

**THE COLLEGE OF WILLIAM AND MARY
SCHOOL OF EDUCATION**

Course Number: EPPL 670

Semester: Spring 2008

Course Title: Gifted Program Planning, Development, and Evaluation

Credit Hours: 3

Schedule: Thursdays, 4:30 – 7:00 p.m.
Morton Hall Room 3

Instructor: Dr. Carol L. Tieso
Jones Hall 311 and Center for Gifted Education, Scotland Street
757.221.2461
clties@wm.edu

Office Hours: Wednesdays & Thursdays, 1:00 – 4:00.

Required Text: Purcell, J. H., & Eckert, R. D. (Eds.). (2006). *Designing services and programs for high-ability learners*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Recommended Text: VanTassel-Baska, J., & Feng, A. X. (2004). *Designing and utilizing evaluation for gifted program improvement*. Waco, TX: Prufrock Press.

Additional required and recommended readings will be made available in class or online.

Course Description

This course focuses on the fundamental principles of program design and development for gifted learners. Role functions and reference groups are emphasized as well as general educational administration and supervision theories. Program evaluation models are also stressed.

Relationship of This Course to Program and Professional Standards

This course is one in a required sequence in gifted education leading to State of Virginia endorsement and as part of a master's and Ed.D./Ph. D. program emphasis in gifted education. It has been revised in 2002 using NCATE and NAGC program standards as a base.

Course Objectives

Upon completion of this course, students should be able to...

1. Analyze the relationship of general theories of administration and supervision to gifted education.
2. Analyze the relationship among conceptions of giftedness, definitions, and identification criteria, and choice of instrumentation.
3. Develop an appropriate identification model and system for a gifted program, using appropriate national and state standards as a guide.

4. Analyze strengths and weaknesses of alternative program models for gifted learners at elementary and secondary levels, based on defining characteristics of the learner.
5. Design and implement a needs assessment (incorporating formal and informal measures) for assessing gifted students and/or program needs.
6. Demonstrate knowledge of important legal provisions, standards, policies, and issues that affect gifted education, and analyze their educational implications.
7. Evaluate the advantages and disadvantages of current educational trends and issues for gifted learners and program development.
8. Create an appropriate professional development plan that would educate designated stakeholder groups on parenting and community involvement, teaching/learning strategies, and supervising and administering gifted programs.
9. Implement effective communication, supervision, and evaluation systems for gifted programs.
10. Communicate and collaborate with relevant groups in the operation of gifted programs.
11. Demonstrate an understanding of the change process in order to effect program improvement.
12. Design a program plan for gifted education that highlights need, relevant research, goals, outcomes, and assessment approaches.

Content Overview

1. General theories of administration and supervision
 - Contingency models
 - Human relations models
 - Systems perspectives
2. Principles of program development for the gifted
 - Historical development of gifted programs
 - Optimal match between identification and program
 - Multiple options
 - Comprehensive articulation of programs and services
 - Targeting resources
 - The school as the critical unit of intervention
 - Cost effectiveness
3. Aspects of program design and development
 - Student identification
 - Needs assessment
 - Curriculum development
 - Professional development
 - Budgeting
 - Resource identification and utilization
 - Evaluation (assessment of learning and program operation)
4. Utilizing parent and community resources
 - Establishing mentorships, internships, and service learning opportunities
 - Working with stakeholders
 - Communication issues
5. Program evaluation issues
 - Accountability/discrepancy approach

- Accreditation/standards approach
 - Goal-based approach
 - Naturalistic techniques
 - Instrumentation issues
 - Utilization of evaluation
6. Current educational trends and issues
 - General education: Standards, assessment, NCLB
 - Special education: Inclusion and collaboration
 - Gifted education: Challenging learning opportunities for diverse learners
 7. Promoting change
 - Havelock's model of systems change
 - Fullan's model of change
 - Research on institutionalization of innovation

Illustrative Course Activities

1. Lecture/discussion on central topics and assigned readings
2. Simulation activities/role play on program development topics
3. Group problem-solving on educational issues
4. Developing, implementing, and analyzing a needs assessment instrument for a selected stakeholder group
5. Analysis of national and state program policies and procedures for administering gifted programs.
6. Development of program plan

Minimal Student Requirements

1. Satisfactorily participate in class discussion and activities.
2. Satisfactorily complete needs assessment analysis.
3. Satisfactorily complete course project/program plan and presentation to class.
4. Satisfactorily complete collaborative professional development project and presentation.
5. Satisfactorily complete final exam.

