

# Gifted Child Quarterly

<http://gcq.sagepub.com>

---

## **A National View of Promising Programs and Practices for Culturally, Linguistically, and Ethnically Diverse Gifted and Talented Students**

Christine J. Briggs, Sally M. Reis and Erin E. Sullivan

*Gifted Child Quarterly* 2008; 52; 131

DOI: 10.1177/0016986208316037

The online version of this article can be found at:  
<http://gcq.sagepub.com/cgi/content/abstract/52/2/131>

---

Published by:



<http://www.sagepublications.com>

On behalf of:



[National Association for Gifted Children](http://www.nagc.org)

**Additional services and information for *Gifted Child Quarterly* can be found at:**

**Email Alerts:** <http://gcq.sagepub.com/cgi/alerts>

**Subscriptions:** <http://gcq.sagepub.com/subscriptions>

**Reprints:** <http://www.sagepub.com/journalsReprints.nav>

**Permissions:** <http://www.sagepub.com/journalsPermissions.nav>

**Citations** <http://gcq.sagepub.com/cgi/content/refs/52/2/131>

# A National View of Promising Programs and Practices for Culturally, Linguistically, and Ethnically Diverse Gifted and Talented Students

Christine J. Briggs

*University of Louisiana at Lafayette*

Sally M. Reis

Erin E. Sullivan

*University of Connecticut*

**Abstract:** The low representation of culturally, linguistically, and ethnically diverse (CLED) and high-poverty students in gifted and talented programs has long been an area of concern. This qualitative study investigated methods to increase successful participation of CLED students in gifted programs across the nation. Twenty-five programs were selected for inclusion in the study. Of those, 7 programs were selected for in-depth site visits that included interviews with administrators and teachers, as well as observations. Data suggested five categories that contributed to the successful identification and participation of CLED students in gifted programs. These categories included modified identification procedures; program support systems, such as front-loading (identifying high-potential children and providing opportunities for advanced work prior to formal identification); selecting curriculum/instructional designs that enable CLED students to succeed; building parent/home connections; and using program evaluation practices designed to highlight avenues to CLED students' success.

**Putting the Research to Use:** This article describes identification and programming strategies designed to foster the successful inclusion of students from all cultural groups and all ages and geographic locations in gifted programs. The strategies have been implemented in various types of programs and reflect a variety of approaches, including acceleration, enrichment, mentorships, and combinations of curricular and instructional approaches. These approaches can be implemented before identification has taken place to help prepare students for more challenging content (a strategy called front-loading) and after students have been identified to help them succeed in the program. It is our responsibility to cultivate the talents of all young people, including those from groups historically overlooked for gifted programs. The relative success of the programs described in this article suggests that educators seeking to create more inclusive gifted programs may look to creative identification and support strategies to help them reach this end.

**Keywords:** *diversity; front-loading; identification; gifted services; talent development*

Researchers and educators in the field of gifted education have long been concerned about the low representation of culturally, linguistically, and ethnically diverse (CLED) students in gifted programs across the country (Baldwin, 1978; Ford & Harmon, 2001; Gallagher & Gallagher, 1994; Lohman, 2005; Oakland & Rossen, 2005; Renzulli & Reis, 1997). With changing demographics in public schools, and both political pressure and funding sources focused on this concern, educators must consider how to change identification

procedures and services to adequately recognize and develop these students' talents. This article summarizes a study investigating how some exemplary

**Authors' Note:** Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Christine Briggs, Department of Curriculum and Instruction, University of Louisiana-Lafayette, Lafayette, LA 70503; e-mail: [cbriggs@louisiana.edu](mailto:cbriggs@louisiana.edu).

**Note:** This article accepted under the editorship of Paula Olszewski-Kubilius.

gifted education programs have been implemented or adapted to improve the underrepresentation and successful participation of diverse gifted and talented students (Tomlinson, Ford, Reis, Briggs, & Strickland, 2004).

### **Research on Identification and Services for Culturally Diverse Students**

During the past four decades, educators have increasingly recognized the need to reform and enhance the education of culturally and linguistically diverse students in U.S. schools (Baldwin, 2002; Castellano & Diaz, 2002). Even with this consideration, CLED students continue to be overidentified for remedial classes and underrepresented in gifted and talented (GT) programs and services (Donovan & Cross, 2002). National surveys indicate that only 10% of those students performing at the highest levels are CLED students, even though they represent 33% of the school population (Gallagher, 2002).

Clearly, there is a need for strategies that will allow CLED students with gifts and talents to participate in GT programs and services. Research on the topic offers several broad areas of focus for achieving this goal, including expanding identification and selection procedures (Ford & Grantham, 2003; Frasier, Garcia, & Passow, 1995; Frasier & Passow, 1994, Morris, 2002), understanding test bias (Ford & Harmon, 2001; Ford & Harris, 1999), implementing cultural awareness training in teacher education programs (Ford & Trotman, 2001; Rios & Montecinos, 1999), considering a variety of behaviors indicating giftedness (Baldwin, 2002; Frazier & Passow, 1994; Maker & Schiever, 1989), and fostering multicultural educational reform (Banks & McGee-Banks, 2001; Bernal, 2002; Ford & Harmon, 2001; Ford & Harris, 1999).

Recent research also provides examples of districts that have used specific strategies and models to increase program enrollment and retention of CLED students in gifted programs (Tomlinson et al., 2004). Cited strategies include using multiple criteria for identification, providing talent development opportunities prior to the identification process (defined here as “front-loading”), demonstrating administrative support for program changes, preparing teachers to implement changes, and turning to the community for resources and support. Although these reports have been promising, further evaluation and research is needed to assess the specific processes and stages that led to change in these programs and districts (Bernal, 2002). The purpose of this

study was to identify programs using these types of alternative identification strategies and program services to help CLED students achieve and to provide research-based information about strategies that may lead to more CLED students being identified as gifted and talented.

### **Factors in Identification and Service of CLED Students**

Too often, representative numbers of CLED students are not included in programs for gifted and talented students, when compared to demographics of CLED students in the total school population (Ford & Grantham, 2003; Maker & Schiever, 1989). The vast majority of young people participating in gifted and talented programs in the United States represent the dominant culture (Donovan & Cross, 2002), perhaps because many educators may hold a more traditional view of giftedness. A correlation exists between the identification of gifts and talents in students and high scores on achievement or IQ tests (Ford & Grantham, 2003; Ford & Trotman, 2001; Frasier & Passow, 1994). This form of giftedness, described as schoolhouse or academic giftedness by Renzulli and Reis (1985, 1997), is usually characterized by high grades, high scores on standardized achievement and aptitude tests, and strong classroom performance. With the current emphasis on this traditional type of giftedness, identified CLED students generally represent a fraction of the talented CLED students in our schools—students whose gifts may be latent or newly emerging (Baldwin, 1978; Ford & Harris, 1999; Frasier & Passow, 1994; U.S. Department of Education, 1993).

