Summer 2015
Gifted Program Development
Course# 15:294:534
3 Credits
Dates: May 15-June 28, 2015

Instructor Name: Dr. Elissa Brown	Email address: elissabrown21@gmail.com
Phone Number: (757) 593-2224 (cell)	Office Location: off campus (Paterson Public Schools, Paterson, NJ)
Office Hours: as needed	Prerequisites or other limitations: No Prerequisites
Mode of Instruction: Hybrid/Face to Face and __X_ Online Face-to-face meetings: • May 15 (4:00-8:30)-May 16 (9:00am-4:00 pm) • June 6 (9:00 am-4:00 pm) • June 26 (9:00 am-4:00 pm) Online meetings (6 weeks): May 15-June 28	Permission required: __ No _X_ Yes Directions about where to get permission numbers: Send a request for a special permission number to gifteded@docs.rutgers.edu

Student Learning Goals

Upon completion of this course, the student will be able to:

- Analyze the relationship of theories of program development to practice in gifted education.
- Analyze the relationship among conceptions of giftedness, definitions, and identification criteria, and choice of instrumentation.
- Develop an appropriate identification model for a gifted program, using appropriate national and state standards as a guide.
- Analyze strengths and weaknesses of alternative program models within a continuum of services for gifted learners at elementary and secondary levels, based on defining characteristics of the learner.
- Design and implement a needs assessment (incorporating formal and informal measures) for assessing gifted students and/or program needs.
- Demonstrate knowledge of important legal provisions, standards, policies, and issues that affect gifted education, and analyze their educational implications.
- Critique appropriate professional development plans that would support a comprehensive program implementation and growth.
- Implement effective communication, supervision, and evaluation systems for gifted programs.
- Communicate and collaborate with relevant groups in the operation of gifted programs.
- Demonstrate an understanding of the change process in order to effect program improvement.

- Design a program plan for gifted education that highlights need, relevant research, goals, outcomes, roles and responsibilities, and assessment approaches.

Gifted Education Certificate Program Goals Addressed
1. Understand the variations in learning and development in cognitive and affective areas between and among individuals with gifts and talents and apply this understanding to provide meaningful and challenging learning experiences for individuals with exceptionalities.
2. Create safe, inclusive, and culturally responsive learning environments so that individuals with gifts and talents become effective learners and develop social and emotional well being.
3. Use knowledge of general and specialized curricula to advance learning for individuals with gifts and talents, and improve programs and services at the classroom and school level.
4. Use multiple methods of assessment and data sources in making educational decisions about identification of individuals with gifts and talents and student learning. Use valid and reliable assessment practices to minimize bias.
5. Select, adapt, and use a repertoire of evidence-based instructional strategies to advance the learning of individuals with gifts and talents.
6. Use foundational knowledge of the field and professional ethical principles and programming standards to inform gifted education practice.
7. Collaborate with families, other educators, related service providers, individuals with gifts and talents, and personnel from community agencies in culturally responsive ways to address the needs of individuals with gifts and talents across a range of learning experiences.

NAGC/CEC-TAG Teacher Preparation Standards Addressed
The course will address the Teacher Preparation Standards in Gifted and Talented Education (Standards 1-7) and the Advanced Standards in Gifted Education Teacher Preparation (Standards 1-7) developed by the National Association for Gifted Children (NAGC), the Council for Exceptional Children (CEC), and The Association for the Gifted (TAG). The Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP) approved the NAGC - CEC-TAG standards in 2013.

Course Catalog Description:
This course is designed to provide educators with the basic tools to design and develop research-based programs and services for the gifted. It focuses on the development of systems necessary to start gifted programs and keep them operating over time in school contexts, including an identification system, curriculum and instructional management systems, guidance and counseling, and an assessment and evaluation system. The role of grouping and acceleration as supportive aspects of gifted programming will also be featured. Participants will develop a gifted plan for their school district as a part of the course, using a problem-based learning scenario as the basis for their work.

