

MINUTES OF THE MEETING
EDUCATION COMMITTEE
MONTANA STATE SENATE

March 26, 1977

The thirty-first meeting of the Senate Education Committee was called to order by Senator Chet Blaylock, Chairman, on the above date, in Room 402 of the State Capitol Building at 11:00 o'clock A. M.

ROLL CALL: All members of the Committee were present, with the exception of Senator Ed Smith who was excused.

CONSIDERATION OF HOUSE BILL No. 348: An act entering into the interstate agreement on qualification of educational personnel and for related pruposes.

Representative Estenson, District 32, sponsor of the Bill, was called on to present her testimony. She stated this was enabling legislation to allow resciprocity with other states on teacher qualifications and certification.

Proponents of the Bill included:

John Vorhees, OSPI, who presented his testimony in support to the Committee, in writing, copy of which is attached.

There was no opposition to the Bill

When questioned by the Committee, Mr. Vorhees replied that this practice was adopted throughout the Pacific Northwest where most of our students go and had accepted this inter-state agreement.

Senator Dunkle moved that House Bill 348 BE CONCURRED IN; motion was seconded and carried unanimously. Senator Warden will carry the Bill on the floor.

CONSIDERATION OF HOUSE BILL No. 410: An act allowing school districts to establish programs for serving gifted and talented children and providing for administration of these programs; amending Sec. 75-7121 to allow for financial administration of the program by school districts and establishing an automatic re-peal date.

Representative Dussualt, District 95, Missoula, sponsor of the Bill, was called on to present her testimony. She explained this Bill sets up the mechanics allowing programs to be established by all schools pertaining to gifted and talented children. These children should be identified and allowed to progress at their accelerated rate rather than forced to be kept at normal grade-

progression levels which is detrimental to their intellect and talent.

Proponents of the Bill included:

George Camp, school psychologist, Great Falls Public Schools, stated the program was originally funded by the government and now was by local district money, and introduced a PACE student enrolled in the Great Falls program.

Eric Jacobsen, PACE student, Great Falls, testified as to the variety of subjects and crafts students in this program learned about and their interest in a large number of matters.

Mr. Camp further explained the advanced stages of intellect of gifted children and how this was lost by lack of stimulation or encouragement of their creativity.

Harriet Meloy, Board of Public Ed., testifying as an interested mother, submitted written testimony to the Committee, copy of which is appended to these minutes.

Marie McAlear, teacher at Twin Bridges, Mont., stated at Twin Bridges there was budgeted \$40,000 to take care of one educationally handicapped child under the Special Ed program, but nothing to help several especially gifted children; that the program was not even allowed to be set up voluntarily as there was no provision for it in the law.

Lyle Eggum, OSPI, submitted his statement in writing, copy of which is attached.

George Camp handed out information relating to the subject matter.

In closing, Rep. Dussault mentioned funding would be matched by federal money.

Fred G. Carl expressed his approval of the proposed Bill.

Gene Cetrone, former senator, rose in support of the measure.

Discussion centered on the cost of this type of program; Rep. Dussault indicating general estimates of \$140 per pupil for gifted compared to \$4,900 for handicapped child; and that grants are available for this purpose.

There being no further questions, the Chair closed the hearing on House Bill 410.

The sponsor of House Joint Resolution No. 75 set for hearing this date was unable to attend, and the Chair rescheduled the hearing for March 31st.

ADJOURNMENT:

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 11:55 A.M.

Chet Blaylock, Chairman

SENATE

Education

COMMITTEE

BILL 348, 410
HJR 75

VISITORS' REGISTER

DATE March 24
1977

Please note bill no.

(check one)

NAME

REPRESENTING

BILL #

SUPPORT

OPPOS

J R Voorhis

OPT

348

✓

Lyle Eggum

OPT

410

✓

George Camp

Gt Falls Public Schools

410

✓

Eve Jacobsen

Pass students

410

✓

Margaret G. Jacobsen

parent

410

✓

Alve Thomas

OPT

—

—

Jean Peterson

OPT

348

✓

Marie McLean

self

410

✓

Larry Hall

OPT

HJR #15

✓

Beverly C. May

Receipt

410

✓

Thelma Mary Russell

House Dist 95

410

✓

Beth Dayton

self

348

✓

Jean Dayton

self

410 348

✓

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, my name is John Voorhis and I represent the Office of Public Instruction. We are supporting this piece of legislation.

When the Board of Public Education came into existence under the new constitution, one of their first tasks was to review Teacher Education and Certification. After considerable input, the Board of Public Education, on October 29, 1974, established some objectives to pursue. One of these objectives was to revise the certification policies and incorporate more discretion and flexibility into the procedures at the state level.

At that time, it was suggested that legislation be introduced to institute reciprocity. HB 348 does this! HB 348 is an enabling piece of legislation that allows the Superintendent of Public Instruction to judge comparable teacher training in other states and to enter into agreements to exchange certified personnel.

From a practical point of view, Montana has reciprocity with other states but other states do not have it with us. Let me explain. Usually, a person trained in another state finds they can teach in Montana (at least on a provisional); however, with several developments in recent years in other states, our graduates are finding it more difficult to go to other states. This piece of legislation can resolve this problem.

We urge favorable consideration for this bill.

NAME: John R. Vooch DATE: 3/26/77

ADDRESS: Helena

PHONE: 449-3150

REPRESENTING WHOM? Office of Public Inst.

