



Ohio's Twice
Exceptional
Students:
A Status Study



School Study Council of Ohio

OHIO'S TWICE
EXCEPTIONAL
STUDENTS:
A STATUS STUDY

Dr. Joan S. Wolf, Project Consultant
Dr. Jeanie Goertz, Specialist
Dr. Thomas M. Stephens, Project Director
Michael Nelson, Research Specialist

January 2005

School Study Council of Ohio

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This study was supported by the Office for Exceptional Children of the Ohio Department of Education.

We very much appreciated Michael Armstrong's support and assistance. As Ohio's Director of Special Education, he has been committed to quality education for all students.

We thank Dawn Cauldwell, Coordinator for Gifted Education, Kettering City Schools, for sharing information about services to twice exceptional students.

We also thank Kathy Richards and Alexis Forest, the School Study Council of Ohio's Project Assistants, for their excellent technical assistance.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Executive Summary	2
Review of state education agency regulations and policies	4
Analysis of twice exceptional survey results: gifted coordinators and gifted education service providers	21
Annotated bibliography for twice exceptional	28
Two case studies of youngsters who are twice exceptional.....	39
Annotated bibliography of organizations for exceptionalities	44
Appendix	60
Technical report: survey of gifted coordinators and service providers	
Focus group: discussion responses and technical report for coordinators and service providers for gifted education	
Focus group: discussion responses and technical report for principals	

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report contains a review of state education agency regulations and policies, an analysis of a survey of gifted coordinators and gifted education service providers and two case studies of youngsters who are twice exceptional. In addition, annotated bibliographies of twice exceptional and of organizations for exceptionalities are included. The Appendix includes the technical report for the survey and focus group documents.

In order to determine current district practices for serving students who are gifted and disabled, an email survey of gifted coordinators and service providers was completed in October 2004. The survey questions were developed based on two focus groups, one comprised of gifted coordinators and the other of school principals. Survey responses were received from 104 individuals. The majority of respondents identified their position as "coordinator" of gifted and over 80% said they had worked with twice exceptional students. Over sixty-four percent of respondents reported working with gifted students for a period from one to ten years. Twenty-two percent were involved in programs in multiple districts. Respondents believed that laws and regulations for disabled students benefit twice exceptional more than do laws and regulations for gifted students. Complete survey results are included in the Technical Report.

Two case studies representing students who are twice exceptional are included in this report. In addition, an interview was conducted with a gifted coordinator regarding policies and practices in her district. She described the relationship between the Special Education staff and the gifted personnel. She indicated that approximately one to three students/year qualify as twice exceptional - this in a district of approximately 8,000 students. Decisions for service are made on an individual basis and parents are an integral part of the development of the service plan. She reported that, because the district program serves only academically gifted students and resources are extremely stretched, it is difficult to include gifted students who are disabled in the program. The major focus for most students is typically the child's disability.

Ohio Revised Code 3324.04 for identifying children who are gifted addresses twice exceptional by providing assurances for inclusion in screening and assessment procedures. Twice exceptional students are referred to as "children with disabilities." Districts are required to select testing instruments from an approved list that will allow for appropriate screening and identification of children with disabilities. Ohio does not mandate services for gifted students

with funding; however, identification of children who are gifted is mandated and some funding for teachers of the gifted is provided. There are a number of barriers to identification and programming for children who are twice exceptional. These barriers include: 1) inappropriate identification procedures that are receptive to the masking impact of disabilities; 2) stereotypic attitudes about children who are gifted and disabled; 3) lack of information about the nature and impact of developmental delays associated with disabilities; 4) inadequate training of professionals; 5) lack of program models, research and dissemination strategies; 6) lack of supportive technology; 7) lack of appropriate career counseling; and 8) inadequate funding.¹

Both the review of state education agency regulations and policies and the survey conducted indicate a need for improvement in all areas of serving twice exceptional. There was a perception that twice exceptional students are a higher priority on the state level than in many districts. Therefore, the state can have a role in strengthening laws and regulations for serving this population. Based on the survey results, identification would be improved with the implementation of a formal, written policy and a system for identifying and serving twice exceptional students. Two key areas for improvement on the local level involve the rate of identification of twice exceptional students and professional development for all staff working with this population. Another critical component involves the role of parents who, according to the survey, are seeking a high level of service for their children and who must be engaged and educated with regard to twice exceptional issues.

¹ Johnson, L.J., Karnes, M.B., & Carr, V.W. (1997)/ Providing services to children with gifts and disabilities: A critical need. N. Colangelo & G.A. Davis, (2nd Ed.) Handbook of Gifted Education (pp. 516-527). Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Review of State Education Agency Regulations and Policies

Twice Exceptional

Twice exceptional children and adults are gifted with disabling conditions. This population remains a major group of under identified and underserved children and adults in education (Cline 1999) despite the 1975 Education for All Handicapped Children Act (P.L. 94-142*), which required public schools to identify and then to provide special education services to all children with educational, emotional, developmental, or physical disabilities. This would include the definition for gifted disabled as:

gifted disabled are individuals with exceptional ability or potential and who are able to achieve high performance despite such disabilities as hearing, speech, vision, orthopedic, or emotional impairments, learning disabilities, or other health problems, either singly or in combination

US Congress, 1975; Yewchuk & Lupart, 1993

Legislation clearly states that children with disabilities must be served. However, Schnur and Stefanich (1979) pointed out that the disabled gifted child may be omitted from special services if they are functioning reasonably well within the regular classroom. This means for example, an intellectually gifted child who performs at grade level, but whose achievement is depressed by her disability, would not necessarily be provided with any special services because her performance is equivalent to that of average classmates.

This report, *Twice Exceptional*, examines research about disabled/gifted and reviews policies and procedures that state education agencies have developed to identify and serve the **twice exceptional**.

*P.L.94-142 was amended in 1990 and is now called the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA).

Defining Twice Exceptional

Recognizing intellectual giftedness in the presence of a disability such as visual impairment, hearing impairments, learning disabilities, emotional disturbance, orthopedic

impairment and other health impairment is often difficult. The major problem is that the individual's gifts usually remain invisible to teachers and sometimes even parents. Teachers and parents may focus concern for these children on accommodations for their disabilities instead of recognition and development of their cognitive abilities. It is not unexpected, then, to find a significant discrepancy between the measured academic potential of these students and their actual performance in the classroom (Whitmore & Maker, 1985). The twice exceptional must be recognized for their intellectual strengths and nurtured, while accommodating their disability.

The existence of twice exceptional people is well documented. Porter (1982) noted that some 211 of 700 eminent persons in two major historical surveys (Goertzel & Goertzel, 1962; Goertzel, Goertzel, & Goertzel, 1978) could be labeled gifted and disabled. The fact that the twice exceptional are hardly mentioned as a group in the literature until the 1970's confirms the lack of service (Shore, 1991). To further support the lack of service for this population, a survey conducted by Corn and Bishop (1984) of teacher training programs showed that:

“IEP writing for gifted-handicapped is not emphasized in teacher training programs which include coursework in the gifted handicapped” p. 144.

Maker (1977) and Blacher-Dixon and Turnbull (1978) suggest that services for the gifted handicapped (twice exceptional) should be individualized, because of the low numbers of any combination of dual exceptionalities.

Because there are many types of giftedness and possible disabilities, it can be difficult to describe or list typical characteristics of twice exceptional that would aid educators in recognizing these students. Most standard lists of characteristics of gifted students are inadequate for the twice exceptional without including the disability. Because gifted children with disabilities often use their intelligence to compensate for the disability, both exceptionalities

may appear less extreme. The disability may appear less severe because the child uses the intellect to cope, thereby hiding the giftedness.

For example, children whose hearing is impaired cannot respond easily to oral directions and they may lack the vocabulary that reflects the complexity of their thoughts. Children whose speech or language is impaired cannot respond to well to tests requiring verbal responses. Children whose vision is impaired may be unable to respond to certain performance measures, and, although their vocabulary may be quite advanced, they may not understand the full meaning of the words they use. Children with learning disabilities may use high-level vocabulary in speaking, but be unable to express themselves in writing, or vice versa. In addition, limited life experiences due to impaired mobility may artificially lower test scores (Whitmore & Maker, 1985). Since the population of twice exceptional students is difficult to locate, they seldom are included in standardized test norming groups, adding to the problems of comparison.

A recent report, *Appropriate Practices for Screening, Identifying and Instructing Gifted/Disabled Youth* (Karnes, 2004), a project funded by the United States Department of Education and The University of Southern Mississippi, includes an extensive list of characteristics that defines the twice exceptional. The list includes: gifted/autistic, gifted/deaf-blind, gifted/deaf and gifted/hearing-impaired, gifted/developmentally delayed, gifted/emotional-behavioral disability, gifted/multi-disabled, gifted/physically or orthopedically impaired, gifted/specific learning disabled, gifted/speech or language impaired, gifted/traumatic brain injured and gifted/visually impaired. In this report, Karnes (2003) explains appropriate practice for screening, identifying and instructing twice exceptional.

State Education Agencies Reference to Twice Exceptional

Twice exceptional is rarely recognized by state education agencies in definition, rules and regulations (Karnes, 2003). In reviewing the state education agencies' definitions of gifted and talented, Arizona and Kentucky are the only two in the *State of the States Gifted and Talented Education Report 2001-2002* that specifically address disabled in their state definition. The Arizona legal definition of giftedness says:

Gifted child means a child of lawful school age who, due to a superior intellect or advanced learning ability, or both is not afforded an opportunity for otherwise attainable progress and development in regular classroom instruction and who needs special instruction or special ancillary services, or both, to achieve at levels commensurate with his intellect and ability. (A.R.S. 15-761.7.)

Additionally, Arizona definitions for exceptional children includes:

*A gifted child or a **child with a disability**. (A.R.S. 15-761.6)*

Kentucky defines gifted and talented student within the definition of “**exceptional children**” in the law. KRS 157.200(1)(n) includes within the definition of “exceptional children” a category of “exceptional students” who are identified as:

Possessing demonstrated or potential ability to perform at an exceptionally high level in general intellectual aptitude, specific academic aptitude, creative or divergent thinking, psychosocial or leadership skills, or in the visual or performing arts.

An examination of categories specifically addressed in state education agency rules and regulations reveals that Arizona, Kentucky, Mississippi, Missouri, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and Tennessee include **the category disabled gifted** (Karnes, 2003).

As previously mentioned, Arizona explains **disabled gifted in the definition** which automatically includes this population in Arizona Administrative Code Section R7-2-406:

Gifted education programs and services, which require governing boards to adopt policies for the education of gifted students, which shall include:

- *Procedures for identification and placement of students to be placed*
- *In gifted programs*
- *Curriculum, differentiated instruction, and supplemental services for gifted students.*
- *Parent involvement. The scope and sequence shall be a written program description that demonstrates articulation across all grades and schools to ensure opportunities for continuous progress.*

The Arizona Department of Education shall develop and make available model policies for the development implementation, an evaluation of services for gifted students.

The Arizona Department of Education has published *Education of Gifted Students in Arizona: A Guide to Arizona Statutes, Services, Promising Practices, and Resources* (Neilson, Carr & Gore, 2001). This publication has the category *Dual Diagnosis and Special Needs Students* that addresses twice exceptional.