Class materials/ Textbooks:

Course Text:
Best Practices in Gifted Education, 2007 (Robinson, Shore& Enersen, eds.). ISBN#: 978-1-59363-210-6

- Additional Readings will be assigned:

o Purcell, J.H. & Eckhart, R.D. (2006) *Designing Programs and Services for High Ability Learners: A Guidebook for Gifted Education*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

o Renzulli, J.S. & Gubbins, E.J. McMillen, K.S., Eckert, R.D., & Little, C.E. (2009) *Systems and Models for Developing Programs for the Gifted and Talented, 2E*. Prufrock Press.

o Relevant articles and/or book chapters

Grading Policy:
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 the degree of insight.
(*Valid grades at the GSE include A, B, B+, C, C+, F, IN, NC, PA)*

25%	Attendance and Participation in onsite classes
20%	Participation in online discussions and appropriate responses to assignments
20%	In-class quiz/mid-semester
35%	Final assignment (Program Plan)

Course Assignments:

1. Classroom participation including online discussion postings
   Students are expected to contribute to discussions and activities and post responses to all assignments required by the instructor. A rubric will be used to assess quality of student responses.

2. Needs Assessment/Interview
   Students will conduct a needs assessment of stakeholders in an existing gifted program or educational setting considering gifted programming. Students will design a class interview guide with the instructor and can refine the interview questions depending upon the target population. The interview questions are for assessing current status and needs. Based on the responses students will complete a program plan with relevant sections. Students will submit a copy of their questions and analyzed responses, and synthesis of suggestions and recommendations. Student papers are assessed based on quality of data collection and analysis, alignment of recommendations with results obtained, and clarity of presentation.

3. Mid-point in class open book quiz (1 hour/4 questions): Students will be responsible for material learned up to the point of the quiz. Quiz will be distributed and collected.

Students have 1 hour and may use book, any class notes, pp, etc. Responses should be substantiated by research.

4. Program Plan

   Students will complete a program proposal based on results from needs assessment data, approximately 20 pages in length, consisting of the following major sections: Rationale and documentation of need, review of research, description of proposed program with goals and objectives identified, target population to be served, key tasks to be completed with role responsibility assigned, timeline, and budget. Identification processes and professional learning options should be an integral component of the plan. Students are assessed based on written plan and class presentation. Papers are assessed based on clarity of writing, reference to key resources, completion of all relevant sections, logical organization of ideas and recommendations, and potential practicality of plan. Students are also assessed on in-class presentation of proposal; presentation grade is based on organization, clarity, and cogency.

Web site: *(If any)*

Academic Integrity Policy:

The Office of Student Conduct supervises issues related to violations of academic integrity (see http://academicintegrity.rutgers.edu). Please familiarize yourself with the university policy on academic integrity at http://academicintegrity.rutgers.edu/files/documents/AI_Policy_2013.pdf

Office of Disability Services:

Rutgers University welcomes students with disabilities into all of the University's educational programs. In order to receive consideration for reasonable accommodations, a student with a disability must contact the appropriate disability services office at the campus where you are officially enrolled, participate in an intake interview, and provide documentation: https://ods.rutgers.edu/students/documentation-guidelines. If the documentation supports your request for reasonable accommodations, your campus's disability services office will provide you with a Letter of Accommodations. Please share this letter with your instructors and discuss the accommodations with them as early in your courses as possible. To begin this process, please complete the Registration form on the ODS web site at: https://ods.rutgers.edu/students/registration-form.

Course Schedule

Date	Topic	Assignment(s)
May 15-16 (F2F) 4-8:30 pm 9:00 am-4:00 pm	• Pre-assessment • Trends/Issues • Discussion of course requirements	Introduction Chapters 24 and 26 Chapters 27 and 28

Paterson School Board Office #	• NAGC program standards as framework: *NAGC-CEC P-12 Program Standards* • Nonnegotiables in program development • ppt. (discussion/activity) • Conducting a class needs assessment/interview guide for use with stakeholder groups on identified area and target population	Feng chapt: Constructing and Implementing Surveys
On line discussion board May 17-June 5	Readings and Discussion Board Assignments Construct needs assessment and distribute	
June 6 (F2F) 9:00 am-4:00 pm Paterson School Board Office #	• Myths of acceleration, enrichment and grouping ppt. • Research-based programs & services • Discussion and analysis of grouping models activity • Scenario on program choices	Chapters 13, 14, and 25 *(In class) mid point Quiz*
On line June 7-June 25	Readings and Discussion Board Assignments Collect needs assessment data & analyze results. Write plan proposal	
June 26 (F2F) 9:00 am-4:00 pm Paterson School Board Office #	• Teacher competencies, selection, program facilitation • Supporting Program Implementation: • Program Evaluation, Advocacy, & Leadership • Presentation and discussion of program plans	

<u>**Course Readings for on-line discussion**</u> *(instructor will upload relevant articles)*

Other online articles will be shared throughout the course. These will be readings that will assist in the preparation of your program plan. Use your text chapters to assist in this process as well.