APPEARING ON WHICH PROPOSAL A 348

DO YOU: SUPPORT? ☒ AMEND? ☐ OPPOSE? ☐

COMMENTS: Prepared statement

PLEASE LEAVE ANY PREPARED STATEMENTS WITH THE COMMITTEE SECRETARY.

NAME: Marie McPhear DATE: Mar. 26

ADDRESS: Box 364 Twin Bridges, Mont.

PHONE: 684-5516

REPRESENTING WHOM? self

APPEARING ON WHICH PROPOSAL: HB 410

DO YOU: SUPPORT? ☒ AMEND? ☐ OPPOSE? ☐

COMMENTS: Current law does not encourage this
type of program. The over budgeting for special
education for slow learners and retarded is not
fair to students on other end of spectrum.
Small school systems need encouragement through
laws to set up a program like this

PLEASE LEAVE ANY PREPARED STATEMENTS WITH THE COMMITTEE SECRETARY.

NAME: FELICIA GLASS DATE: 11/1/78

ADDRESS: 3918 1st NEW YORK AVE

PHONE: 547-9401

REPRESENTING WHOM?

APPEARING ON WHICH PROPOSAL; 9041

DO YOU: SUPPORT? ☒ AMEND? ☐ OPPOSE? ☐

COMMENTS:

PLEASE LEAVE ANY PREPARED STATEMENTS WITH THE COMMITTEE SECRETARY.

Gene Cetrone

2315 Broadwater

656. 8110

myself

B 410

SUPPORT?

X

AMEND?

OPPOSE?

COMMENTS :

PLEASE LEAVE ANY PREPARED STATEMENTS WITH THE COMMITTEE SECRETARY.

NAME:

Lumett McLaugh

DATE: 3/26/77

ADDRESS:

1317- 9th Ave

PHONE:

442-8112

REPRESENTING WHOM?

self

APPEARING ON WHICH PROPOSAL:

HB 410

DO YOU:

SUPPORT? ☒

AMEND? ☐

OPPOSE? ☐

COMMENTS:

PLEASE LEAVE ANY PREPARED STATEMENTS WITH THE COMMITTEE SECRETARY.

NAME: Eric Jacobsen DATE: 3/26/77

ADDRESS: 3229 3rd Ave So

PHONE: 452-1966

REPRESENTING WHOM? Pace students

APPEARING ON WHICH PROPOSAL: HB 410

DO YOU: SUPPORT? ☒ AMEND? ☐ OPPOSE? ☐

COMMENTS: Will testify

PLEASE LEAVE ANY PREPARED STATEMENTS WITH THE COMMITTEE SECRETARY.

NAME: George Camp DATE: 3-26-77

ADDRESS: Great Falls Public Schools

PHONE: 791-2276

REPRESENTING WHOM? Gt Falls Public Schools

APPEARING ON WHICH PROPOSAL: HB 410

DO YOU: SUPPORT? ☒ AMEND? ☐ OPPOSE? ☐

COMMENTS: will testify

PLEASE LEAVE ANY PREPARED STATEMENTS WITH THE COMMITTEE SECRETARY.

NAME: Lyle Eggum DATE: 26 Mar 77

ADDRESS: Helena

PHONE: 449-2418

REPRESENTING WHOM? Office of Public Instruction

APPEARING ON WHICH PROPOSAL: HB 410

DO YOU: SUPPORT? ✓ AMEND? OPPOSE?

COMMENTS: Prepared statement

PLEASE LEAVE ANY PREPARED STATEMENTS WITH THE COMMITTEE SECRETARY.

Mr. Chairman, members of the Committee

I am Lyle Eggum and I represent the Office of Public Instruction.

My purpose today is to encourage you to give favorable consideration to the concept H.B. 410 proposes - Encouragement to school districts to provide programs for gifted and talented students through matching funds.

H. B. 410

The recognition of different needs among children and the attempt to educate each child according to his strengths and abilities is an essential part of our educational system. The need of the gifted child to realize his potential is as compelling as that of the child who develops slowly or who is handicapped in some/way. ^{other}

Montana's three to four thousand gifted and talented children are being shortchanged because they have few programs to challenge and stimulate them to use their unusual potential for the benefit of themselves and society.

H. B. 410 is meant to encourage local school districts to make an extra effort to organize programs to ^{accommodate} ~~accommodate~~ this special groups of children. A great deal of money is not needed, but commitment is. These children will not be/separated from the ^{entirely} overall student population, but will be given some enriching experience that will keep them interested and involved.

Some persons believe that really smart students will make it on their own and should not be pandered to, but the fact is that these children often become bored and discouraged. They are the underachievers of a school system in many instances. They waste time and lose their capacity to learn-- and the greatest loss is in the early years where programs are the fewest.

In a state where we are making an unusual effort to educate the handicapped child, surely we can find a few dollars to give some special attention to the gifted and talented child.

The future of this very complex society may well depend on the development of one of its components --the two to three million gifted and talented children in this country. Future leaders in government, business, the arts and other professions may well come from this small pool of creative people. We can only hope that these children will be prepared to bear the responsibility thrust upon them all too soon.

On behalf of these children, their parents-- and in fact society-- please give serious consideration to this bill.

RESOLUTION TO THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF STATE BOARDS OF EDUCATION

WHEREAS, in this complex and fast-changing society, the gift of intellect is a major national resource, and

WHEREAS, students endowed with unusual talents should be encouraged because of their potential as future leaders, and

WHEREAS, despite the efforts of educators during the past few years to provide gifted students with programs to suit their needs, only a small percentage is being touched by any special offering, and

WHEREAS, like handicapped persons, gifted students need special programs if they are to benefit uniquely from their schooling, and

WHEREAS, without special attention, gifted children may never realize their full potential,

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Montana Board of Public Education requests the National Association of State Boards of Education to encourage the design of special programs to develop the ability and skill of gifted children, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Montana Board of Public Education commits itself to immediate and personal concern with identifying and serving gifted students, and encourages the National Association of State Boards of Education to urge program funding on a scale commensurate with allocations to other handicapped students.

