



## Talented & Gifted:

### Working with High Achievers

Instructor Name: Dr. Pamela Bernards  
Phone: 509-891-7219  
Office Hours: 8 a.m. to 5 p.m. PST Monday – Friday  
Email: [pamela\\_bernards@virtualeduc.com](mailto:pamela_bernards@virtualeduc.com)  
Address: Virtual Education Software  
23403 E Mission Avenue, Suite 220F  
Liberty Lake, WA 99019  
Technical Support: [support@virtualeduc.com](mailto:support@virtualeduc.com)

#### Introduction

Welcome to *Talented & Gifted*, an interactive computer-based instruction course designed to help you achieve a better understanding of the talented and gifted student, methods used in identification, and strategies for instruction of these students in an inclusive classroom. *Talented & Gifted* provides information on the history of the exceptional in relation to education, current law, and accepted methods for referral, assessment, and identification of these students. The course also covers methods of differentiating instruction to meet the rate and level of learning of those students identified. The course gives you an understanding of ways to meet the affective needs of the gifted and talented student in the regular classroom.

This computer-based instruction course is a self-supporting program that provides instruction, structured practice, and evaluation all on your home or school computer. Technical support information can be found, in the Help section of your course.

#### Course Materials (Online)

Title: *Talented & Gifted: Working with High Achievers*  
Publisher: Virtual Education Software, inc. 2002, Revised 2008, Revised 2010, Revised 2014, Revised 2017, Revised 2020, Revised 2024  
Instructor: Dr. Pamela Bernards, Ed.D.

## **Academic Integrity Statement**

The structure and format of most distance-learning courses presume a high level of personal and academic integrity in completion and submission of coursework. Individuals enrolled in a distance-learning course are expected to adhere to the following standards of academic conduct.

## **Academic Work**

Academic work submitted by the individual (such as papers, assignments, reports, tests) shall be the student's own work or appropriately attributed, in part or in whole, to its correct source. Submission of commercially prepared (or group prepared) materials as if they are one's own work is unacceptable.

## **Aiding Honesty in Others**

The individual will encourage honesty in others by refraining from providing materials or information to another person with knowledge that these materials or information will be used improperly.

***Violations of these academic standards will result in the assignment of a failing grade and subsequent loss of credit for the course.***

## **Level of Application**

This course is designed to be an informational course with application in work or work-related settings. The intervention strategies are designed to be used with gifted and talented students ranging in age from approximately five years to early adolescence. Some alterations may be needed if working with younger children.

## **Expected Learning Outcomes**

Upon successful completion of this course, students will:

- Have become familiar with common practice in relation to identification of and service to gifted and talented students
- Have gained working knowledge of common school practices in the identification of TAG process
- Be familiar with tools used in assessment for identification purposes in TAG education
- Have learned techniques for assessing level and rate of learning
- Be familiar with the characteristics and needs of typical talented and gifted students from special populations
- Be able to select appropriate programming based upon individual student needs
- Have gained a working knowledge of common models of delivery of instruction that meet TAG needs
- Become familiar with methods of differentiating curriculum for talented and gifted students
- Have developed an understanding of the social and emotional needs of TAG students (affective domain)

## Course Description

*Talented & Gifted* provides information on the history of the exceptional student in relation to education, current law, and accepted methods for referral, assessment, and identification of these students. Included are major program models and methods of differentiating instruction to meet the rate and level of learning of identified gifted students. Meeting the affective needs of the gifted and talented student in the classroom is emphasized.

Due to the structure of this course, it is suggested that you complete each section in order. The course will allow you to move ahead to various chapters, but completing the course out of sequence may cause difficulty with your understanding of the materials. It will also make it more difficult to pass the examinations and the course itself.

## Student Expectations

As a student you will be expected to:

- Complete all four information sections showing a competent understanding of the material presented in each section.
- Complete all four section examinations, showing a competent understanding of the material presented. **You must obtain an overall score of 70% or higher, with no individual exam score below 50%, and successfully complete ALL writing assignments to pass this course. \*Please note: Minimum exam score requirements may vary by college or university; therefore, you should refer to your course addendum to determine what your minimum exam score requirements are.**
- Complete a review of any section on which your examination score was below 50%.
- Retake any examination, after completing an information review, to increase that examination score to a minimum of 50%, making sure to also be achieving an overall exam score of a minimum 70% **(maximum of three attempts). \*Please note: Minimum exam score requirements may vary by college or university; therefore, you should refer to your course addendum to determine what your minimum exam score requirements are.**
- Complete all course journal article and essay writing assignments with the minimum word count shown for each writing assignment.
- Complete a course evaluation form at the end of the course.

## Course Overview

### ***Chapter One: What Does Gifted & Talented Mean?***

If you've ever had a highly gifted student in your classroom, you certainly know what a blessing or what a handful that child can be. Sometimes you may think there is no way to keep up with this student while meeting the educational needs of all the others in your classroom. This student might challenge you at every turn, might decide to "just get by," or might become a real joy for you to work with. This chapter will help you start to identify characteristics of gifted and talented students in order to be a more effective teacher.

## **Chapter Two: Identification & Assessment**

The identification and assessment of talented and gifted students can be controversial. For that reason, we will look at several sources to gain information about identifying talented and gifted students. If these seem contradictory at times, you will start to understand the controversy.

## **Chapter Three: Curriculum & Modifications**

One of the myths of teaching gifted students is that you can just give them harder work, or more work. More accurately, as with any student who learns differently, we need to look at differentiating the curriculum. We differentiate curriculum for our students who are considered special education, for our students who are learning English as they are learning content—why not for our gifted students? We will spend time in this section of the course looking at ways to differentiate the curriculum.

## **Chapter Four: Resources for Parents**

This chapter of the course consists entirely of public domain documents for parents of talented and gifted children. These will contain valuable information for you in the classroom. However, the primary purpose of this chapter is to give you resources that you have freedom to copy and give to parents. All of these documents contain valuable information.