Online assignments (N=6):
1. Week of May 17-23
- Read Gallagher's article (Unthinkable Thoughts)
- Read Spielhagen and Brown's chapter (Politics of Gifted Education)

Answer the following questions:
1.	Which question (Gallagher's 3 questions on first page of article) and his response, do you think has the most leverage in advancing the field of gifted?
2.	Which event in Spielhagen and Brown's article had the most positive or negative impact on gifted education and why? Cite the event, whether it was positive or negative and explain its importance.

2. Week of May 24-30
- Read the VanTassel-Baska article on the history of urban gifted education in this country.
- Read the Olszewski-Kubilius article on talent development

Answer the following questions:
1.	 Why should we pay attention to what happened in gifted programs 30 years ago in urban centers in the US?
2.	What have model urban programs found to be successful approaches to gifted programming and services?
3.	What can we take from those experiences to provide exemplary programs and services today?
4.	What are the critical factors to consider in the talent development process for students from urban environments?

3. Week of May 31-June 5
- Read Hertzog's article on student perspectives of gifted programs
- Read Gentry, Steenbergen-Hu & Choi's article on student-identified exemplary teachers

Answer the following questions:

1. You were just hired to be principal of a GT program. One of the first things you need to do is hire some teachers. Based on the both Hertzog's and Gentry's article, create a list of 5 interview questions you would ask.
2. According to researchers (Rogers, 2002; Hansen & Feldhusen, 1994; Mills, 2003; VanTassel-Baska, 1998; Kitano & Landry, 2001) the following are characteristics & dispositions that teachers of the gifted should possess:

- High degree of intelligence
- Expertise in specific academic area
- Ability to give "accurate" feedback-specific, detailed comments
- Level-headed, emotional maturity
- Openness to innovation and acceptance of divergent, creative thinking
- High level of energy, enthusiasm, confidence, and resourcefulness
- A genuine interest in, and liking of, gifted learners
- Belief in individual differences and ability to facilitate students' independence and personal responsibility for their own learning

The majority of gifted students spend more time in general education classrooms then in any "gifted" setting (eg pull-out resource room, ability grouped by subject area, etc.). Select **two** characteristics above that <u>general education classroom teachers</u> should possess in order to work with gifted students.

4. Week of June 7-13
Pick any of the course text chapters and answer the following questions:
1. Identify the chapter and describe the 3-5 salient points made.
2. In the "what can we do" section of the chapter, list supports and barriers for implementation.

5. Week of June 14-20
Read VanTassel-Baska's article on evaluation and answer the following questions:
1. Using the steps outlined in the article, create an evaluation design that answers the following:
   -What questions do you want to ask about your program?
   -Which stakeholders do you want to consult (eg. parents, students, teachers)
   -What instruments will you need to carry out the evaluation (eg. tests, questionnaires, interview protocols)?
   -How will you collect and analyze date?
   -With whom will you share your findings? What purpose will they serve?

6. Week of June 21-28
Respond to the following prompt:

The program development course is intended as a capstone course in providing gifted educators the foundations of planning, development, implementation, and evaluation of research-based programs and services for this special population. Please describe to what degree the course content enhanced your learning of what matters in this area of education.

References

Besnoy, K. (2006) How do I do that? Integrating web sites into the gifted education classroom. *Gifted Child Today*, 29, 1, 28-34.

Brown, E. & Stambaugh, T. (2014). Placement of students who are gifted. In J. Bakken, F. Obiakor, and A. Rotatori, (Eds.) *Gifted Education Current Perspectives and Issues, Advances in Special Education,* vol. 26, pp 41-69.