Requirement Description: Product Guidelines and Assessment Criteria

All student evaluation is based on accuracy, clarity, and creativity of thought. Accuracy addresses the comprehensiveness and accuracy of the material; clarity addresses the writing style, organization, and flow of ideas; and creativity speaks to the uniqueness of the ideas and degree of insight.

1. **Attendance/Participation (10%):** This course is designed to be a mix of lectures, discussions, readings, simulations, and other activities. As such, each student's active and knowledgeable participation is critical. Students will be expected to do all readings and any associated homework tasks **prior to** class so they can comfortably participate. Course expectations include requirements for in-class collaborative work, so regular attendance and timely arrival are expected.
2. **Needs Assessment (15%):** Students will prepare and conduct a needs assessment regarding specific aspects of current gifted programming in a given educational context. Students will design an instrument with key questions for assessing current status and needs, conduct the assessment with a reasonable sample, analyze results, and synthesize findings across categories to drive

recommendations for program planning. Students will submit a copy of the instrument with an introductory letter and an outline of the proposed program for approval before conducting the needs assessment. Students will then submit a summary of results and synthesis of suggestions and recommendations. Student papers are assessed based on quality of instrument design, appropriateness of analysis and conclusions, alignment of recommendations with results obtained, and clarity of presentation. **DUE DATES: February 21 (Instrument, letter, and outline); March 20 (Needs assessment results)**

3. **Professional development experience (20%):** In groups of 3-4, students will prepare and facilitate a professional development mini-workshop on a key topic or issue in gifted education. The content of the workshop should be connected to and extend upon the content of the course and the gifted education graduate programs in general. The experience should consist of three main components: (a) a presentation of key content elements, using presentation software; (b) an active learning component for participants, and (c) follow-up for implementations. Groups will submit an outline of the session and a copy of any handouts or workshop materials. In addition, the group will complete a brief report of group participation documenting individual and collective efforts. Groups will be assessed based on the content and organization of the presentation, reflection of key principles of good professional development, and group participation. **DUE DATE: April 10 (write-up); April 10 or April 17 (presentation and group evaluation)**
4. **Program Plan (35%):** Students will complete a program proposal based on results from needs assessment data (see #2 above), approximately 20 pages in length, consisting of the following major sections: Rationale and documentation of need, review of research, description of proposed program with goals and objectives identified, target population to be served, key tasks to be completed with role responsibility assigned, timeline, and budget. Students will also prepare a class presentation to share key elements of program plan. Written products are assessed based on clarity of writing, reference to key resources, completion of all relevant sections, logical organization of ideas and recommendations, and potential practicality of plan. Students are also assessed on in-class presentation of proposal; presentation grade is based on organization, clarity, and cogency. **DUE DATE: May 1**
5. **Final Exam (20%):** Students will complete a final examination consisting of essay questions addressing major course topics and objectives. Student papers are assessed on the basis of reflection of course content, synthesis of ideas, clarity of writing, and reference to key resources. As appropriate to question content, student responses are assessed for balance of theory, research, and practice discussion. **DUE DATE: May 8.**

Summary of Assignments and Deadlines

<i>Assignment</i>	<i>Weight</i>	<i>Due Date</i>
Needs Assessment	15%	Instrument/outline: February 21 Results: March 20
Professional Development Experience	20%	Write-up: April 10 Presentation and Group Evaluation: April 10 or April 17
Program Plan	35%	May 1
Final Exam	20%	May 8
Attendance/Participation	10%	

Assignment submission guidelines

- As appropriate, assignments should include reference to course readings and other literature. Reference format should follow APA guidelines (samples posted on Blackboard site).
- All assignments are expected to be turned in on time unless PRIOR arrangements have been made with the instructor for special circumstances.
- Assignments may be submitted by email or in hard copy (hard copy preferred in most cases).
- All assignments **except** the final exam may be submitted early for feedback, and time for revision before resubmission will be given. If you wish to submit an assignment early for feedback, it must be submitted **no later than** 4 p.m. on the **FRIDAY** prior to the due date.