Identification and subsequent provision of gifted program services to CLED students are influenced by the specific assessment tools used for identification, educator bias and perception of cultural behaviors, quantity and quality of teacher preparation for working with CLED students, and degree of variety in instructional strategies. Educator bias, for example, occurs when preconceived ideas about what constitutes giftedness results in a failure to recognize indicators of giftedness in CLED students with high potential (Bruch, 1975; Callahan, Hunsaker, Adams, Moore, & Bland, 1995; Deslonde, 1977; Ford & Grantham, 2003; Grossman, 1998). For the past 20 years, two perspectives of cultural differences have existed, one focused on cultural deficits and the other on cultural differences. The cultural-deficit model reflects the belief that the dominant culture is normative, and different customs

and behaviors deviant or inappropriate. The cultural-difference perspective suggests that differences in behaviors and customs between people of different cultures are to be expected; avoids value judgments about cultural beliefs and behaviors; and presents various cultures, including the dominant culture, as parallel or cocultures (Ford, Howard, Harris, & Tyson, 2000; Morris, 2002). Teachers who use a cultural-differences perspective recognize CLED students' individual communication and working preferences and respond in one of two ways. They either recognize differences but require CLED students to adapt to fit in the common societal group or recognize differences and modify the learning environment to support student learning preferences (Baldwin, 2002; Ford & Grantham, 2003; Ford et al., 2000; Morris, 2002; Renzulli & Reis, 1997).

Other factors influencing identification include language issues and the absence of appropriately stimulating environments, as well as unfounded fear of reducing program quality and the mistaken perception that few gifted students can be found in CLED groups. With the emphasis on high-stakes testing inherent in No Child Left Behind, students whose language or academic skills differ from those tested by state and national assessments may be regarded deficient and not well suited to high levels of academic challenge (Gallagher, 2004). These issues may continue to adversely affect the referral of high-potential CLED students for gifted programs.

Students are often nominated for gifted programs by teachers, who must have knowledge, understanding, awareness, and appreciation of their students' cultures to ensure recognition of diverse talents (Briggs & Reis, 2004; Ford, Moore, & Milner, 2005; Frasier et al., 1995). Teachers may misunderstand students' attributes, characteristics, and behaviors may vary across cultures and fail to realize that these diverse characteristics do not reflect absence of abilities and aptitudes. Hence, different manifestations of aptitude may constitute one barrier to teacher nominations of culturally diverse students (Briggs & Reis, 2003; Ford, Moore, & Milner, 2005; Frasier et al., 1995).

Teachers must learn how general characteristics used for identifying gifted behaviors may differ in a cultural context and in what ways these behaviors influence identification of giftedness in CLED students. Frasier et al. (1995) suggested that three biases affect CLED students' nomination and subsequent identification for participation in gifted programs. First, there is linguistic bias, which occurs when test errors made by students who are not proficient in English mask the students' true knowledge of a topic. Second, communication-style

bias refers to the discrepancies between ability and performance when students are forced to respond to test items in a manner culturally or socially different from their accustomed style of communicating. Third, cognitive style bias refers to oversights in talent recognition when students from a given cultural group manifest their abilities primarily in ways not measured by standardized tests (Ford & Grantham, 2003). As racial and cultural customs influence the ways advanced abilities may be manifested, the lists of characteristics of giftedness in introductory textbooks may fail to describe culturally diverse gifted and talented students (Reis & Small, 2005). Because these customs may emerge differently in various cultural groups, classroom teachers should understand both the specific cultural behaviors and the various ways to recognize the gifts and talents of CLED students (Menendez, 1995; Morris, 2002; Rhodes, 1992).

## Research Method

Qualitative methodology, including multiple comparative and in-depth case study analysis, was used in this study (Merriam, 1988; Miles & Huberman, 1994; Yin, 2002). Questionnaires, document review, in-depth interviews, and observations were used to gather data, to probe perceptions of program coordinators and teachers, and to construct thick case studies. Additional primary source data including program reports and evaluations, curriculum descriptions, newspaper articles, curriculum units, and program handbooks allowed researchers to examine how program teachers and coordinators increased the number of culturally diverse students who successfully participate in gifted programs.

## Data Collection and Instrumentation

Prior to data collection, an informational questionnaire, Exemplary Programs for Culturally Diverse Gifted Students Information Matrix (EPCDGS; Briggs & Reis, 2003), was developed using a broad related research literature review (Tomlinson et al., 2004) and a field test with content experts. Content experts included those associated with the National Research Center on the Gifted and Talented at the University of Connecticut and the University of Virginia, as well as additional researchers interested in gifted students across the country. The EPCDGS included open-ended sections requesting demographic information, program description and goals, identification procedures, evidence of program success and evaluation, case studies, and the perceived benefits of program participation for

**Table 1**  
**Geographic Representation of Programs**

Region	Number of Programs	Grade Level	Program Delivery
Northeast	4	K-12	Pullout; resource; summer
Midwest	7	K-12	Within classroom; summer; Saturday; after school; pullout; resource
Northwest/West Coast	3	K-12	Within classroom; magnet; pullout
Plains/Southwest	6	K-12	Pullout; within classroom; after school; summer
East Coast/Southeast	5	K-12	pull-out; resource; summer; after school; Saturday

the student. As sections were open-ended, they were designed to elicit information about program success. This instrument was used to collect data about programs that could potentially yield information about practices that successfully identified and enabled CLED student participation in gifted education programs.

Qualitative data collection procedures followed guidelines suggested by Strauss (1987) and Strauss and Corbin (1990). The selection of programs was completed in four phases. In Phase 1, inquiry letters and e-mails soliciting nominations were sent to leaders in the field, such as directors of graduate programs, gifted education researchers, members of the Board of Directors for the National Association for Gifted Children, and state-level directors of gifted programs. Invitations to nominate programs were accompanied by a questionnaire also available on the Web site of the National Association for Gifted Children and the National Research Center on the Gifted and Talented. Forty-six programs were initially nominated, representing a cross section of geographic areas across the United States. Nominations included school-based programs; after-school programs; and summer programs for elementary, middle school, and high school students.

In Phase 2, program coordinators of all nominated programs were asked to complete and submit the EPCDGS and additional program documentation. The completed questionnaire and additional program information, including descriptions of increases in the participation of CLED students, were received from 40 programs. The information submitted with the questionnaires included program handbooks, tables documenting numbers of students identified over a period of time, identification procedures, demographic data, evaluation data, newsletters, and other information. The data collected during this phase enabled researchers to identify 25 programs for follow-up, in-depth interviews with program directors. These programs were selected from all regions of the nation, representing all grade levels, and multiple types of delivery models, as indicated in Table 1. Although most program coordinators

did not have precise data on percentage of CLED students identified for their programs compared to the percentage of these students in the school or community, many could supply data on increases in the numbers of CLED students identified as compared to previous years, as well as the success of participating CLED students. An ability to provide some form of information documenting increased identification of CLED students was the primary selection criterion for participation in the study.

In Phase 3, an interview protocol was developed using Patton's (1997) approach and implemented during interviews with the directors or coordinators of the 25 selected programs. Interview questions were designed to gather additional information about how the representation of CLED students had increased in the programs, as well as information about identification practices, instructional design, and other factors that may have resulted in increased representation of CLED students in the program. Questions were clustered in six categories: distinctive program qualities, teacher preparation, parent/community involvement, learning environment, program evaluation, and future plans.

Program directors or coordinators were then contacted by telephone. Prior to the interviews, each director/coordinator received a copy of the interview protocol, as well as an interview permission form. Interviews lasted approximately 1 to 2 hours, enabling sufficient time for program directors/coordinators to expand on the information previously submitted and to describe and emphasize different elements of the program. The majority of the program directors and coordinators also participated in semistructured follow-up interviews to clarify and expand information obtained in the original interviews.

Information from these interviews was transcribed and a program summary was developed for each interview. These summaries were sent to the program director for member check verification to enable program directors to review the interview transcriptions and summary to ensure accurate description of the program.



Further clarification was sought about questions that emerged at this time, and coding was carried out to identify categories emerging in the interviews.

