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Gifted services are not equally distributed across schools within districts as much variance within districts as between districts.

- Percentage of Gifted Students
- Percentage of Free and Reduced-Price Lunch Students
- Average Reading
- Average Math
Using Building Norms can help address this issue
Underserved populations are not being identified at the same rates as non-underserved students even after controlling for student achievement.
Conducting Universal Screening and considering Achievement Data can help address this issue.
Some combinations of the above produce better identification equity than others, but no combination completely addresses the equity issue.
Multiple Criteria Help but don’t totally address under-representation
Variability in teachers’ ratings is not fully accounted for by students’ achievement and cognitive scores.
Expanding Training of Raters can help address this issue
Very few districts reassess students once they have been identified, non-identified students are not regularly reassessed, and most students are identified at third grade.

How frequently are students assessed?

- Non-identified students are reassessed at regular intervals (16% - 60%)
- Non-identified students are reassessed upon request (47% - 84%)
- Identified students are reassessed at regular intervals 2% - 10%
- Identified students are reassessed upon request (4% - 10%)

At what grade are students first identified

- Kindergarten - .9%
- 1\textsuperscript{st} – 2.8%
- 2\textsuperscript{nd} – 27.8%
- 3\textsuperscript{rd} – 53.6%
- 4\textsuperscript{th} – 12.0%
- 5\textsuperscript{th} – 1.6%
- None of the above – 1.3%
Conducting Frequent Screening can help address this issue
Third grade academic achievement accounts for many of the identification gaps.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>State 1</th>
<th>State 2</th>
<th>State 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FRPL (compared to non-FRPL)</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EL (compared to non-EL)</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black (compared to White)</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic (compared to White)</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Closing early Achievement Gaps can help address this issue.
Improved Acceptance and Placement for Gifted Services

- Change in Identification Practices
  - Identification Preparation Opportunities
  - Universal Screening
  - Alternative Identification Pathways
  - More Frequent Screening
  - Culturally Appropriate Assessments

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

- Develop Practice of Being Talent Scouts
  - Inclusion of Culturally Responsive Curriculum
  - Adding Support Services to Ensure Student Success

- Modifications in Program Services

- Increased Identification of Underserved Students

- Improved Acceptance and Placement for Gifted Services

- Increased Trustworthiness of Communications

Champion for Under-Served Students

Professional Learning

Improved School Personnel Awareness of Under Identification Issues

National Center for Research on Gifted Education (http://ncrge.uconn.edu)
Advocates make a difference
Developing a Web of Communication can improve identification
Gifted programs seldom focus on core curriculum such as math and reading. Gifted programs have a greater focus on critical thinking and creative thinking than reading/language arts and mathematics.

- 28.9% schools offer gifted reading/LA but 28.7% of them don’t have specific reading/LA curriculum
- 28.4% schools offer gifted mathematics but 24.2% of them don’t have specific gifted math curriculum
- 93.7% of districts do not have a designated math curriculum for gifted
- 90.2% of districts do not have a designated reading/LA curriculum for gifted
Gifted students start ahead in reading and mathematics achievement at 3rd grade but don’t grow any faster than other groups by 5th grade. In some cases, gifted students show slower growth than non-identified gifted students.
Aligning Identification and Service can help address this issue.
School principals shape the climate in which teachers feel empowered or limited to manage their instructional time in the world of pacing guide dominance.

“We follow a pacing guide and those components of the pacing guide need to be covered in order to meet our goal by the end of the year.”

 “[The pacing guide is] just a road map of what needs to be addressed.”
Teachers who feel a sense of autonomy report using a wider variation of practices to enact their autonomy as it relates to pacing, instruction, content, and materials/resources.
Offering teachers some Instructional Autonomy can improve pacing guide use.
Differentiated work for advanced students is often an afterthought or a way to occupy them while teachers work with students who need remediation.

“When I’m reviewing the primary standards and working with those students that didn’t understand the lesson, the students that understood, they either go with a re-teach activity or they continue with their own portion from the lesson.”

37/68 of the teachers viewed differentiation as lip service
Recognizing Differentiation is Critical for Every Student can help address this issue
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importance of Recognizing Strengths Identification Programming
importance of alignment

Identification
Services
Outcomes