W. C. McLaughlin
Chairman
Montana 12/1/62

Bill H. Bennett (Secretary)
June, 1958

WHEREAS, the measure of success of an educational system is the high quality of schooling provided for all its students, and

WHEREAS, increased attention has been paid to the problems of the disadvantaged and exceptional child, and

WHEREAS, the school system has functioned well for children in the normal range of ability, and

WHEREAS, the needs of gifted and talented pupils have not received special attention even though these students have the ability to make rich contributions to our culture and society,

BE IT RESOLVED, that American Association of University Women foster endeavors on the local level to identify gifted and talented children and assist in encouraging special attention toward these students, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that members of AAUW urge school districts to plan and develop programs which meet the needs of all children including the gifted and talented, and further that AAUW request the Montana Legislative Assembly to give attention to the funding of such programs.

Dorothy M. G.
Pass Book - Mrs. D. M. G.

EDUCATION OF THE GIFTED AND TALENTED

Report to the Congress of the
United States by the
U.S. Commissioner of Education

AND

Background Papers Submitted to the
U.S. Office of Education

Prepared for the
SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION
of the

COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND
PUBLIC WELFARE
UNITED STATES SENATE

March 1972

Public Law 91-230, Section 806, states that the Commissioner of Education shall define "gifted and talented" for purposes of Federal education programs. The definition established by the advisory panel reads:

Gifted and talented children are those identified by professionally qualified persons who by virtue of outstanding abilities, are capable of high performance. These are children who require differentiated educational programs and/or services beyond those normally provided by the regular school program in order to realize their contribution to self and society.

Children capable of high performance include those with demonstrated achievement and/or potential ability in any of the following areas, singly or in combination:

1. general intellectual ability
2. specific academic aptitude
3. creative or productive thinking
4. leadership ability
5. visual and performing arts
6. psychomotor ability.

It can be assumed that utilization of these criteria for identification of the gifted and talented will encompass a minimum of 3 to 5 percent of the school population. Evidence of gifted and talented abilities may be determined by a multiplicity of ways. These procedures should include objective measures and professional evaluation measures which are essential components of identification.

Professionally qualified persons include such individuals as teachers, administrators, school psychologists, counselors, curriculum specialists, artists, musicians, and others with special training who are also qualified to appraise pupils' special competencies.

The advisory panel established three characteristics for a differentiated educational program:

1. A differentiated curriculum which denotes higher cognitive con-

of the gifted and talented and curriculum content.

3. Special grouping arrangements which include a variety of administrative procedures appropriate to particular children, i.e., special classes, honor classes, seminars, resource rooms, and the like.

This definition was subsequently tested through the *Advocate Survey* and in the research review.

It was determined early in the development of the study plan that inclusion in the Elementary and Secondary Amendments would delimit the study population to the elementary and secondary school age (5-17 years), although recommendations within the report have implications for early education of gifted and talented children (before age 5) and post-secondary education.

Because of the inadequacy of available data on education programs of other Federal agencies the study was limited to education programs administered by USOE.

FINDINGS AND ACTION STEPS

This study has produced recommendations on special programs and suggested priorities in planning individual programs, estimates of the professional support and teacher training required, and adjustments in legal definitions that would enhance the possibility of State and local fiscal support. Details may be found in the text and Volume II (appendixes). The major findings of the study—those with particular relevance to the future planning of the Office of Education—may be summarized as follows:

—A *conservative* estimate of the gifted and talented population ranges between 1.5 and 2.5 million children out of a total elementary and secondary school population (1970 estimate) of 51.6 million.

—Existing services to the gifted and talented do not reach large and significant subpopulations (e.g. minorities and disadvantaged) and serve only a very small percentage of the gifted and talented population generally.

—Differentiated education for the gifted and talented is presently perceived as a very low priority at Federal, State, and most local levels of government and educational administration.

—Although 21 States have legislation to provide resources to school districts for services to the gifted and talented, such legislation in many cases merely represents intent.

—Even where there is a legal or administrative basis for provision of services, funding priorities, crisis concerns, and lack of personnel cause programs for the gifted to be miniscule or theoretical.

—There is an enormous individual and social cost when talent among the Nation's children and youth goes undiscovered and undeveloped. These students cannot ordinarily excel without assistance.

—Identification of the gifted is hampered not only by costs of appropriate testing—when these methods are known and adopted—but also by apathy and even hostility among teachers, administrators, guidance counselors and psychologists.

—Gifted and talented children are, in fact, deprived and can suffer psychological damage and permanent impairment of their abilities. It will be as good to or greater than a similar

education suffered by any other population with special needs served by the Office of Education.

Special services for the gifted (such as the disadvantaged) and talented will also serve other target populations singled out for attention and support.

Services provided to gifted and talented children can and do produce significant and measurable outcomes.

States and local communities look to the Federal Government for leadership in this area of education, with or without massive funding.

The Federal role in delivery of services to the gifted and talented is presently all but nonexistent.

These findings, which are documented in Volume II, provide ample evidence of the need for action by the U.S. Office of Education to eliminate the widespread neglect of gifted and talented children. Federal leadership in this effort is required to confirm and maintain provisions for the gifted and talented as a national priority, and to encourage the States to include this priority in their own planning.