Suggested program portfolio product: Program plan (leadership product)

Schedule of Topics and Readings

DATE	TOPICS	READINGS* and ASSIGNMENTS (to be prepared FOR the class indicated)
January 17	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Introduction to course • Pre-assessment • Comprehensive program planning, development, and evaluation • Historical overview of gifted programs • Philosophy and goals in gifted programming 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Purcell & Eckert, chapters 1-3
January 24	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Philosophy and goals continued • Standards for gifted programs • Assessing program needs • Basic program models 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Purcell & Eckert, chapters 4, 6, 7, 10 • NAGC Pre-K to Grade 12 Gifted Program Standards (http://www.nagc.org/index.aspx?id=546) • Virginia Plan for the Gifted (http://www.pen.k12.va.us/VDOE/Instruction/Gifted/resourceguide.pdf) • Feng, Constructing and implementing surveys
January 31	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Program design • Program administration and supervision 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Purcell & Eckert, chapters 20-21 • Davis & Rimm, chapter 3 • VanTassel-Baska, Metaevaluation findings: A call for gifted program quality • Rogers, Program provisions (grouping) within the school
February 7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Program facilitation • Student identification: Key considerations and tools • Examination of state policy 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Text, chapters 5, 16, 19 • <u>Optional</u>: Ryser, Culture-fair and nonbiased assessment • <u>Optional</u>: Johnsen, Making decisions about placement” with Appendix A • <u>Optional</u>: Karnes & Marquardt, A case-by-case look at school policies <p>Needs assessment instrument/ letter/ program plan outline due</p>
February 14	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gifted program personnel: Selecting teachers • Professional development in gifted education 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Purcell & Eckert, chapters 13-14 • <u>Optional</u>: Hansen & Feldhusen, Comparison of trained and untrained...
February 21	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Professional development (continued) • Conditions for change and program implementation issues 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Purcell & Eckert, chapter 20 • Selected articles and documents <p>Needs Assessment Due</p>
February 28	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Grouping issues • Curriculum and instruction in gifted programs: Trends, issues, and considerations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Purcell & Eckert, chapters 8 • <u>Optional</u>: Rogers, Program provisions (grouping) within the school

DATE	TOPICS	READINGS* and ASSIGNMENTS (to be prepared FOR the class indicated)
March 6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Spring Break 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Spring Break: No Class
March 13	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Counseling and guidance components • Interventions beyond the classroom • Special schools and programs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Purcell & Eckert, chapter 9, 11 • <u>Optional</u>: Kirschenbaum et al., Resource consultation model in gifted education...
March 20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gifted program evaluation • Legal issues and court cases in gifted education 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Purcell & Eckert, chapter 15, 17, 18 • <u>Optional</u>: Karnes & Marquardt, Court cases and gifted students' educational opportunities <p>Needs Assessment Results Due</p>
March 27	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • AERA 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Davis & Rimm, chapter 18 • VTB, chapters 1 & 2 <p>No class: AERA</p>
April 3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gifted program evaluation (continued) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • VTB, chapters 6-7
April 10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Team presentations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As assigned by professional development teams <p>Professional development product due Group evaluation due</p>
April 17	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Team presentations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As assigned by professional development teams <p>Group evaluation due</p>
April 24	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Catch-up as needed 	
May 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Program plan presentations 	Program plan due
May 8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Final Exam 	Final Exam due

* Additional readings may be distributed in class or online as relevant to course topics.