## **Examinations**

At the end of each course section, you will be expected to complete an examination designed to assess your knowledge. You may take these exams a total of three times. Your last score will save, not the highest score. After your third attempt, each examination will lock and not allow further access. The average from your exam scores will be printed on your certificate. However, this is not your final grade since your required writing assignments have not been reviewed. Exceptionally written or poorly written required writing assignments, or violation of the academic integrity policy in the course syllabus, will affect your grade. As this is a self-paced computerized instruction program, you may review course information as often as necessary. You will not be able to exit any examinations until you have answered all questions. If you try to exit the exam before you complete all questions, your information will be lost. You are expected to complete the entire exam in one sitting.

## **Writing Assignments**

**All assignments are reviewed and may impact your final grade.** Exceptionally or poorly written assignments, or violation of the Academic Integrity Policy (see course syllabus for policy), will affect your grade. Fifty percent of your grade is determined by your writing assignments, and your overall exam score determines the other fifty percent. ***Refer to the Essay Grading Guidelines, which were sent as an attachment with your original course link. You should also refer to the Course Syllabus Addendum, which was sent as an attachment with your original course link, to determine if you have any writing assignments in addition to the Critical Thinking Questions (CTQ) and Journal Article Summations (JAS). If you do, the Essay Grading Guidelines will also apply.***

Your writing assignments must meet the minimum word count and are not to include the question or your final citations as part of your word count. In other words, the question and citations are not to be used as a means to meet the minimum word count.

### **Critical Thinking Questions**

There are four CTQs that you are required to complete. You will need to write a minimum of 500 words (maximum 1,000) per essay. You should explain how the information that you gained from the course will be applied and clearly convey a strong understanding of the course content as it relates to each CTQ. To view the questions, click on REQUIRED ESSAY and choose the CTQ that you are ready to complete; this will bring up a screen where you may enter your essay. Prior to course submission, you may go back at any point to edit your essay, but you must be certain to click SAVE once you are done with your edits.

**You must click SAVE before you write another essay or move on to another part of the course.**

### **Journal Article Summations**

You are required to write, in your own words, a summary on a total of three peer-reviewed or scholarly journal articles (one article per JAS), written by an author with a Ph.D., Ed.D., or similar, on the topic outlined within each JAS section in the “Required Essays” portion of the course (blogs, abstracts, news articles, or similar are not acceptable). Your article choice must relate specifically to the discussion topic listed in each individual JAS. You will choose a total of three relevant articles (one article per JAS) and write a thorough summary of the information presented in each article (you must write a minimum of 200 words with a 400 word maximum per JAS). Be sure to provide the URL or the journal name, volume, date, and any other critical information to allow the facilitator to access and review each article.

To write your summary, click on REQUIRED ESSAYS and choose the JAS that you would like to complete. A writing program will automatically launch where you can write your summary. When you are ready to stop, click SAVE. Prior to course submission you may go back at any point to edit your summaries but you must be certain to click SAVE once you are done with your edits. For more information on the features of this assignment, please consult the HELP menu.

**You must click SAVE before you write another summary or move on to another part of the course.**

### **Instructor Description**

Pamela Bernards has 43 years of combined experience in diverse PK–8 and high school settings as a teacher and an administrator. In addition to fulfilling these responsibilities, she was the founding director of a K–8 after-school care program and founder of a preschool program for infant-to-4 year-olds. The school where she was the principal was named a U.S. Department of Education Blue Ribbon School of Excellence in 1992, as was the school at which she served as director of Curriculum in 2010. She served as the director of Professional Development at the National Catholic Educational Association and is currently a teacher at Arlington Public Schools. Her areas of interest include curriculum, research-based teaching practices, staff development, assessment,

data-driven instruction, and instructional intervention (remediation and gifted/talented). She received a doctorate in leadership and professional practice from Trevecca Nazarene University.

### **Contacting the Instructor**

You may contact the instructor by emailing [pamela\\_bernards@virtualeduc.com](mailto:pamela_bernards@virtualeduc.com) or by calling 509-891-7219, Monday through Friday, 8:00 a.m. – 5:00 p.m. PST. Phone messages will be answered within 24 hours. Phone conferences will be limited to ten minutes per student, per day, given that this is a self-paced instructional program. Please do not contact the instructor about technical problems, course glitches, or other issues involving the course's operation.

### **Technical Questions**

If you have questions or problems related to the operation of this course, please try everything twice. If the problem persists please check our support pages for FAQs and known issues at [www.virtualeduc.com](http://www.virtualeduc.com) and also the Help section of your course.

If you need personal assistance then email [support@virtualeduc.com](mailto:support@virtualeduc.com) or call 509-891-7219. When contacting technical support, please know your course version number (it is located at the bottom left side of the Welcome Screen) and your operating system, and be seated in front of the computer at the time of your call.

### **Minimum Computer Requirements**

Please refer to VESi's website: [www.virtualeduc.com](http://www.virtualeduc.com) or contact VESi if you have further questions about the compatibility of your operating system.

***Refer to the addendum regarding Grading Criteria, Course Completion Information, Items to be Submitted, and how to submit your completed information. The addendum will also note any additional course assignments that you may be required to complete that are not listed in this syllabus.***

### **Bibliography (Suggested Readings)**

- Ackerman, P. L. (1993). *Learning and individual differences: An ability/information processing framework for skill acquisition*. Final Report, Contract N00014-89-J-1974, Office of Naval Research, Arlington, VA. doi:10.1037/e476532004-001
- Ackerman, P. L., Sternberg, R. J., & Glaser, R. (Eds.). (1999). *Learning and individual differences: Advances in theory and research*. New York, NY: W.H. Freeman.
- Adderholdt-Elliott, M., & Goldberg, J. (1999). *Perfectionism—What's bad about being good?* Minneapolis, MN: Free Spirit.
- Adelson, J. L., McCoach, D. B., & Gavin, M. K. (2012). Examining the effects of gifted programming in math and reading using the ECLS-K. *Gifted Child Quarterly*, 56, 25–39. doi:10.1177/0016986211431487
- Anderson, J. R. (2013). *The architecture of cognition*. New York, NY: Psychology Press.