Recognizing these needs, the U.S. Office of Education is taking steps to meet them immediately. Ten major activities, under existing education legislation, will be initiated in 1971.

1. The Deputy Commissioner for School Systems will complete a planning report for the Commissioner on implementing a Federal role in education of gifted and talented children by February 1, 1972.

2. Assignment of continuing program responsibility for gifted and talented education within USOE will be made to the Deputy Commissioner for School Systems, with the expectation of further delegation to the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped. A staff program group will initially consist of three professional positions with appropriate secretarial and staff support services.

3. A nationwide field survey will obtain information on successful programs and program elements, develop more precise cost figures, improve evaluation procedures, furnish the bases for model programs, and develop a clearinghouse on gifted and talented education.

4. USOE will utilize title V, ESEA and other authorizations, to strengthen State Education Agencies capabilities for gifted and talented education.

5. USOE will support in the summer of 1972 two national leadership training institutes to upgrade supervisory personnel and program planning for the gifted at the State level.

6. USOE will support additional program activities in major research and development institutions which have the interest and capacity to work on learning problems and opportunities among minority groups.

7. USOE will build on the career education models being developed by the National Center for Educational Research and Development by including program activities specific to employer-based career education for the gifted and talented.

8. The Commissioner has requested special attention in at least one of the comprehensive experimental school projects to the individualization of programs to benefit the gifted and talented students as a component of the comprehensive design to effect educational reform

9. USOE will continue to encourage ESEA title III activities through communication with State education agencies, issuance of program guidelines, and cooperative assignment of USOE title III program staff to the Gifted and Talented Program Group.

10. One staff member will be identified in each of the ten Regional Offices of Education as responsible, at least part time, for gifted and talented education.

11. The existing OE programs relating to higher education will be carefully studied by the Gifted and Talented Program Group in order to optimize their potential for the gifted and talented population and teachers of these students.

Gifted and talented youth are a unique population, differing markedly from their age peers in abilities, talents, interests, and psychological maturity. They are the most versatile and complex of all human groups, possibly the most neglected of all groups with special educational needs. Their sensitivity to others and insight into existing school conditions make them especially vulnerable, because of their ability to conceal their giftedness in standardized surroundings and to seek alternative outlets. The resultant waste is tragic.

Research studies on special needs of the gifted and talented demonstrate the need for special programs. Contrary to widespread belief, these students cannot ordinarily excel without assistance. The relatively few gifted students who have had the advantage of special programs have shown remarkable improvements in self-understanding and in ability to relate well to others, as well as in improved academic and creative performance. The programs have not produced arrogant, selfish snobs; special programs have extended a sense of reality, wholesome humility, self-respect, and respect for others. A good program for the gifted increases their involvement and interest in learning through the reduction of the irrelevant and redundant. These statements do not imply in any way a "track system" for the gifted and talented.

Identification of the gifted and talented in different parts of the country has been piecemeal, sporadic, and sometimes nonexistent. Very little identification has been carried on in depth, or with appropriate testing instruments. Many of the assumptions about giftedness and its incidence in various parts of the American society are based on inadequate data, partial information, and group tests of limited value. The United States has been inconsistent in seeking out the gifted and talented, finding them early in their lives, and individualizing their education. Particular injustice has occurred through apathy toward certain minorities, although neglect of the gifted in this country is a universal, increasing problem.

The next chapter discusses the typical obstacles and necessary steps in overcoming this neglect.

WHY SHOULD WE BE PARTICULARLY CONCERNED ABOUT THE GIFTED AND TALENTED?

Although some of the questions discussed in this section border on the philosophical and are difficult to answer directly through research, an attempt is made to document the answers. Where this cannot be done, another question or a comment will clarify the implications of the question.

Won't special programs separate the gifted from others; create an elite group, and reduce their possibilities for personal contacts with others?

This question implies two types of segregation—physical and psychological. When planning and meaningful assistance to teachers occurs, many different approaches to educating the gifted are successful, in both segregated and nonsegregated situations within and outside the classroom and school (103). Planning for the gifted has succeeded in isolated rural areas and in plural cultures, as well as in densely populated urban areas. The hallmark of successful education for the gifted is a constant increase in the diversity of planning for individuals with a complex array of talents who need special intervention. An example is found in the San Diego schools, where programs range from individual teaching and regular class participation to a variety of individual sponsorship programs, special interest groups, special classes, honors groups, and independent study seminars (116).

While research in the 1930's was based largely on the study of special classes and part-time groupings, the present day programs have become highly differentiated and individualized. The word *planning* is rapidly displacing the word *program*.

The question of separation or nonseparation must be examined in the light of educational arrangements which permit learning for a given student. This consideration is based not only upon numbers of gifted, readiness of parents and educators to accept change, resources available, and arrangements possible, but also most importantly upon the child's academic, creative, social and psychological needs.

Exceptional capacities create problems for people, even at the earliest ages. Young gifted children encounter difficulties in managing and directing activities. Since their ideas differ from average children, they lose the participation of others and find themselves marginal and isolated (103). Of all children in a large gifted population, those at kindergarten level were reported by teachers to have the highest incidence of poor peer relationships. This was ascribed to the lack of experience by this age in adapting to requirements, in coping with frustrations, or in having available a repertoire of suitable substitute activities, as older pupils do (103).

