

Section 7 – Program Design and Management

The gifted “program” must take into consideration the characteristics of the gifted learners that it is to serve. For this reason, the Kentucky regulation requires that a variety of services be provided at every grade level.

Section Includes:

- [Frequently Asked Questions](#)
- [Competencies Needed By Teachers – NAGC Position paper](#)
- [Developing Programs for Students of High Ability](#)
- [5 Strategies to Limit the Burdens of Paperwork](#)
- [Teacher-Parent Partnerships](#)
- [20 Plus Questions to Start the Thinking](#)

Frequently Asked Questions related to Programming For The GIFTED & TALENTED

(This document is intended to provide guidelines for interpreting **704 Kentucky Administrative Regulation (KAR) 3:285. Programs for the gifted and talented**. Kentucky Department of Education is here to assist in the implementation of this interpretation and/or the regulation.)

Q: What should quality GT programming look like?

A: In any school district, high quality gifted programming requires careful planning, maintenance, and evaluation. Quality GT programming necessitates: clearly articulated policies, procedures and services, primary through grade twelve; a grievance procedure through which a parent, guardian, or student may resolve a concern regarding the appropriate and adequate provision of primary talent pool services or services addressed in a formally identified gifted and talented student's services plan; employment of properly certified and professionally qualified personnel; evidence of appropriate professional development for all personnel working with gifted and talented students; and equitable opportunities for consideration for services at the primary level and in each category of service in grades 4-12.

Q: Can parents have input on local district programming for GT services?

A: District policies and procedures shall ensure that a program evaluation process shall be conducted annually and shall address parent(s) attitudes toward the program.

Q: Must a district assign a GT coordinator for the program?

A: Yes. A district receiving state funding shall designate a properly endorsed GT program coordinator.

Q: What are some of the duties of a GT program coordinator?

A: Some duties include: the oversight of the district GT program; to serve as a liaison between the district and the state; to ensure internal compliance with state statutes and administrative regulation for GT programs; and to administer and revise the GT program budget.

Leah Ellis, former Gifted and Talented Consultant

COMPETENCIES NEEDED BY TEACHERS OF GIFTED AND TALENTED STUDENTS

The National Association for Gifted Children (NAGC) periodically issues policy statements dealing with issues, policies, and practices that have an impact on the education of gifted and talented students. Policy statements represent the official convictions of the organization.

All policy statements approved by the NAGC Board of Directors are consistent with the organization's belief that education in a democracy must respect the uniqueness of all individuals, the broad range of cultural diversity present in our society, and the similarities and differences in learning characteristics that can be found within any group of students. NAGC is fully committed to national goals that advocate both excellence and equity for all students, and we believe that the best way to achieve these goals is through *differentiated* educational opportunities, resources, and encouragement for all students.

NAGC believes that all children deserve the highest quality of instruction possible and that such instruction will only occur when teachers are aware of and able to respond to the unique qualities and characteristics of the students they instruct. Gifted and talented students present a particular challenge and often experience inadequate and inappropriate education. To provide appropriate learning experiences for gifted and talented students, teachers need to possess:

- a knowledge and valuing of the origins and nature of high levels of intelligence, including creative expressions of intelligence;
- a knowledge and understanding of the cognitive, social, and emotional characteristics, needs, and potential problems experienced by gifted and talented students from diverse populations;
- a knowledge of and access to advanced content and ideas;
- an ability to develop a differentiated curriculum appropriate to meeting the unique intellectual and emotional needs and interests of gifted and talented students; and
- an ability to create an environment in which gifted and talented students can feel challenged and safe to explore and express their uniqueness.

NAGC believes that these competencies, in addition to those required for good teaching and learning in general, such as modeling openness, curiosity, and enthusiasm, are necessary for teachers of gifted and talented students. NAGC also believes that educational experiences through comprehensive programming must be available for teachers to develop these competencies.

ERIC Digests

Developing Programs for Students of High Ability

ERIC EC Digest #E502

Author: Sandra L. Berger

August 1991

As educators undertake the task of program planning to accommodate the diverse abilities students bring to school, they are faced with a bewildering array of choices. In education for students who are gifted, a variety of theories and models have been developed. Instructional methods and materials of all types are presented with enthusiasm, each claimed to be "ideal" for students of high ability. To make sound decisions, educators need to understand the components of an effective educational program for these students.

What Constitutes an Effective Program?