- Anderson, L. W., Krathwohl, D. R., Airasian, P. W., Cruikshank, K. A., Mayer, R. E., Pintrich, P. R., Rath, J., . . . Wittrock, M. C. (2001). *A taxonomy for learning, teaching, and assessing: A revision of Bloom's taxonomy of educational objectives*. New York, NY: Longman.
- Association for Childhood Education International. (2010). No Child Left Behind: The inadvertent costs for high-achieving and gifted students [Report]. *Childhood Education*, 87(1). doi:10.1080/00094056.2010.10521436ln
- Assouline, S., Colangelo, N., Vantessell-Baska, J., Sharp, M. (2015). *A Nation Empowered: Evidence Trumps the Excuses Holding Back America's Brightest Students*. Iowa City, IA: The Belin-BlankCenter.
- Assouline, S., Colangelo, N., Vantessell-Baska, J., Sharp, M. (2015). *A nation empowered: Evidence trumps the excuses holding back America's brightest students*. Iowa City: The Belin-BlankCenter.
- Banks, J. A. (1993). *An introduction to multicultural education: Theory and practice*. Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Banks, J. A., & McGee Banks, C. A. (2019). *Multicultural education: Issues and perspectives* (10th ed.). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.
- Berlin, J. E. (2009). It's all a matter of perspective: Student perceptions on the impact of being labeled gifted and talented. *Roeper Review*, 31(4), 217–223. doi:10.1080/02783190903177580
- Boazman, J. (2017). *The meaning of gifts and talents: Framing the elements for flourishing*. Arlington, VA: National Catholic Educational Association.
- Boothe, D., & Stanley, D. (2004). *In the eyes of the beholder: Critical issues for diversity in gifted education*. Waco, TX: Prufrock Press.
- Breen, A. (2019). Renowned educator and scholar Carol Tomlinson defined a new way of teaching. *UVA Today*. Retrieved from [Renowned Educator and Scholar Carol Tomlinson Defined a New Way of Teaching | UVA Today](#)
- Brown, E. F., & Abernathy, S. H. (2009). Policy implications at the state and district level with Rtl for gifted students. *Gifted Child Today*, 32(1), 52–57. doi:10.1177/107621750903200311
- Bui, S., Craig, S., & Imberman, S. (2014). Is gifted education a bright idea? Assessing the impact of gifted and talented programs on students. *American Economic Journal: Economic Policy*, 6(3), 30-62.
- Carpenter, P. A., Just, M. A., & Shell, P. (1990). What one intelligence test measures: A theoretical account of the processing in the Raven Progressive Matrices test. *Psychological Review*, 97(3), 404–431. doi:10.1037/0033-295X.97.3.404
- Castellano, J. A., & Diaz, E. I. (2002). *Reaching new horizons: Gifted and talented education for culturally and linguistically diverse students*. Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

- Cawelti, G. (n.d.). *Consequences of the educational policies of the Reagan administration*. Retrieved from <http://docs.lib.purdue.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1370&context=eandc>
- Cohen, L. M., & Frydenberg, E. (2007). *Coping for capable kids: Strategies for parents, teachers and students* (Updated ed.). Waco, TX: Prufrock Press.
- Colangelo, N., Assouline, S., & Gross, M. U. M. (Eds.). (2004). A nation deceived: How schools hold back America's brightest students. Templeton National Report on Acceleration. *University of Iowa, Belin-Blank Center for Gifted Education & Talent Development*. Retrieved from <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED535137.pdf>
- Coleman, M. R. (2005). Academic strategies that work for gifted students with learning disabilities. *Teaching Exceptional Children*, 38(1), 28–32. doi:10.1177/004005990503800105
- Coleman, M. R., Buysse, V., & Neitzel, J. (2007). Establishing the evidence base for an emerging early childhood practice: Recognition and response. In V. Buysse & P. W. Wesley (Eds.), *Evidence-based practice in the early childhood field* (pp. 117–159). Washington, DC: ZERO TO THREE Press.
- Coleman, M. R., & Johnson, S. (2011). *Rtl for gifted students: A CEC-TAG educational resource*. Waco, TX: Prufrock Press.
- Coleman, M. R., & Johnson, S. (2013). *Implementing Rtl with gifted students: Service models, trends, and issues*. Waco, TX: Prufrock Press.
- Commission on No Child Left Behind. (2007). Beyond NCLB: Fulfilling the promise to our nation's children. *Roeper Review*, 26, 121–123.
- Conlan, T. J. (1984). The politics of federal block grants: From Nixon to Reagan. *Political Science Quarterly*, 99, 247–270. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2150404>
- Crain, W. (2011). *Theories of development: Concepts and applications*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Cross, T. L., & Frazier, A. D. (2010). Guiding the psychosocial development of gifted students attending specialized residential STEM schools. *Roeper Review*, 32(1), 32–41.
- Daniels, S., & Piechowski, M. M. (2009). *Living with intensity*. Scottsdale, AZ: Great Potential Press.
- Davidson, B., & Davidson, J. (2004). *Genius denied: How to stop wasting our brightest young minds*. New York, NY: Simon and Schuster.
- Deno, S. L. (2002). Problem solving as best practices. In A. Thomas & J. Grimes (Eds.), *Best practices in school psychology* (4th ed., pp. 37–56). Bethesda, MD: National Association of School Psychologists.
- Dixon, F., & Moon, S. M. (2014). *The handbook of secondary gifted education* (2nd ed.). Waco, TX: Prufrock Press.



Dixon, D. D., Peters, S.J., Makel, M. C., Jolly, J. L., Matthews, M. S., Miller, E. M., Rambo-Hernandez, K. E., Rinn, A.N., Robins, J. H., & Wilson, H. E. (December 2019/January 2021). A call to reframe gifted education as maximizing learning. *The Phi Delta Kappan*, 102(4), 22-25.

Deary, I.J. (2012). Intelligence. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 63, 453–482.

Duke, M. P., Nowicki, S., & Martin E. A. (1996). *Teaching your child the language of social success*. Atlanta, GA: Peachtree.