Kentucky defines gifted and talented within the definition of exceptional children and requires educational services to meet the needs of students who are gifted and talented including those students who are twice exceptional. Kentucky offers gifted education services for identified students across all grade levels. Primary students are screened and selected as high potential learners and students in grades 4-12 are formally identified for services in one or more of the following areas: general intellectual aptitude specific academic aptitude, creative or divergent thinking psychosocial or leadership skills and visual or performing arts. The Kentucky state document *Gifted and Talented Education Assurances* outlines the responsibilities of the local school districts for identification and services for gifted and talented, which includes the twice exceptional. Administrative regulation 704 KAR 157.230 addresses local school district's responsibility to operate programs for resident exceptional children, primary-grade twelve. In Kentucky a school district must develop a system for searching the entire school

population on a continuous basis for likely candidates for services. According to Section 4(a)

Data gathering (2) Exceptions and special considerations for eligibility:

*School personnel shall take into consideration environmental, cultural, and **disabling conditions, which may mask a child's true abilities that lead to exclusion of otherwise eligible students**, such as a student who qualifies as: (a) An exceptional child as defined in KRS 157.2000; (b) Disadvantaged; or (c) Underachieving. (704 KAR 157.230)*

This statement directs schools to include the twice exceptional in their plan to find gifted children and to provide services.

In reviewing Mississippi statutes the statement that could indicate twice exceptional is within Section 37-23-173. *Legislative Finds and Declarations; Purpose* in paragraph two says:

*Consequently, it is the purpose of Sections 37-23-171 through 37-23-18 to provide for a uniform system of education for gifted children in the public schools of Mississippi, to **provide for a nondiscriminatory process of identification of these children**, to provide for periodic evaluation of the program and its benefit to the gifted children, and to insure gifted children are identified and offered an appropriate education.*

The third line in the “Purpose” indicates that public schools of Mississippi must “provide for a nondiscriminatory process of identification of these children,” which could include the twice exceptional.

Missouri addresses disabled and gifted within the state law.

*Missouri school districts are expected to provide programs of instruction suitable **for the full range of student ability, from handicapped and disadvantaged learners through those who are academically advanced**. In 1973 the General Assembly recognized that there is a limited number of academically advanced students who mental capacity and learning potential are so advanced that they need services beyond the level of those ordinarily provided.*

The Missouri Administrative Manual and Website in the section *Guidelines for Student Selection* mentions the twice exceptional as **the hard-to-identify and traditionally underrepresented students**.

*Any information contained in permanent records should be used, including nationally-normed achievement test scores, group intelligence test, scores, MAP scores, previous grades, anecdotal records demonstrating creative problem-solving and general creativity, and recommendations from teachers, parents, peers, and other personnel. Districts should also consider what methods would be effective **in selecting hard-to-identify and traditionally underrepresented students.***

The traditionally underrepresented student would be the gifted/disabled student. Following screening and referral of a student, Missouri schools must use at least three of the four identification criteria to evaluate and place students in the gifted program. The school district determines the criteria, which would be appropriate for the academic or fine arts...

*It is expected that the use of tests and scales may differ within districts as well as between districts. For example, different procedures or instruments may be used with students of different ages or parts of the program. Alternate selection criteria and methods may also be used for special populations or **students with special needs (i.e., LEP, LD, ADD.)***

Missouri has alternate identification plans to acknowledge that the task of identifying gifted children is a complex one, especially the task of finding children who are **gifted and also have other exceptionalities**. Missouri recognizes several groups as being under-identified and under-served, and in the need of alternate assessment strategies. Missouri is very clear that alternate selection should include:

1. *Using alternate tests, (such as non-verbal IQ or achievement tests for children with language differences or alternate types of tests for fine arts programs or subject-specific classes;)*
2. *Alternate test administration (such as **removing time limitations for children with learning disabilities or physical challenges;**)*
3. *Using interpreters or adaptive technology;*
4. *Any adaptation that is part of a child's IEP (p. 9.)*

Ohio Revised Code 3324.04 for identifying children who are gifted addresses twice exceptional by providing:

*(b)(ii)(b) assurance of inclusion in screening and assessment procedures for minority and disadvantaged students, **children with disabilities**, and children for whom English is a second language...*

The section addressing testing and assessment (4)(c) addresses twice exceptional as “children with disabilities”:

*The district shall select instruments, from the approved list, that will allow for appropriate screening and identification of minority or disadvantaged children, **children with disabilities**, and children for whom English is a second language (p. 4).*

The Pennsylvania Department of Education clearly states twice exceptional in Title 22- Education (22 Pa. Code Chs. 14, 16 and 342); Gifted Education; Special Education Services and Programs (30 Pa.B.6330) Section 16.7 Special Education as:

*(b) If a student is determined to **be both gifted and eligible for special education**, the procedures in Chapter 14 and 342 shall take precedence. For these students identified with dual exceptionalities, the needs established under gifted status in this chapter shall be fully addressed in the procedures required in Chapters 14 and 342.*

*(c) For students who are **gifted and eligible for special education**, it is not necessary for school districts to conduct separate screening and evaluations, develop separate IEPs, or use separate procedural safeguards processes to provide for a student’s needs as both a gifted and an eligible student (p. 14).*

Pennsylvania laws, rules and regulations view the twice exceptional as a child who must have a program tailored to meet individual needs. The position on gifted education programs in Pennsylvania according to Secretary Vicki Phillips is that the Pennsylvania Department of Education is:

committed to providing all students in the Commonwealth with a quality education by tailoring students’ educational experiences to meet their individual needs whenever possible (p. 1).

The Tennessee Department of Education, Division of Special Education has published *Guidelines for Identifying Children with Disabilities- Intellectually Gifted*, a child find

document. This document contains practices consistent with the goals and objectives of Tennessee's Intellectually Gifted Education Program and incorporate policies and practices designed to identify and service students from traditionally **underrepresented populations**. Within the child find program, the Tennessee document is concerned with all children, regardless of the school system's service delivery model for children identified as intellectually gifted. It is based on the premise that intellectual giftedness is found throughout diverse populations and crosses all economic and cultural boundaries.

*Early identification and intervention is often required to meet the unique needs of children from culturally divergent and/or **traditionally underrepresented student populations**.*

When school systems develop child find and public awareness campaigns, special effort should be made for finding hard-to-reach children whose parents might not be aware of the need for, or the availability of services for high ability students. Methods should also be planned to reach persons in the community who may not understand English language materials and broadcast as well as persons living in rural or isolated geographical areas. Particular attention should be given to children from culturally diverse, economically disadvantaged, or **disability populations** during the child find process. School systems must be able to assure their communities **that traditionally underrepresented** children who demonstrate characteristics of intellectually giftedness are recognized and given a chance to receive the thorough evaluation needed to establish eligibility. (p. 6)

Within the *Comprehensive Assessment*, the alternative assessment is mentioned as the

*component menu selections, including test assessment instruments or assessment strategies, which may be used for the evaluation of **traditionally "underrepresented" students** as more equitable methods for assessing potential intellectual giftedness. (p. 14)*

The seven states, Arizona, Kentucky, Mississippi, Missouri, Ohio, Pennsylvania and Tennessee that mention twice exceptional, five mandate gifted and talented education. Missouri and Tennessee do not require gifted education. Arizona and Ohio have state law specific to

mandate gifted education. Mississippi has state department of education policy that mandates gifted and talented education and Pennsylvania is mandated by the state board of education.

Of the seven states that speak to twice exceptional in their definitions and or categories of gifted and talented only two states, Mississippi and Tennessee, mandate gifted education with funding. Ohio funds identification of children who are gifted and provides some funding for teachers of the gifted. According to Karnes (2004)

... the presence of a state mandate, without accompanying funding, creates the illusion of support without the reality and produces a type of political fraud...

Without money to purchase tests, materials, services, personnel for twice exceptional it certainly limits the possibility of finding these children through state requirements.

Although the SEA's of Arizona, Kentucky, Mississippi, Missouri, Ohio, Pennsylvania and Tennessee have rules, regulations and policies that provides the foundation for serving children who are twice exceptional, barriers to identification and programming for these children still remain. These barriers include the following: 1) inappropriate identification procedures that are receptive to the masking impact of disabilities; 2) stereotypic attitudes about children who are gifted and disabled; 3) lack of information on the nature and impact of developmental delays associated with disabilities; 4) inadequate training of professionals; 5) lack of program models, research, and dissemination strategies; 6) lack of supportive technology; 7) lack of appropriate career counseling; and 8) inadequate funding (Johnson, 1997).

One barrier to identification of gifted children with disabilities is the expectation that these children will demonstrate the same characteristics of giftedness as children without disabilities who are identified as gifted. It is important to remember that the disability may obscure or suppress the giftedness.

The expectations about gifted children in general may mask the giftedness in a child with a disability. For example, the misinformed might expect a gifted child to “look bright,” but some physically challenged child may not. The child with hearing impairment whose language is absent or difficult to understand would be overlooked because, stereotypically, it is expected that a gifted child would have advanced language ability.

A developmental delay associated with the disability is another barrier to identifying the gifted disabled. For example, a child with a motor delay who has artistic gifts would be delayed in presenting these abilities because of the masking of the motor delay.

Most educators and other personnel working in the classroom have little knowledge to enable them to identify and educate the twice exceptional. Special educators of the disabled may have little or no knowledge about characteristics of gifted children or how to program for them just as professionals in gifted education have little knowledge about handicaps or the effects of a handicapping condition on learning. In-service and professional development is one way to help professionals become knowledgeable about twice exceptional. Pre-service training is also needed as well as collaboration of educators who work with disabled with those who work with teachers of the gifted and the general educator.

The lack of program models to guide practice is another barrier to providing best practice for this population (Maker, Redden, Tonelson & Howell, 1978). The lack of funds for the needed equipment and materials for instruction is another barrier. The use of technology-based assessment and instruction is needed to advance best practice. Another barrier is adequate counseling. In the past, individuals with disabilities were counseled into vocational training rather than advanced education and professional careers. Having adequate counseling services

for twice exceptional would help them acquire the knowledge and skills they need to actualize their full potentials and develop realistic, healthy self-concepts and self-esteem.

According to Johnson, Karnes and Carr (1997), the most serious barrier to the identification and service for the twice exceptional and the most difficult to solve is the inadequate funding of education. As a society we need to reap the benefits that accrue, both to individuals and to society by serving the twice exceptional. As Whitmore and Maker (1985) stated:

It is obvious that appropriate educational programming for these children could release a very significant amount of creative productivity of great value to society and would also reduce the possibility of economic dependence in adult years, as is often the case when suitable employment cannot be obtained.

For the good of society and for the well-being of the twice exceptional, educators must put forth greater effort to address the problem of underserving the twice exceptional. It is time to provide an educational system that will enable these children to reach their full potential.

References

- Arizona Department of Education. Title 15, Arizona Revised Statutes (ARS) 761.6 and 761.7.
- Arizona Department of Education (1998). *Gifted education programs and services*. Arizona Administrative Code Title 7, Education, Chapter 2, State Board of Education Supp. 02-2A.R.S 15-20 Article 4, Special Education Section R7-2-406.
- Blacher-Dixon, J. & Turnbull, A.F. (1978). A preschool program for gifted-handicapped children. *Journal for the Education of the Gifted*, 1, 15-23.
- Cline, S., & Schwartz, D. (1999). *Diverse populations of gifted children*. NJ: Merrill.
- Coleman, M.R., Gallagher, J. & Foster, A. (1994). *Updated report on state policies related to the identification of gifted students*. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina.
- Corn, A.L., & Bishop, V.E. (1984). Educating teachers of the gifted-handicapped: A survey of teachers education programs. *Journal for the Education of the Gifted*, 7, 137-145.
- Goertzel, V. & Goertzel, M.G. (1962). *Cradles of eminence*. Boston: Little Brown.
- Goertzel, M.G., Goertzel, V. & Goertzel, T.G. (1978). *300 eminent personalities*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Johnson, L.J., Karnes, M.B., & Carr, V.W. (1997). Providing services to children with gifts and disabilities: A critical need. In N. Colangelo & G.A. Davis (2nd ed.) *Handbook of gifted education*, (pp. 516-527). Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Karnes, F. (2003). *State of the states gifted and talented education report 2001-2002: Council of state directors of programs for the gifted and national association for gifted children*. Washington, DC: National Association for Gifted Children.