A program "is part of the mainstream of education and doesn't rise and fall with public opinions" (Morgan, Tennant, & Gold, 1980, p. 2). It is a comprehensive, sequential system for educating students with identifiable needs (The Association for the Gifted [TAG] 1989); it is often designed by a curriculum committee; and it is supported by a district or school budget. Like literature and mathematics programs, programs for students with high ability are assumed to be integral parts of a school curriculum. Teaching strategies may change, but the question of whether or not they should be a part of the curriculum is never raised.

A distinction should be made between programs for students who are gifted students and provisions for these students (Tannenbaum, 1983). "Provisions are fragmentary, unarticulated, and temporary activities, which are neither followed up in any meaningful way nor preceded by any meaningful lead-in activity" (Morgan, Tennant, & Gold, 1980, p. 2). For example, a teacher with vision and energy might recognize that a particular student needs to have his or her curriculum modified and decide to provide special activities. However, unless there is a commitment on the part of the school system to continue meeting the student's needs and to offer similar opportunities to other able students at each grade level, it does not constitute a program. When budgetary cuts have to be made, enrichment provisions become expendable.

What Are the Components of an Effective Program?

An effective program comprises eight major components. These are described in the following paragraphs.

1. Needs Assessment. A program is an integrated curriculum response to the educational needs of a group of students. Therefore, a logical first step is to determine what needs should be met. Need is defined as the discrepancy between the current status and a

desired status and indicates a direction in which an individual or school system wants to move. An effective needs assessment enables educators to gather information about the nature and instructional needs of the students and the resources of the school or school district. Information about community attitudes and teacher skills may also be gathered. Borland (1989) has provided a list of useful questions that might be asked, possible sources of information, and ways to obtain it.

2. **Definition of Population.** A clear definition of the population serves as the foundation of a program. The definition should be based on information gleaned from the needs assessment and state and local requirements. It should address specific abilities and traits possessed by persons of high ability. In his 1971 Report to Congress, Marland (1972) included a definition that is well known for its diversity and usefulness. Updated in 1981 (P.L. 97-35, the Educational Consolidation and Improvement Act), this definition has provided guidance to many states. Other programs are based on a multidimensional view of intelligence (Gardner, 1983; Sternberg, 1985). However, a local frame of reference gleaned from the needs assessment is equally important.
3. **Identification Procedures.** The purpose of identification is to locate students whose needs are not being met by the core curriculum, evaluate their educational needs, and provide them with an appropriate program. Identification procedures must be consistent with the definition in local use and should measure diverse abilities.

Identification is generally divided into several phases that might be conceptualized as a pyramid. The base of the pyramid involves the entire student body and is typically called screening. As the process evolves, the population becomes smaller. The apex of the pyramid comprises the students who will participate in a program. A wide variety of instruments and methods are used as the pyramid narrows. Student records and portfolios, parent and teacher referrals and recommendations, anecdotal evidence, student products, group tests, and individual tests are just some of the ways information is gathered throughout the school year. The identification process should be ongoing and articulated with curriculum options.

4. **Program Goals.** The goals of a program should be written as clear policy statements of what the district will do to respond to the needs of the target population. They should be stated broadly and may refer to desired student outcomes. Outcomes should reflect the assessed needs of the students. Since program goals should be made available to the public, they should be stated in easily understood language. A comprehensive plan might also state program objectives and suggested activities. Borland (1989), Clark (1988), Maker (1982), VanTassel-Baska and colleagues (1988), and other textbook authors have provided examples of justifiable program goals and objectives.
5. **Program Organization and Format.** Organization and format refer to decisions on how students will be grouped for instruction, where instruction will take place, how often instruction will occur, who will provide instruction, and who will be responsible for the program and the administrative organization. Like other program components, organization and format are derived in part from the needs assessment. The choice of format(s) involves a number of complex decisions regarding effective delivery of educational services and includes fiscal considerations. The central question is, "Which format(s) will best serve the needs of the defined population(s)?" Special magnet schools,

pull-out programs, a school within a school, full-time self-contained classes, resource rooms, effective grouping arrangements based on specific needs, and mainstreaming are just some of the available options (Cox, Daniel, & Boston, 1985; Daniel & Cox, 1988; Eby & Smutny, 1990).

6. **Staff Selection and Training.** Selection and training of staff are crucial to the success or failure of a program for students of high ability (Renzulli, 1975). But how can an administrator select the people who will ultimately inspire students and others? Researchers have consistently identified effective teachers as those who "are all things to all people." No definitive profile of the ideal teacher for these students has been published to date. However, interest in and eagerness to work with students who are curious and highly able are essential.

