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Never doubt that a small group of thoughtful, committed citizens can change the world. Indeed, it is the only thing that ever has.

--unconfirmed
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Addressing Needs

Intersecting Literature

Native American Studies (AI/AN)
Rural Schools
Gifted, Creative, and Talented Studies ($N=20$)
Underserved Populations
Culturally Responsive Practices
English Language Learners
Poverty
Special Needs (e.g., remedial, disability)
Native Americans in GCT Literature

- Rarely addressed (See summary)
- Little exists in recent years
- Trend studies using NAEP data
- Non-empirical
- Lacks generalizability (a good thing?)
- Frequently eliminated from large studies due to small numbers (e.g., Excellence Gap)
(Yoon & Gentry, 2009)
“...an achievement gap exists at higher levels of academic performance. The economically disadvantaged, English Language Learners, and historically underprivileged minorities represent a smaller proportion of students scoring at the highest levels of achievement...The presence of an excellence gap is demonstrated both on national and state assessments ...the proportion of all students (including more advantaged groups) that score at the highest level constitutes a relatively small share of all students...”
Poverty
(Wyner et al. 2009)

- 3.4 million high-achieving students from low-income families
- Over time, they are less likely than their non-low income peers to
  - Persist
  - Improve
  - Graduate HS
  - Attend college (or attend selective college)
  - Earn a bachelor’s degree
  - Achieve at highest levels
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EDUCATIONAL DISPARITIES AMONG HIGH ACHIEVERS

(Wyner et al., 2009)

Percent of 1st Grade High Achievers

- Higher Income: 72%
- Lower Income: 28%

Chance of Remaining a High Achiever Throughout Elementary School (Reading)

- Higher Income: 69%
- Lower Income: 56%

Chance of Remaining a High Achiever Throughout High School (Math)

- Higher Income: 84%
- Lower Income: 76%

Chance of Completing a Bachelor’s Degree

- Higher Income: 78%
- Lower Income: 54%

Chance of Receiving a Graduate Degree (Among College Graduates)

- Higher Income: 47%
- Lower Income: 29%
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Figure M-11. Percentage of fourth-grade AI/AN students in NAEP mathematics, by achievement level and jurisdiction: 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Below Basic</th>
<th>Basic</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
<th>Advanced</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nation</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

# Rounds to zero.

NOTE: AI/AN = American Indian/Alaska Native. Detail may not sum to totals because of rounding.
Figure M-13. Percentage of eighth-grade AI/AN students in NAEP mathematics, by achievement level and jurisdiction: 2009

Jurisdiction
- Minnesota: Below Basic 29, Basic 51, Proficient 16, Advanced 4
- Oregon: Below Basic 36, Basic 40, Proficient 19, Advanced 6
- Oklahoma: Below Basic 41, Basic 41, Proficient 16, Advanced 2
- Washington: Below Basic 43, Basic 35, Proficient 14, Advanced 8
- Nation: Below Basic 44, Basic 37, Proficient 15, Advanced 3
- Alaska: Below Basic 49, Basic 36, Proficient 13, Advanced 2
- Montana: Below Basic 49, Basic 35, Proficient 13, Advanced 2
- Utah: Below Basic 49, Basic 32, Proficient 17, Advanced 1
- North Dakota: Below Basic 52, Basic 34, Proficient 12, Advanced 1
- South Dakota: Below Basic 52, Basic 35, Proficient 12, Advanced 1
- North Carolina: Below Basic 55, Basic 30, Proficient 12, Advanced 2
- Arizona: Below Basic 58, Basic 31, Proficient 10, Advanced 1
- New Mexico: Below Basic 59, Basic 32, Proficient 8, Advanced 1

Percentage below Basic
- Minnesota: 44
- Oregon: 39
- Oklahoma: 40
- Washington: 41
- Nation: 42
- Alaska: 43
- Montana: 43
- Utah: 43
- North Dakota: 45
- South Dakota: 45
- North Carolina: 48
- Arizona: 51
- New Mexico: 52

Percentage at Basic, Proficient, and Advanced
- Minnesota: Basic 51, Proficient 16, Advanced 4
- Oregon: Basic 40, Proficient 19, Advanced 6
- Oklahoma: Basic 41, Proficient 16, Advanced 2
- Washington: Basic 35, Proficient 14, Advanced 8
- Nation: Basic 37, Proficient 15, Advanced 3
- Alaska: Basic 36, Proficient 13, Advanced 2
- Montana: Basic 35, Proficient 13, Advanced 2
- Utah: Basic 32, Proficient 17, Advanced 1
- North Dakota: Basic 34, Proficient 12, Advanced 1
- South Dakota: Basic 35, Proficient 12, Advanced 1
- North Carolina: Basic 30, Proficient 12, Advanced 2
- Arizona: Basic 31, Proficient 10, Advanced 1
- New Mexico: Basic 32, Proficient 8, Advanced 1

NOTE: AI/AN = American Indian/Alaska Native. Detail may not sum to totals because of rounding.
Figure R-13. Percentage of eighth-grade AI/AN students in NAEP reading, by achievement level and jurisdiction: 2009