Karnes, F. (2004). Appropriate practices for screening, identifying and instructing gifted/disabled youth. Hattiesburg, MS: University of Southern Mississippi.

Kentucky Department of Education (1999-2004). *Gifted and talented assurances*.

Kentucky Department of Education (1999-2004). 704 KRS 157.200(1)(n), 157.224(1), 157.230.

Kentucky Department of Education (1999-2004). *Programs for the gifted and talented*. 704 KAR 3:285.

Maker, C. J. (1977). *Providing programs for the gifted handicapped*. Reston, VA: Council for Exceptional Children.

Maker, C.J., Redden, M.R., Tonelson, S., & Howell, R.M. (1978). *The self-perception of successful handicapped scientists*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico, Department of Special Education.

Mississippi Department of Education (1993). *Promulgation of rules, regulations, and guidelines; office for gifted education; implementation of programs of gifted education by local school districts; funding of programs*. Mississippi Code of 1972 as amended. SEC. 37-23-173-179.

Missouri Department of Education (1973). State special education law (H.B. 474). Section 162.675; 162.720; 162.975, RSMo.

Missouri Department of Education (2004-2005). General Administrative Manual: Procedures for state-assisted Gifted Programs. Division of School Improvement.

<http://www.dese.state.mo.us/divimprove/gifted/manual>

Nielson, A.B., Carr, C. & Gore, J.L. (Eds.) (2001). *Education of gifted students in Arizona: A guide to Arizona statues, services, promising practices, and resources*. Arizona Department of Education. <http://www.ade.az.gov/ess/Gifted>

Ohio Department of Education (2000). *Identification and services for children who are gifted*. Ohio Administrative Code 3301-51-15.

Ohio Department of Education (1999). Ohio Revised Code 3324.01-.07.

Pennsylvania Department of Education. *Gifted Education; Special education services and programs*. Rules and Regulations Title 22-Education 22 PA. Code Chs. 14, 16, and 342. State Board of Education.

Porter, R.M. (1982). Gifted handicapped: A status report. *Roeper Review*, 4(3), 24-25.

Schnur, J.O. & Stefanich, G.P. (1979). Science for the handicapped gifted. *Roeper Review*, 2(2) p. 26-28.

Shore, B.M., Cornell, D.W., Robinson, A. & Ward, V.S. (1991). Education of the gifted handicapped must recognize strengths and handicaps. In J.H. Borland (Ed.) *Recommended practices in gifted education a critical analysis*, (pp. 255-258). NY: Teachers College Press.

Tennessee Department of Education (2003). *Guidelines for identifying children with disabilities: Intellectually gifted Tennessee*.

US Congress (1975). *The education for all handicapped children act of 1975*. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.

Whitmore, J.R., & Maker, C.J. (1985). *Intellectual giftedness in disabled persons*. Rockville, MD: Aspen Systems Corporation.

Yewchuk, C. & Lupart, J.L. (1993). Gifted handicapped: A desultory duality, In K.A. Heller, F.J. Monks, & A. H. Passow (Eds.) *International handbook of research and development of giftedness and talent*, (pp. 709-725). NY: Pergamon.

Analysis of Twice Exceptional Survey Results: Gifted Coordinators and Gifted Education Service Providers

Analysis of Twice Exceptional Survey Results

Introduction

As part of the School Study Council of Ohio's study of twice exceptional students and their needs, we conducted a survey of gifted coordinators and gifted education service providers. The survey items were based on the results of earlier focus groups conducted with gifted education professionals. The survey was administered online and participants were contacted by email. The email addresses were provided by the Ohio Department of Education.

Of the 426 professionals emailed, 104 (24.4%) responded to the survey. Most respondents reported working with gifted students for either 1 to 5 years (30, 28.8%) or 6 to 10 years (35, 33.7%). 80 respondents (76.9%) were involved in gifted programs in a single district, while 23 (22.1%) were involved in programs in multiple districts. The majority of respondents (64, 55.2%) identified their position as a "coordinator" of gifted, with 24 (20.7%) saying they were teachers, 15 (12.9%) gifted intervention specialists, and the remainder (13, 11.2%) were listed as "other" or did not identify their position.

Most respondents have had direct personal interaction with clients regarding twice exceptional issues. 84 (80.4%) said they had worked with twice exceptional students; 80 (76.4%) said they had worked with twice exceptional parents; and 83 (79.8%) said they had worked with teachers of twice exceptional students.

Methodology

Respondents were asked to rate their agreement with items using the following scale: Strongly Agree = 5; Agree = 4; Neither Agree nor Disagree = 3; Disagree = 2; Strongly Disagree = 1; Not Applicable = N/A; Don't Know = D/K. Our analysis of the results uses the plus-minus

system, in which ratings above 3 are considered positive and ratings below 3 are considered negative. A rating of 3 is considered neutral.

Respondents also were asked to provide comments after each section of the survey. The complete results are available in the technical report of the survey.

General Items

Of the six (6) items in this section, only two (2) items received a positive mean rating, with no mean rating exceeding 3.23. Negative ratings were given to each of the following items (mean ratings in parentheses):

- Twice exceptional students are a **high priority in my district**. (2.63)
- In addition to state-mandated policies, my **district has an official written policy** regarding twice exceptional students. (2.63)
- There is a **common understanding of the meaning of “twice exceptional”** among gifted coordinators, service providers, administrators, and teachers. (2.75)
- The **laws and regulations regarding gifted students** facilitate the delivery of services to twice exceptional students. (2.91)

Positive ratings were given to each of the following items (mean ratings in parentheses):

- Twice exceptional students are a **high priority at the state level**. (3.14)
- The **laws and regulations regarding disabled students** facilitate the delivery of services to twice exceptional students. (3.23)

Note that respondents believed laws and regulations for disabled students benefit twice exceptional students more than do laws and regulations for gifted students. Also, twice exceptional students are perceived to be a higher priority on the state level than on the district level.

Identification Items

Of the five (5) items in this section, only two (2) items received a positive mean rating, with no mean rating exceeding 3.91. Negative ratings were given to each of the following items (mean ratings in parentheses):

- In addition to state-mandated policies, there is a **formal written process in place in my district to identify twice exceptional students.** (2.62)
- There is a **high rate of identification of twice exceptional students** in my district. (2.09)
- Gifted and talented staff, IAT members, school psychologists, and other **staff work together effectively to identify twice exceptional students** in my district. (2.99)

Positive ratings were given to each of the following items (mean ratings in parentheses):

- **School psychologists in my district have the knowledge and training to identify twice exceptional students.** (3.91)
- Current **methods of assessment in my district are effective** for identifying twice exceptional students. (3.23)

Note that the rating for how well staff works together to identify twice exceptional students (2.99) is listed as negative but is virtually neutral. Also, while the mean rating of school psychologists' knowledge and training to identify twice exceptional students is relatively high (3.91), almost one-fifth (20) of respondents said they didn't know enough about the issue to rate their agreement.

Services and Impact Items

Of the six (6) items in this section of the survey, three (3) received positive mean ratings, with the highest mean rating being 3.62. Negative ratings were given to each of the following items (mean ratings in parentheses):

- There is a **formal system in place in my district to meet the needs of and deliver both gifted and disabled services** to twice exceptional students. (2.87)
- Teachers, school psychologists, gifted and talented personnel, and other **staff receive the professional development** they need to understand and address the needs of twice exceptional students in my district. (2.17)
- Programs currently in place in my district **address the social and emotional needs** of twice exceptional children, in addition to their educational needs. (2.62)

Positive ratings were given to each of the following items (mean ratings in parentheses):

- Classroom teachers, special education teachers, gifted and talented staff, and other **staff work together effectively to meet the needs of and deliver services** to twice exceptional students. (3.16)
- **IEPs reflect the needs of twice exceptional** students where appropriate in my district. (3.62)
- **Programs currently in place in my district have had a significant positive impact** on the education of twice exceptional students. (3.01)

Note that, while programs currently in place for twice exceptional children are rated positively, the rating (3.01) is approximately neutral.

Parental Involvement Items

All five (5) items in this section received positive ratings. They are (mean ratings in parentheses):

- In my district, **there is a high level of parent involvement** in the education of twice exceptional students. (3.04)
- In my district, **parents generally understand the meaning and significance** of their children being twice exceptional. (3.06)
- In my district, **parents work collaboratively with the schools** to ensure that the needs of their twice exceptional children are addressed. (3.38)
- In my district, **parents want their twice exceptional children to receive services for their giftedness**. (3.97)
- In my district, **parents want their twice exceptional children to receive services for their disability**. (4.03)

Items referring to parental involvement and parental understanding were rated positively; however, the ratings for involvement (3.04) and understanding (3.06) are only slightly higher than neutral.

Note that the two items with the highest ratings in this section, referring to parents' desire for their children to receive gifted services (3.97) and disability services (4.03), both indicating an existing demand for services. The high ratings for these items do not indicate whether or not that demand is being met.

Discussion

Overall, the survey results show that there is need for some improvement in all areas of twice exceptional service and a strong need for improvement in some areas. Parents do want

their children to receive services for all of their needs, but parents must be engaged and educated with regard to twice exceptional issues. Given the disparity between demand from parents and the level of prioritization and organization on the district level, schools have a long way to go to address the giftedness of twice exceptional students with the same effectiveness as they address students' disabilities.

If the perception that twice exceptional students are a higher priority on the state level than in many districts is correct, there are opportunities for the state to facilitate improvements on the district level. One way for the state to help districts that were identified in the study would be for the state laws and regulations regarding gifted students to be strengthened. Currently, gifted coordinators and service providers believe that laws and regulations for disabled students are more comprehensive than those for gifted students.

Two key areas for improvement on the local level involve the rate of identification of twice exceptional students and professional development for all staff working with twice exceptional students. Professional development will help staff to work together, to have a common understanding of the issues involving identification and services for twice exceptional students, and to deliver services to these students. Based on results of the survey, identification could also be improved with the implementation of a formal, written policy and a system for identifying and serving this population. These changes will contribute to increased recognition of students who are twice exceptional and heightened priority for their welfare.

Annotated Bibliography for Twice Exceptional

Twice Exceptional Annotated Bibliography

Baum, S.M. & Owen, S.V. (2004). *To be gifted & leaning disabled: Strategies for helping bright students with LD, ADHD, and more*. Mansfield, Conn: Creative Learning Press, Inc.

-Part I reviews the unique characteristics of gifted, learning-disabled (GLD) children and provides background information for understanding the GLD child. The authors describe pioneering studies of GLD students and use those results to forge a clearer approach to educational intervention. Finally, the authors examine the confusion in diagnoses between LD and ADHD, especially gifted children.

-Part II discussions of contemporary psychological theory and research that leads to educational applications for GLD student.

-Part III provides strategies for meeting needs for effective learning which includes guidelines for developing a comprehensive individual education plan that assures gifted students with disabilities a free appropriate public education (FAPE); effective strategies for identifying GLD students; ideas for programs that nurture gifts in students with gifts and disabilities; curricular strategies, modifications accommodations and compensation strategies that enhance the learning and self-efficacy of the students; and finally, strategies for meeting the social and emotional needs of students with gifts and disabilities. This second edition has three new chapters-self-regulations, developing comprehensive individual educational programs, sources of support and expanded chapters on classroom practices.

Baum, S.M., Olenchak, F.R. & Owen, S.V. (1998). Gifted students with attention deficits: Fact and/or fiction? Or, can we see the forest for the trees? *Gifted Child Quarterly*, 42(2), 96-104.

The authors explore unique issues of attention deficit disorders among gifted students and offer alternative explanations for the occurrence of those behaviors among some students. They distinguish among three groups of students who demonstrate behaviors associated with ADHD; (a) students whose learning and attention problems stem, for the most part, from a neuro-chemical disorder; (b) those with behavioral disorders that are mostly brought about, and perhaps intensified, by the learning environment; and (c) those who fall into both of the preceding categories. Suggestions are offered for determining whether the behaviors are primarily environmental, neurological, or both.