Eddles-Hirsch, K., Vialle, W., Rogers, K. B., & McCormick, J. (2010). “Just challenge those high-ability learners and they’ll be all right!” The impact of social context and challenging instruction on the affective development of high-ability students. *Journal of Advanced Academics*, 22, 106–128. doi:10.1177/1932202X100220

Elementary and Secondary Education Consolidation Act of 1981, §1103.

Endacott, N. (2018). Top ten resources for parents of gifted children. Institute for Educational Advancement. Retrieved from <https://educationaladvancement.org/blog-top-10-resources-for-parents-of-gifted-children/>

Erwin, O. E., & Worrell, F. C. (2011). Best practices in identifying students for gifted and talented education programs. *Journal of Applied School Psychology* 27(4), 319–340. doi:10.1080/15377903.2011.615817

Foley-Nicpon, M., Assouline, S. G., & Colangelo, N. (2013). Twice exceptional learners: Who needs to know what? *Gifted Child Quarterly*, 57(3), 169–180. doi:10.1177/00169862134900

Forstadt, L. (2009). Living with intensity: Understanding the sensitivity, excitability, and emotional development of gifted children, adolescents, and adults. *Roeper Review*, 31(2), 130–131.

Gagné, F. (1985). Giftedness and talent: Reexamining a reexamination of the definition. *Gifted Child Quarterly*, 29(3), 103–112. doi:10.1177/00169862850290

Gagne, F. (1993). Constructs and models pertaining to exceptional human abilities. In K. A. Hellar, F. J. Mönks, & A.H. Passow (Eds.), *International handbook of research and development of giftedness and talent* (pp. 69–87). New York, NY: Pergamon Press.

Gagné, F. (1995). From giftedness to talent: A developmental model and its impact on the language of the field. *Roeper Review*, 18, 103–111. doi:10.1080/02783199509553709

Gagné, F. (1999). Is there any light at the end of the tunnel? *Journal for the Education of the Gifted*, 22, 191–234.

Gagné, F. (2004). Transforming gifts into talents: The DMGT as a developmental theory. *High Ability Studies*, 15, 119–147. doi:10.1080/1359813042000314718

Gagné, F. (2009). Building gifts into talents: Detailed overview of the DMGT 2.0. In B. MacFarlane & T. Stambaugh (Eds.), *Leading change in gifted education: The festschrift of Dr. Joyce Van Tassel-Baska* (pp. 61–80). Waco, TX: Prufrock Press.

- Gagné, F. (2012). Building gifts into talents: Brief overview of the DMGT 2.0. Retrieved from [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/287583969\\_Building\\_gifts\\_into\\_talents\\_Detailed\\_overview\\_of\\_the\\_DMGT\\_20](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/287583969_Building_gifts_into_talents_Detailed_overview_of_the_DMGT_20)
- Galbraith, J., & Delisle, J. (2015). *When gifted kids don't have all the answers: How to meet their social and emotional needs*. Minneapolis, MN: Free Spirit.
- Galton, F. (1869). *Hereditary genius: An inquiry into its laws and consequences*. London, England: McMillan and Company.
- Gardner, H. (2006). *Multiple intelligences: New horizons in theory and practice*. New York, NY: Basic Books.
- Gardner, H. (2009). *Five minds for the future*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.
- Gardner, H. & Hatch, T. (1989). Multiple intelligences go to school: Educational implications of the theory of multiple intelligences. *Educational Researcher*, 18(8), 4–10.
- Gifted and Talented Children's Education Act of 1978, §901, 20 U.S.C. 3311.
- Goddard, H. H. (1911). Two thousand normal children measured by the Binet measuring scale of intelligence. *Pedagogical Seminary*, 18(2), 232–259. doi:10.1080/08919402.1911.10532788
- Hallahan, D. P., Kauffman, J. M., & Pullen, P. C. (2014). *Exceptional leaders: An introduction to special education* (12<sup>th</sup> ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson.
- Henshon, S. E. (2009). Talent development across the lifespan: An interview with Paula Olszewski-Kubilius. *Roeper Review*, 31(3), 134–137. doi:10.1080/02783190902993482
- Hess, K. K., Jones, B. S., Carlock, D., & Walkup, J. R. (2009, March 9). *Cognitive rigor: Blending the strengths of Bloom's taxonomy and Webb's Depth of Knowledge to enhance classroom-level processes*. Retrieved from <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED517804.pdf>
- Horn, J. L. (1999). Cognitive diversity: A framework for learning. In P. L. Ackerman, R. J. Sternberg, & R. Glaser (Eds.), *Learning and individual differences: Advances in theory and research* (pp. 61–116). New York, NY: W.H. Freeman.
- Johnsen, S. K. (2008). Identifying gifted and talented learners. In F. A. Karnes & K. R. Stephens (Eds.), *Achieving excellence: Educating gifted and talented* (pp. 135–153). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson/Merrill Prentice Hall.
- Johnsen, S. K. (2009). Best practices for identifying gifted students. *Principal*, 88(5), 8–14.
- Johnsen, S. K. (2011). Making decisions about placement. In S. K. Johnsen (Ed.), *Identifying gifted students: A practical guide* (pp. 107–131). Waco, TX: Prufrock Press.
- Jolly, J. L. (2009). A resuscitation of gifted education. *American Educational History Journal*, 36(1/2), 37–53.
- Jolly, J. L. (2014). Building gifted education: One state at a time. *Gifted Child Today*, 37, 128–130.