The previous section (dealing with academic, social, and psychological traits of the gifted) referred to studies which indicated wide differences between gifted persons and their agemates. The differences

of children with exceptional abilities showed that these persons typically performed far below their capacity, that they found their educational experiences frustrating, that developmental disharmonies between high intelligence and adequate physical ability caused problems, and that they often felt inferior, inadequate, and insecure within their peer group (79; 165, V. 1; 193).

The highly gifted received little understanding and emotional support from school and community. Their chances for attaining genuine group leadership were very slight, most of them tending to follow rather than lead in attempts to adjust to group mores. The higher the ability, the greater the conflict and inconsistencies between the culture and the individual in values, standards, concepts of behavior, and ways of life (79; 165, V. 1; 193).

When conditions are changed and the gifted and talented are given opportunities to satisfy their desires for knowledge and performance, their own sense of adequacy and well-being improves. Those who can function within an appropriate learning milieu also improve in their attitudes toward themselves and others.

The question of elitism, separation, and lack of contact with others assumes a different aura, if we accept the thesis that people who can make satisfactory contacts with others are secure about themselves and in a better position to make satisfying contacts with others than are those who feel alien, unaccepted and frustrated. If education and life experiences for the gifted are what they should be, the likelihood that the gifted and talented will relate to the total society and work within it actually is enhanced.

Are't Special Provisions Undemocratic?

This question is in large part philosophical. If *democratic education* practice is interpreted as the *same* education for all, then the answer is yes. If we believe that democratic education means appropriate educational opportunities and the right to education in keeping with one's ability to benefit, then the answer is no. If the answer to the question were yes, then all special educational programs would disappear, and hundreds of millions now expended by the States and the Federal Government would be diverted to other uses. Other facets of the question than the philosophical, however, have been examined in research. Among these is the waste of talent, sometimes brought on by the pressure of the society.

Gifted adolescents as a group have reduced the extent of their reading from junior high to high school, perhaps because of fears that they will be viewed as "grinds" (61) or have suffered group pressures unless they exhibit athletic prowess (162).

One study of 251 high ability students found that 54.6 percent were working below a level of which they were intellectually capable. The author charged that the majority were working at least four grades below that at which they could be working, and concluded that the overall picture was one of marked wastage of intellectual ability within the school system (115).

A study of Michigan high school graduates found that gifted high school students found satisfaction in extraclass activities and high social involvement, while they remained apathetic toward classwork

be appreciably higher.) Almost twice as many gifted girls as boys were dropouts. The total loss represented a 17.6 percent loss through dropouts among the talented (65). No differences were found in performance on an achievement test battery or in level of parental occupation between the dropouts and persisters. The persisters participated in significantly greater numbers of activities and made significantly higher grades.

The effect of social adjustment on success was evident in Terman's analysis of the life histories of 150 of most successful and 150 of the least successful among the gifted adult males he had studied from childhood. Terman found a consistently positive relationship between success and social-emotional adjustment. The greatest contrast in the two groups was in measured social and emotional adjustment and in drive to achieve (165, V.5).

Gifted women encounter special problems. In a 1930 study, only one woman in 28 of ability comparable to that of the Terman group entered a graduate professional school (114). In the Terman group 38 percent of some 700 were in routine office work, and only 1.6 percent in medicine. Few went beyond the M.A. degree; marriage and social life instead of intellectual or artistic pursuits occupied the majority (165, V.5). Recent studies indicate that while more girls attend college and enter graduate studies, they are still penalized socially if they have interests in traditionally masculine fields (6). Although the gifted tend to retain their high test competence into adolescence and adulthood, females tend to regress toward the mean of the general college population more than males (114).

Wastage occurs not only with females, but also with other groups. Environments in which language development is discouraged will retard the development of general intelligence (21). Certain minorities are notoriously undereducated, including those members who have high potential (134). In many of these groups the capacities are virtually untapped (58).

One minority group which has suffered psychological wounds and has dramatically failed to reach its potential is the American Indian, according to a British authority on achievement and intelligence. After a recent study involving cultures on several continents, he concluded that intelligence may depend on the future as well as the past. He found that the North American Indians had normal academic and intellectual development until adolescence, at which time apathy sets in and regression occurs because of their awareness of lack of opportunity for advancement (172).

The waste of talent has been emphasized by Pressey in several writings. In one article he compared the 18th Century European society, which valued the arts and nurtured many outstanding composers who produced works of lasting benefit, to the 20th Century American society, which values athletics and provides outstanding opportunities and rich rewards to those who reached stardom (135). Consequently, Europe of one and two centuries ago experienced the remarkable achievements of Handel, Haydn, Mozart, Chopin, Liszt, Verdi, Schubert, Rossini, Mendelssohn, Debussy, Dvorak, Berlioz, and Wagner, all of whom played, composed and/or conducted their own composi-

high. Valuation of attributes (Pressey) showed the ranking of the achievements of Bobby Jones and Marlene Bauer in golf, Sonja Henie and Barbara Ann Scott in skating, Vincent Richards and Maureen Connolly in tennis, and Mel Ott and Bobby Feller in baseball, all before the age of 18.

All of the individuals listed, whether musician or athlete, had the benefit of strong familial and social encouragement, early opportunity to develop their abilities, superior early and continuous guidance and instruction, individualized programs, close association with others in their fields, and many strong successes.

The Terman works show that while the principal avocations of his youths were creative and artistic, their chosen occupations were those best rewarded economically (165, V. 5).

