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A Snapshot of Today's Students

Most of the 50 million public school children are students of color.

25% of children in the US live in poverty and 51% of children in school qualify for reduced and free lunch.*

More than four million of today's students are English language learners, whose families speak more than 450 different languages.

More than six million students have identified disabilities or special needs (many more are undiagnosed).

*See https://www.washingtonpost.com/local/education/majority-of-us-public-school-students-are-in-poverty/2015/01/15/df711d00-9-cee9-11e4-a7ee-526b10565b4_story.html and the SEF site for more info.
Jacob K. Javits Gifted and Talented Students Education Act asserts that

“outstanding talents are present in children and youth from all cultural groups, across all economic strata, and in all areas of human endeavor”

(United States Department of Education, 1993, p. 3).
Data Collected by NCRGE in Phase 1

- 133 Variables for 293 State District Gifted Plans
- 362,254 Current 9th-Grade Students’ Math and Reading Achievement in Grades 3, 4, and 5
- 2 Comprehensive Literature Reviews
- 202 Interview Transcripts
- 2419 School Survey Responses (53% [45-68%] Response - 80% Title 1)
- 332 District Survey Responses (78%-90% Response)
Take home message from Phase 1...

1. Gifted services are not equally distributed across schools within districts and poverty appears to be a key factor.

2. Underserved populations are not being identified at the same rates as non-underserved students even after controlling for student achievement.

3. The gap in identification rates for high achieving FRPL vs. non-FRPL almost disappears in districts that use modification policies.

4. Gifted students start ahead in reading and mathematics achievement but don’t grow any faster than other groups.

5. Most teachers of the gifted have choice in what they teach.
### States with Requirement to Identify and Serve Gifted Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Number of Schools</th>
<th>Number of Schools with No Gifted Students in Our Cohort</th>
<th>Number of Schools with No Free and Reduced Lunch Gifted Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State 1</td>
<td>1,177</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State 2</td>
<td>573</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State 3</td>
<td>1,495</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What is the relationship between the % of free and reduced lunch students in a school and the % of students identified as gifted?

-0.31

-0.56

-0.64
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>State 1</th>
<th>State 2</th>
<th>State 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% Gifted students</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% FRL ID as gifted</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Black ID as gifted</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Latinx ID as gifted</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% EL ID as gifted</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of White who are ID as GT</td>
<td>24.6%</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Asian ID as gifted</td>
<td>36.7%</td>
<td>16.67%</td>
<td>24.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>State 1</td>
<td>State 2</td>
<td>State 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Gifted students</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free and reduced Lunch</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latinx</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Learners</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>1.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>2.37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Probability of Being Identified as Gifted after Controlling for Achievement in State 1
1. No gifted program is some schools with high numbers of underserved students
2. High academic achievement isn’t enough
3. Hurdle approach with multiple criteria
4. Students are not being nominated
5. Students and parents are choosing not to participate
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Frequency of Modifications in Identification

31% (26% - 23% - 65%) modify identification for underserved students

Frequency of Strategies to Modify Identification

38% evaluating EL students in their native language
74% using non-verbal assessments to identify underserved students
59% being more flexible about the scores that are necessary for identification as gifted for students from underserved populations
43% using a “talent pool approach” to identify and/or serve potential gifted students prior to more formal identification
37% giving students “extra consideration” during the identification process
27% using different weighting of the identification data
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Prototypical students by gifted and historically under-represented minority/free and reduced priced lunch status (Under/FRL), controlling for gender and English language status in State 1 (panels A1&A2) and State 2 (panels B1&B2).
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How much autonomy do your school's teachers of the gifted have in choosing the content to deliver?

- Very Little – 4.6%
- Some – 26.8%
- A Lot – 51.9%
- Complete 15.8%
There is an institutional and individual relationship between poverty and the likelihood of a student being identified for gifted services. Even when they exhibit equally high achievement, free/reduced lunch students were less likely to be identified for gifted services. In addition, higher poverty schools tend to have lower proportions of gifted students.

The implications of our research are clear: between school inequities appear to contribute to the under-identification of students of poverty as gifted. High potential students of poverty are less likely to be recognized and served in programs for the gifted. Such inequities have the potential to increase, rather than decrease social inequities. Gifted education is certainly not the root of our social inequities. However, at present, it appears that gifted programs may be perpetuating societal inequities rather than helping to eliminate them.
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English Learners Growth & Inclusion

- English Learners (ELs) are the fastest growing population of learners in the United States (National Center for Education Statistics, 2013). According to the United States Department of Education, Office of Civil Rights (2014)

- 2% of English learners (ELs) are enrolled in gifted programs, as compared to 7% of non-ELs.
- Historically, there is an underrepresentation of economically disadvantaged students, students of color, students from ethnic minorities, and ELs in programs for gifted and talented students
- Identification procedures and policies have been cited as the crux of the problem.
Data Collection

**Quantitative Methods**
- 3 years of school-reported state data
- 3 states with mandates for identification and programming for gifted students

**Qualitative Methods**
- 16 schools from 9 districts
- Interviews and focus groups (225 informants)
- 84 transcripts
- 2,207 excerpts
- 6,278 total code applications
- 208 total axial codes
- Four selective codes (i.e., core categories)
Model for Improving Identification of EL Students

National Center for Research on Gifted Education (http://ncrge.uconn.edu)

Champion for Identifying EL Students

Professional Development

Improved School Personnel Awareness of EL Identification Issues

Change in Identification Practices

Improved Acceptance and Placement for Gifted Services

Evolution of a Web of Communication Among Administration, Faculty, Staff, Specialists, & Parents/Guardians

Increased Identification of EL Students for Gifted Services

Modifications in Program Services

Development Practice of Being Talent Scouts

Increased Trustworthiness of Communications

• Identification Preparation Opportunities
• Universal Screening
• Alternative Identification Pathways
• More Frequent Screening
• Culturally Appropriate Assessments

• Inclusion of Culturally Responsive Curriculum
• Adding Support Services to Ensure Student Success

Increase Trustworthiness of Communications

Champion for Identifying EL Students
Web of Communication Process for Improving Identification of English Learners for Gifted and Talented Programs

National Center for Research on Gifted Education (http://ncrge.uconn.edu)

Web of Communication

- Professional Development
- Awareness of EL Gifted Identification Issues
- Changes in Identification Practices
  - Identification Preparation Opportunities
  - Universal Screening
  - Broadened Definition With Alternative Identification Pathways
  - More Frequent Screening
  - Culturally Appropriate Assessments
  - Develop Practice of Being Talent Scouts
- Modifications in Program Services
  - Inclusion of Culturally Responsive Curriculum
  - Adding Support Services to Ensure Student Success
- Increased Parental Understanding of Program Services and Trustworthiness of Communications
- Increased Identification and Placement of EL Students for Gifted Programs
Ideas for Increasing Student Participation

1. Adopt Universal Screening Procedures
2. Create Alternative Pathways to Identification
3. Establish a “Web of Communication”
4. View Professional Development as Lever for Change


The National Center for Research on Gifted Education (NCRGE – http://ncrge.uconn.edu) is funded by the Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education PR/Award # R305C140018.
Best practices involve a fair and equitable nomination process. This requires a paradigm shift where the focus changes from identifying and remediating weaknesses to identifying strengths and giftedness through multiple lenses (Esquierdo & Arreguin-Anderson, 2012).
Talent Development is a Two Step Process—
1. We must provide opportunities for talent to surface
2. Then we must provide programs that develop students’ talents
The only way our country will reach its potential is if we help all our children reach their potential.
“Our lives begin to end the day we become silent about things that matter.”

- Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.