- Jolly, J. L. & Makel, M. (2010). No Child Left Behind: The inadvertent costs for high-achieving students and gifted students. *Childhood Education*, 87, 35–40.  
doi:10.1080/00094056.2010.10521436
- Jolly, J. J., & Robins, J. H. (2016). After the Marland Report: Four decades of progress? *Journal for the Education of the Gifted*, 39(2), 132–150. doi:10.1177/0162353216640937
- Kaufman, S. B. (2013). *Ungifted: Intelligence redefined*. New York, NY: Basic Books.
- Kerr, B. A. (2010). Smart girls, gifted women: Special guidance concerns. *Roeper Review*, 8(1), 30–33. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02783198509552923>
- Kerr, B. (2005). *Smart girls: A new psychology of girls, women and giftedness*. Scottsdale, AZ: Gifted Psychology Press.
- Kerr, B., & Cohn, S. (2001). *Smart boys: Talent, manhood and the search for meaning*. Scottsdale, AZ: Great Potential Press.
- Kirk, S. A., Gallagher, J. J., Anastasiow, N. J., & Coleman, M. R. (2015). *Educating exceptional children*. Stamford, CT: Cengage Learning.
- Kruteĭskii, V. A. (1976). *The psychology of mathematical abilities in schoolchildren* (J. Teller, Trans., J. Kilpatrick & I. Wirszup, Eds.). Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.
- Levande, D. (1999). Gifted readers and reading instruction. *Hoagies' Gifted Education Page*. Retrieved from <https://www.hoagiesgifted.org/levande.htm>
- Loertscher, D. (2008). Using the national gifted education standards for university teacher preparation programs/using the national gifted education standards for pre-K–12 professional development. *Teacher Librarian*, 36(1), 52–53.
- Lohman, D. F. (1989). Human intelligence: An introduction to advances in theory and research. *Review of Educational Research*, 59(4), 333–374.  
doi:10.3102/00346543059004333
- Lohman, D.F. (1993). Teaching and testing to develop fluid abilities. *Educational Researcher*, 22(7), 12–23. doi:10.3102/0013189X022007012
- Malone, D. (2015, April 7). Cognitive rigor in lesson planning: Where Bloom's Taxonomy and Webb's DOK meet. *Edgenuity*. Retrieved from <https://blog.edgenuity.com/cognitive-rigor-in-lesson-planning-where-blooms-taxonomy-and-webbs-dok-meet/>
- Marland, S. P. (1972). *Education of the gifted and talented (Report to the Subcommittee on Education, Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, US Senate)*. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.
- Marope, P.T.M. (2014). Learning and competences for the 21st century. *PROSPECTS*, 44(4), 483–486.

- Marshalek, B., Lohman, D. F., & Snow, R. E. (1983). The complexity continuum in the radex and hierarchical models of intelligence. *Intelligence*, 7, 107–127. doi:10.1016/0160-2896(83)90023-5
- Mellard, D., Byrd, S., Johnson, E., Tollefson, J., & Boesche, J. (2004). Foundations and research on identifying model responsiveness to intervention sites. *Learning Disability Quarterly*, 27, 1–14. doi:10.2307/1593676
- Miller, B. H. (2016). *Theories of developmental psychology*. New York, NY: Worth.
- Milner, J., Coker, C. P., Buchanan, C., & Newsome, D. (2009). Accountability that counts. *Clearing House*, 82(5), 237–243. doi:10.3200/TCHS.82.5.237-243
- Missett, T. C., Brunner, M. M., Callahan, C. M., Moon, T. R., & Azano, A. P. (2014). Exploring teacher beliefs and use of acceleration, ability grouping, and formative assessment. *Journal for the Education of the Gifted*, 37(3), 245–268. doi:10.1177/0162353214541326
- Morawaka, A., & Sanders, M. R. (2009). Parenting gifted and talented children: Conceptual and empirical foundations. *Gifted Child Quarterly*, 53(3), 164–173. doi:10.1177/0016986209334962
- Muratori, M. C., & Smith, C. K. (2015). Guiding the talent and career development of the gifted individual. *Journal of Counseling and Development*, 93, 173–182. <https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1556-6676.2015.00193.x>
- NAGC [National Association for Gifted Children]. (2005). The history of gifted and talented education. Retrieved from <http://people.uncw.edu/caropresoe/GiftedFoundations/EDN%20552/NAGC%20-%20History%20of%20g-t.htm>
- National Association for Gifted Children. (2019). *NAGC pre-k-grade 12 gifted programming standards: A blueprint for quality gifted education programs*. Washington, DC: Author.
- NAGC. (2019). Key considerations in identifying and supporting gifted and talented learners: A report from the 2018 NAGC definition task force. Retrieved from [https://cdn.ymaws.com/nagc.org/resource/resmgr/knowledge-center/position-statements/Task\\_Force\\_Report\\_Gifted\\_Def.pdf](https://cdn.ymaws.com/nagc.org/resource/resmgr/knowledge-center/position-statements/Task_Force_Report_Gifted_Def.pdf)
- NAGC. (2019). A definition of giftedness that guides best practice. Retrieved from [https://cdn.ymaws.com/nagc.org/resource/resmgr/knowledge-center/position-statements/a\\_definition\\_of\\_giftedness\\_t.pdf](https://cdn.ymaws.com/nagc.org/resource/resmgr/knowledge-center/position-statements/a_definition_of_giftedness_t.pdf)
- NAGC. (n.d.) Applying the Pre-K-Grade 12 Gifted Education Programming Standards: Guiding Questions. Retrieved from <https://nagc.org/page/Guiding-Questions-to-Apply-the-Pre-K-to-Grade-12-Gifted-Programming-Standards>
- NAGC. (2023, March). Jacob K. Javits gifted and talented students education program. Retrieved from [https://cdn.ymaws.com/nagc.org/resource/resmgr/lac/javits\\_one\\_pager\\_march\\_2023.pdf](https://cdn.ymaws.com/nagc.org/resource/resmgr/lac/javits_one_pager_march_2023.pdf)