The assumption must be made that the benefit accruing to the fully educated person will last much longer than the formal school years, and that lifelong contributions will be advantageous to the society as a whole. Pressey recently pointed out that Michelangelo was chief architect of St. Peters from age 72 until 89, Voltaire published a tragedy at 83, Benjamin Franklin was a member of the Constitutional Convention at 81, Goethe completed *Faust* at 82, Churchill was Prime Minister of England from 77 to 81. Michelangelo wrote his best poetry after 60, Franklin began his autobiography at 65 and finished it at 82, and at 70 helped draft the Declaration of Independence (139).

Rather than argue that special planning is undemocratic, one might conclude that the special planning should be carried on for the benefit of the democracy. The government which educates its youth as they ought to be educated should realize many benefits.

Aren't the gifted a favored group already? If couldn't funds be better spent on the disadvantaged and handicapped?

Large-scale studies conclude that gifted and talented children are disadvantaged and handicapped in the usual school situation. Terman observed that the gifted are the most retarded group in the schools when mental age and chronological ages are compared. Great discrepancies continue to persist between what the gifted child knows and what he is offered, whether in academic or artistic areas (103). The ensuing boredom leads to underachievement and unworthy patterns of functioning, along with dissatisfaction with oneself and others. Parental attitudes toward learning affect the achievement of groups of children. Thus Jewish children as a population were found to possess markedly high achievement motivation. Conversely, a number of studies dealing with lower class, or lower socio-economic families, noting that these families do not set adequate goals for their children and even are hostile toward the notion that children should seek education (140).

Ralph, Goldberger, and Passow, in an excellent summary of research on underachievement in the gifted during the 1950's and 1960's, documented enormous wastage of talent. For instance, a study of gifted students classified 42 percent as underachievers (140). In a country high school population, only 35 percent were achieving adequately. In a population of 4,900 bright boys and girls, 54 percent of the boys and 33 percent of the girls had scholastic averages so low that their

underachievement in bright pupils is identified by one under-graduate. They recommended early identification of the potential underachiever, in terms of cognitive as well as socio-personal factors, to permit schools to prevent rather than cure underachievement. Their own work with gifted underachievers at the high school level, as well as their evaluation of an extensive body of research literature, suggested that efforts initiated at the senior high school level had little promise of success, since underachievement at that stage had become a deeply rooted unamenable way of life (140).

Patterns of underachievement may explain some of the data from the 1950 decade, in which only six of ten in the most promising 5 percent of high school graduates finished college. At that time 60 percent of women college graduates were either unemployed or engaged in nonprofessional work (60).

While the gifted as a group generally demonstrated superior adjustment, compared to the average population, they nevertheless encountered problems of anxiety, insecurity, feelings of clumsiness, inaccuracy with physical tasks, difficulties because of differing interests, and a desire to read incessantly, preference for self-direction to direction by others, and isolated interests and talents (79; 165, V. 1). Severe psychological problems have been found among gifted children, often caused by accumulated frustrations in environments insensitive to their needs (79; 129; 193).

The higher the ability level, the greater the problems of adjustment. If highly gifted children can relate to others of similar ability, their adjustment improves (51; 79; 165, v.1).

In a recent study Torrance found that expected sex roles affect the degree of productive thinking. Elementary boys were reluctant to write poetry, make up or perform dances, or write letters. Girls were less willing than boys to read science magazines, perform experiments, explore caves, and keep weather records (169). In another study, better attitudes and higher self-concepts were found among young adolescent boys than among girls, as well as generally better levels of functioning, despite the fact that all were gifted (48). Again, the pattern of expected underachievement or restricted achievement may penalize girls, although boys also operated in socially approved categories rather than freely.

The negative impact of peer pressures on the gifted was dramatized in the recollections of school experiences by the gifted themselves. The unhappiest experiences recalled by high school students were caused by peers, and developed mainly from feelings of embarrassment or inferiority. Adequate functioning with such self-attitudes would be difficult (23).

Some of the traits in the individual with potential for originality are both socially approved and disapproved. Those clearly disapproved are rebelliousness, disorderliness, and exhibitionism; those approved include independence of judgment, freedom of expression, and originality of construction and insight (12). In many school situations even the socially approved traits would be subject to censure. It appears that much of the educational disadvantage or handicap faced by the gifted and talented lies in external restrictions which prevent a satisfying experience.

This question implies that the gifted and talented are placed in completely separate programs, and that they do not associate with others during the school day. This is not the case in the vast majority of programs. One characteristic of programs for the gifted is the great variety of arrangements; in school systems with a history of consistent planning, the variety increases year by year as planning for improvement continues (116).

Even in programs in which highly gifted and talented students work in seminars, independent study, and individual tutorials, the gifted spend some time with other groups, and periodically bring their creative productions to class in the form of creative publications, inventions, original plays, and others.

Further evidence that special programs do not cause separation is seen in the improved social status of gifted students who have participated in special groupings. As their educational fare becomes more adequate, they apparently relate more successfully to others and actually increase in social stature.

Won't special attention to the gifted and talented create problems of competition for others? In view of current unemployment do we need more specialized persons?

Numerous government-sponsored studies indicate the increasing rapidity of change in society and its pursuits. Our increasing reliance on machines and technology has simultaneously created thousands of new occupations and increased leisure.

Wolfe, in a 1951 survey of talent resources, reported that each 3 percent annual increase in the Gross National Product requires approximately a 5 percent increase in scientific manpower. The need for trained intelligence increases proportionately in total numbers (187).

Six years later, the National Science Foundation substantiated Wolfe's estimates of loss in transition from high school to college. Wolfe indicated that less than a third of those who should go to college actually attend (185).