As with other program components, staff selection and training should relate to the needs of the target population. If students are transported to a central location, they need a teacher who has had some experience with self-contained classes. Above all, teachers in programs for students who are gifted should have a demonstrated understanding of these students (TAG, 1989). If teacher selection precedes curriculum development, the teacher will have a critical influence on what will be taught. Because good programs for students of high ability often grow, it is useful to have a core staff who can model effective teaching and collaboration for new teachers.

7. **Curriculum Development.** The most effective curriculum includes substantive scope and sequence and is based on the needs of the target population (TAG, 1983; VanTassel-Baska et al., 1988). School systems that purchase packaged programs should consider whether or not they are sufficiently rigorous, challenging, and coherent. Appropriate curriculum produces well-educated, knowledgeable students who have had to work hard, have mastered a substantial body of knowledge, and can think clearly and critically about this knowledge.

Maker (1982) has explained how to differentiate curriculum for students who are gifted in terms of process, content, and product. Her discussion enables educators to develop appropriate objectives based on the school system's core curriculum. VanTassel-Baska and colleagues (1988) have provided theoretical bases, specific procedures, and practical applications.

8. **Program Evaluation.** The evaluation component is critical because it allows a school system to reassess student needs and determine the efficiency and effectiveness of its various program components (Callahan, 1983; Callahan & Caldwell, 1986). Evaluation should be both formative (ongoing) and summative (final outcomes). Evaluation enables a school system to make midcourse corrections and answers the question, "Is this program doing what we want it to do?"

References

- Borland, J. H. (1989). *Planning and Implementing Programs for the Gifted*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Callahan, C. M. (1983). Issues in evaluating programs for the gifted. *Gifted Child Quarterly*, 27, 3-7.
- Callahan, C. M., & Caldwell, M. S. (1986). Defensible evaluation of programs for the gifted and talented. In C. J. Maker (Ed.), *Critical Issues in Gifted Education: Defensible Programs for the Gifted* (pp. 277-296). Rockville, MD: Aspen Systems.
- Clark, B. (1988). *Growing Up Gifted*. Columbus: Merrill.
- Cox, J., Daniel, N., & Boston, B. (1985). *Educating Able Learners*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Daniel, N., & Cox, J. (1988). *Flexible Pacing for Able Learners*. Reston, VA: The Council for Exceptional Children.
- Eby, J., & Smutny, J. F. (1990). *A Thoughtful Overview of Gifted Education*. New York: Longman.
- Gardner, H. (1983). *Frames of Mind: The Theory of Multiple Intelligences*. New York: Basic Books.
- Maker, C. J. (1982). *Curriculum Development for the Gifted*. Rockville, MD: Aspen Systems.
- Marland, S. P. (1972). *Education of the Gifted and Talented*. Report to Congress. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Morgan, H. J., Tennant, C. G., & Gold, M. J. (1980). *Elementary and Secondary Programs for the Gifted and Talented*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Renzulli, J. (1975). Identifying key features in programs for the gifted. In W. Barbe & J. Renzulli (Eds.), *Psychology and Education of the Gifted* (pp. 214-219). New York: Irvington.
- Sternberg, R. J. (1985). *Beyond IQ: A Triarchic Theory of Human Intelligence*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- The Association for the Gifted (TAG). (1989). *Standards for Programs Involving the Gifted and Talented*. Reston, VA: The Council for Exceptional Children.
- VanTassel-Baska, J., Feldhusen, J., Seeley, K., Wheatley, P. G., Silverman, L., & Foster, W. (1988). *Comprehensive Curriculum for Gifted Learners*. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

ERIC Digests are in the public domain and may be freely reproduced and disseminated, but please acknowledge your source. This publication was prepared with funding from the U.S. Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, under Contract No. RI88062207. The opinions expressed in this report do not necessarily reflect the positions or policies of OERI or the Department of Education.

ERIC Digests

Five Strategies to Limit the Burdens of Paperwork

ERIC Digest #E654
ERIC Identifier: A
Publication Date: December 2003
Author: Lynne Cook & K. Sarah Hall

While the need for paperwork in special education is often viewed as burdensome, it has value and cannot be eliminated. There are strategies that teachers can use to handle paperwork more effectively and efficiently without reducing its value. It is first important to have a clear understanding of exactly what is meant when people refer to "paperwork." Interactions with teachers in hundreds of schools suggest that burdens associated with paperwork include collecting data from multiple records and professionals, arranging meeting times, making parent contacts, exchanging information with other professionals—all activities that require paperwork and may interfere with instructional time (Cook & Hall, in press). Perhaps, then, when teachers refer to "paperwork" they are also referring to other related challenges. If this is the case, "paperwork" serves as a "proxy" term that includes other associated activities.

