

## **Notes Taken by CHAT Leadership Representatives on Presentations Made at the MSU Gifted Symposium on October 5, 2017**

### **Tracy Missett - UM gifted chair**

#### **Montana Gifted Education:**

- no requirements for gifted Ed programs, despite language that suggests it is mandatory
- little consistency; range of services
- little training for teachers in regular class
- State does not monitor or audit local school districts

2013 Jack Kent Cooke foundation study. Finding: vast majority under equipped to address these needs

- excellence gaps- disparity in lower-income vs higher income and continues and widens over time
- gave grades - MT had a D. Have good "must" language; criteria and methods and services left to local schools and no enforcement.
- acceleration, no state policy to encourage it
- training and endorsements not required. No special competency requirement anymore for teachers
- reporting not required; 12-15K students in MT
- \$20/student in funding

As result of these factors, Jack Kent Cooke study gave MT a "D" for its gifted education program.

ESSA language with high ability kids and low income high ability kids

- ESSA had no GT representation at the table in MT
- result doesn't do much for gifted kids

What can we do?

- MT has momentum
- work with administrators to buy in to GT
- work with school counselor
- UM has a program for certificate for gifted Ed (online) aligned with NAGC-CEC standards
- gifted lab school (Fairfax county Virginia)

Attitudes that Limit Change in Gifted Education:

Elitism

Attitudes: Gifted kids will make it

More needy students than those who are gifted

All are gifted

### **Suzanne and Dave Peterson Endowed Professor in Gifted Education**

#### **Jann Leppien, Whitworth U**

[jleppien@whitworth.edu](mailto:jleppien@whitworth.edu)

Culture: kids are doing Ok, Jann argues that is a MT way. This attitude gets in the way of doing what is needed.

- getting pre-service teacher to challenge all kids
- teacher can lack content specialist, but do we need this?
- kids will get increasingly anxious

- MT has spots of promise
- perception of only top 1%; etc
- think it is the all around perfect kids; rather than jagged (meaning gifted in one or a few areas but not others)
- almost 2.5 less likely to get in, even if they have the scores of poor.
- need to age mate

Differentiation: goes wrong, work alone, more not different work - not a high enough skill level

- need to move level of expertise; aware of need to move. Cluster, accelerate, practices are researched, but little practiced

- underserved populations:

Rural student

Native American

ELL

Hispanic

African-American

Twice-exceptional - challenge to ID

Low income

Don't recognize strength in arts

Washington - recent changes in gifted education:

- Washington coalition for gifted and talented
  - legislative remedy - gifted out of general fund
  - compliance review
  - can't be 1 hour a week
  - 5% for supplementary materials
- Big changes in relatively recent times

- need requirements for universal screening
- need kindergarten kids screened, rather than 3rd grade
- screening for services; study in FL saw huge increases in services for underrepresented groups 180% increase in ID

[Ncrgc.uconn.edu](http://Ncrgc.uconn.edu) - research

- low SES (social-economic status) schools esp marginalized
- culture shapes giftedness. Ex: Native American kids in culture with less competition, 2E needs.

Key Take-Home Summary for Change:

Administrators are key allies in serving kids.

Professional development is a lever for change

Counsellors need training in GT

Educators, communities, legislators matter too.

### **Q and A:**

1964: started honors college at MSU

1972: eliminated by legislature

1983: MSU REESTABLISHED program

1992: Tamara Fisher established mentor program; Wendy Morical runs it now

2017: 1,500 in honors program at MSU; has small classes

Q: is there a screener you'd recommend

A: Cogat, then looking and achievement data. Need alternative pathways to get in. Thinks Cogat offered by OPI. Need to use local norm for inclusion, not a universal level - peers matter for level.

Definition of giftedness is important - ID needs to align with services. If only math and language, then that is what to assess

Q: ESSA at federal vs. state level?

A: at Fed level, language to fund GT. Title I could be used for high ability kids. But states left to own implementation. No fed \$ to kids, except in small ways

GT only exceptionality with no robust support.

Q: state advocacy?

A: AGATE; HJ 1 in process, has \$ for lobbyist.

Q: is Cogat ok for Kindergarten

A: yes, and don't composite scores

For 2E kids, trained psychologist and 1:1 tests way to go.

Problem with transition of ID from site to site.

Q: what about compliant kids? Are they missed?

A: yes, kids do check out. They distance themselves intellectually. Kids need respect.

Yes, run risk of pathologizing gifted kids. We need to serve compliant kids too. There are myths. Asynchronous development can make social fit a challenge - needs to be a consideration forever, potentially.

MSU is going to get an endowed chair in exceptionalities, hopefully next spring (sounds like all kinds of exceptionalities, not just gifted)