Illustrative Bibliography

- Avery, L. D., & VanTassel-Baska, J. (2001). Investigating the impact of gifted education evaluation at state and local levels: Problems with traction. *Journal for the Education of the Gifted*, 25, 153-176.
- Avery, L. D., VanTassel-Baska, J., & O'Neill, B. (1997). Making evaluation work: One school district's experience. *Gifted Child Quarterly*, 41, 124-132.
- Benbow, C. P., & Minor, L. L. (1990). Cognitive profiles of verbally and mathematically precocious students: Implications for the identification of the gifted. *Gifted Child Quarterly*, 34, 21-26.
- Berger, S. L. (Ed.) (1992). *Programs and practices in gifted education*. Reston, VA: The Council for Exceptional Children.
- Bloom, B. (Ed.) (1985). *Developing talent in young people*. New York: Ballantine Books.
- Borland, J. (1989). *Planning and implementing programs for the gifted*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Buchanan, N. (1991). *Conducting research and evaluation in gifted education: A handbook of methods and applications*. New York: Teacher's College Press.

- Callahan, C. M., Tomlinson, C. A., & Pizzat, F. M. (Eds.). (1993). *Contexts for promise: Noteworthy practices and innovation in the identification of gifted students*. Charlottesville, VA: National Research Center on the Gifted and Talented, University of Virginia.
- Clark, B. (2002). *Growing up gifted: Developing the potential of children at home and at school* (6th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Clark, G., & Zimmerman, E. (2001). Identifying artistically talented students in four rural communities in the United States. *Gifted Child Quarterly*, 45, 104-114.
- Colangelo, N., & Davis, G. A. (Eds.). (2003). *Handbook of gifted education* (3rd ed.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Coleman, M., & Gallagher, J. (1992). *Report on state policies related to the identification of gifted students*. Chapel Hill, NC: Gifted Education Policy Studies Program. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 344 368).
- Cox, J., Daniel, N., & Boston, B. (1985). *Educating able learners*. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.
- Cross, J., & Dobbs, C. (1987). Goals of a teacher training program for teachers of the gifted. *Roeper Review*, 9, 170-171.
- Csikszentmihalyi, M., Rathunde, K., & Whalen, S. (1993). *Talented teenagers: The roots of success and failure*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Cunningham, C. M., Callahan, C. M., Plucker, J. A., Roberson, S. C., & Rapkin, A. (1998). Identifying Hispanic students of outstanding talent: Psychometric integrity of a peer nomination form. *Exceptional Children*, 64, 197-209.
- Donovan, M. S., Bransford, J. D., & Pellegrino, J. W., (Eds.). (1999). *How people learn: Bridging research and practice*. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.
- Education of the gifted and talented*. Report to the Congress. Washington, D. C.: United States Government Printing Office, 1972.
- Fasko, D., Jr. (2001). An analysis of multiple intelligences theory and its use with the gifted and talented. *Roeper Review*, 23, 126-130.
- Feldhusen, J. F. (1991). Identification of gifted and talented youth. In M. C. Wang, M. C. Reynolds, & H. J. Walberg (Eds.), *Handbook of special education: Research and practice* (pp. 7-22). New York: Pergamon Press.
- Feldhusen, J. F. (1995). Talent development vs. gifted education. *The Educational Forum*, 59, 346-349.
- Fernandez, A. T., Gay, L. R., Lucky, L. F., & Gavilan, M. R. (1998). Teacher perceptions of gifted Hispanic limited English proficient students. *Journal for the Education of the Gifted*, 21, 335-351.
- Ford, D. (1996). *Reversing underachievement among gifted black students: Promising practices and programs*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Fox, L. (1981). Identification of the academically gifted. *American Psychologist*, 36, 1103-111.
- Fullan, M. (1991). *The new meaning of educational change* (2nd ed.). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Gallagher, J. J., & Gallagher, S. A. (1994). *Teaching the gifted child* (4th ed.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Gardner, H. (1983). *Frames of mind*. New York: Teachers College Press.