If we accept that paperwork can be used as a proxy for associated time-consuming tasks, there is also a possibility that paperwork may become a general proxy for much non-instructional time. Encroachments on the time teachers spend on instruction derive from numerous factors, including standardized testing days, pre-holiday days, classroom schedules and arrangements, and so forth. "Down time," long settling-in routines, and repeated directions are all non-instructional activities that take time away from teaching (Smith, 2000).

This digest describes five approaches to coordinating and deriving meaning from what otherwise may seem to be disjointed paperwork tasks and documents. First, paperwork makes the most sense when we focus on the student's progress and use the curriculum as a reference point. Second, analyzing how one source of information can be used to communicate with different audiences can increase efficiency. Third, time-saving techniques can be applied to informal record-keeping such as progress monitoring, scheduling, and maintaining work samples and anecdotal records. Fourth, having a clear understanding of exactly what is needed to comply with legal policies can limit unnecessary work. Finally, having students take active roles in their own individualized education programs (IEPs) can help to ease the burden on teachers.

Strategy 1: Focus on the Student

When we allow ourselves to focus our primary attention on the needs of the students, we can make the most sense out of paperwork requirements. Our commitment to students requires that we take the time to step back, reflect on their needs, and provide leadership in developing and implementing the instructional plan. The time we spend reflecting and planning at the front end of the process will ensure that greater benefits are derived from subsequent time spent doing paperwork.

Think about the student's needs and consider the nature of the information that must be collected

and systematically maintained for instructional as well as various compliance reasons, such as planning for, monitoring, and reporting student progress. When we ask ourselves what information will be needed, we can design strategies to collect information that will meet multiple needs. For example, what are the common data elements needed to fulfill IEP data requirements, make quarterly progress reports, or communicate with other professionals? Is it possible that data collected for local progress monitoring or assessment results can be used for these purposes?

It is helpful to remember that all instructional goals and objectives need to be developed and planned against a reference point—the curriculum. And, most typically, this will be the general education curriculum unless an approved alternative curriculum has been agreed upon. When proficiency measures and monitoring forms are available through the district, they can save time and help to maintain a closer alignment with general education frameworks and practices.

Strategy 2: Use One Source of Information to Communicate with Different Audiences

It is a useful exercise to think about how one could use a single data source as the basis for communication with different audiences: parents, teachers, other professionals, and students. One example would be to use curriculum-based assessment (CBA) as part of IEP evaluations and re-evaluations. Often, busy professionals grab a single measure, generally a standardized test, to assess students. But language in the reauthorization of IDEA (1997) includes, "use a variety of assessment tools and strategies to gather relevant functional and developmental information (20 U.S.C. sec. 1414 (b)(2)(A))" and assessment tools and strategies that provide relevant information that directly assist persons in determining the educational needs of the child." (20 U.S.C. sec. 1414 (b)(3)(D)). CBA or criterion-referenced measures are in line with this directive and also provide valuable information for designing and redesigning instruction and monitoring of student progress. Furthermore, if CBA is conducted in specific areas of student need as described in IEP goals, the results would be appropriate for quarterly progress reports to parents and for communication with other professionals. That is four for the price of one—efficiency at its finest!

Strategy 3: Save Time in Keeping Informal Records

Because grading, promotion, graduation, and program changes are based on individual goals and related progress, individualized and often informal records must be kept for students. These typically include informal monitoring of student progress, student schedules, work samples and anecdotal records.

Evaluating, recording, and maintaining student records may create additional paperwork. A number of time-saving suggestions are offered by Kronowitz (1992), including the following:

- *Plan to assess every other response (e.g., odd numbered or even numbered items) on activities with multiple examples of similar tasks or problems

- *Use a scoring key and have students score their own work

- *Create portfolios and progress charts that allow students to complete selected recording tasks themselves.

Also consider commercial, technologically based proficiency measures. Many textbooks are accompanied by proficiency measures, some of which may be completed by the student electronically. When this is appropriate and available, the computer maintains the scores and can generate many different types of data reports including item analysis, progress reports and so on.