- NAGC. (2024). Frequently Asked Questions about Gifted Education. Retrieved from [Frequently Asked Questions about Gifted Education - National Association for Gifted Children \(nagc.org\)](https://nagc.org/page/frequently-asked-questions-about-gifted-education)
- NAGC. (2024). Federal legislative update. Retrieved from <https://nagc.org/page/federal-legislative-update>
- National Association for Gifted Children (n.d.). Glossary of Terms. Retrieved from [Glossary of Terms](#)
- National Association of State Directors of Special Education. (2007). *Response to intervention: Research for practice*. Alexandria, VA: Author.
- National Center for Research on Gifted Education. (2024). Every child has a right to learn something new every day. Retrieved from <https://ncrge.uconn.edu/>
- National Commission on Excellence in Education. (1983). *A nation at risk: The imperative for educational reform*. Washington, DC: US Government Printing Office.
- National Defense Education Act of 1958, Pub. L. No 85–865, § 72 Stat. 1580 (1958).
- National Science Foundation Act of 1950, Pub. L. No 81–507, § 64 Stat. 149 (1950).
- Newman, J. L., Gregg, M., & Dantzler, J. (2009). Summer enrichment workshop (SEW): A quality component of the University of Alabama’s gifted education preservice training program. *Roeper Review*, 31(3), 170–184. doi:10.1080/02783190902993995
- No Child Left Behind Act, 20 U.S.C. §6301 (2001).
- Office of Elementary & Secondary Education. (2024). Jacob K. Javits gifted and talented students education program. Retrieved from <https://oese.ed.gov/offices/office-of-discretionary-grants-support-services/well-rounded-education-programs/jacob-k-javits-gifted-and-talented-students-education-program/>
- Peters, S. J., Carter, J. & Plucker, J. A. (December 2020/January 2021). Rethinking how we identify “gifted” students. *The Pyi Delta Kappan*, 102(4), 8-13.
- Peters S. J., Rambo-Hernandez, K., Makel, M. C., Matthews, M. S., & Plucker J. A. (2017). Should millions of students take a gap year? Large numbers of students start the school year above grade level. *Gifted Child Quarterly*, 61 (3), 229-238.
- Peters, S.J., Rambo-Hernandez, K., Makel, M.C., Matthews, M.S., & Plucker, J.A. (2019). Effect of local norms on racial and ethnic representation in gifted education. *AERA Open*, 5(2).
- Peterson, J. S. (2009). Myth 17: Gifted and talented individuals do not have unique social and emotional needs. *Gifted Child Quarterly*, 53(4), 280–282. doi:10.1177/0016986209346946
- Peterson, J. S., & Wachter Morris, C. (2010). Preparing school counselors to address concerns related to giftedness: A study of accredited counselor preparation programs. *Journal for the Education of the Gifted*, 33, 311–366.

- Plucker, J. (2024, March 28). I read the president's FY25 budget so you don't have to! NAGC Blog. Retrieved at <https://nagc.org/blogpost/2061726/499234/I-Read-the-President-s-FY25-Budget-Proposal-So-You-Don-t-Have-to>
- Plucker, J.A. & Callahan, C.M. (2020). The evidence base for advanced learning programs. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 101(4), 14-21.
- Plucker, J.A. & Peters, S.J. (2016). *Excellence gaps in education: Expanding opportunities for talented students*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education Press.
- Purcell, J. & Eckert, R. (2006). Designing services and programs for high-ability learners. *National Association for Gifted Children*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Rambo-Hernandez, K., Makel, M.C., Peters, S.J., & Plucker, J.A. (2020). *Researchers estimate that students coming back after COVID-19 closures may have greater variance in academic skills*. Portland, OR: NWEA
- Ratcliff, N. J., Jones, C. R. Costner, R. H., Knight, C. Disney, G., Savage-Davis, E., ... Hunt, G. H. (2012). No need to wait for Superman: A case study of one unique high school. *Journal for the Education of the Gifted*, 35, 391–411. doi:10.1177/01623532124592
- Renzulli Center for Creativity, Gifted Education, and Talent Development. (2017). *Schoolwide Enrichment Model (SEM)*. Retrieved from <http://gifted.uconn.edu/schoolwide-enrichment-model/>
- Renzulli, J. S. (1978). What makes giftedness? Reexamining a definition. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 60, 180–184. doi:10.1177/003172171110920
- Renzulli, J. S. (1999). What is this thing called giftedness, and how do we develop it? A twenty-five year perspective. *Journal for the Education of the Gifted*, 23, 3–54. doi:10.1177/016235329902300102
- Renzulli, J. S. (2002). Emerging conceptions of giftedness: Building a bridge to the new century. *Exceptionality: A Special Education Journal* 10(2), 67–75. doi:10.1207/S15327035EX1002\_2
- Renzulli, J. S. (2009). Myth 1: The gifted and talented constitute one single homogeneous group and giftedness is a way of being that stays in the person over time and experiences. *Gifted Child Quarterly*, 53(4), 233–235. doi:10.1177/0016986209346824
- Renzulli, J., Reis, S., Baum, S., & Betts, G. (2009). *Systems and models for developing programs for the gifted and talented*. Mansfield Center, CT: Creative Learning Press.
- Ricci, M. C. (2017). Equitable identification processes. *TAG Update*, Winter 2017, 1 and 7–10. Retrieved from [https://cectag.com/sites/default/files/2022-03/FINAL\\_TAG-Update\\_Winter-2017.pdf](https://cectag.com/sites/default/files/2022-03/FINAL_TAG-Update_Winter-2017.pdf)
- Rinn, A. N., Mun, R. U., & Hodges, J. (2022). 2020-2021 State of the states in gifted education. National Association for Gifted Children and the Council of State Directors of Programs for



Gifted. Retrieved from [https://cdn.ymaws.com/nagc.org/resource/resmgr/2020-21\\_state\\_of\\_the\\_states\\_.pdf](https://cdn.ymaws.com/nagc.org/resource/resmgr/2020-21_state_of_the_states_.pdf)