Bees, C. (1998). The GOLD program: A program for gifted learning disabled adolescents. *Roepers Review*, 21(2) 155-161.

The GOLD program is a model for adolescents who are both gifted and learning disabled. The program has resource room support and enrichment. Entrance criteria are described. The curriculum is critical thinking, word processing, communication skills and ethics. The success of this program has resulted from intense involvement of staff, one-to-one tutoring, a flexible approach to timetables and attendance and an environment that encourages hope, humor, trust, and student decision-making.

Benito, Y. (2003). Intellectual giftedness and associated disorders: Separation anxiety disorders or school phobia. *Gifted and Talented International*, 18(1), 27-35.

Although a great amount of literature about the definition and education of gifted students exists, information about gifted students with associated disorders is not so abundant. The author uses case studies to show how separation anxiety disorder affects

gifted children. He poses the question, “Is the child afraid of going to school or is there a fear that she would be unable to adapt as a gifted child? Is the child afraid of being separated from her parents or does she suffer from anxiety at the thought of new responsibilities?”

Betts, G.T. & Neihart, M. (1988). Profiles of the gifted and talented. *Gifted Child Quarterly*, 32(2), 248-253.

After several years of observations, interviews and reviews of literature, the authors have developed six types of profiles of gifted and talented children and youth. The authors address the twice exceptional in the profile of a “double labeled” gifted child. These profiles help educators and parents to look closely at the feelings, behaviors and needs of the gifted and talented. There are tips on identification of each profile and information on facilitating the gifted in school.

Birely, M. (1994). *Crossover children: A sourcebook for helping children who are gifted and learning disabled* (2nd ed.). Reston, VA: The Council for Exceptional Children.

A rich resource that provides specific strategies to help children who are gifted and learning disabled and/or ADD control impulsivity, increase attention, enhance memory, improve social skills and develop a positive self concept. It provides recommendations for academic interventions and enrichment activities.

Bisland, A. (2004). Using learning-strategies instruction with students who are gifted and learning disabled. *Gifted Child Today*, 7(3), 52-58.

Explores current policies and practices concerning the definition, identification, and educational needs of students who are both gifted and learning disabled.

Recommendations stress the need for less rigid definitions and cutoff scores for program eligibility and the provision of a variety of settings and services.

Students who are gifted and learning disabled have unique needs that must be met through the education system. Special education teachers, classroom teachers and gifted teachers should be aware of the unique characteristics of this population and know strategies to advance their learning.

Brody, L.E. & Mills, C.J. (1997). Gifted children with learning disabilities: A review of the issues. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 30(3), 282-296.

This article explores current policies and practices concerning the definition, identification, and educational needs of students who are both gifted and learning disabled. Recommendations stress the need for less rigid definitions and cutoff scores for program eligibility and the provision of a wide variety of settings and services options.

Cline, S. & Schwartz, D. (1999). *Diverse populations of gifted children*. NJ: Merrill.

This book provides classroom teachers with guidance in identifying and planning curricula for special populations of gifted children. This book is divided into four sections: 1) background on intelligence theory, public policy on special education; 2) twice exceptional children (gifted children with physical or learning disabilities or sensory impairments; 3) special populations of gifted (culturally diverse, disabled gifted

children, young gifted children, and gifted females; and 4) issues and concerns for gifted education in the 21st century. The chapters begins with framing questions, followed by an advance organizer on how the chapter addresses these questions.

Coleman, M.R., Gallagher, M.R., & Foster, A. (1994). *Updated report on state policies related to the identification of gifted students*. Washington, DC: Office of Educational Research and Improvement.

An analysis was conducted of state policies in the identification of gifted students, especially those traditionally underserved (the culturally diverse, economically disadvantaged, and students with disabilities). Content analysis of each state's documents focused on six major areas: (1) legislation; (2) definitions of gifted; (3) standard identification practices; (4) nonstandard identification practices; (5) due process and grievance procedures; and (6) specific references to gifted from special populations. The analysis revealed that a range of attention is being given to these special populations and that state policies tend to be both permissive and inclusive regarding identification and services.

Cross, T.L. (2000), Gifted students' social and emotional development in the 21st century. *Gifted Child Today*, 23(2), 14-15 and 52.

This article provides two examples of ways that children's experiences vary significantly from previous generations. The author states that by realizing our limitations in being empathetic and by utilizing the strategies we have the opportunity to provide effective guidance to the gifted youth of the 21st century.

Delisle, J. (1994). Dealing with the stereotype of underachievement. *Gifted Child Today*, 17(6), 20-21.

The issue of labeling in dealing with the stereotype of under- achievement. The author poses the question is there such a thing as underachievement, do we need to put a label to a child? Dr. Delisle suggest that we treat individuals who are not doing as well in school as their aptitude as individuals. We need to ask these able students if they can pinpoint reasons for their disinterest in or distrust of school.

Flint, L. (2001). Challenges of identifying and serving gifted children with ADHD. *Teaching Exceptional Children*, 33(4), 62-69.

This article describes the special situations and needs of three children-Tony, Mikey, and Gina. As you read the first part of the article, consider suggestions for interventions and what might happen in the classroom. The author describes what others have to say about working with children who are gifted and have attentional difficulties.

Ford, D.Y. & Trotman, M. (2000). Office for civil rights and non-discriminatory testing, policies, and procedures: Implications for gifted education. *Gifted Child Quarterly*, 23(2), 109-112.

This brief article examines Office for /Civil Rights (OCR) positions on non-discrimination test policies and practices. The intent is not to present an extensive review of the literature on the topic, but to focus specifically on the OCR and its goals and

responsibility in securing the civil rights of culturally and linguistically diverse students in the context of gifted education.

Hartnett, D.N., Nelson, J.M. & Rinn, A.N. (2004). Gifted or ADHD? The possibilities of misdiagnosis. *Roeper Review*, 26(2), 73-76.

This research provides empirical support for the possibility of misdiagnosis of giftedness and Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder (ADHD). Forty-four graduate students enrolled in a school counseling program acted as participants. Participants were given one of two forms, both of which provided a hypothetical case study of a young boy and then asked for a diagnosis. Implications for educators and graduate level counseling and psychology programs are provided.

Hishinuma, E.S. & Nishimura, S.T. (2000). Parent attitudes on the importance and success of integrated self-contained services for students who are gifted, learning disabled, and gifted/learning disabled. *Roeper Review*, 22(4), 241-250.

This study reported on an assessment of parent attitudes of services provided by a specialized school in which the majority of the students were gifted, learning disabled (LD) or both. The findings supported the need for specialized and integrated services for students who are gifted, LD and gifted/LD. The description of this particular specialized school provided a starting point for discussion on comprehensive and integrated programs to meet their needs of these populations.

Ingraham, C.L., Daugherty, K.M. & Gorrafa, S.(1995). The success of three gifted deaf-blind students in inclusive educational programs. *Journal of Visual Impairment & Blindness*, 89(3), 257-261.

This article examines the challenges and successes experienced over four years by three academically gifted students with deaf-blindness in inclusive educational programs and presents recommendations about placement of students with similar needs in inclusive programs.

Kay, K. (2000). *Uniquely gifted: Identifying and meeting the needs of twice-exceptional students*. Gilsum, NH: Avocus Publishing, Inc.

The 32 readings in this collection discuss the needs of children who are both gifted and have special needs such as disability. The readings are grouped into four sections. Section 1 Family matters: Perspectives from Family Members includes the personal viewpoints of individuals who are themselves twice exceptional or have a family member who is twice exceptional. Section 2 is Teaching Strategies: Learning and Leadership. This section addresses the special problems of placement and instructional needs of this population. Section 3 is Research and Theory: Discovering Possibilities and Section 4 is Administrative Options: Working Together, which discusses a variety of different services, delivery systems and programmatic options for the twice-exceptional child. The two appendices contain a list of Internet resources and an explanation of the autonomous learner model.

Karnes, F. (2003). *State of the states gifted and talented education report 2001-2002: Council of state directors of programs for the gifted and national association for gifted children*. Washington, DC: National Association for Gifted Children.

This report contains the results of 2001-2002 state of the states survey. The survey questions completed by state education agencies (SEA) are about state definition, mandate, identification, programming and accountability, personnel preparation, state and national funding.

The report contains graphs and diagrams and actual data of the results. Questions about disabled gifted are included in the survey sections about definition, identification and programming questions.

Karnes, F. (2004). *Appropriate practices for screening, identifying and instructing gifted/disabled youth*. Hattiesburg, MS: University of Southern Mississippi.

This manual promotes appropriate practices for screening, identifying, and instructing gifted/disabled youth. Throughout the manual, children who are both gifted and disabled are referred to as twice exceptional.

Each chapter is the review of literature of appropriate practices for screening, identifying and instructing gifted/disabled. In this manual, the twice-exceptional include gifted/autistic students, gifted/deaf-blind students, gifted/deaf and gifted/hearing-impaired students, gifted/developmentally delayed student, gifted/emotional-behavioral disability students, gifted/multi-disabled students, gifted/physically or orthopedically impaired students, gifted-specific learning disabled students, gifted/speech or language impaired students, gifted/traumatic brain injured students and gifted/visually impaired students.

Despite these specific definitions, Karnes maintains that it remains difficult to screen, identify and instruct gifted/disabled students. Appropriate time, effort and planning must be spent to satisfy their needs. This manual is used in the school districts for teachers of the gifted, regular classroom teachers, special education coordinators and parents.

Karnes, F.A., Shaunessy, E., & Bisland, A. (2004). *Gifted students with disabilities are we finding them? Gifted Child Today*, 27(4), 16-21.

This article reports the results of study to determine the number of gifted students with disabilities identified and served in gifted education programs in the state of Mississippi. The results of the study indicate that few gifted students with disabilities in Mississippi have been identified. To address this situation the author suggestions that more emphasis may be needed in training teachers of the gifted and regular classroom teachers of the characteristics of gifted students with disabilities, a suggestion also found in the literature (Cline & Schwartz, 1999).

Lichtenstein, J.L. (1997). The essence of empowerment: Richard's story. *Teaching Exceptional Children*, 30(2), 16-19.

This article uses a case study of the educational history of a gifted young man with severe visual impairment to show how principles of dialogic education can empower both students and teachers. Collaboration between Richard and his teachers and between regular and special educators led to high school graduation and his accomplishment of class valedictorian.

Little, C. (2002). Which is it? Asperger's syndrome or giftedness? Defining the Differences. *Gifted Child Today*, 25(1), 58-63.

This article clarifies what Asperger's Syndrome is and how it can seemingly mirror certain gifted behaviors. The author suggests intervention strategies for this twice-exceptional learner.

Maker, J. (1977). *Providing programs for the gifted handicapped*. Reston, VA: Council for Exceptional Children.

This is the first book devoted entirely to the gifted handicapped. In this book are descriptions of the work by Sanford and Karnes. In 1975, these educators received funds from the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped, now known as the Office of Special Education Programs, for development of demonstration models for educating young handicapped and gifted children.

Moon, S.M. & Dillon, D.R. (1995). Multiple exceptionalities: A case study. *Journal for the Education of the Gifted*, 16(2), 111-130.

This case study reports is an 11-year-old boy with multiple exceptionalities. The child was verbally gifted, learning disabled in mathematics, and health impaired. He had received homebound instruction throughout his elementary school years. Qualitative research methods were used to explore the subject's learning characteristics and educational experiences.

National Academy of Sciences & United States Department of Education. (2002). *Minority students in special and gifted education*. Donovan, M.S. & Cross, C.T. (Eds.) Washington, DC: National Academy Press.