Garet, M. S., Porter, A. C., Desimone, L., Birman, B. F., & Yoon, K. S. (2001). What makes professional development effective? Results from a national sample of teachers. *American Educational Research Journal, 38*(4), 915–945.

Gentry, M., & Keility, B. (2004). Rural and suburban cluster grouping: Reflections on staff development as a component of program success. *Roeper Review, 26,* 147–155.

Gubbins, E. J., Westberg, K. L., Reis, S. M., Dinnocenti, S. T., Tieso, C. L., & Muller, L. M., et al. (2002). *Implementing a professional development model using gifted education strategies with all students*. (Report RM02172). Storrs: University of Connecticut, National Research Center on the Gifted and Talented.

Guskey, T. R. (2000). *Evaluating professional development*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Guskey, T. R. (2002). Does it make a difference? Evaluating professional development. *Educational Leadership, 59*(6), 45-51.

Guskey, T. R. (2002). Professional development and teacher change. *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice, 8*(3/4), 381-391.

Johnson, A. (2008) Internet strategies for gifted students. *Gifted Child Today,*31, 2, 58-64.

Matthews, D. & Foster, J. (2005). A dynamic scaffolding model of teacher development: The gifted education consultant as catalyst for change. *Gifted Child Quarterly*, 49(3), 222-230.

National Association for Gifted Children and Council of State Directors of Programs for the Gifted. (2003). *The 2007-2008 state of the states gifted and talented education report.* Washington, DC: Author.

Hany, E. & Grosch, C. (2007) Long term effects of enrichment summer course on the academic performance of gifted adolescents. *Educational Research and Evaluation,* 13, 6, 521-537.

Moon, T., Brighton, C. Callahan, C. & Robinson, A. (2005) Development of authentic assessments for the middle school classroom*. Journal of Secondary Gifted Education, 16, 2/3, 119-133.*

Neihart, M. (2007) the socioaffective impact of acceleration and ability grouping: Recommendations for best practice. *Gifted Child Quarterly,* 51, 4, 330-341.

Noble, K., Vaughan, R., Chan, C., Childers, S. et al. (2007) Love and work: the legacy of early university entrance. *Gifted Child Quarterly,* 51, 2, 152-166.

*Purcell, J. & Eckhart, R. (2004) *Program planning and development in gifted education*. Waco, TX: Prufrock Press.

Reid, C., Romanoff, B., Algozzine, B., & Udall, A. (2000) An evaluation of alternative screening procedures. *Journal for the Education of the Gifted, 23*, 378–396.

Revital, T. & Miedijensky, S. (2005) A model of alternative embedded assessment in a pull-out enrichment program for the gifted. *Gifted Education International, 20, 166-186.*

Robinson, A., & Moon, S. M. (2003). A national study of local and state advocacy in gifted education. *Gifted Child Quarterly, 47*(1), 8-25.

*Robinson, A., Shore, B. & Enersen, D. (2007) *Best practices in gifted education: An evidenced-based guide.* Waco, TX: Prufrock Press.

Swanson, J. (2007) Policy and practice: a case study of gifted education policy implementation. *Journal for the Education of the Gifted,* 31, 2, 131-164.

Swiatek, M. (2007) The talent search model: Past, present and future. *Gifted   Child Quarterly, 51, 4, 320-329.*

VanTassel-Baska, J. (2002). Assessment of gifted student learning in the language arts. *Journal of Secondary Gifted Education, 13*, 67–72.

VanTassel-Baska, J. & Stambaugh, T. (Eds.) (2008). *What works: 20 years of curriculum development and research for advanced learners.* Williamsburg, VA: Center for Gifted Education. Available online at http://cfge.wm.edu/Documents/What%20Works.pdf

VanTassel-Baska, J., Quek, C. & Feng, A. (2007). Developing structured observation scales for   instructional improvements in classrooms accommodating gifted learners. *Roeper Review, 29*(2), 84-92.

Van Tassel-Baska, J. ed. (2007) *Assessment of gifted students.* Waco, TX: Prufrock Press.

VanTassel-Baska, J. (2002). Considerations in evaluating gifted programs. *Gifted Education Communicator, 33*(2), 20-24.
*May be used as a text at the discretion of the instructor.