Jurisdiction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Below Basic</th>
<th>Basic</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
<th>Advanced</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nation</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: AI/AN = American Indian/Alaska Native. Detail may not sum to totals because of rounding.
Figure R-11. Percentage of fourth-grade AI/AN students in NAEP reading, by achievement level and jurisdiction: 2009

Jurisdiction

- Oklahoma: 38% Below Basic, 36% Basic, 22% Proficient, 5% Advanced
- Washington: 41% Below Basic, 33% Basic, 20% Proficient, 6% Advanced
- Oregon: 44% Below Basic, 39% Basic, 14% Proficient, 3% Advanced
- Nation: 50% Below Basic, 29% Basic, 16% Proficient, 4% Advanced
- Montana: 50% Below Basic, 33% Basic, 13% Proficient, 3% Advanced
- North Carolina: 53% Below Basic, 28% Basic, 13% Proficient, 6% Advanced
- North Dakota: 56% Below Basic, 30% Basic, 11% Proficient, 2% Advanced
- Minnesota: 57% Below Basic, 23% Basic, 13% Proficient, 7% Advanced
- Utah: 59% Below Basic, 25% Basic, 14% Proficient, 2% Advanced
- Arizona: 67% Below Basic, 23% Basic, 8% Proficient, 2% Advanced
- South Dakota: 68% Below Basic, 23% Basic, 7% Proficient, 2% Advanced
- New Mexico: 69% Below Basic, 23% Basic, 8% Proficient, 1% Advanced
- Alaska: 73% Below Basic, 18% Basic, 7% Proficient, 1% Advanced

NOTE: AI/AN = American Indian/Alaska Native. Detail may not sum to totals because of rounding.
Comprehensive Continuum of Gifted Education and Talent Development Services

- Who are these children and how do we find them?
  - Will HOPE Scale help?
  - More is better (services, identification, areas of focus, efforts)

- Strength-based is essential

- General (GFAC) and GCT Services
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Setting an Agenda

- AERA SIG: Research on Giftedness, Creativity and Talent (priority)
  - Opportunity to set agenda and collaborate
  - Refine and update language and assumptions
  - Leverage resources and knowledge
  - Develop services
  - Create a research agenda that affects practices and services in an important way
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Considerations: Reading and Analysis of Non-fiction framework (RAN)

❖ A modification of the traditional KWL chart developed by Tony Stead (*Reality Checks: Teaching Reading Comprehension with Non-fiction*, 2006).

❖ KWL charts are limiting:
  ▪ They do not sufficiently support the research process
  ▪ They do not take into account misinformation
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The Process

- What we think we know
  - Assumptions that are believed to be true
- Yes, we were right!
  - Confirmation of assumptions
- Misconceptions
  - Assumptions that should be disregarded
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The Process

- New Information
  - Additional information not stated in our assumptions that should be considered

- Wonderings
  - Important research questions raised based upon the new information
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Your Task

- In small groups, consider the assumptions on your RAN charts:
  - Which are correct? Misconceptions?
  - What else should we consider?
  - What areas exist as potential partnerships for future research?
Assumptions: Talent Development

- Talented youth exist among Native populations
- Recognition, development, services, and programs are needed to nurture these youth
- More youth can achieve at higher levels than current expectations indicate
- Specific considerations should be given to develop spiritualistic, naturalistic, leadership, visual/spatial, artistic, musical, creative problem solving, and communication (naat'aanii) strengths
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Assumptions: Talent Development

- Programs and curriculum should be tied to culture, and delivered according to learning preferences and cognitive styles of the students.
- Group work and solving relevant problems should be a focus.
- Early identification, enrichment programming, and on-going identification should be done in a variety of areas.
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Assumptions: Culture and Traditions

- Collective society
- Matriarchal society
- Respect for authority and elders
- Traditions and cultural knowledge are important to hand down to future generations
- Oral traditions, ceremonies, and storytelling exist and are important
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Assumptions: Culture and Traditions

- Present, cyclical view of time is prevalent
- Religion and spirituality are ways of life
- Live in harmony with nature, non-materialistic
- Patience and self-control are valued
- Tribal leaders, spiritual leaders, and medicine people are valuable community members
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Assumptions: Cognition and Learning

- Public display of knowledge is not encouraged (humility)
- Cooperative and sharing
- Anonymity
- Non-competitive, non-aggressive
- Watch, learn, then do
- Practice, hands-on, participation
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Assumptions: Cognition and Learning

- Spatial strengths
- Simultaneous processing
- Naturalistic, holistic views
- Storytelling, auditory learning
- Psychomotor, physical learning
- Concern for accuracy over speed
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Assumptions: Communication

- Soft, slow speech, quiet, few interjections, delayed responses
- Non-verbal communication emphasized
- Indirect, non-verbal cues to speaker or listener
- May be fluent in two or more languages
- Introspective rather than questioning
- Feelings unlikely to be openly expressed
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Links

- www.purdue.edu/geri
- www.gifted.uconn.edu
- www.hoagiesgifted.org
- www.nagc.org
- www.aeragifted.net
- http://ceep.indiana.edu/mindthegap/
Links

- www.nationdeceived.org
If we are to achieve a richer culture, rich in contrasting values, we must recognize the whole gamut of human potentialities, and so weave a less arbitrary social fabric, one in which each diverse human gift will find a fitting place.

--Margaret Mead