- Roberts, J. L., & Inman, T. F. (2015). *Strategies for differentiating instruction: Best practices in gifted education. An evidence-based guide*. Waco, TX: Prufrock Press.
- Robinson, A. (2009). Myth 10: Examining the ostrich: Gifted services do not cure a sick regular program. *Gifted Child Quarterly*, 53(4), 259–261. doi:10.1177/0016986209346935
- Rollins, K., Mursky, C. V., Shah-Coltrane, S., & Johnsen, S. K. (2009). Rtl models for gifted children. *Gifted Children Today*, 32(3), 21–30. doi:10.1177/107621750903200308
- Rost, D. H. (2008). Hochbegabung – Fakten and Fiktion. In H. Ulrich & S. Strunck (Eds.), *Begabtenförderung an Gymnasium Entwicklungen, Befunde, Perspektiven [Fostering gifted students at secondary schools: Development, results, and perspectives]* (pp. 44–50). Wiesbaden, Germany: Springer.
- Rost, D. H. (2009). *Intelligenz – Fakten und Mythen [Intelligence – Facts and myths]*, Weinheim, Germany: Beltz.
- Rose, J. (2012, May 9). How to break free of our 19th-century factory-model education system. The Atlantic.
- Rotigel, J., & Fello, S. (2004). Mathematically gifted students: How can we meet their needs? *Gifted Child Today*, 27(4), 46–51. doi:10.4219/gct-2004-150
- Russo, C. J. (2001). Unequal educational opportunities for gifted students: Robbing Peter to pay Paul? *Fordham Urban Law Journal*, 29, 727–758.
- Sak, U. (2009). Test of the three-mathematical minds (M3) for the identification of mathematically gifted students. *Roeper Review*, 31(1), 53–67. doi:10.1080/02783190802527372
- Schindler, M., & Rott, B. (2017). Networking theories on giftedness—What we can learn from synthesizing Renzulli's domain general and Krutetskii's mathematics-specific theory. *Education Sciences*, 7(6). doi:10.3390/educsci7010006
- Schroth, S. T., & Helfer, J. A. (2009). Practitioners' conceptions of academic talent and giftedness: Essential factors in deciding classroom and school composition. *Journal of Advanced Academics*, 20(3), 384–407. doi:10.1177/1932202X0902000302
- Slocumb, P. D., & Payne, R. K. (2015). *Removing the mask: How to identify and develop giftedness in students from poverty*. Highland, TX: Aha Process.
- Shaughnessy, M. F. (Ed). (2010). *Reading in 2010: A comprehensive review of a changing field*. New York, NY: Nova.
- Shaughnessy, M. F. (2014). A reflective conversation with Joe Renzulli and Sally Reis: About the Renzulli learning system. *Gifted Education International*. 30(1), 24–32. doi:10.1177/0261429413480419

- Sisk, D. (1980). Issues and future directions in gifted education. *Gifted Child Quarterly*, 24(1), 29–32. doi:10.1177/001698628002400106
- Smith, C. K., & Wood, S. M. (2020). Supporting the career development of gifted students: New role and function for school psychologists. *Psychol Schs*. 2020;57:1558–1568.  
<https://doi.org/10.1002/pits.22344>
- Sternberg, R. J. (2007). *Wisdom, intelligence, and creativity synthesized*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Sternberg, R. J. (1985). *Beyond IQ: A triarchic theory of human intelligence*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Sternberg, R. J. (1991). Death, taxes, and bad intelligence tests. *Intelligence*, 15(3), 257–269. doi:10.1016/0160-2896(91)90035-C
- Sternberg, R. J. (1992). Ability tests, measurements, and markets. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 84(2), 134–140. doi:10.1037//0022-0663.84.2.134
- Sternberg, R. J. (2020). Transformational Giftedness: Rethinking Our Paradigm for Gifted Education. *Roeper Review*, 42(4), 230–240.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/02783193.2020.1815266>
- Sternberg, R.J., Chowkase, A., Desmet, O., Karami, S., Landy, J., Lu, J. (2021). Beyond Transformational Giftedness. *Educ. Sci.*, 11, 192. <https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci11050192>
- Subotnik, R. F., Olszewski-Kubillus, P., & Worrell, F. C. (2011). Rethinking giftedness and gifted education: A proposed direction forward based on psychological science. *Psychological Science in the Public Interest*, 12, 3–54. doi:10.1177/1529100611418056
- Swanson, J. D., & Lord, E. W. (2013). Harnessing and guiding the power of policy: Examples from one state's experiences. *Journal for the Education of the Gifted*, 36, 198–219. doi:10.1177/0162353213480434
- Swanson, J. L., & D'Achiardi, C. (2005). Beyond interest, needs/values, and abilities: Assessing other important career constructs over the life span. In S. D. Brown & R. W. Lent (Eds.), *Career development and counseling: Putting theory and research to work* (pp. 353–381). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.
- Tannenbaum, A. (2003). Nature and nurture of giftedness. In N. Colangelo & G. A. Davis (Eds.), *Handbook of gifted education* (3rd ed., pp. 45–59). Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Terman, L. M. (1916). *The measurement of intelligence*. Cambridge, MA: The Riverside Press.
- Thomson, D., & Olszewski-Kubilius, P. (2014). The increasingly important role of off-level testing in the context of the talent development perspective. *Gifted Child Quarterly*, 58, 51–68. doi:10.1177/10762175135096



- Tomlinson, C. A. (2000). *Differentiation of instruction in the elementary grades*. Champaign, IL: ERIC Clearinghouse on Elementary and Early Childhood Education.
- Tomlinson, C. A. (2001). What is differentiated instruction? *LD Online*. Retrieved from <http://www.ldonline.org/article/263/>
- Tomlinson, C. A. (2017). Differentiated instruction. In *Fundamentals of gifted education* (pp. 279-292). Routledge.
- Trail, B. A. (2011). *Twice-exceptional gifted children: Understanding, teaching, and counseling gifted students*. Waco, TX: Prufrock Press.
- Trawick-Smith, J. (2013). *Early childhood development: A multicultural perspective*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill.
- University of Connecticut (2020). *The National Research Center on the gifted and talented (1990–2013)*. Retrieved from <https://nrcgt.uconn.edu/>
- U.S. Department of Education. (1993, October). *National excellence: A case for developing America's talent*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Publishing Office.
- U.S. Department of Education Office of Civil Rights. (2014). Civil rights data collection: Data snapshot (College and Career Readiness). Issue brief no. 3. Retrieved from <https://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ocr/docs/crdc-college-and-career-readiness-snapshot.pdf>
- University of Connecticut (2020). The National Research Center on the Gifted and Talented (1990-2013). Retrieved from <https://nrcgt.uconn.edu/>
- VanTassel-Baska, J. (1993). Academic counseling for the gifted. In L. Silverman (Ed.), *Counseling the gifted and talented* (pp. 201–241). Denver, CO: Love Publishing.
- VanTassel-Baska, J., & Brown, E. F. (2021). An analysis of gifted education curriculum models. *Methods and materials for teaching the gifted*, 107-138.
- VanTassel-Baska, J. L. (2009). *Patterns and profiles of promising learners from poverty*. Waco, TX: Prufrock Press.
- VanTassel-Baska, J. L., Cross, T. L., & Olenchak, F. R. (2009). *Social-emotional curriculum with gifted and talented students*. Waco, TX: Prufrock Press.
- VanTassel-Baska, J. L., & Stambaugh, T. (2005). *Comprehensive curriculum for gifted learners* (3rd ed.). Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- von Hippel, P.T., Workman, J., & Downey, D.B. (2018). Inequality in reading and math skills forms mainly before Kindergarten: A replication, and partial correction, of “Are Schools the Great Equalizer?” *Sociology of Education*, 91(4), 323–357.
- Weselby, C. (2020). What is differentiated instruction? Examples of how to differentiate in the classroom. Retrieved from <https://resilienteducator.com/classroom-resources/examples-of-differentiated-instruction/>