Strategy 4: Understand Formal Paperwork Requirements

Considerable documentation is needed to comply with federal, state and local policies for educating students with disabilities. The IEP and the individualized family service plan (IFSP) are two critically important documents that have been expanded significantly in recent years. Other formally required documents include reports from locally adopted progress monitoring systems, testing and assessment results, reports for related services providers, and other required student performance reports such as behavior reports or medical observations.

Misconceptions about the actual requirements associated with IEPs and IFSPs abound. For example, behavior plans are now included in both IEPs and IFSPs in many states, but behavioral plans only need to be included in an IEP if a child's behavior impedes his or her learning or that of other students. And, although transition plans are required for students at a certain age, it may not be necessary to prepare a separate transition document if the services needed by the student can be addressed in the IEP.

Often, to protect themselves from litigation, state and local educational agencies require additional documentation beyond that required by federal regulations, and this results in even more paperwork. In discussing the U.S. Department of Education, Office of Special Education Programs' review of paperwork required by states, the National Education Association (NEA) reported that "One IEP package that was sent in was 43 pages long—the educators were told that most of what they were documenting was unnecessary under the new federal law" (Green, 2000). In fact, the Department of Education's sample IEP form is only 5 pages long.

In many districts, teachers are joining with local administrators to streamline paperwork and related processes. Schools are also developing creative ways to provide financial support for tracking paperwork, including paying part-time aides and clerical workers for additional hours of support and making arrangements for release time. Some solutions by districts, including hiring substitutes to cover classrooms so teachers can attend IEP meetings, recognize the time constraints on teachers, but do not succeed in increasing teacher time in instruction.

Strategy 5: Encourage Student Participation in IEPs

When the IEP is incorporated into lesson planning so that students take an active role in developing and monitoring their own educational programs, student skills in such areas as self-determination, awareness, and advocacy are developed (National Information Center for Children and Youth with Disabilities [NICHCY], 2002). This also provides a means of remaining focused on the student while maintaining legally compliant documents.

There are a variety of ways students can participate in the IEP process. The format and procedures for participation must be tailored to the student's age and degree of disability. NICHCY (2002) has published activities, audiotapes, and workbooks to encourage collaboration between teachers and older students with disabilities. A Student's Guide to the IEP (<http://www.nichcy.org/pubs/stuguide/st1book.htm>) provides step-by-step guidelines for walking

students through the process of participating in the writing of their own IEPs. In general, the idea is to begin the process of IEP planning at the beginning of the year. After discussing what an IEP is and some of the language that is used, older students may participate in reviewing their own IEP. It's a good idea to discuss key ideas with them, such as what the general education curriculum is or terms such as "present level of performance" and "accommodations." With students who are able, we can take it a step further by having them revisit their IEPs periodically to provide feedback based on guided discussions. Sample questions for these discussions include

- * Are there goals, objectives, or benchmarks that students have met that need to be updated?
- * Are there other goals or objectives that the student would like to address?
- * Is the student able to recognize the connections between goals and objectives or benchmarks and his or her schoolwork?

This process may take the form of class discussions, individual seatwork, one-on-one conferences with the teacher and/or paraprofessional, and even homework with parental support. Then, when it comes time for an annual review, the teacher can draft various sections of the IEP using data gathered throughout the year, rather than in a last minute dash to the deadline. In all of this, privacy issues and age appropriateness play a major role and, as always, it is a good idea to inform parents of the plan and include them in the process if they are able to participate.

While paperwork can't be eliminated from the special education teacher's role, there are many forms of assistance to be drawn upon. Those mentioned in this digest are a few of the solutions developed by creative teachers and administrators to address the paperwork burden in special education.

References

Cook, L., & Hall, K.S. (in press). Making paperwork work for you and your students. In J. Burnette & C. Peters-Johnson (Eds.). *Thriving as a special education teacher*. Arlington, VA: The Council for Exceptional Children.

Smith, B. A. (2000). Quantity matters: Annual instructional time in an urban school system. *Educational Administration Quarterly, Supplement*, 36(5), 652-683.

Kronowitz, E. L. (1992) *Your first year of teaching*. (2nd ed.). White Plains, NY: Longman.

Green, M. Y. (2000, November). Taming the paper tiger. *NEA Today Online, Cover Story*. Retrieved October 11, 2002, from http://www.nea.org/nea_today/0011/cover.html

National Information Center for Children and Youth with Disabilities (NICHCY). (2002). *A Student's Guide to the IEP*. (Retrieved October 11, 2002, from <http://www.nichcy.org/pubs/stuguide/st1book.htm>).