Special education and gifted and talented programs were designed for children whose educational needs are not well met in regular classrooms. From their inception, these programs have had disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic minority students. The report examines the important problem in U.S. education and makes recommendations for early intervention and general education, as well as for changes in referral and assessment processes. This book is an excellent resource to educators and policy makers at all levels from schools and school districts to the state and federal government. The entire contents of this 350 page book are available free online at <http://books.nap.edu/books/0309074398/html/index.html>.

Neihart, M. (2000). Gifted children with Asperger's Syndrome. *Gifted Child Quarterly*, 44(4), 222-230.

This author maintains that gifted children with Asperger's syndrome may not be identified because their unusual behaviors may be wrongly attributed to either their giftedness or to a learning disability. Ways in which the syndrome might be missed and guidelines for differentiating characteristics of giftedness from Asperger's characteristics are discussed.

Nielsen, E.M., Higgins, L.D., Hammond, A.E. & Williams, R.A. (1993). Gifted children with disabilities. *Gifted Child Today (GCT)*, 16(5), 9-12.

The Twice-Exceptional Child Project is a collaborative project of the Albuquerque (New Mexico) Public School system and the University of New Mexico to serve students who are gifted and have a mild-to-moderate handicapping condition. This article describes the project's training components, screening and identification procedures, curriculum, and technology interventions.

Norton, M.S. & Zeilinger, E.R. (1983). A principal's handbook of programs for gifted students. *NASSP Bulletin*, 67(459), 102-106.

The authors maintain that principals supporting effective programming for gifted students should exhibit competencies listed in this article when exercising planning and leadership, developing philosophy determining goals and objectives, understanding gifted students' characteristics, identifying gifted students, financing and staffing the program, providing guidance and counseling, using community resources, communicating and evaluating the program.

Passow, A.H. & Rudnitski, R.A. (1993). *State policies regarding education of the gifted as reflected in legislation and regulation. Collaborative research study*. Storrs, CT: National Research Center on the Gifted and Talented.

This study analyzed state policies on the identification and education of gifted students as reflected in legislation, regulations, rules, recommendations and guidelines provided by 49 states. The elements examined include: (1) state mandated services; (2) district plans for the gifted; (3) gifted education as part of special education; (4) philosophy or rationale; (5) definitions of gifted; (6) identification procedures; (7) programs for gifted; (8) differentiated curriculum and instruction; (9) counseling and other support services; (10) parent involvement; (11) program evaluation; (12) teacher education/certification; and (13) state funding for gifted. Major recommendations are: establishing challenging curriculum standards; providing high-level learning opportunities; ensuring access to early childhood education; offering extended opportunities for economically disadvantaged and minority children; and providing teacher training and technical assistance.

Reis, S.M. & McCoach, D.B. (2000). The underachievement of gifted students: What do we know and where do we go? *Gifted Child Quarterly*, 44(3), 152-170.

This article reviews and analyzes three decades of research on the under-achievement of gifted students in an attempt to clarify the state of research. The problems inherent in defining and identifying underachieving gifted students are given special attention. The authors also include suggestions for new lines of research and inquiry in this area.

Reis, S.M., McGuire, J.M. & Neu, T.W. (2000). Compensation strategies used by high-ability students with learning disabilities who succeed in college. *Gifted Child Quarterly*, 44(2), 123-134.

This study reports the results of how 12 high-ability students with learning disabilities succeeded in postsecondary academic environments. Extensive interviews with these adults provided examples of the problems they faced as high-ability students with

learning disabilities. The compensation strategies used by academically gifted students who were successful include: study strategies; cognitive learning strategies; compensatory supports; environmental accommodations; opportunities for counseling; self-advocacy; and the development of an individual plan incorporating a focus on metacognition and executive functions.

Rittenhouse, R.K. & Blough, L.K. (1995). Gifted students with hearing impairments: Suggestions for teachers. *Teaching Exceptional Children*, 27(4), 51-53.

These suggestions for teachers of gifted students with hearing impairments address definitional dilemmas affecting this population and special screening and evaluation problems. Guidance is given concerning choosing a “gifted” definition, selecting measures for identifying giftedness and determining the reference group.

Rizza, M.G. & Morrison, W.F. (2003). Uncovering stereotypes and identifying characteristics of gifted students and students with emotional/behavioral disabilities. *Roeper Review*, 25(2), 73-77.

The authors report the results of an instrument that asked preservice and in-service teachers to categorize a set of characteristics and behaviors according to whether each described a student identified with an Emotional/Behavior Disability (EBD) who is gifted, both or neither. Results of this survey revealed stereotypical thinking in the identification of characteristics of the student labeled EBD. The degree of teachers’ training and experience also played a role in the understanding and categorization of the characteristics/behaviors used in the survey.

Schnur, J.O. & Stefanich, G.P. (1979). Science for the handicapped-gifted child. *Roeper Review*, 2(2) p.26-28.

The authors state that, with the passage of P.L. 94-142 it seems reasonable that, as individual States respond to this legislative mandate, the handicapped-gifted should and will be identified. They further state that this legislation should have the effect of improving the incidence of identification of the handicapped-gifted. The authors interviewed three handicapped scientists who have pursued scientific careers to illustrate some educational practices that appear to account for the scarcity of handicapped individuals in scientific fields.

Smutny, J.F. (2001). Meeting needs of gifted underachievers-individually. *Gifted Education Communicator*, 32(3), 44-46.

The author reviews Whitmore’s definition for underachievement and examines the most promising solutions to underachievement.

Southern, W.T. and others. (1995). Twice exceptional: Gifted children with learning disabilities and gifted students with learning disabilities. *LD Forum*, 20(2), 48-50.

This column offers two articles: one about problems in identifying students who are gifted and learning disabled and recommendations for working with this population; and a second article describes a resource program involving collaboration through weekly team meetings for students in grades six through eight who are gifted and learning disabled,

Strop, J. & Goldman, D. (2002). The affective side: Emotional issues of twice exceptional students. *Understanding Our Gifted*, Winter, 28-29.

This article looks at the dilemma faced by twice-exceptional students in balancing the expectations of being gifted while trying to overcome learning challenges. Consequently, twice exceptional students need a strong support group to assist them with several key emotional issues that may impede their academic achievement: anger; fear of failure; a strong need to control; low self esteem; and sometimes even fear of success.

Vantassel-Baska, J. & Baska, A. (2004). Working with gifted students with special needs: A curriculum and program challenge. *Gifted Education Communicator*, 35(2), 4-7 & 27.

This article addresses the realities of educating twice-exceptional or thrice-exceptional children, and the need to tailor the educational process. The author states that every generalization about giftedness must be filtered through the disabilities. Table I Comparison of Needs and Responses examines the needs of gifted and the needs of the LD/ADD.

Vialle, W. & Paterson, J. (1998). Deafening silence: The educational experiences of gifted deaf people. *Gifted Education International*, 13(1), 13-22.

Case studies based on interviews with gifted deaf adults reported a common frustration with schooling, a reluctance to be double-labeled as gifted and deaf, recognition of the importance of a supportive home environment and positive socialization experiences and identify with the deaf community as a critical factor in personal success. Results have implications for identification and educational services.

Webb, J. (2000). *Misdiagnosis and dual diagnosis of gifted children*. Paper presented at the American Psychological Association Annual Convention, Washington, D.C., August 7, 2000.

This presentation is about gifted children and adults who are at particular psychological risk due to both internal characteristics and situational factors. These internal and situational factors can lead to interpersonal and psychological difficulties for gifted children and subsequently to misdiagnoses and inadequate treatment.

Whitmore, J. (1980). *Giftedness, conflict, and underachievement*. Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

This classic book is about the gifted child who experiences conflict and is an underachiever. This book is one of the first books that thoroughly addresses these issues with a review of literature, practical experience by the author with this population, suggestions for parent involvement, educators needs for in-service and staff development and successful strategies for identification and service for these students. This book has been wonderful reference on underachievement for educators, teachers, parents and students.

Whitmore, J.R. & Maker, C.J. (1985). *Intellectual giftedness in disabled persons*. Rockville, MD: Aspen Systems Corporation.

The text examines the emerging field of educating gifted handicapped students in the mid 1980's. An initial chapter traces the history of the field and offers definitions. These authors cite Mary Meeker, Merle Karnes and Anne Sanford as the first educators to concentrate on giftedness in disabled persons. This book is a valuable resource with case

studies. Five goals include identifying gifted students with specific disabilities, preparing professionals and increasing the sharing of responsibility. Five case studies of gifted persons with hearing impairments, visual impairments, severe physical impairments, severe disabilities, and learning disabilities are included. Each case study includes a discussion, specific guidelines and recommendations, conclusions and reaction. The final three chapters examine implications and recommendations for practices to meet the affective and intellectual needs of gifted persons with disabilities.

Williard-Holt, C. (1998). Academic and personality characteristics of gifted students with cerebral palsy: A multiple case study. *Exceptional Children*, 65(1), 37-50.

Using a qualitative cross-case methodology over three years, this study investigated how two gifted students with cerebral palsy and no speech exhibited their cognitive abilities. Findings indicated such traits as maturity, goal orientation, persistence/determination, patience, recognition of limitations, desire for independence from aids and devices and use of intellect to circumvent the disability.

Williard-Holt, C. (1999). Dual exceptionalities. *ERIC Clearinghouse on Disabilities and Gifted Education*. Washington, DC: Office of Educational Research and Improvement.

Gifted students with disabling conditions remain a major group of underserved and understimulated youth. This digest stresses the importance of both accommodating the disability appropriately while recognizing and nurturing the individual's intellectual strengths. Discussion of assessment is followed by a series of lists intended to assist parents and teachers in recognizing intellectual giftedness in the presence of a disability specifically gifted students with visual impairments, gifted students with physical disabilities, gifted students with hearing impairments and gifted students with learning disabilities. Three additional lists are intended to help distinguish between gifted students who are bored and students who have Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder. The final section considers implications for students with dual and issues related to identification, instruction and classroom dynamics.

Two Case Studies of Youngsters Who Are Twice Exceptional

Joey: A Child With A Language Based Learning Disability

Joey was a ten-pound baby at birth and arrived without complications. He developed quickly and began walking at nine months. At less than one year, Joey was physically active, observant and very much aware of his surroundings. For example, his mother explained one incident which one-year-old Joey used his keen sense of observation and recall. Joey was outdoors watching the neighbor across the street mowing his lawn. After watching the neighbor for some time, they soon got his toy lawn mower out of the garage. He began pushing the mower imitating the neighbor. After a few minutes, Joey noticed the man taking the grass catcher off and shaking the grass into a box. He then got a paper sack out of the garage and placed it on his mower as a grass catcher. Joey continued to push his mower, taking his grass catcher off and shaking the pretend grass into a grocery box just like the neighbor.

His mother noted that he was very curious and would discover how things worked. For example he would screw nuts and bolts together to find out what objects would float and sink. By age three Joey was riding a two-wheeler. He attended Montessori school as a preschooler and was advanced to first grade at age five. His mother noted that even though he was physically advanced for his age, he was limited in his vocabulary development. She remembered that Joey would cope with this limitation by showing her what he meant.

Joey showed little interest in board games, blocks or other activities that require fine motor skills, but rather would be involved in activities that required body movement. He used large strokes when painting at the easel and had difficulty with fine motor skills as observed in his struggle in coloring small pictures on a worksheet page.

Joey's mother recognized his delayed vocabulary development and had him tested by a private psychologist to diagnose Joey's learning problem. He was diagnosed as having a

language based learning disability. Joey's mother reported that there were several cases of dyslexia in the immediate family. Even with low reading scores, Joey retained information by observing, watching videos, and listening to information from the teacher. By using his intellectual ability and because of his ability to retain information, he easily masked his disability. His mother recalls that Joey was a sociable child with lots of friends in elementary, middle, and high school. He gained the respect of his peers and was recognized for his leadership ability by serving on student council.