- Wood, S. M. (2010). Best practices in counseling the gifted in schools: What's really happening? *Gifted Child Quarterly*, 54(1), 42–58.
- Wood, S., & Estrada-Hernandez, N. (2009). Psychosocial characteristics of twice-exceptional individuals: Implications for rehabilitation practice. *Journal of Applied Rehabilitation Counseling*, 40(3), 11–18. doi:10.1891/0047-2220.40.3.11
- Yekovich, F. R. (1994). Current issues in research on intelligence. Retrieved from <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED385605.pdf>
- Yun Dai, D., & Chen, F. (2013, July). Three paradigms of gifted education: In search of conceptual clarity in research and practice. *Gifted Child Quarterly*, 57, 151–168. doi:10.1177/00169862134900
- Zettel, J. J. (1982). The education of gifted and talented students from a federal perspective. In J. Ballard, B. Ramirez, F. J. Wientraub (Eds.), *Special Education in America: Its legal and governmental foundations* (pp. 51–64). Reston, VA: Council for Exceptional Children.
- Zirkel, P. A., & Stevens, P. L. (1987). The law concerning public education of gifted students. *Journal for the Education of the Gifted*, 10, 305–322. doi:10.1177/016235328701000408

#### **Additional Sources:**

[Bloom's Taxonomy of Learning | Domain Levels Explained](#)

<http://www.davidsongifted.org/search-database/entry/a10250>

<https://oedb.org/ilibrarian/50-essential-links-for-the-parents-of-gifted-children/>

<https://cft.vanderbilt.edu/guides-sub-pages/blooms-taxonomy/>

<https://dam.assets.ohio.gov/image/upload/sboe.ohio.gov/Educator-Evaluations/QualityAssessments/DOK-Compared-to-Blooms-Taxonomy.pdf>

<https://www.prodigygame.com/main-en/blog/webbs-depth-of-knowledge-dok>

<https://iris.peabody.vanderbilt.edu/module/math/cresource/q1/p01/>

[Parent Tip Sheets - National Association for Gifted Children](#)

*Course content is updated every three years. Due to this update timeline, some URL links may no longer be active or may have changed. Please type the title of the organization into the command line of any Internet browser search window and you will be able to find whether the URL link is still active or any new link to the corresponding organization's web home page.*



## **COURSE SYLLABUS ADDENDUM**

**Important - Please Read - Do Not Discard**

It is each student's responsibility to read all course materials, including course syllabus and addendum, and to know and understand the course requirements, exam score minimum requirements, and deadlines. Students enrolled in VESi courses are required to check their email for any communications regarding the course until their final grade is posted with the college or university. Once your course materials are received by VESi and have been reviewed, the GRADE IS FINAL.

### **Grading Criteria:**

**You must obtain an overall score of 70% or higher, with no individual exam score below 50%, and successfully complete ALL writing assignments to pass this course.** This course requires a minimum overall passing grade of "C-" to receive credit. The average from your exam scores will be printed on your certificate. However, this is not your final grade since your required writing assignments have not been reviewed. Exceptionally written or poorly written required writing assignments, or violation of the academic integrity policy in the course syllabus, will affect your grade. Fifty percent of your grade is determined by your writing assignments, and your overall exam score determines the other fifty percent.

**No grade will be submitted for partial completion of course assignments, regardless of partial score. An F will be reported if course is not completed by the end of the term enrolled. Exceptions only apply to those that request an extension (must have extenuating circumstances) prior to course deadline.**

Letter grades will be assigned as follows:	90% to 100%	A
	80% to 89%	B
	70% to 79%	C
	69% - lower	F

### **Course Completion Information:**

Grading will take approximately two weeks from the time your materials are received by the instructor, after which we will submit grades to the college/university weekly. If you have a timeline to meet certain school or state requirements, please keep this time period in mind when planning your course completion dates.

### **Course Completion Instructions**

- Once you have completed all of the course requirements, follow the instructions from the Complete Course toolbar to submit your materials to VESi's office for processing. You can only submit the course ONE TIME. Be sure that you have completed all requirements and exams.**
- Course Evaluation:** Please take a moment to fill out the course evaluation which is also found under the Complete Course toolbar.

- **Print Certificate:** You can print a copy of your course certificate for your records.

### **Accessing your NDSU Transcript:**

After the grade for your course(s) is posted, approximately two weeks after the course submission, you can access your NDSU transcript for documentation of course completion and performance.

Instructions are found at this link: [Transcript Instructions | Continued Learning | NDSU](#)

### **Drops & Refunds:**

Once learners have received the course materials, they are no longer eligible for a refund. Appeals will be considered on a case-by-case basis.

### **Questions or Concerns:**

Please direct any questions or concerns regarding this class to [ndsudce@ndsudce.edu](mailto:ndsudce@ndsudce.edu). Please include the title of the course in your correspondence.