In Phase 4, seven programs were selected for site visits to probe more deeply the methods used to increase successful participation of CLED students. Several criteria were used to select these programs, including varied program design, region of the country, innovativeness of the program, and an increase in CLED students who participated successfully in the gifted program during prior years. Programs selected had either increased the numbers of CLED students identified or provided data documenting success of CLED students in the program being studied and in subsequent gifted program participation, such as entrance to selective middle school gifted programs or very competitive colleges. A range of program models was included to potentially yield strategies that could be generalized to other programs with a need for increased diversity.

Contact persons from the selected programs were called to obtain consent and to arrange dates and times for the site visits, as well as to explain the required interviews and observations of teachers, administrators, and instructional sites. The researchers had extensive experience in both urban and gifted education. One of the two researchers spent 1 to 2 full days at each site, triangulating data by interviewing teachers, program coordinators, and administrators with an interview protocol; reviewing program documents; and conducting classroom observations. The interview protocol included information about the primary and secondary documents submitted about programs, as well as questions prompted by specific responses to questionnaires or preliminary interviews (Creswell, 1994).

Observational evidence provided additional information about the program and practices, as well as substantiated or refuted survey and/or interview data. As this phase of the study constituted nonparticipant observation, the observer did not interact with teachers or students during observations. Observers wrote rich, thick descriptions of the physical environment, demographics, and learning experiences during and following the visits. These observations augmented researchers' understanding of limitations or problems faced by program personnel in their efforts to increase representation of CLED students in gifted programs (Yin, 2002). When data collection for each case study was completed, program summaries were written and sent to program directors for member check, enabling them to review and make edits.

## Data Coding and Analysis

All data from site visits and interviews were analyzed following procedures outlined by Strauss and Corbin (1990) to generate an explanatory theory and to develop an "inductively derived grounded theory" about expanding program opportunities for CLED students. The analysis procedures employed three hierarchical, interrelated, and recurring types of coding: open coding, axial coding, and selective coding. In open coding, discrete parts of the data were compared and contrasted to formulate conceptual labels, such as the procedures used to identify these students. These concepts were then compared for similarities and grouped together in categories. Axial coding focused on identifying and linking subcategories to a set of relationships that denoted causal conditions, intervening conditions, interaction strategies, the consequences of those strategies, and the context in which they occurred. These concepts and relationships were in turn cross-referenced with information provided by gifted program directors and coordinators in documents about the case study programs and during the interviews used to select the programs. This triangulation was implemented to ensure that seemingly emergent patterns were supported by external data. Finally, selective coding procedures guided the selection of a core category that relates all major categories to each other. In this study, the core category involved the identification and program delivery methods used to integrate CLED students into gifted and talented programs.

### *Trustworthiness*

The limitations of qualitative research involve the accuracy of the description of the participants in the natural setting, the ways in which the biases of the researcher affect the study, and how the research has addressed his or her biases in the study. In this study, trustworthiness (Lincoln & Guba, 1985) was established through the following strategies: triangulation of the data through multiple sources including interviews, observations, surveys and material data, member checking to ensure accurate representations of the informant's reality, and another researcher's examination of all phases of the research. Rich, thick, detailed case study descriptions established a solid framework for transferability (Merriam, 1988). Trustworthiness was also ensured through the detailed description of the focus of the study, sample selection, triangulation of data collection, and data collection. Analyses were

**Table 2**  
**Case Studies**

Region	Program	Grade Level	Category
Midwest	Rockwood Treasures	Elementary	Modified identification
Midwest	Project Excite	Elementary	Front-loading (earlier experiences to prepare students for gifted programs)
Northeast	Mentor Connection	Secondary	Curriculum changes
West Coast	Euclid High Ability Magnet	Elementary	Curriculum changes
West Coast	Project College Bound	Secondary	Parent connections
All regions	All programs	K-12	Program evaluations

reported in detail to provide an accurate portrait of the methods used.

## Findings

The findings in this section include a discussion of the five axial categories developed in the analysis of the programs identified as meeting the needs of gifted and potentially gifted CLED students. To illustrate the findings in each category, brief case studies of programs exemplifying the categories are provided. Information about case study schools is offered in Table 2.

### Category 1: Modified Identification Procedures

To understand how program coordinators modified identification procedures to increase representation of CLED students in gifted programs, identification strategies were studied across programs, with three categories of identification strategies emerging from the data: (a) use of alternative pathways for program identification, (b) early identification usually at the primary grade level, and (c) inclusion of information about broader perspectives of student performance.

Alternative pathways to identification included the use of different assessment tools in seven (28%) of the programs and elimination of formal identification procedures combined with the use of special consideration in three of the programs (12%). In cases of special consideration, students who did not necessarily meet typical standards for inclusion but who showed potential for advanced-level work were provided with gifted services that could nurture their talents.

Early identification, in some cases as early as preschool, in others, in the early primary grades, was used in five programs (20%) and was followed by student preparation (front-loading with advanced learning opportunities) for later program participation.

Student preparation focused on advanced and enriched learning experiences for students who did not have access to these experiences at home, in regular classrooms, or in their communities.

Student performance assessments were used in nine programs (36%), and these included observations of students during enriched lessons to watch for signs of gifted behaviors, student work portfolios indicating students' strengths and talents, and probationary placement in gifted services to provide opportunity for students to demonstrate their abilities (24%).

Seven programs used one of two identification practices intended to make programs more inclusive: reduction of "gatekeepers" and increased use of talent-spotting opportunities. In each of these programs, the emphasis on formal assessment was reduced and a renewed importance placed on student performance during learning experiences. In all seven programs, the inclusion of student performance data enabled students to display gifted behaviors as well as advanced thinking and problem solving. The seven public school programs used more inclusive identification procedures and represented five different regions of the country. A description of one exemplary program, Treasures, illustrates the use of modified identification procedures.

*The Treasures Gifted Program of Rockwood Schools.* The Treasures program, in Ellisville, Missouri, provides services to gifted and talented students from kindergarten through high school, using different organizational components, as well as varying curricular and instructional methods across grade levels. The Treasures program (To Recruit, Educate, And Service Under-Represented Exceptional Students) helps to find, identify, and serve underrepresented gifted students in the district, including those who are culturally diverse, economically disadvantaged, and/or physically disabled, as well as those who speak English as a second language. This program won a state award in Missouri and is

considered a state model for a way to increase the successful participation of diverse students.

The Treasures program was created to fill an obvious need in the system: Ten years ago, just 10 students from culturally diverse backgrounds (primarily African American and Latino) participated in the elementary pull-out program. That number has grown dramatically, and currently, 202 students or 7.3% of the population of identified gifted students are identified through the Treasures Identification Procedures. These numbers are more representative of the district in which the program is housed, but direct proportional comparisons cannot be made, for students from other urban areas are bused into the district. The identification process for Treasures relies on case study procedures and includes a review of intelligence test scores, achievement test scores, and qualitative reviews of student work designed to provide educators with multiple indicators of gifted behavior.

This approach enables the program coordinator and faculty members to use a wider range of standardized assessment instruments, the opportunity to meet individually with candidates and their parents or teachers, and the option to evaluate student work and other potential indicators of giftedness. Collecting and processing these data is more time intensive than traditional identification approaches but enables educators to understand an individual student's academic abilities and needs. The end result is increased numbers of diverse students identified for, and participating in, the gifted program.