Joey displays his ability to retain information through his outstanding athletic ability. He quickly grasps the coach's football plays since they were coded in pictures and were explained verbally. Joey's mom explained that, when he was 16 years old, he had a back injury that didn't allow him to attend summer football training. However, he did play first string without the summer training camp - another example of his rapid comprehension of football plays. He was voted the number one defensive end as a junior in high school. Joey also competed in the high school varsity wrestling program and won state competitions.

Throughout Joey's schooling, teachers have been helpful. Once Joey was able to tell teachers what he needed in order to learn, he flourished. His IEP emphasized his individualized needs for his language-based learning difficulty. His teachers described him as a popular student in high school with an excellent self-concept despite his learning disability. His mother mentioned that Joey had tutors for math and literature during much of his education. Joey thrives when the special education teachers and content teachers collaborate in planning his educational program. As a senior he continues to be a successful suburban high school student in his academic classes and in the athletic program. Joey plans to attend college.

Michel: A Child with Spina Bifida

The account of Michel is the result of an interview with the school psychologist. Michel is a 4-year-old spina bifida child whose condition is complicated by a brittle bone syndrome, making it necessary for him to be strapped into a special device to simulate standing. A desktop can be extended to allow him to write, eat, play games, and do puzzles. Recently, during a visit to Michel's special school for handicapped, the school psychologist was greeted by a cheery "Hi," and asked a quick series of questions. Why are you here? What is in your briefcase? Are you a medical doctor?

After completing his rounds, the psychologist found the boy, who quickly invited him to dinner. He was surprised; the psychologist took his home telephone number and promised to call. When he questioned the school about Michel's education program, he found that he received occupational therapy for part of the day and free play with other handicapped preschool youngsters for the remainder of the day.

What the psychologist noted was an alert, curious, outgoing, eager mind. He called the mother and asked if he could test the youngster at his office. She began to cry, saying he was the first person who believed Michel had a mind. She told him about the school officials who wanted to talk about his handicap but not about his gifts.

Michel was given the Wicshler Intelligence Scale for Children (WISC-R) and achieved an IQ of 152. He demonstrated reading skills and the creative ability to tell favorite stories with changes of characters and settings.

As a result of the psychologist's intervention, Michel attended the first and second grade classes for reading and social studies and the kindergarten class for the remainder of the day. Working at his ability level, he began to blossom. His mother is grateful for the school's new

perception of Michel as gifted. His medical prognosis is that he will live less than 2 years; however, the quality of this mental and emotional life is easing the struggle and pain of his physical life.

Annotated Bibliography of Organizations for Exceptionalities

Annotated Bibliography of Organizations for Exceptionalities

Autism and Asperger's Syndrome

Autism Society of American

7910 Woodmont Avenue, Suite 30
Bethesda, MD 20814-3067
(800) 3AUTISM

<http://www.autism-society.org/site/PageServer>

The mission of the Autism Society of America is to promote lifelong access and opportunity for all individuals within the autism spectrum, and their families, to be fully participating, included members of their community. Education, advocacy at state and federal levels, active public awareness and the promotion of research.

Autism Web

<http://www.autismweb.com/>

A parents' guide to the diagnosis, treatment and education of children with autism, Pervasive Development Disorder (PAA) and related disorders.

Autism National Committee

<http://www.autcom.org/>

This is the only autism advocacy organization dedicated to "Social Justice for All Citizens with Autism" through a shared vision and a commitment to positive approaches. The organization was founded in 1990 to protect and advance the human rights and civil rights of all persons with autism, Pervasive Developmental Disorder, and related differences of communication and behaviors. In the face of social policies of devaluation which are expressed in the practices of segregation, medicalization, and aversive conditioning, we assert that all individuals are created equal and endowed with certain inalienable rights, and that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.

Autism Research Institute (ARI)

4182 Adams Avenue
San Diego, CA 92116

<http://www.autism.com/ari/>

ARI is primarily devoted to conducting research, and to disseminating the results of research, on the causes of autism and on methods of preventing diagnosing and treating autism and other severe behavioral disorders of childhood. This institute provides information based on research to parents and professionals throughout the world.

Families for Early Autism Treatment

PS Box 255722
Sacramento, CA 95865

<http://www.feat.org/>

Families for Early Autism Treatment, Inc. (FEAT) is a nonprofit organization of parents and professionals, designed to help families with children who have received the diagnosis of Autism

Spectrum Disorder (ADS), including Autism, Pervasive Development Disorder (PDD), or Asperger's syndrome. It offers a network of support where families can meet each other and discuss issues surrounding autism and treatment options.

Asperger's Syndrome Coalition of the United States (ASC-U.S.)

P.O. Box 524

Crown Point, IN 46308

<http://www.asperger.org>

The mission of ASC-U.S. is to enable individuals with AS and related disorders to realize their potential. Families, professionals and affected individuals work together on a national, regional and local level to strengthen grassroots efforts that provide support and reliable information and bring people together to create a national voice, advocating for research, education and public awareness.

Asperger's Syndrome Education Network, INC. (ASEN)

<http://www.aspeni.org/>

ASEN is a regionally based nonprofit organization headquartered in New Jersey, with 12 local chapters, providing families and other individuals affected with Asperger's Syndrome, PDD-NOS, High Functioning Autism, and related disorders.

Deaf/Blind

American Associations for the Deaf-Blind (AABD)

814 Thayer Avenue, Suite 302

Silver Spring, MD 20910-4500

<http://www.aadb.org>

The AADB seeks to enable def-blind persons to achieve their maximum potential by increasing independence, productivity and integrations into the community.

The Helen Keller Foundation for Research and Education

1201 11 the Avenue South, Suite 300

Birmingham, AL 35205

<http://www.helenkellerfoundation.org>

The foundation's mission is based on the legacy of Helen Keller. This organization strives to prevent blindness and deafness by promoting research and education. The foundation's goals include being a leader in integrating sight, speech and hearing research with the greater biomedical research community, as well as creating and coordinating a per-reviewed, worldwide network of investigators and institutions.

Deaf and Hearing Impaired

Alexander Graham Bell Association for the Deaf and Hard of Hearing

3417 Volta Place, NW
Washington, DC 20007
<http://www.agbell.org/>

The Alexander Graham Bell Association for the Deaf and Hard of Hearing is the world's oldest and largest membership organization promoting the use of spoken language by children and adults with hearing loss. Members include parents of children with hearing loss, adults who are deaf or hard of hearing, educators, audiologists, speech-language pathologists, physicians, and other professionals in fields related to hearing loss and deafness. Through advocacy, publications, financial aid and scholarships, and numerous programs and services, AG Bell promotes its mission: advocating indolence through listening and talking.

American Society for Deaf Children

P.O. Box 3355
Gettysburg, PA 17325
<http://www.deafchildren.org/hom/home.html>

ASDC's primary mission is to advocate for the highest-quality programs and services for parents in making sound and informed choices to meet their children's educational, communication, personal and social needs so that they may fully participate in the global community of the 21st century.

National Association of the Deaf (NAD)

814 Thayer Avenue
Silver spring, MD 20910-4500
<http://www.nad.org/>

The National Association of the Deaf is the oldest and largest constituency organization safeguarding the accessibility and civil rights of 28 million deaf and hard of hearing Americans in education, employment, health care, and telecommunications.

National Theatre of the Deaf (NTD)

55 Van Dyke Avenue, Suite 312
Hartford, CT 06106
<http://www.ntd.org/>

Through its art, the National Theatre of the Deaf has created profound social change. The magic of it all has been he NTD's remarkable ability to entertain and inform at the same time. As one critic has praised, "*Sculpture in the air.*"

Developmental Delays

Center on Human Development and Disabilities (CHDD)

Box 357920

Seattle, WA 98195-7920

<http://depts.Washington.edu/chdd/>

The Center on Human Development and Disability at the University of Washington makes important contributions to the lives of people with developmental disabilities and their families, through a comprehensive array of research, clinical services, training, community outreach, and dissemination activities.

The Division for Early Childhood

634 Eddy Avenue

Missoula, MT 59812

www.dec-sped.org

The Division for Early Childhood (DEC) is a division of the Council for Exceptional Children advocating individuals who work with r on behalf of children with special needs, birth through age eight, and their families.

National Association for Child Development

549 25th Street

Ogden, UT 84401-2422

<http://www.nacd.org/>

The National Association for Child Development is an internally organization of professionals and parents dedicated to helping children and adults reach their full potential through the implementation of innovative individual programs, research, and the dissemination of information.

Emotional-Behavioral Disabilities

American Medical Association

515 North State Street

Chicago, IL 60610

www.ama-assn.org/

This organization provides patients and doctors with a vast array of medical information including treatment, research, and descriptions of multiple disabilities.

American Psychological Association

750 First Street, NE

Washington, DC 20002

www.apa.org/

This is a scientific and professional organization that represents psychology in the United States. It is the largest association of psychologists worldwide. This organization provides information for both professionals and the public concerning psychological issues such as emotional-behavioral disabilities.

The Family Village

Waisman Center
University of Wisconsin-Madison
1500 Highland Avenue
Madison, WI 53705-2280
www.familyvillage.wisc.edu

The Family Village integrates resources and communication opportunities on the Internet for people with disabilities, their families, and those who support and serve them.

Family Voices

3411 Candelaria NE, Suite M
Albuquerque, NM 87107
www.familyvoices.org

Family Voices is a national grassroots network of families and friends speaking on behalf of children with special health care needs.

National Alliance for the Mentally Ill (NAM)

(800) 950-6164
www.nami.org/

This organization is dedicated to the eradication of mental illnesses and to the improvement of the quality of life of all whose lives are affected by these diseases. It is a nonprofit, grassroots, self-help, support and advocacy organization of consumers, families and friends of people with severe mental illnesses, such as schizophrenia, schizoaffective disorders, bipolar disorder, major depression disorder, obsessive-compulsive disorder, panic and other severe anxiety disorders, pervasive developmental disorders, and other severe and persistent mental illnesses that affect the brain.

National Institutes of Health

9000 Rockville Pike
Bethesda, MD 20892
www.nih.gov/

This governmental agency is responsible for distributing information related to all health issues. They have several sites that deal specifically with multiple disabilities and include definitions and treatment options, as well as contact information for referral sources.

National Mental Health Association

2001 N. Beauregard Street, 12th Floor
Alexandria, VA 22311
www.nmha.org/

This is the country's oldest and largest nonprofit organization addressing all aspects of mental health and mental illness. It works to improve the mental health of all Americans, especially the 54 million people with mental disorders, through advocacy, education, research and service. This organization provides much valuable information for professionals, individuals, and families.

Multiple Disabilities

ERIC Clearinghouse on Disabilities and Gifted Education

2277 Research Boulevard, 6M

Rockville, MD 20850

www.ericec.org

ERIC gathers and disseminates professional literature, information, and resources on the education and development of all ages who have disabilities and/or who are gifted.

MayoClinic.com

The Mayo Foundation owns this site for Medical Education and Research, which is located at 200 1st Street. S.W.

Rochester, MN 55905

www.mayoclinic.com/index.cfm

This organization strives to empower people to manage their health by providing useful and up-to-date information and tools reflecting the expertise and standard of excellence of the Mayo Clinic. There is helpful information related to cerebral palsy and other multiple disabilities.

There are links to other helpful Web sites including www.mayoclinic.org/, which gives more information about the Mayo Clinic.

MEDLINEplus

www.medlineplus.com/

This organization can also be contacted directly by e-mail at

www.nlm.nih.gov/cgi/medlineplus/feedback.pl?from=&lang=EN.

This is a division of the National Library of Medicine that provides health professionals and consumers with authoritative and current information. This site includes extensive information on over 600 diseases and conditions as well as other helpful info including lists of hospitals and physicians, medical encyclopedia and a medical dictionary, health information in Spanish, extensive information on prescription and nonprescription drugs, health information from the media, and links to thousands of clinical trials.