The importance to the public of educating the gifted has never been greater than at present. One may use the example of thousands of occupations in television and related fields which came from the creative efforts of a 15-year-old boy. If invention and creation are encouraged and the necessary learning is supported, increased discoveries may generate possibilities for improved employment and conditions of life in many areas. As leisure time increases, the creative and artistic will be vital to the total well-being of society, both as artists and teachers; the creatively scientific will be indispensable in efforts to cure social and human ills which now plague all people.

Is a good program for the gifted a good program for all children?

No. If the program were good for all children, it would not be good for the gifted. Gifted pupils who are advanced 4 or more years beyond their contemporaries need to work with content and ideas appropriate for them, but beyond the capacity of their peers. Children who have developed specialized talents, if they are truly specialized, need tutorial attention at their level of capability if they are to im-

gifted will depart increasingly from the norm in attainments if their programs are suitable and their educational experiences, while proper for them, become increasingly inappropriate for their ages (103).

If the program for all children is necessarily adjusted to the norm or average, those markedly different in potential encounter a program of limited significance for them.

Won't special programs further segregate the gifted and talented from minorities and from general population?

Relationships between the gifted and society have been discussed in several previous sections. However, the impact of special planning for the gifted and talented on relationships with minorities requires special discussion here. The question implies an unjustified separation of talent from minority background; the late Whitney Young, Jr., and Ralph Bunche are gifted examples from one minority. Helen Keller was a member of several minorities, yet unquestionably gifted. Many others could be named. The extension of opportunities to the gifted should increase involvement with others for the gifted who happen to come from minorities, and should extend opportunities for contacts through a variety of specialized groupings based on common talents and accomplishments.

Failure to seek giftedness and talents within minorities has restricted severely the educational opportunities open to them. While 25 percent of the national high school population attended interracial colleges with adequate programs in 1957, only 1 percent of Indians and 2 percent of Negroes attended such colleges (134). In 1964, the proportion of black children in an economically disadvantaged neighborhood with superior intelligence decreased markedly from the primary to intermediate grades. In five schools, 73 percent of those with superior intelligence were in the primary grades, while only 27 percent were in the upper elementary grades. The same individual test was used throughout. Apparently factors were operating to progressively retard the intellectual development of economically disadvantaged black children (48). Studies by Deutsch also pointed out progressive loss of measured ability among the economically deprived as they progress through the grades.

In a later section more will be said about the identification of the gifted and talented among minorities. Evidence exists from both pre-school level studies that alteration in the learning environment can be accompanied by marked increase in accomplishment and in measured ability levels (4; 41). One study indicated that economically deprived black children who were given learning opportunities made significantly greater gains than did children of comparable ability from nondeprived backgrounds (41).

The question of psychological separation of the gifted from others because of their advanced psychological maturity is interesting. When gifted junior and senior high school students, boys and girls, are totally unlike their age peers, and very similar to those 4 years or more older, some association with others somewhat like themselves in factors beyond age alone is necessary. Similarities of the gifted to other gifted youth 3 or 4 years their senior were closer than the

tions were markedly dissimilar. The true social peer of the gifted may be found on criteria other than age (103).

When special learning opportunities do not exist, the likelihood of psychological separation from the general population is great, according to reports on childhood school experiences by eminent scientists. These men indicated that they had quite specific and strong feelings of personal isolation as children. They felt different or apart in some way. Comments like the following were made: "I have always felt like a minority member." "I was always lonesome." Social scientists made remarks like these: "The family was essentially self-ostracized." "We developed forms of living which were different from those around us." (142)

Apparently the burden of the majority is to create conditions which will lessen feelings of alienation, and allow the gifted and talented to feel that they are valued members of the human race, whatever the circumstances of background.

What benefits will we derive from special education of the gifted?

An earlier section cited the accomplishments of a gifted population. Another kind of response may come from listing of a few persons from Volume II of *Genetic Studies of Genius*, in which ability levels were assessed biographically. We have evidence here that many lasting contributions to society were made by individuals who would rank within the gifted and talented category: John Quincy Adams, Coleridge, Voltaire, Macanley, Grotius, John Stuart Mill, Leibnitz, Goethe, Mozart, Longfellow, Luther, Agassiz, Kant, Dickens, Jung Galileo, Berkeley and William Pitt. These are only some names from more than 300 who rated among the 500 most eminent leaders of history and who were selected as representing adult human distinction (165 v.2).

The benefit to be derived from a Mozart or Dickens is difficult to describe but may rest in his enduring value to mankind.

Modern changes toward increasing urbanization and complexity demands increasing skills in adaptation. Societal needs for highly educated and highly skilled persons are increasing. Conservation as a social priority includes human conservation; the conservation of the gifted and talented requires that society tolerate the right of the individual with exceptional abilities and talents, even though unconventional, to attain the goals he seeks. Benefits to society will increase as we reach the point when we extend our present encouragement of the athlete to excel to all other fields of endeavor.

CAN WE IDENTIFY THE GIFTED AND TALENTED?

The answer to this question covers several factors: age of identification, screening procedures and test accuracy, the identification of children from different ethnic groups and cultures, underachievers, and tests of creativity.

Can we identify the very young gifted or talented child?

On the basis of both previous and current studies, we can identify young gifted and talented children. Studies cited in the previous section

3717 Creekwood Road
Missoula, MT 59801
January 21, 1977

Mr. George Camp
Great Falls Public Schools
Great Falls, Montana 59401

Dear Mr. Camp:


I am writing this letter on the behalf of the bill permitting school districts to establish programs for gifted and talented children.