This digest is based on Cook, L. & Hall, S.K. (in press). *Making Paperwork Work for You and Your Students*. In J. Burnette and C. Peters-Johnson (Eds.), *Thriving as a Special Education Teacher*. Arlington, VA: Council for Exceptional Children.

ERIC Digests are in the public domain and may be freely reproduced and disseminated, but please acknowledge your source. This publication was prepared with funding from the Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education, under Contract No. R188062007. The opinions expressed in this report do not necessarily reflect the positions or policies of OERI or the Department of Education.

ERIC Digests

Teacher-Parent Partnerships

ERIC Digest
ERIC Identifier: ED351149
Publication Date: 1992-00-00
Author: Kevin J. Swick

The partnership construct is based on the premise that collaborating partners have some common basis for action and a sense of mutuality that supports their joint ventures. Teachers and parents have a common need for joining together in partnership: the need to foster positive growth in children and in themselves. It is their challenge to create a sense of mutuality so that their efforts are meaningful to all those involved.

PARENT AND TEACHER ATTRIBUTES THAT PROMOTE PARTNERSHIP

Research provides insight on parent attributes that support meaningful partnerships. These attributes include warmth, sensitivity, nurturance, the ability to listen, consistency, a positive self-image, a sense of efficacy, personal competence, and effective interpersonal skills.

Marital happiness, family harmony, success in prior collaborations, and openness to others' ideas have also been related to parental competence in promoting partnerships (Swick, 1991). Schaefer (1985) has noted that parents who are high in self-esteem are more assertive in their family and school involvement. Not all parents achieve the competence that supports these attributes. Teachers can provide a setting that encourages the development of partnership behaviors in parents. Modeling respect and communication skills, showing a genuine interest in the children, responding constructively to parent concerns, promoting a teamwork philosophy, and being sensitive to parent and family needs are some ways to promote this process. Lawler (1991) suggests that teachers encourage parents to be positive through the example they set in being supportive, responsive, and dependable.

Teacher attributes that appear to positively influence teachers' relationships with children and parents include: warmth, openness, sensitivity, flexibility, reliability, and accessibility (Comer and Haynes, 1991). From the parents' perspective, these teacher characteristics are desirable: trust, warmth, closeness, positive self-image, effective classroom management, child-centeredness, positive discipline, nurturance, and effective teaching skills. Researchers have cited the following teacher attributes as highly related to successful parent involvement: positive attitudes, active planning to involve parents, continuous teacher training, involvement in professional growth, and personal competence (Epstein, 1984; Galinsky, 1990).

TEACHER-PARENT PARTNERSHIP ROLES: A FRAMEWORK

The research on parent involvement indicates that parents and teachers can create viable partnerships by engaging in joint learning activities, supporting each other in their respective roles, carrying out classroom and school improvement activities, conducting collaborative curriculum projects in the classroom, participating together in various decision-making activities, and being advocates for children (Swick, 1991). Integral to these activities are the various parent and teacher roles and behaviors that make for successful partnerships.

* Parenting roles are performed within the family and within family-school relationships. Roles critical to family growth are nurturing, teaching, and modeling. Within the larger family-school structure, parents must carry out learning, doing, supporting, and decision-making roles. Naturally, parents use these various roles across contexts, but they emphasize particular roles as family or family-school situations dictate (Schaefer, 1985). For example, recent findings suggest that when parents sense an inviting school climate, they emphasize nurturing and supporting behaviors in their interactions with teachers; their participation in the school environment also increases (Comer and Haynes, 1991).

* Teacher roles critical to the partnership process include the family-centered roles of support, education, and guidance. Teacher roles that focus on family involvement in school and classroom activities include those of nurturing, supporting, guiding, and decision-making.

* Together, parents and teachers can foster their partnership through such behaviors as collaborating, planning, communicating and evaluating (Epstein and Dauber, 1991; Swick, 1991).

A FRAMEWORK AND STRATEGIES: APPLICATIONS FROM RESEARCH

An action-oriented philosophy of family-school support and nurturance is a powerful force in creating a positive learning environment. Teacher actions that promote such a philosophy include the sensitive involvement of parents from cultural, ethnic, and racial backgrounds (Lightfoot, 1978). Relating classroom activities to the varying needs and interests of children and families is another reflection of a family-centered program.