United Cerebral Palsy Association

1660 L Street, NW, Suite 700

Washington, DC 20036

www.ucpa.org

As one of the largest health charities in America, the United Cerebral Palsy Association's mission is to advance the independence, productivity and full citizenship of people with cerebral palsy and other disabilities, through their commitment to the principals of independence, inclusion and self-determination. This association is the leading source of information on cerebral palsy and is a pivotal advocate for the fights of persons with any disability.

Physical Disabilities

The Consortium for Citizens with Disabilities

1331 H Street, NW, Suite 301
Washington, DC 20005

<http://www.c-c-d.org/>

The Consortium for Citizens with Disabilities is a coalition of approximately 100 national disability organizations working together to advocate for nation public policy that ensures the self determination, independence, empowerment, integration and inclusion of children and adults with disabilities in all aspects of society.

Easter Seals

230 West Monroe Street, Suite 1800
Chicago, IL 60606

<http://www.easter-seals.org>

Whether through a birth condition, injury or illness or because of functional limitations experienced in aging, Easter Seals medical rehabilitation services-including physical therapy, occupational therapy, speech-hearing therapy ad early intervention-are the first step toward helping people with disabilities gain greater independence.

March of Dimes Birth Defects Foundation

1275 Mamaroneck Avenue
White Plains, NY 10605

<http://www.marchofdimes.com/home.asp>

March of Dimes researchers, volunteers, educators, outreach workers and advocates work together to give all babies a fighting chance against the threats to their health. Publications are available in Spanish and Spanish speaker is on staff.

National Library Services for the Blind and Physically Handicapped

The Library of Congress
1291 Taylor Street N.W.
Washington, DC 20542

<http://lceb.loc.gov/nls/>

The National Library Service for the Blind and Physically Handicapped (NLS), Library of congress, administers this free program hat loans recorded and Braille Books and magazines, music scores in Braille and large print, and specially designed playback equipment to residents of he United States who are unable to read or use standard printing materials because of visual or physical impairment.

National Organization on Disability

910 Sixteenth Street, N.W., Suite 600
Washington, DC 20006

<http://www.nod.org/about/>

The mission of the National Organization on Disability is to expand the participation and contribution of America's 54 million men, women and children with disabilities in all aspects of life.

National Spinal Cord Injury Association

8300 Colesville Road, Suite 551
Silver Spring, MD 20910

<http://www.spinalcord.org/>

The National Spinal Cord Injury Association is the nation's oldest and largest civilian organization dedicated to improving the quality of life for hundreds of thousands of Americans living with the results of spinal cord injury and disease and their families.

TASH (formerly the Association for Persons with Severe Handicaps)

29 W. Susquehanna Avenue, suite 210
Baltimore, MD 21204

<http://www.tash.org/>

TASH is an international association of people with disabilities, their family members other advocates, and professionals fighting for a society in which inclusion of all people in all aspects of society is the norm.

United Cerebral Palsy Association

1660 L Street, NW, Suite 700
Washington, DC 20036

www.ucpa.org

As one of the largest health charities in America, the United Cerebral Palsy Association's mission is to advance the independence, productivity and full citizenship of people with cerebral palsy and other disabilities, through their commitment to the principals of independence, inclusion and self-determination. This association is the leading source of information on cerebral palsy and is a pivotal advocate for the fights of persons with any disability.

Learning Disabled

Association of Educational Therapists

1804 W. Burbank Blvd.
Burbank, CA 91506

<http://www.actionline.org/>

An educational therapist works in the educational domain with individuals who exhibit learning disabilities and learning problems. This site contains information on upcoming events and a list of association publications.

Council for Learning Disabilities

P.O. Box 4014
Leesburg, VA 20177

<http://www.cldinternational.org/c@w1SiZ6cJ.JabA/Pages/home.html>

The Council for Learning Disabilities (CLD) is an international organization concerned about issues related to students with learning disabilities. Information about conferences and legislation are available on this site.

Learning Disabilities Association of America (LDA)

4156 Library Road
Pittsburgh, PA 15234-1349

<http://www.ldanatl.org/>

This organization promotes the advancement of education for learning disabled individuals. Furthermore, it supports individual's learning disabilities, their families, and the professionals who work with them.

National Center for Learning Disabilities

381 Park Avenue South Suite 1401
New York, NY 10016

<http://www.ld.org/>

The center provides national leadership in support of children and adults with learning disabilities offering information, resources, and referral services. This site includes a lot of information about learning disabilities, tips for parents and teachers, legislative information, research news and a resource locator.

The Complete Learning Disabilities Directory-2004 Edition

Grey House Publishing.

185 Millerton Road

PO Box 860

Millerton, NY 12546

(800) 562-2139

<http://www.greyhouse.com/learningdisabilities.htm>

This is the eleventh edition of the most comprehensive reference book covering the wide range of learning disabilities resources available nationwide. This directory contains over 7,000 entries and covers the schools, learning centers, vocational training programs, associations and organizations, and governmental agencies involved in learning disabilities.

In addition, there are comprehensive chapters on teaching materials, assistive devices, technology resources, magazines, newsletters and workshops that are specifically designed to meet the needs of individuals with learning disabilities, as well as those who work with them.

Speech-Language Impaired

American Speech-Language-Hearing Association

10801 Rockville Pike

Rockville, MD 20852

<http://www.asha.org/default.htm>

The mission of the American speech-Language-Hearing Association is to promote the interests of and the highest quality services for professions in audiologist, speech-language pathology, and speech and learning science, and to advocate for people with communication disabilities.

National Institute on Deafness and Other Communication disorders

National Institutes of Health 31 Center Drive, MSC 2320
Bethesda MD 20892-2320

<http://www.nided.nih.gov/index.asp>

The purpose of NIDCD is to conduct and support biomedical and behavioral research and research training in the normal and disordered processes of hearing, balance, smell, taste, voice, speech, and language. NIDCD has focused national attention disorders of human communication and has contributed to advances in biomedical and behavioral research that will improve the lives of millions of individuals with communication disorders.

The Stuttering Foundation

3100 Walnut Grove Road, Suite 603
P.O. Box 11749
Memphis, TN 38111-0749

<http://www.stuteringhelp.org/>

The Stuttering Foundation provides free online resources, services and support to those who stutter and their families, as well as support for research into the causes of stuttering.

Traumatic Brain Injuries

The Beach Center on Families and disabilities

The University of Kansas
Haworth Hall, Room 3136
1200 Sunnyside Avenue
Lawrence, KS 66045-7534

<http://heachcenter.org>

The Beach Center is committed to conducting research while listening to the priorities of families, incorporating family priorities into the center's research agenda, carrying out research in a participatory way, and ensuring that the research makes a meaningful and sustainable difference in the lives of families who have children with disabilities.

Bio Tech Institute

2007 N. Collins Boulevard, 441

Richardson, TX 75080

<http://www.texoma.com/business/biotech/biotech4.htm>

Bio Tech Institute is a distinguished facility with immediate access to a net wok of professional, medical and scientific consultants, providing comprehensive evaluation and documentation to identify or rule out the presence of soft tissue head trauma, toxic chemical and /or related injuries-conditions that are often extremely difficult to diagnose.

Brain Injury Association

105 N. Alfred Street
Alexandria, VA 22314

<http://www.biausa.org>

This organization assists people with brain injury and their families to seek out needed resources and services.

Brain Train

727 Tin Ridge Lane
Richmond, VA 23235

<http://www.brainstrain.com>

Brain Train is a publisher of software catalogs for brain-injured rehabilitation.

Higher Education and Training for People with Handicaps (HEATH)

2121 K Street NW, 220
Washington, DC 20037

<http://www.heath.gwu.edu>

The Health resource Center of the American Council on Education is the national clearinghouse on postsecondary education for individuals with disabilities. Support from the U.S. Department of Education enables the center to serve as an information exchange about educational support services, policies, procedures, adaptations, and opportunities at campuses, vocational technical schools, and others.

Visually Impaired**American Foundation for the Blind**

11 Penn Plaza, Suite 300
New York, NY 10001

<http://www.afb.org>

The America Foundation for the Blind assists blind or visually impaired individuals acquire improved rehabilitation services and education and employment opportunities. This organization also aids such individuals with daily living activities through resource and education materials. Foundation publications include a *Directory of Services for Blind and Visually Impaired Persons in the United States and Canada*.

American Printing House for the Blind

1839 Frankfort venue
P.O. Box 6085
Louisville, KY 40206-0085

<http://www.aph.org>

This is a national organization that produces literature and manufactures other educational aids for blind and visually impaired persons.

Lighthouse International

111 East 59th Street
NY, NY 10022

Lighthouse International provides information on vision and aging as well as hearing impairment and aging. This organization offers educational materials for consumers and professionals and also promotes the improvement of service delivery to sensory-impaired older people.

National Alliance of Blind Students

1155 15th Street NW, Suite 004
Washington, DC 20005

<http://www.wacb.org>

The National Alliance of Blind Students is a national organization of blind students who encourage and promote the integration and education of college students who are blind or have vision impairments. This organization is involved such activities as legislation and policy making regarding rehabilitation programs, financial aid, equal access to classes, provision of alternative textbooks and new technologies as well as establishing a scholarship fund in 1990.

National Association for Parents of the Visually Impaired Inc.

P.O. Box 317
Watertown, MA 02272-0317

www.napvi.org

This association addresses the needs and concerns of parents and families of visually impaired children by providing information about care, treatment, and other quality services.

National Association for Visually Handicapped

22 West 21st Street
NY, NY 10010

<http://www.navh.org>

NAVH provides information regarding all services available to partially seeing people from federal, state, and local government agencies as well as private sources. This association publishes materials that cannot be found elsewhere-addressing problems encountered by people with partial vision. These special publications include two newsletters in large print, one for children and one for adults.

National Federation of the Blind

1800 Johnson Street
Baltimore, MD 21230

<http://www.nfb.org>

The National Federation for Blind offers the National Blindness Information Center that attempts to answer, by phone or mail, any questions about blindness and the rights of people who are blind. This organization also acts as a legislative resource for its state chapters and serves as advocate discrimination cases for blind individuals. Organizational publications include a monthly magazine, The Braille Monitor, discussing technological issues, and two quarterly magazines, Future reflections, for parents and educators of blind children, and Voice of the Diabetic provided by the Diabetes Division of the National Federation of the Blind.

Additional Resources

The Council for Exceptional Children

1110 North Glebe road, Suite 300

Arlington, VA 22201-5704

<http://www.cec.sped.org/>

This international professional organization is dedicated to improving educational outcomes for individuals with exceptionalities, students with disabilities, and/or the gifted. The site contains information about professional development, articles from their publications, information about professional standards and public policies, and a bulletin board system.

The Council for Exceptional Children-Ohio

<http://cec-ohio.org/>

The Council for Exceptional Children/Ohio advocates for the rights of individuals with exceptionalities. All persons have unique needs and differing learning abilities. The CEC/Ohio is especially committed to an effective and comprehensive educational service delivery system based on best practice and research. All persons have equal rights and therefore CEC/Ohio promotes a positive quality of life for all persons.

ERIC Clearinghouse on Disabilities and Gifted Education

www.eduref.org

searchERIC.org

<http://www.eric.ed.gov/>

ERIC gathers and disseminates professional literature, information, and resources on the educational and development of individuals of all ages who have disabilities and/or who are gifted.

National Association for Gifted Children (NAGC)

1707 L Street Suite 550

Washington, DC 20036

<http://NAGC.org/>

NAGC is a non-profit organization of parents, teachers, educators, other professionals and community leaders who unite to address the unique needs of children and youth with demonstrated gifts and talents as well as those children who may be able to develop their talent potential with appropriate educational experiences.

