, S. K. (2007) Teacher education standards for the field of gifted education. *Gifted Child Quarterly*, 51 (2), 182-205.

VanTassel-Baska, J. ed. (2009) *Patterns and profiles of promising learners from poverty*. Waco, TX: Prufrock Press.

Wyner, J. S., Bridgeland, J. M., & DiIulio, J. J. (2007) *Achievement trap: How American is failing millions of high-achieving students from lower-income families*. Washington DC: Jack Kent Cooke Foundation & Civic Enterprise.

\* Course text