- Gardner, H. (1993). *Multiple intelligences: The theory in practice*. New York: Basic Books.
- Garet, M. S., Porter, A. C., Desimone, L., Birman, B. F., & Yoon, K. S. (2001). What makes professional development effective: Results from a national sample of teachers. *American Educational Research Journal*, 38, 915-945.
- Gentry, M., & Owen, S. V. (1999). An investigation of the effects of total school flexible cluster grouping on identification, achievement, and classroom practices. *Gifted Child Quarterly*, 43, 224-243.
- Grimm, J. (1998). The participation of gifted students with disabilities in gifted programs. *Roeper Review*, 20, 285-286.
- Guskey, T. R. (2000). *Evaluating professional development*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Guskey, T. R. (1994). The most significant advances in the field of staff development over the last twenty-five years. *Journal of Staff Development*, 15, 5-6.
- Han, K., & Marvin, C. (2000). A five year follow-up study of the Nebraska project: Still a long way to go. . . . *Roeper Review*, 23, 25-33.
- Hansen, J., & Feldhusen, J. F. (1994). A comparison study of trained and untrained teachers of gifted students. *Gifted Child Quarterly*, 38, 115-121.
- Johnsen, S. K. (2004). *Identifying gifted students: A practical guide*. Waco, TX: Prufrock Press.
- Johnsen, S. K. & Ryser, G. R. (1997). The validity of portfolios in predicting performance in a gifted program. *Journal for the Education of the Gifted*, 20, 253-267.
- Karnes, F. A., & Marquardt, R. G. (2000). *Gifted children and legal issues: An update*. Scottsdale, AZ: Gifted Psychology Press.
- Karnes, F., & Marquardt, R. (1991). *Gifted children and the law: Mediation, due process, and court cases*. Dayton, OH: Ohio Psychology Press.
- Kennedy, M. (1999). Form and substance in mathematics and science professional development. *NISE Brief*, 3 (2), 1-7.
- Lidz, C. S., & Macrine, S. L. (2001). An alternative approach to the identification of gifted culturally and linguistically diverse learners: The contribution of dynamic assessment. *School Psychology International*, 22, 74-96.
- Maker, C. J., Rogers, J. A., Nielson, A. B., & Bauerle, P. R. (1996). Multiple intelligences, problem solving, and diversity in the general classroom. *Journal for the Education of the Gifted*, 19, 437-460.
- Mills, C., & Tissot, S. (1995). Identifying academic potential in students from underrepresented populations: Is using the Ravens Progressive Matrices a good idea? *Gifted Child Quarterly*, 39, 209-217.
- Moon, T. R., & Callahan, C. M. (2001). Curricular modifications, family outreach, and a mentoring program: Impacts on achievement and gifted identification in high-risk primary students. *Journal for the Education of the Gifted*, 24, 305-321.
- National Commission on Teaching and America's Future. (1996). *What matters most: Teaching for America's future*. New York: Author.
- Olszewski-Kubilius, P. (1998). Talent search: Purposes, rationale, and role in gifted education. *Journal of Secondary Gifted Education*, 9, 106-113.

- Olszewski-Kubilius, P., & Laubscher, L. (1996). Economically disadvantaged gifted students and their subsequent college adjustment. *Roeper Review*, 18, 202-208.
- Passow, A., & Frasier, M. M. (1996). Towards improving identification of talent potential among minority and disadvantaged students. *Roeper Review*, 18, 198-202.
- Piirto, J. (1994). *Talented children and adults: Their development and education*. New York: Macmillan.
- Reis, S. M., Gentry, M., & Maxfield, L. R. (1998). The application of enrichment clusters to teachers' classroom practices. *Journal for the Education of the Gifted*, 21, 310-334.
- Renzulli, J. (Ed.) (1986). *Systems and models for developing programs for the gifted and talented*. Mansfield Center, CT: Creative Learning Press.
- Renzulli, J. S. (1995). *Building the bridge between gifted education and total school improvement: Talent development research-based decision making*, series 9502. Storrs, CT: National Research Center on the Gifted and Talented. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. 388013).
- Rogers, K. B. (2002). *Re-forming gifted education: Matching the program to the child*. Scottsdale, AZ: Great Potential Press.
- Sarouphim, K. M. (2001). DISCOVER: Concurrent validity, gender differences, and identification of minority students. *Gifted Child Quarterly*, 45, 130-138.
- Saunders, W. I., & Rivers, J. C. (1988). *Cumulative and residual effects of teachers on future students' academic achievement*. Knoxville, TN: University of Tennessee Value-Added Research and Assessment Center.
- Shore, B. M., Cornell, D. G., Robinson, A., & Ward, V. S. (1991). *Recommended practices in gifted education*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Southern, W. T., & Jones, E. (Eds.). (1991). *The acceleration of gifted children*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Stake, J. E., & Mares, K. R. (2001). Science enrichment programs for gifted high school girls and boys: Predictors of program impact on science confidence and motivation. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*, 38, 1065-1088.
- Stanley, J. (1997). Varieties of giftedness. *Journal of Creative Behavior*, 31, 93-119.
- Stigler, J. W., & Hiebert, J. (1999). *The teaching gap: Best ideas from the world's teachers for improving education in the classroom*. New York: Free Press.
- United States Department of Education. (1993). *National excellence: A case for developing America's talent*. Washington, DC: Office of Educational Research and Improvement.
- VanTassel-Baska, J. (1986). Lessons from the history of teacher inservice in Illinois: Effective staff development in education of gifted. *Gifted Child Quarterly*, 30, 124-126.
- VanTassel-Baska, J. (1998). *Excellence in educating gifted and talented learners* (3rd ed.). Denver: Love.
- VanTassel-Baska, J. (2000). Curriculum policy development for secondary gifted programs: A prescription for reform coherence. *NASSP Bulletin*, 84 (615), 14-29.
- VanTassel-Baska, J., & Feng, A. X. (2003). *Designing and utilizing evaluation for gifted program improvement*. Waco, TX: Prufrock Press.