Since teacher-parent partnerships are developmental in nature and best realized through a comprehensive approach, a framework for carrying out the process is essential. The following elements need close scrutiny: teacher and parent contexts, role understandings, and an appreciation of the partnership process itself. Further, a sensitivity to each others' needs, situations, and talents is a requisite basis for a viable program.

Given that each program is and should be unique, particular elements, such as the following, are essential: needs assessments, goal statements, prioritization of activities, strategy development, implementation plans, and evaluation tools (Comer and Haynes, 1991). It has been noted that parents, when given the opportunity, are quite active in setting program goals (Powell, 1989). Swick (1992) notes that the availability of teachers and the offering of such services as transportation and child care to parents increases participation in program planning significantly.

A plethora of strategies have proven effective in promoting strong partnerships. The degree to which strategies are related to the needs and interests of parents and to the unique situations of schools and teachers influences the level of success. Home visits, conferences, parent centers, telecommunication, involvement in the classroom, participatory decision-making, parent and adult education programs, home learning activities, and family-school networking are some of the many strategies that have effectively engaged parents and teachers in supportive and collaborative roles (Swick, 1991). Creative uses of technology offer new possibilities for building partnerships with parents that reach beyond traditional limits (Bauch, 1990).

FAMILY-CENTERED SCHOOLS

Early childhood education's commitment to families is strengthened through the partnership process. True collaborative efforts are prompting teachers and parents to plan from a family-centered perspective. Family-centered schools need to be intimately involved with families in planning and nurturing healthy environments. A significant part of this effort is the development of a curriculum for caring that promotes a shared learning process among children, parents, and teachers. This school-family curriculum should focus on the caring elements of self-image, prosocial relationships with others, development of multicultural understandings, sensitive and empathetic relationships, nurturing and positive discipline, and creative problem-solving strategies.

A family-centered focus must also become a part of the community's fabric. A human network of family, school, and community learners needs to be part of a covenant for creating positive human environments. In particular, intergenerational family wellness needs, the family's and the school's needs for learning and sharing, and related community partnership needs provide the foundation for a family-centered effort.

REFERENCES

- Bauch, J. *The Transparent School Model: From Idea to Implementation*. Washington, DC: National Education Association, 1990.
- Comer, J., and Haynes, M. "Parent Involvement in Schools: An Ecological Approach." *Elementary School Journal* 91 (1991): 271-278. EJ 429 059.
- Epstein, J. "School Policy and Parent Involvement: Research Results." *Educational Horizons* 62 (1984): 70-72. EJ 429 689.
- Epstein, J., and Dauber, S. "School Programs and Teacher Practices of Parent Involvement in Inner-City Elementary and Middle Schools." *Elementary School Journal* 91 (1991): 289-306. EJ 429 061.
- Galinsky, E. "Why Are Some Parent-Teacher Relationships Clouded with Difficulties?" *Young Children* 45 (1990): 2-3, 38-39. EJ 415 403.
- Lawler, D. *Parent-Teacher Conferencing in Early Childhood Education*. Washington, DC: National Education Association, 1991.
- Lightfoot, S. *Worlds Apart: Relationships Between Families and School*. New York: Basic Books, 1978.
- Powell, D. *Families and Early Childhood Programs*. Washington, DC: National Association for the Education of Young Children, 1989. ED 309 872.
- Scheafer, E. "Parent and Child Correlates of Parental Modernity." In Sigel, B., ed. *Parental Belief Systems: The Psychological Consequences for Children*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1985.
- Swick, K. *Teacher-Parent Partnerships To Enhance School Success in Early Childhood Education*. Washington, DC: National Education Association, 1991.
- Swick, K. *An Early Childhood School-Home Learning Design*. Champaign, IL: Stipes Publishing, 1992.

ERIC Digests are in the public domain and may be freely reproduced and disseminated, but please acknowledge your source. This publication was prepared with funding from the Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education, under Contract No. RI88062007. The opinions expressed in this report do not necessarily reflect the positions or policies of OERI or the Department of Education.

Questions to Start the Thinking

Kentucky Association for Gifted Education ♦ Box 9610 ♦ Bowling Green, KY 42102-9610 ♦ 270.745.4301 ♦ www.wku.edu/kage ♦ kage@wku.edu

During times of budget constraints, decisions are often made regarding gifted programming that look like quick fixes but in reality have long term detrimental effects for gifted students.

Service options may go away but gifted students remain.

The needs of gifted students remain.

Academic modifications to meet these needs remain.