## Category 2: Front-Loading

Front-loading is defined here as the process of preparing students for advanced content and creative and critical thinking prior to the formal identification process or before advanced-level courses are offered. The process of front-loading bridges the gap in the readiness of some CLED students, nurtures their abilities, and prepares them for success in advanced content programs. Five programs (20%) used front-loading prior to formal identification. All of the programs that used front-loading were affiliated with public schools and had some form of university partnership. Project Excite serves an urban community in the Midwest and illustrates the use of front-loading to prepare CLED students for acceleration and high levels of academic performance.

*Project Excite.* Project Excite, in Evanston, Illinois, resulted from collaborative efforts of the Evanston School District and Northwestern University to address

the disparity between the numbers of CLED students enrolled in the district and the number of CLED students identified and served in district gifted programs. The student enrollment in this district represents a very diverse population: 43.7% African American, 7.1% Latino, 2.5% Asian American, and 45.6% European American. Staff at the Center for Talent Development at Northwestern University helped develop Project Excite as a way to increase the number of CLED students prepared to take advanced placement courses in math and science at the high school. Third-grade students participate in a program every other week each trimester, and fourth- and fifth-grade students may attend three separate 8-week sessions in the fall, winter, and spring, with an optional spring session for sixth graders preparing for the pre-algebra placement assessment. A summer session is also offered to Grades 3-8 (a majority of students are in Grades 7-8).

One of the main goals of the program was to address the achievement gap between CLED students and other students in the district. Other program goals were developed to address the related achievement gap issues, such as teachers' low expectations for student achievement, poverty, low-quality schools, perceived negative ramifications of achieving, lack of access to extracurricular programs and "tacit knowledge" about education, and students' own lack of belief in their abilities and talents. Several specific goals for the program were also developed. First, the program was developed to increase the identification of minority children in early elementary school with potential and/or demonstrated talent and ability in mathematics and science. This goal is addressed through teacher nominations of promising CLED students and use of various nonverbal assessments. Once identified, students are provided supplemental educational opportunities, including advanced learning opportunities, to help them fully realize their abilities. Ideally, students receive support through their freshman year of high school, such that they are prepared to enter into, and succeed in, advanced math and science tracks at Evanston High School. A 2004 investigation of Project Excite (Olszewski-Kubilius, Lee, Ngoi, & Ngoi, 2004) found that following participation in Project Excite's summer classes, 17.3% of middle school students were placed in a high-ability group for instruction in math, 14.8% were placed in the next course in the sequence in math, and 12.3% were placed in an advanced course at the local high school. Thus, approximately 44% of summer programs participants went on to participate in high-ability or advanced-level math classes. Overall, there



was a 300% increase in the number of minority children eligible for an advanced math class in Grade 6 after 2 years of involvement with the program.

Another goal is to provide increased support for high achievement and talent development through sustained interactions with older student role models, teachers, and other adults. Contact with older mentors can reinforce students' beliefs in their abilities, help them maintain motivation in times of stress, and assist them as they negotiate important transitions such as the move to middle or high school (Renzulli & Reis, 1985, 1997; Wright & Borland, 1992). Finally, Project Excite strives to create a positive peer culture in the elementary and middle school by encouraging the formation of a supportive group of peer program participants, as research on underachieving, urban CLED students has demonstrated that positive peer influence and support can help to avoid underachievement in gifted students (Reis & McCoach, 2000).

In Project Excite, the curriculum is delivered through hands-on science and math activities including measuring, graphing, manipulating, and experimenting. Hourlong after-school and Saturday classes designed through collaborative efforts of the high school math and science teachers and elementary teachers are held at the high school in the physics lab, providing access to real lab experience. The Saturday and Summer Enrichment Program portion of Project Excite is held at Northwestern University, exposing students to the university community. Tutoring is provided as part of this program to support students who struggle with other content areas. Front-loading advanced content in these areas with students who might otherwise have limited access to challenging material and skills is intended to excite, support, and motivate students possessing latent talent and/or interest. Nurturing these talents and interests has the potential to improve the representation of CLED students in advanced placement math and science programming in this district's diverse, urban high school.

### Category 3: Curriculum Changes

Curriculum/instructional strategies used by gifted programs in this study included three subcategories: implementation of a continuum of services ( $n = 14$ ; 56%), adoption of a specific curriculum framework ( $n = 8$ ; 32%), and an emphasis on directly addressing the needs of CLED students ( $n = 5$ ; 20%). Each of these strategies, in turn, leveraged various subcomponents and methods.

A continuum of services developed by program personnel incorporated several instructional methods,

such as individualized instruction, use of advanced content, training in research skills, and development of creative and critical thinking skills. Programs also emphasized differentiation (depth and complexity and thematic units), questioning strategies, project/interest-based activities, hands-on experiences, problem solving, and enrichment opportunities.

Three different specific curricular frameworks were used in these programs. First, curricular frameworks were used to guide instruction, including areas such as dual language/bilingual methods, field-specific knowledge and skills, and service learning ( $n = 3$ ; 12%). Second, some of the programs identified particular curriculum models that were used as their curriculum model, including the Schoolwide Enrichment Model (SEM; Renzulli & Reis, 1985, 1997), the Purdue Model (Feldhusen & Kolloff, 1986), or a differentiation model using Kaplan's (1999) interdisciplinary themes based on depth and complexity ( $n = 4$ ; 16%). Third, two programs created a specific framework for their individual needs (8%).

Some curricular practices were adopted specifically to meet the unique needs of CLED students. In these programs, curricular methods were used to help students make connections between the curriculum, specific program opportunities, and students' language and culture. In Mentor Connection, for example, research professors from culturally diverse backgrounds were invited to make research presentations to students. In others, CLED students were given early access to enriched experiences, providing access to important learning opportunities prior to identification for the gifted program. Some programs provided dual language classroom opportunities in which bilingual students could learn in both English and their first language. In other programs, opportunities for integrating cultural traditions into the learning process occurred.

Curricular modifications used by the programs to support student connections and learning fell into two categories; use of a curriculum model (25%) and use of a wide range of gifted education instructional or assessment strategies (63%). The most frequently used instructional or assessment strategies were enrichment and exposure activities (29%), use of alternative assessments (17%), implementation of gifted instructional strategies and materials (17%), incorporation of themes (16%), emphasis on problem solving and higher order thinking (16%), use of higher order questioning strategies (13%), implementation of differentiation/individualization (13%), and focus on student interests to guide curriculum development (12%).

In 9 of the 25 programs, specific efforts were made to address the underrepresentation of CLED students in gifted programs through a curriculum delivery system. To achieve this goal, two strategies were described by program directors. These two strategies involved linking learning to real-world applications and addressing achievement gap issues in a direct way. In programs using real-world applications, students worked with professionals in a field, addressed community problems, and were encouraged to give back to their communities. In programs that attempted to reduce the achievement gap, specific need areas were identified for specific populations, pertaining to language, culture, access to content, and services to bridge the disparity between school-valued knowledge and student strengths. Two case studies provide illustrations of the use of relevant curriculum for CLED students.

*The Euclid Avenue Gifted/High Ability Magnet.* The Euclid Avenue Gifted/High Ability Magnet is located in a neighborhood school in the Boyle Heights area of Los Angeles and serves students in Grades 1-5. The magnet program is housed in the Euclid Avenue School, and 352 of the 800 students enrolled in the school participate in the gifted/high-ability magnet program. The magnet program (based on the work of Kaplan, 1999) has existed for 15 years. The goal of the instruction is to increase levels of depth and complexity in curricular challenges. The Gifted/High Ability Magnet exists as a "school within a school." The school population and the magnet program population are both 98% Hispanic. In the magnet program, only one child is African American and less than five were European Americans. All of the participants in the Euclid Avenue Gifted/High Ability Magnet are eligible for free or reduced-price lunch. The program demonstrates almost 100% retention of students at the elementary school level, and 75% of participants go on to participate in gifted education programs at the middle school level. Most students transition from classification as Spanish speakers to English speakers while participating in the program, and data were provided that documented increasing numbers of CLED students who attended competitive, gifted magnet schools from this urban elementary school. The number of students identified for these competitive gifted magnet schools had doubled in the past 5 years.