I have an intellectually gifted son, now age 17, who has suffered from the lack of suitable programs in the Missoula schools. In view of the amount of taxes we pay to support them, his father and I deeply resent the inability of the public schools to give our only child a suitable education. We see large sums of money spent on handicapped children and we think that money well spent. I would suggest, however, that the exceptionally bright child is at least as valuable a resource as the handicapped child and that he also deserves education designed especially for his needs.

I have heard it said that the bright children will succeed anyway. Some may - although without guidance and inspiration they may never develop their potential - but others will not. Our son was bored and disenchanted with school; he could easily have become a dropout. Because we were financially able to do so, we put him in a private school designed for gifted students. We are astonished at the change in his attitude toward education and his growing respect for intellectual achievement. But most parents of gifted children cannot afford the high costs of private schools, and their children are being short changed in our classrooms.

If we really believe in developing individual potential and if we believe in the pursuit of excellence, then we must provide adequate education for the gifted and the talented. We are not doing it now. Please let me know what I can do to help promote this legislation.

Sincerely,


Maxine C. Johnson

tqg

Our readers' opinions

Downtown suggestions

We, the Room Six, sixth grade class of Lewis and Clark School, have been discussing the problems of the downtown Great Falls area. Here are some of our ideas:

1. Transportation—City bus lines to help cut down traffic and aid shoppers who cannot drive.
2. Nursery to provide babysitting to shoppers at a minimum fee which would be used to allow free parking.
3. Free parking on the streets only.
4. A parking building and more city parking lots. This would be free paid parking.
5. Doors between the stores so shoppers would not have to go outside so often. (For example, between the Anita and the Gold Faucet stores.)
6. Wishing well in front of the Civic Center with all proceeds from wishes to "flow" into the city treasury.
7. Revolving restaurant over Central Avenue so people could look out over the streets and shops while eating.
8. Bridges over Central Avenue to connect stores and buildings.
9. Open mall area on Central Avenue from Park Drive to Sixth Street to make it more attractive in appearance.
10. Amusement park and zoo to attract citizens and tourists. To be located in the vicinity of the old police station.

ANN MCKITTRICK, ERIC JACOBSEN, and 21 other members of the Room Six, Sixth grade class, Lewis and Clark School.

Ideas for downtown area

A central business district market study released last month gave a strong warning regarding Great Falls' downtown. The study said this city is standing at a crossroads, and added, "Your downtown will thrive or wither based upon the decisions to be made in the coming months. Your time is short."

That's a pretty blunt message and it calls for some response, not only from downtown merchants, but also from other Great Falls residents of all ages. So far, little response has been heard.

A corporation whose members are downtown merchants is planning to undertake the task of raising \$10,000 as matching money for \$20,000 in available federal funds.

That's a start. Another start—of a different kind—has been made in the "Our readers opinions" section on this page. A sixth grade class at Lewis and Clark School has been thinking about downtown improvement, and it makes some suggestions for Tribune readers.

Some of those suggestions are good, others are not feasible—but all of them are imaginative. And it's encouraging to see a group of sixth graders take interest in this subject. Because of their interest, these elementary school students put a good number of Great Falls residents to shame.

The market study insists this is a crucial time for Great Falls' downtown. Let's hear more from area residents about this issue.

MONTANA FEDERATION
COUNCIL FOR EXCEPTIONAL CHILDREN

January 7, 1977

Dear Education Committee Members,

Representatives from our state Political Action Network have been actively involved in seeking and supporting legislation for gifted students in our public schools. We, as an organization for parents, clinicians, medical personnel, and others who are directly or indirectly involved with exceptional children, are asking you for your consideration of legislation being presented this legislative session for gifted students.

Many federal and state dollars are being spent for exceptional students each year to assist them in improving their academic, social and physical skills. Public school programs assist these students and parents in developing skills so that the student will be able to cope with and adapt or contribute to society.

Gifted students who are also seen as exceptional because they need additional assistance and resources to challenge and develop their intellectual capabilities and talents beyond what can be afforded them by existing educational programs. By providing the educational programs that can improve the capabilities of gifted and talented students, schools can help send a population of students into society not only as contributors but as leaders.

We recognize that it will be difficult to prioritize demands on you personally and state money this legislative session, but we, as a statewide organization, are asking for your consideration to provide enabling legislation for gifted and talented students.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Robert B. Duncan".

Robert B. Duncan, Ed. D.
President

RBD/blb

SENATE COMMITTEE EDUCATION

Date March 26, 1977 HOUSE Bill No. 348 Time 4:10 -

NAME	YES	NO
Senator Chet Blaylock, Chairman	✓	
Senator Ed Smith, Vice Chairman	✓	
Senator George McCallum	✓	
Senator Bill Mathers	✓	
Senator William E. Murray	✓	
Senator Frank Dunkle	✓	
Senator Paul Boylan	✓	
Senator Larry Fasbender	✓	
Senator Bill Thomas	✓	
Senator Margaret Warden	✓	

Jennie Lind
Secretary

Chet Blaylock
Chairman

Motion: Senator Frank Dunkle moved that House Bill No. 438

BE CONCURRED IN; motion was seconded and carried by

Senator Warden will carry on the floor.

(include enough information on motion--put with yellow copy of committee report.)

STANDING COMMITTEE REPORT

.....March 26..... 19 77.....

MR.PRESIDENT.....

We, your committee onEDUCATION.....

having had under considerationHOUSE Bill No. 348,...

Respectfully report as follows: That.....HOUSE Bill No. 348,.....

Third Reading Bill,

DO PASS

BE CONCURRED IN

Chet Blaylock

Chairman.