The need for educators trained in the nature and needs of gifted students remains.

Thoughtful consideration of the pros and cons of the decision and how that decision will affect gifted students in the long term should be made. Bad decisions are difficult to undo and have a ripple effect. Before decisions are made questions need to be asked and answered by a variety of people to assess the value of the decision. Here are some questions to start the thinking:

For Identification Issues

1. How are equitable screening, selection, and services for all primary high potential learners, with selection of the top quartile to be provided and by whom?
2. How is equitable identification for students in all five (5) categories, in all grade levels four (4) through twelve (12) to be provided and by whom?
3. How is an effective and efficient system for searching the entire student population on a continuous basis for likely candidates for services using both informal and available formal, normed standardized measures including measures of nonverbal ability to be conducted? Who is to do the searching and processing of the information?
4. What considerations and search mechanisms are in place for students who qualify as gifted and exceptional, disadvantaged, or underachieving due to environmental, cultural, and disabling conditions? Who collects and processes this information?

For Student Service Options

5. Are identified and selected students, primary through grade twelve (12), provided multiple, articulated, differentiated services and educational experiences commensurate with students' individual interests, needs, and abilities facilitating a high level attainment of goals? Who is to provide these services and experiences?
6. Does the district and school differentiate, replace, supplement, or modify the curricula of gifted students, K-12, facilitating a high level of attainment of learning goals to assist students to further develop their individual interests, needs, and abilities? How is this monitored?
7. Are primary students allowed continuous progress through differentiated curriculum and flexible grouping based on individual needs, interests, and abilities?

8. Are grouping options regularly used at all levels, in all schools, utilized in the local district gifted education plan, and based on student interest, ability, and need including social and emotional?
9. Are a multiple range of service options that address needs of high potential learners and formally identified gifted students in all five (5) categories provided at all levels across the district?
10. Are there appropriate acceleration policies and practices available? Have the district/schools' administrations read the Templeton report on acceleration, *A Nation Deceived: How Schools Hold Back America's Brightest Students?* (www.nationdeceived.org)
11. Do educational decisions ensure that instruction is at an appropriate challenge level and provide continuous progress for the gifted child? Are these decisions reflected on the identified gifted child's *Gifted Student Services Plan* (GSSP)? Who conducts the necessary monitoring?
12. Is there a procedural grievance safeguard established through which a parent/guardian/student may petition and appeal for services and resolve a concern regarding appropriate and adequate provision of PTP services or services addressed in students GSSP? Who initially responds to these requests? Is the availability of procedural grievance safeguards known by parents?
13. Do parents/guardians have the opportunity to provide information related to the interests, needs, and abilities of the identified child for use in determining potential identification and appropriate services? Who seeks and processes the information?
14. Are the parents/guardians notified annually of services included in students' GSSPs with specific procedures to follow in requesting a change in services?
15. Who collects the information for the GSSPs, prepares them, and sends them to parents/guardians? Who conducts the requested parent follow-up meetings?
16. Does the parent/guardian receive a progress report related to the student's GSSP at least once a semester? Who gathers and completes the report?
17. Is counseling assistance offered and planned in coordination with the teacher of the gifted and provided by a counselor familiar with the social and emotional needs of gifted and talented students?

For Professional Development:

18. Are all teachers with Primary Talent Pool or formally identified students in their classrooms prepared with appropriate professional development to address the individual interests, needs, and abilities of gifted students? Do they know how to differentiate or modify curriculum for a gifted child?

For the School District:

19. What assurances are there that modifications for gifted students are being implemented? Is there evidence of appropriateness, process, timeline, chain of command, forms and authorization, and documentation? Are accommodations or modifications for gifted students noted in lesson plans? Who monitors the process and provides guidance if the modifications are not occurring?

20. Are gifted children making annual yearly progress within the school, district? Is there at least one year's gain academically for the child for the year in the school?
21. Has the school district designated an endorsed and certified gifted education coordinator to oversee the compliance prescribed in the regulation for gifted and talented? Is this person trained in the nature and needs of gifted students and able to devote the time necessary to see that the students are appropriately identified and served?
22. Does the district use seventy-five (75) percent of the district's gifted education allocation to employ certified and endorsed personnel to provide direct instructional services for gifted and talented students? Is the student and school workload such that the personnel are able to appropriately provide these services?
23. Does the school district have local board approved policies and procedures in operation and available for public inspection which address each requirement in the gifted and talented administrative regulation?