The program goals of the Gifted/High Ability Magnet are to provide a dual-language model, to offer diverse academic opportunities for children to develop their talents in two languages while gaining English proficiency, and to build creative and critical thinking skills.

Using Kaplan's (1999) approach to depth and complexity, teachers identify universal themes at each grade level by examining their district reading and math curriculum materials to select universal themes encompassing both curriculum foci. This process familiarizes teachers with universal themes that can be implemented across content areas to promote deep, interdisciplinary understanding. The teachers identified the following themes for study: change (Grade 2), order (Grade 3), relationships (Grade 4), and power (Grade 5). Differentiated questioning skills, tasks, and products, along with high levels of teacher input and creativity, were observed in magnet classrooms. The program uses a 3-day instructional pacing schedule, enabling teachers to move more efficiently through required content and use the remaining 2 days for additional opportunities to explore content in greater depth and complexity.

Students in the Gifted/High Ability Magnet actively learn in a rich environment. Common characteristics of classrooms include several computers with Internet access, evidence of grade-level themes, depth and complexity icons, and engaged discussions of small groups of students about advanced content. In one classroom, for example, students were engaged in a challenging art lesson, actively using Kaplan's icon ideas to discuss their work. In another classroom, fifth-grade students worked with big ideas, trends, and different points of view as part of their study of the Aztecs and the Incas. Twenty-eight students were divided into five groups. In each group, students worked with the depth and complexity icons, identifying different elements of depth and complexity from their social studies assignment. Occasionally, the groups referred to the depth and complexity icon wall; the chalkboard; and a large poster that explained the work of sociologists, historians, and anthropologists. Enrichment opportunities are also available during the summer for approximately 100 second- through sixth-grade students because the school serves as a demonstration site for Kaplan's approach for adding depth and complexity.

*The Mentor Connection.* The Mentor Connection is a 3-week summer program for gifted and talented high school juniors and seniors at the University of Connecticut, Storrs. This program provides students with the opportunity to complete an in-depth study in an interest area, to prepare for challenging college experiences, and to further identify academic interests. Mentorships are available in the physical and biological sciences, literature, history, the arts, communications, and theater and can be individually developed to meet the unique needs of participants.

The purpose of the program is to recognize students' interest, abilities, and motivation as important to learning and to provide opportunities for students to manifest their talents at high levels of creative productivity. Approximately 60% of participating students are from culturally diverse groups, and this number has increased each year over the course of the program. Scholarships are provided to all students in need. The program is based on Renzulli's Enrichment Triad Model (1977; Renzulli & Reis, 1985, 1997). Central to the program's philosophy are the ideas that above-average ability, creativity, and task commitment can be found in individuals from every ethnic and cultural group and across all socioeconomic levels, and that this creative productivity can be developed and nurtured. Each summer, Mentor Connection offers approximately 30 mentorship sites, from which participants select one of the offerings or request one be developed in their specific interest areas.

During the 3-week program, students work with a researcher to learn advanced methodologies at their site, to assume the duties of a professional, and to learn how to perform the work of a researcher at their mentorship site daily. Research at each site varies based on the content area of the professor, and care is taken to ensure students have a broad range of site choices. Some students study brain growth and experience work in electrophysiology, histology, and cell structure. Others study with a professor who is also the state archaeologist. Activities on site provide an opportunity for students to learn about archaeological field techniques, including site grid development, mapping, recovering and recording data, and laboratory work. In program evaluations, students describe their experience at Mentor Connection as "life changing." Students' journal and verbal reflections indicate the effect of their experience. More than 99% of Mentor Connection students have attended college, and approximately 30% of Mentor Connection participants attended the University of Connecticut, reporting that their decision to matriculate is due to the connections made during the program. Mentor Connection students have turned down more competitive Ivy League colleges and universities to attend the University of Connecticut to have the opportunity to continue to conduct undergraduate research with their mentor from this program.

#### **Category 4: Parent–Home Connection**

The fourth key feature of diverse gifted programs is a commitment to building bridges between school and home. Strategies used to increase communication

and interaction included involving parents as volunteers ( $n = 6$ , 24%), consistently disseminating program information ( $n = 18$ , 72%), and making family and culture connections ( $n = 7$ , 28%). In programs with an emphasis on identifying and serving CLED students, parents tend to help in the classroom and lead student learning groups. In the majority of the programs, parents also volunteered for field trips and fund-raising activities, often serving as chaperones or supplying food or services. To ensure dissemination of information to parents, programs held parent meetings and support groups; issued newsletters, program brochures, and parent–teacher conferences; and maintained Web sites. In programs reporting family and culture connections, educators used translators for meetings and print materials, gave student homework that required family participation, and fostered collective decision making between students and parents concerning course selections.

Some program directors reported numerous efforts to address specific parental needs and areas requiring additional support, including transportation, gifted characteristic awareness, and safety concerns. These efforts were reportedly used to help parents accept the program by considering the benefits for their children. A primary focus involved working with parents to help them connect the goals of home and school. In one program, parents were asked to serve as cultural leaders for student groups, and they helped build connections with home values and program instruction. In another program, parents were involved in program leadership and served on the advisory board or assisted with carrying out program goals to meet guidelines. Project College Bound demonstrates the use of school-to-parent connections to support student access to college.

*Project College Bound.* Project College Bound, in the Los Angeles Unified School District, was developed 5 years ago to assist students in the college application and financial aid process during Grades 10–12, with an end goal of increasing the number of gifted CLED students eligible for admission to, and graduation from, competitive schools across the nation. In the first graduating group identified for Project College Bound, almost all of the 273 participants enrolled in college. The number of African American students from this district who attended a University of California school increased by 150%, and the number of Latinos increased by 31%. In the 1st-year cohort, other data indicated admissions to Ivy League schools, including Harvard, Princeton, Columbia, Cornell, Yale, Dartmouth, and the

University of Pennsylvania, as well as other competitive colleges and universities, such as Georgetown, the University of Chicago, the University of Michigan, Purdue, Colgate, Howard, Wesleyan, Pepperdine, Morehouse, and Stanford.

In this program, students eligible for free lunch who participated in gifted programs in elementary or middle school and who have high school GPAs of 3.0 or higher are identified and made known to college guidance counselors in their high schools. They are then invited to participate in the program, and, if they accept, monitored monthly for scholastic progress and eligibility for competitive colleges, especially those found in the California university system.

A parent network is developed in each school to monitor the progress of targeted students. The program director meets with the parent group monthly to develop active relationships with both the parents and students. Presentations by the program director, college admission personnel, and the district technology staff include topics such as how to complete admissions applications, admission essays, test preparation, financial aid, the community college transfer program, and other sessions as needed. Twelfth-grade students in the program receive specific sessions, such as how to understand and compare different admission and financial aid offers. Parents receive a toolkit that includes information on college and financial aid, monthly checklists to monitor college information, and information on summer residential opportunities for 11th-grade students. In addition, a 1-day conference is held for rising 12th-grade students and their parents. Understanding the unique needs of the culturally diverse students in the district enabled the program director to provide speakers for the parent workshops in two languages (Spanish and English) and designate topics that addressed the cultural diversity of the student population, such as distance of the college from home, number of other diverse students who attend specific colleges and universities, and other issues that may be of concern to parents and students.