- VanTassel-Baska, J., Patton, J., & Prillaman, D. (1991). *Gifted youth at risk: A report of a national study*. Reston, VA: Council for Exceptional Children.
- Weiss, P., & Gallagher, J. (1986). Project TARGET: A needs assessment approach to gifted education inservice. *Gifted Child Quarterly*, 30, 114-118.
- Wenglinsky, H. (2000). *How teaching matters*. Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service.
- Westberg, K., Archambault, F., Dobyns, S., & Slavin, T. (1993). *An observational study of instructional and curricular practices used with gifted and talented students in regular classrooms*. Storrs, CT: The National Research Center on the Gifted and Talented.
- Westberg, K. L., Burns, D. E., Gubbins, E. J., Reis, S. M., Park, S., & Maxfield, L. R. (1998). *Professional development practices in gifted education: Results of a national survey*. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. 424708).
- Wright, L., & Borland, J. (1993). Using early childhood developmental portfolios in the identification and education of young, economically disadvantaged, potentially gifted students. *Roeper Review*, 15, 205-210.

Other references of note

- Special Issue: Gifted Education at a crossroad. *Gifted Child Quarterly*, 39, 1995.
- Special Issue, *Gifted Child Quarterly*, 31, 1987.
- Special Issue: The IQ controversy. *Roeper Review*, 8, 1986.
- Special Issue, *Roeper Review*, September, 1992.

EPPL 670
Spring 2008
Carol L. Tieso, Ph.D.

Pre-Assessment

1. Identify and explain at least three key issues to consider in designing an identification model for a gifted program.
2. Describe three grouping models that are used as a component of service delivery in gifted education. Evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of each.
3. List a series of steps that you would follow as a gifted program administrator to *plan* for a new program or program revision. Expand your list as time allows with discussion of the key stakeholders and processes involved at each step.
4. Think about gifted education in today's educational environment. Identify at least two barriers and two facilitating factors that you think hinder and help the cause of gifted education. (For this question, identify in just a few words – longer explanation is not necessary in writing, as we will discuss in class.)

After completing your responses to the questions, please add a paragraph discussing your personal expectations of the course – what you expect to get out of it, what you expect to put into it, what you expect of me, special interest areas, etc.

Workshop Planning Flowchart

Facilitator _____ Date of Session _____

Title of Workshop _____

What Key Concept(s) or Skill(s) Will Be Taught?	What Rationale or Theory Will You Present?
What Demonstration and Instruction Will You Provide?	What Kinds of Simulated Practice Opportunities Will Participants Have?
When and How Will You Provide Feedback to Participants?	What Kinds of Reflection and Processing Opportunities Will Participants Have to Prepare for Follow-Up?