### **Category 5: Program Evaluation**

Program evaluation was described by all participating program directors as an essential component in extending services to CLED students. All directors reported the use of evaluation procedures that incorporated one or more of the following measures of program effectiveness: stakeholder satisfaction ( $n = 13$ , 52%), student achievement reports ( $n = 9$ , 36%), increased

enrollment of CLED students in gifted programs ( $n = 10$ , 40%), and retention of students in gifted services ( $n = 3$ , 12%). Information on program satisfaction was gathered through parent, student, and teacher surveys. Questions focused on student learning, such as “How much did they learn? How did the program affect their thinking? What was their favorite and least favorite part of the program?” The majority of program coordinators reported unsuccessful attempts to measure gains in student achievement through the use of district test data. All program directors discussed their frustration with the difficulty of obtaining disaggregated quantitative data from their district about the performance of gifted students on statewide assessments. Lacking access to this information, student improvement was reported from classroom observations. Qualitative findings included students becoming better at problem solving, more able to implement higher order thinking skills, and developing facility with more challenging content. Other findings suggested increased understanding of professional-level work as a result of access to a field (as in the case of the Mentor Connection Program), as well as increased access to gifted programming and challenging classes in public school settings, and achieving success in various competitions.

Formal evaluation reports documenting the increase in the participation of CLED students in gifted programs were submitted by program directors of 10 of the 25 programs in the study. Documentation of increased representation of CLED students was found by comparing the number of students currently served to previous numbers or compared to other schools in the district. The programs selected for inclusion in the study had data that supported program success in this regard (Tomlinson, et al., 2004). Eight of the 25 programs in this study were specifically developed to address the under-representation of CLED students in gifted and talented programs. Two of the programs received awards from their respective state departments of education for increasing the representation of CLED students in GT programs.

Only five program directors indicated that the retention of CLED students in gifted programs was used as an evaluation measure. In each of these programs, students who left the program were reported to have continued to receive gifted services in other academic sites that included middle school placement, college enrollment, and identification for within-school gifted programs. Some of the evaluation data were extremely promising, as demonstrated by the increased percentages of students participating



in programs such as the Treasures Program and Project College Bound.

## Discussion and Implications

Descriptions of the practices and characteristics of gifted programs that increased the participation of CLED students coalesced around three features of gifted and talented programs and three intervention practices that may help CLED students be identified and achieve at high levels in gifted programs. The three features that increase CLED student participation in gifted and talented programs are (a) the recognition of the underrepresentation problem by district faculty and staff, (b) an increased awareness of cultural impact on student academic performance, and (c) the establishment of program supports to help program directors and teachers make changes. Every program director in these successful programs identified their primary program goal as increasing the number of CLED students identified who participated in their gifted programs. Seventy-five percent of program directors reported changing their program to address the specific needs of CLED/GT students to reflect changing district demographics (Ford & Harris, 1999; Gallagher, 2002) and political and community climates (Castellano & Diaz, 2002; Donovan & Cross, 2002; National Excellence Report, 1993). Some political and community climate shifts occurred as a result of incidents that reflected poorly on the school, such as desegregation orders from the Office of Civil Rights, whereas other districts responded to reports, such as the *National Excellence Report* (U.S. Department of Education, 1993), which documents achievement disparities between students representing the dominant culture and CLED students.

The second feature reported was an increased staff awareness of the impact of student culture on learning and achievement. Program directors indicated they made efforts to change perspective from a deficit to a strength-based model for working with CLED students with gifted potential (Ford et al., 2000). Eleven program directors identified consideration for cultural differences as a starting point for the development of their identification procedures and program designs, including the use of multiple criteria (Frasier & Passow, 1994; Menendez, 1995; Zamora-Duran & Artiles, 1997). Language differences were addressed through the use of dual language classrooms (Castellano & Diaz, 2002; Frasier & Passow, 1994; Kitano & Espinosa, 1995), cultural elements were incorporated using cultural traditions as part of the learning process (Ford et al., 2000;

Slocumb & Payne, 2000; Van Tassel-Baska, Olszewski-Kubilius, & Kulieke, 1994), and community influences were integrated by providing young students with enrichment and acceleration opportunities (Banks & McGee-Banks, 2001; Frasier & Passow, 1994; Ford & Harris, 1999; Menendez, 1995; Gallagher & Gallagher, 1994). Although some teachers have awareness about these critical strategies, many other teachers and gifted specialists still have limited knowledge and few opportunities to gain more (Arredondo, 1999; Gallavan, 1998; Kitano & Espinosa, 1995; Seidl & Friend, 2002).

The third feature of gifted programs successfully integrating CLED students was the establishment of program support systems to help program directors and teachers make changes. Areas identified by program directors as important included extensive and inclusive professional development (Callahan et al., 1995; Gallavan, 1998; Grossman, 1998; Patton, 1997; Peterson, 1999), parental involvement (Slocumb & Payne, 2000), and community involvement (Renzulli & Reis, 1985, 1997). Program directors all acknowledged the importance of professional development, but the professional development ranged from required training in Talents Unlimited to reimbursed college courses, curriculum strategies, and the use of guest speakers. Although the majority of the program directors discussed the importance of trained staff, their professional development practices varied widely across districts.

Although parental involvement and community support were reported by program directors as important tactics for increasing CLED participation and success, family and community received only minimal attention. Approximately 70% of program directors defined parental involvement as sponsoring informational programs, holding parent-teacher conferences, and distributing program newsletters. Community involvement outside of the home was evident in eight programs. Community members contributed to the programs as mentors or donors of materials and organizers of field trips. They also contributed through university partnerships that sometimes helped to organize student performances or opportunities to display products.

Three interventions or practices were found to support the academic achievement of CLED students at high levels in gifted programs, and these included implementation of identification strategies designed to include more CLED students, use of curriculum/instructional strategies, and creation of professional development opportunities. The majority of the program directors reported changes in identification procedures as their primary effort to better recognize and serve CLED students with gifts and talents. The expanding use of multiple

criteria was the predominant change (Frasier & Passow, 1994; Menendez, 1995; Zamora-Duran & Artiles, 1997). Some program directors included expanded notions of identification for gifted services to take into account language differences, environment, and other unique needs (Kitano & Espinosa, 1995; Menendez, 1995; Peterson, 1999; Renzulli & Reis, 1985, 1997; Slocumb & Payne, 2000; Zorman, 1991). Others noted that they incorporated probationary placement and talent spotting during enriched learning experiences (Renzulli & Reis, 1985, 1997). Other programs provided a probationary or trial period when students participated in gifted programs or challenging lesson opportunities so they could demonstrate their abilities within the context of instruction.

The curriculum/instructional strategies used in the 25 programs studied can be categorized into four areas: early intervention, best practices in gifted education, enrichment/challenge opportunities, and mentorships (Banks & McGee-Banks, 2001; Ewing & Yong, 1993; Kaplan, 1999; Maker & Schiever, 1989; Renzulli, 1994; Sleeter, 1990; Slocumb & Payne, 2000). Early intervention opportunities addressed discrepancies in students' early learning experiences and the knowledge necessary for subsequent placement in gifted programs. These learning experiences included exposure to content information, use of higher order thinking skills, and product/performance development.

All program directors involved in this study referred to the use of gifted education strategies as part of the program curriculum, including acceleration, enrichment, and connecting learned concepts with the content field or discipline (Feldhusen, 1994; Renzulli, Leppien, & Hayes, 2000; Renzulli & Reis, 1985, 1997; Tomlinson et al., 2004). The use of acceleration in programs included exposure to a range of learning opportunities and focusing on specific student needs. Enrichment opportunities were reported as the most often used gifted program strategy in this study. Program directors discussed various enrichment methods used to broaden student experiences and knowledge. Many of the enrichment learning experiences included student interests and community cultural offerings. Programs that made connections between learning and the content field or discipline were reported to involve students in thematic or interdisciplinary units, working in a specific field, and working with a professional in the content field. The thematic and interdisciplinary units used by the programs provided students with a way to link each learning experience to another, seeing the shared understandings between and within the different content fields. The final curriculum/instructional strategy mentioned by program coordinators in this study was the

**Table 3**  
**Future Program Plans**

Change Area	<i>n</i>	%
Have plans for change	18	75
Connect GT/ESL/Bilingual/ME	6	25
Expand sites/grades	7	29
Improve data collection	3	13
Acquire additional funding	4	17

Note: GT = gifted and talented; ESL = English as a second language; ME = multicultural education.

use of mentorships, matching students with a professional in their interest field who facilitates student learning in that field.

The reported use of early intervention, gifted education strategies, enrichment and challenge learning, and mentorship suggests these program directors made an effort to bridge the gap between CLED students' command of currently valued knowledge and skills, and their potential. The effectiveness of these interventions as discussed by program coordinators in this study is closely related to teacher professional development and readiness to assume responsibilities for maximizing the impact of the interventions.

All of the program directors had plans for further improving the services provided in their programs, as summarized in Table 3. They wanted to expand offerings and collect additional data about student achievement. They believed exemplary program evaluations should include student achievement data, statistical data that demonstrated increases in CLED students in gifted programs, and documentation of students who were retained in gifted programs throughout their academic careers. Culturally diverse groups of high-potential and gifted students present new and different challenges to teachers, especially if these groups are from low socioeconomic backgrounds. Under these circumstances, it is often difficult to identify academically talented students, and without some of the conscious decisions to modify programs and practices described in this article, too few CLED students will be identified and served.

Each of the programs identified in this study shared a common goal: to include and serve more CLED students in gifted programs. Each program director described the way that systematic changes were made in programming to increase the representation of CLED students in gifted programs. This research provides a clear direction for other programs to follow, as well as a path for future research into recognizing and developing the gifts of CLED students. It is hoped that the

successful program descriptions provided in this article can be adapted for use in more districts, ensuring increased identification and successful participation of students from diverse backgrounds.

## References

- Arredondo, P. (1999). Multicultural counseling competencies as tools to address oppression and racism. *Journal of Counseling and Development, 77*, 102-108.
- Baldwin, A. Y. (1978). *Educational planning for the gifted: Overcoming cultural, geographic, and socioeconomic barriers*. Reston, VA: The Council for Exceptional Children.
- Baldwin, A. Y. (2002). Culturally diverse students who are gifted. *Exceptionality, 10*(2), 39-47.
- Banks, J. A., & McGee-Banks, C. A. (2001). *Multicultural education: Issues and perspectives*. New York: John Wiley.
- Bernal, E. M. (2002). Three ways to achieve a more equitable representation of culturally and linguistically different students in GT programs. *Roeper Review, 24*(2), 82-88.
- Briggs, C., & Reis, S. M. (2003). *Exemplary Programs for Culturally Diverse Gifted Students Information Matrix (EPCDGS)*. In C. Briggs, *Exemplary interventions and practices that develop the gifts and talents of culturally, linguistically, and ethnically diverse students*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Connecticut, Storrs.
- Briggs, C. J., & Reis, S. M. (2004). Case studies of exemplary gifted programs. In C. A. Tomlinson, D. Y. Ford, S. M. Reis, C. J. Briggs, & C. A. Strickland (Eds.), *In search of the dream: Designing schools and classrooms that work for high potential students from diverse cultural backgrounds* (pp. 5-32). Washington, DC: National Association for Gifted Children.
- Bruch, C. B. (1975). Assessment of creativity in culturally different children. *Gifted Child Quarterly, 19*, 164-174.
- Callahan, C. M., Hunsaker, S. L., Adams, C. M., Moore, S. D., & Bland, L. C. (1995). *Instruments used in the identification of gifted and talented students* (RM95139). Storrs: University of Connecticut, the National Research Center on the Gifted and Talented.
- Castellano, J. A., & Diaz, E. I. (2002). *Reaching new horizons: Gifted and talented education for culturally and linguistically diverse students*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Creswell, J. W. (1994). *Research design: Qualitative and quantitative approaches*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Deslonde, J. (1977). You know the rules! Myths about desegregation. In D. E. Cross, G. C. Baker, & L. J. Stiles (Eds.), *Teaching in a multicultural society: Perspectives and professional strategies* (pp. 60-81). New York: Free Press.
- Donovan, S. M., & Cross, C. T. (Eds.). (2002). *Minority students in special and gifted education*. Washington, DC: National Academy of Sciences.
- Ewing, N. J., & Yong, F. L. (1993). Learning style preferences of gifted minority students. *Gifted Education International, 9*, 40-44.
- Feldhusen, J. F. (1994). Learning and cognition of talented youth. In J. Van Tassel-Baska (Ed.), *Comprehensive curriculum for gifted learners* (pp. 17-28). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Feldhusen, J. F., & Kolloff, M. B. (1986). The Purdue three-stage model for gifted education at the elementary level. In J. S. Renzulli (Ed.), *Systems and models for developing programs for the gifted and talented* (pp. 126-153). Mansfield, CT: Creative Learning Press.
- Ford, D. Y., & Grantham, T. C. (2003). Providing access for culturally diverse gifted students: From deficit to dynamic thinking. *Theory Into Practice, 42*, 217-225.
- Ford, D. Y., & Harmon, D. A. (2001). Equity and excellence: Providing access to gifted education for culturally diverse students. *Journal of Secondary Gifted Education, 12*, 141-147.
- Ford, D. Y., & Harris, J. J. (1999). *Multicultural gifted education*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Ford, D. Y., Howard, T. C., Harris, J. J., & Tyson, C. A. (2000). Creating culturally responsive classrooms for gifted African American students. *Journal for the Education of the Gifted, 23*, 397-427.
- Ford, D. Y., Moore, J. L., III., & Milner, H. R. (2005). Beyond colorblindness: A model of culture with implications for gifted education. *Roeper Review, 27*(2), 97-103.
- Ford, D. Y., Moore, J. L., III., & Milner, H. R. (2005). Beyond colorblindness: A model of culture with implications for gifted education. *Roeper Review, 27*, 97-103.
- Ford, D. Y., & Trotman, M. F. (2001). Teachers of gifted students: Suggested multicultural characteristics and competencies. *Roeper Review, 23*, 235-239.
- Frasier, M. M., Garcia, J. H., & Passow, A. H. (1995). *A review of assessment issues in gifted education and their implications for identifying gifted minority students*. (RM95204). Storrs: University of Connecticut, the National Research Center on the Gifted and Talented.
- Frasier, M. M., & Passow, A. H. (1994). *Toward a new paradigm for identifying talent potential* (RM9412). Storrs: University of Connecticut, the National Research Center on the Gifted and Talented.
- Gallagher, J. J. (2002). *Society's role in educating gifted students: The role of public policy*. (RM02162). Storrs: University of Connecticut, the National Research Center on the Gifted and Talented.
- Gallagher, J. J. (2004). No Child Left Behind and gifted education. *Roeper Review, 26*, 121-123.
- Gallagher, J. J., & Gallagher, S. A. (1994). *Teaching the gifted child*. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Gallavan, N. P. (1998). Why aren't teachers using effective multicultural education practices? In F. Schultz (Ed.), *Multicultural education, annual editions* (pp. 43-49). Guilford, CT: Dushkin/McGraw-Hill.
- Grossman, H. (1998). *Ending discrimination in special education*. Springfield, IL: Charles C Thomas.
- Kaplan, S. N. (1999). Teaching up to the needs of the gifted English language learner. *Tempo, 14*(2), 20.
- Kitano, M. K., & Espinosa, R. (1995). Language diversity and giftedness: Working with gifted English language learners. *Journal for the Education of the Gifted, 19*, 234-254.
- Lincoln, Y., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Lohman, D. F. (2005). The role of nonverbal ability tests in identifying academically gifted students: An aptitude perspective. *Gifted Child Quarterly, 49*(2), 111-139.
- Maker, C. J., & Schiever, S. W. (1989). *Critical issues in gifted education: Defensible programs for cultural and ethnic minorities*. Austin, TX: Pro-Ed.
- Menendez, R. J. (1995). *The identification of creative and talented Puerto Rican primary students*. Unpublished dissertation, University of Connecticut, Storrs.



- Merriam, S. B. (1988). *Case study research in education: A qualitative approach*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Miles, M. B., & Huberman, M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis: An expanded sourcebook*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Morris, J. E. (2002). African American students and gifted education. *Roeper Review*, 24, 59-62.
- Oakland, T., & Rossen, E. (2005). A 21st-century model for identifying students for gifted and talented programs in light of national conditions: An emphasis on race and ethnicity. *Gifted Child Today*, 28, 56-63.
- Olszewski-Kubilius, P., Lee, S. Y., Ngoi, M., & Ngoi, D. (2004). Addressing the achievement gap between minority and non-minority children by increasing access to gifted programs. *Journal for the Education of the Gifted*, 28, 127-158.
- Patton, J. M. (1997). Disproportionate representation in gifted programs: Best practices for meeting the challenge. In A. J. Artiles, & G. Zomora-Duran (Eds.), *Reducing disproportionate representation of culturally diverse students in special and gifted education* (pp. 59-81). Reston, VA: The Council for Exceptional Children.
- Peterson, J. S. (1999). Gifted through whose cultural lens? An application of the postpositivist mode of inquiry. *Journal for the Education of the Gifted*, 22, 354-383.
- Reis, S. M., & McCoach, D. B. (2000). The underachievement of gifted students: What do we know and where do we go? *Gifted Child Quarterly*, 44(3), 152-170.
- Reis, S. M., & Small, M. (2005). The varied and unique characteristics exhibited by diverse gifted and talented learners. In F. A. Karnes & S. M. Bean (Eds.), *Methods and materials for teaching the gifted* (pp. 3-32). Waco, TX: Prufrock.
- Renzulli, J. S. (1977). *Interest-a-lyzer*. Mansfield Center, CT: Creative Learning Press.
- Renzulli, J. S. (1994). *Schools for talent development: A practical plan for total school improvement*. Mansfield Center, CT: Creative Learning Press.
- Renzulli, J. S., Leppien, J., & Hayes, T. (2000). *The multiple menu model*. Mansfield Center, CT: Creative Learning Press.
- Renzulli, J. S., & Reis, S. M. (1985). *The schoolwide enrichment model: A comprehensive plan for educational excellence*. Mansfield Center, CT: Creative Learning Press.
- Renzulli, J. S., & Reis, S. M. (1997). *The schoolwide enrichment model: A how-to guide for educational excellence*. Mansfield Center, CT: Creative Learning Press.
- Rhodes, L. (1992). Focusing attention on the individual in identification of gifted Black students. *Roeper Review*, 14(3), 108-110.
- Rios, F., & Montecinos, C. (1999). Advocating social justice and cultural affirmation: Ethnically diverse pre-service teacher perspectives on multicultural education. *Equity and Excellence in Education*, 32(3), 66-75.
- Seidl, B., & Friend, G. (2002). Learning authority at the door: Equal-status community-based experiences and the preparation of teachers for diverse classrooms. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 18(4), 421-433.
- Sleeter, C. E. (1990). Staff development for desegregated schooling. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 72(1), 33-40.
- Slocumb, P. D., & Payne, R. K. (2000). *Removing the mask: Giftedness in poverty*. Highlands, TX: aha! Process.
- Strauss, A. L. (1987). *Qualitative analysis for social scientists*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Strauss, A. L., & Corbin, J. (1990). *Basics of qualitative research: Grounded theory procedures and techniques*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Tomlinson, C. A., Ford, D. Y., Reis, S. M., Briggs, C. J., & Strickland, C. A. (2004). *In search of the dream: Designing schools and classrooms that work for high potential students from diverse cultural backgrounds*. Washington, DC: National Association for Gifted Children, and Storrs, CT: The National Research Center on the Gifted and Talented.
- U.S. Department of Education. (1993). *National excellence report: A case for developing America's talent* (Report No. PIP-93-1201). Washington, DC: Office of Educational Research and Improvement. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED359743)
- Van Tassel-Baska, J., Olszewski-Kubilius, P., & Kulieke, M. (1994). A study of self-concept and social support in advantaged and disadvantaged seventh and eighth grade gifted students. *Roeper Review*, 16, 186-191.
- Wright, L., & Borland, J. H. (1992). A special friend: Adolescent mentors for young, economically disadvantaged, potentially gifted students. *Roeper Review*, 14, 124-129.
- Yin, R. (2002). *Case study research: Design and methods* (3rd ed). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Zamora-Duran, G., & Artiles, A. J. (1997). Disproportionate representation: Current issues and future directions. In A. J. Artiles & G. Zamora-Duran (Eds.), *Reducing disproportionate representation of culturally diverse students in special and gifted education* (pp. 87-93). Reston, VA: The Council for Exceptional Children.
- Zorman, R. (1991). Identification and nurturance of young disadvantaged gifted children. In R. M. Milgram (Ed.), *Counseling gifted and talented children: A guide for teachers, counselors, and parents*. (pp. 161-178). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

**Christine J. Briggs** earned her doctorate at the University of Connecticut, Storrs, with a concentration in gifted education and talent development in diverse populations. She is currently an assistant professor in the department of Curriculum and Instruction at the University of Louisiana at Lafayette teaching elementary methods courses as well as courses in gifted education and research design. Her research interests include tools and methods to increase access to talent development services for students of diversity.

**Sally M. Reis** is a Board of Trustees distinguished professor at the University of Connecticut, Storrs, where she serves as the department head and a professor of educational psychology. She is also principal investigator of the National Research Center on the Gifted and Talented and past president of the National Association for Gifted Children. She has authored numerous publications including journal articles, books, and book chapters. Her book about talent development in females, titled *Work Left Undone: Choices and Compromises of Talented Females*, was published in 1998.

**Erin E. Sullivan** is a doctoral student in the University of Connecticut's Educational Psychology program, with a concentration in gifted education and school psychology. Prior to returning to school, she worked as a writer and editor in Washington, D.C. Research interests include the development of talented writers, social and emotional issues of gifted youths, and special needs of gifted students on the autism spectrum.