National Association of State Directors of Special Education (NASDSE)

<http://www.nasdse.org>

NASCE provides support to all states and territories in the delivery of quality education to children and youth with disabilities through training, technical assistance, research, policy development and the development and modeling of powerful collaborative relationships with other organizations and all constituencies.

NICHCY

P.O. Box 1492

Washington, DC 20013

www.nichcy.org

The National Center for Children and Youth with Disabilities provides information on disabilities and disability-related issues for parents, educators, and other professionals.

Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP)

Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services

U.S. Department of Education

400 Maryland Avenue, S.W.

Washington, DC 20202

www.ed.gov/offices/OSERS/OSEP/index.html

The Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) is dedicated to improving results for infants, toddlers, children and youth with disabilities age birth through 21 by providing leadership and financial support to assist states and local districts.

Ohio Association for Gifted Children

Ohio Coalition for the Education of Children with Disabilities (OCECD)

165 W. Center Street Suite 302

Marion, OH 43302

www.ocecd.org

The mission of OCECD is to ensure that every Ohio child with special needs receives a free, appropriate, public education in the least restrictive environment to enable that child to reach his/her highest potential.

Ohio Association for the Gifted Children

PO Box 30801

Gahanna, Ohio 43230

<http://www.oagc.com/>

OAGC promotes and supports the development of gifted students through dissemination of information, advocacy on their behalf, encouragement of affiliate organizations, and to promote research and education for gifted children.

Ohio Department of Education

Office for Exceptional Children

25 South Front Street, Mail Stop 205

Columbus, OH 43215

www.ode.state.oh.us

The Office for Exceptional Children provides leadership, assistance, and oversight to school districts and other educational entities in the provision of differentiated instructional support to improve results for students with disabilities and students identified as gifted.

PACER Center

8161 Normandate Blvd.
Minneapolis, MN 55347

www.pacer.org/index.htm

The PACER Center expands opportunities and enhances the quality of life of children and young adults with disabilities and their families, based on the concept of parents helping parents. This national center responds to thousands of parents and professionals each year. Services provided include assistance to individual families, workshops, materials for parents and professionals, and leadership in securing a free and appropriate public education for all children.

Appendix

Technical Report: Survey of Gifted Coordinators and Service Providers

Focus Group: Discussion Responses and Technical Report for Coordinators and Service Providers for Gifted Education

Focus Group: Discussion Responses and Technical Report for Principals

TWICE EXCEPTIONAL PROJECT
Survey of Gifted Coordinators and Service Providers
 Technical Report

Number of responses: 104 (24.4%)

Number of people surveyed: 426

Gender of respondents:

Male	Female	No answer
7 6.7%	95 91.3%	2 1.9%

Years working with gifted (including 2004-2005):

1-5 years	6-10 years	11-15 years	16-20 years	21-25 years	25+ years	No response
30 28.8%	35 33.7%	15 14.4%	16 15.4%	6 5.7%	1 1.0%	1 1.0%

Mean	Standard Deviation
10.15	6.50

Number of districts respondent involved with gifted programs in:

A single district	Multiple districts	No response
80 76.9%	23 22.1%	1 1.0%

Professional roles identified by respondents*:

Coordinator	64 55.2%
Teacher	24 20.7%
Gifted Intervention Specialist	15 12.9%
Other**	11 9.5%
No response	2 1.7%

* Respondents were able to list more than one professional role

** Other included:

- Assistant Superintendent
- Director (3)
- Muskingum Valley Educational Service Center Gifted Services Consultant
- Principal (3)
- Supervisor (3)

Have you had any direct personal interaction with:

a. twice exceptional students

Yes	No	No response
84 80.8%	18 17.3%	2 1.9%

b. parents of twice exceptional students

Yes	No	No response
80 76.9%	21 20.2%	3 2.9%

c. teachers of twice exceptional students

Yes	No	No response
83 79.8%	18 17.3%	3 2.9%

Respondents were asked to rate the following items using the scale below:

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Not Applicable	Don't Know
5	4	3	2	1	N/A	D/K

General

	SA	A	N	D	SD	NA/ No Response	D/K Don't Know	Mean	Standard Deviation
6. Twice exceptional students are a high priority in my district.	5 4.8%	15 14.4%	33 31.7%	27 26.0%	17 16.3%	7 6.7%	0 0.0%	2.63	1.10
7. Twice exceptional students are a high priority at the state level.	0 0.0%	14 13.5%	21 20.2%	31 29.8%	16 15.4%	1 1.0%	21 20.2%	3.14	1.70
8. In addition to state-mandated policies, my district has an official written policy regarding twice exceptional students.	0 0.0%	5 4.8%	6 5.8%	53 51.0%	20 19.2%	3 2.9%	17 16.3%	2.63	1.67
9. There is a common understanding of the meaning of "twice exceptional" among gifted coordinators, service providers, administrators, and teachers.	4 3.8%	24 23.1%	12 11.5%	43 41.3%	15 14.4%	1 1.0%	5 4.8%	2.75	1.33

10. The laws and regulations regarding disabled students facilitate the delivery of services to twice exceptional students.	4 3.8%	28 26.9%	13 12.5%	31 29.8%	12 11.5%	2 1.9%	14 13.5%	3.23	1.55
11. The laws and regulations regarding gifted students facilitate the delivery of services to twice exceptional students.	3 2.9%	23 22.1%	14 13.5%	33 31.7%	19 18.3%	1 1.0%	11 10.6%	2.91	1.54

Comments

- #9 and #10: Often educators focus on weakness not strengths. We are moving toward pairing both for better service, but are not there yet.
- #9: Few teacher training programs at the university level require in-depth knowledge of gifted issues and a lack of mandatory professional development opportunities in the same areas impact the quality of instruction for gifted students. #10 & #11: Laws and regulations facilitate the delivery of services, as it pertains to a student's disabilities...NOT ABILITIES.
- All student needs are a high priority in our district. We believe in a diagnostic/prescriptive model, therefore it was difficult to answer questions 6 & 7.
- Although teachers and administrators would agree with the concept of twice exceptional, it is difficult to actually identify the students in a manner that complies with state mandated criteria. Often the children in question do not test well. It seems that the majority of the students who would be in the twice exceptional category are those who fall between the cracks.
- Amazingly, teachers are shocked when a child with a specific learning disability is also identified with a gift.
- Few people I have contact with understand the meaning of twice exceptional students.
- Gifted services just don't happen...period.
- Gifted students are high functioning. 504 Plan can only be implemented with "substantial limitations" in learning compared to the average - not to their gifted peers of potential. ADHD or GT/LD students who need accommodations in time on task or a quiet place to test are out of luck if their GPA or test scores are still very high.
- I am so happy that someone is finally addressing this issue. It is much more common than most educators realize.
- I believe ALL students are a high priority in our state and I KNOW that ALL students are a high priority in our district. I don't care for the choice of words in this survey. There is a general misconception that Asperger's children are all gifted. Only a percentage of any population is gifted. Just because they can memorize math facts at an early age does not mean they are able to apply what they have memorized to new situations. Achievement tests can result in bad data for a primary child who is now identified forever. Also, there is bad data when an instructional aide "helps" too much on these tests. I have brought this to the attention of the ODE people in the past because bad data is still bad data.
- I do not know if there should be goals/objectives for gifted students in their gifted area(s) on an IEP.
- I do not see much progress in this geographical area in the ID of, or service to, twice exceptional students. I know a few and have done some reading, but experience/exposure is limited.
- I feel we need more inservicing on Twice Exceptional students from the state

- I have completed this survey 2 weeks ago.
- I have worked as a special education teacher, gifted specialist and supervisor of both special and gifted. In my experience, the teachers and principals have a belief that a student is 'either / or' but can not be both gifted and be identified special education. I have found that the gifted specialists and special educators for the most part understand the need and would work together, but getting most regular educators to understand and implement the coordination of necessary services is nearly impossible. Most of them resist assuming responsibility for differentiating instruction for any student with an exceptionality, let alone twice exceptional. I believe we have not equipped teachers during pre-service training to accept responsibility for ALL students in their classrooms or to know how to collaborate with specialists to provide the most appropriate services.
- I've taught only 2 handicapped gifted students in my entire 22-year career with gifted students. That was over 19 years ago! The likelihood of twice exceptional students is very low in a small district such as ours, which have a very small population of handicapped students.
- In Ohio, special education is mandated and fully funded, gifted education is neither. Ironically, students who are SED/gifted get their needs addressed much more so than those who are just gifted, because the twice-exceptional students get an IEP, and a special teacher and program that oversees their entire education. I wish I had that for all of our gifted children, especially those who are cognitively gifted. As far as LD/gifted, the situation is different. We have very limited personnel and programming for all of our gifted students, and those programs are often not a "good fit" for LD/gifted students. For example, our cognitive gifted program services those who are also gifted in achievement, so students who are LD/gifted would not have their needs met in that setting. These students also do not fit well with our LD programs, which are oriented to below-average achieving students with average ability.
- It is difficult to get parents/guardians of students with high ability to have students also formally identified with disabilities.
- Most teachers and administrators in my districts don't believe a child can be both gifted and have learning problems.
- My district has been receptive to identifying and serving twice exceptional students. The Coordinator of special Education and I have adjoining offices and have the opportunity to work together to meet the needs of these students. Cooperation is key to acceptance and service for these students.
- My district has no gifted program.
- My understanding is that the state requires that gifted students be identified and parents notified. If there isn't a law requiring services, I can't agree that the laws regarding gifted students facilitate the delivery of services.
- State department has not communicated twice exceptional as a high Priority.
- The fact that the 2xExceptional students get IEP's (which are legally binding documents) helps. In most of my districts the gifted teacher/coordinator is part of the IEP process.
- The laws and regulations regarding disabled students facilitate the delivery of services in regards to the disability. When looking at the exceptionality for giftedness, service is not always considered a necessity because gifted education is not fully funded.
- The laws may facilitate delivery of services but the lack of a mandate for gifted services greatly impacts what is being done at the gifted end.
- The special education component is what mandates these children are served. Therefore, the gifted and special education personnel work together. The main problem is that gifted students with learning disabilities are not often identified. Once they are, the services come because they now have an IEP, which holds weight. The WEP alone does not.
- To me, these questions are for a superintendent of a school district.

- To my knowledge there is no specific mention of twice exceptional students in gifted law. It just states all students generally.
- Twice Exceptional students are most often overlooked or under-rated by professionals. If a student is not performing in the "regular" classroom, teachers are most adamant that these students cannot be "gifted" and will not allow them to go to the G/T Resource Room.
- Twice-gifted child was in pullout services for four years, but is now in high school program. This child was a unique individual in that there has not since been a student thus identified.
- We are currently working on a district policy.
- We are not even mandated to serve gifted students by the State of Ohio. We have had gifted services in place for 12 years in our district. We are only mandated to screen and identify by the ODE. Sad isn't it!
- We have a written policy for special populations regarding fair and varied instruments for testing, but no policy, per se, regarding twice exceptional students.
- We have no students dually identified. I think that part of the problem is that psychs differ in their ability to make the dual identification and if we suspect that we use as an individual WISC by the psych.
- We service some but do not have a written policy.
- While there is not a specific mandate to service gifted students, the interpretation of the law includes an appropriate education for all children inclusive of twice exceptional and gifted.
- Written plans for gifted students are an excellent way to guide teachers, parents in differentiation strategies. Unfortunately the WEP does not have the clout of an IEP or 504.
- You cannot honestly believe that twice exceptional children are truly getting the service they need as long as gifted education is not mandated by the state. These students are a high priority as special needs and they get their aides and IEPs through special education. They are not as high a priority as gifted, as there is nothing to guarantee the model of gifted service they receive.

Identification

	SA	A	N	D	SD	NA/ No Response	D/K Don't Know	Mean	Standard Deviation
12. In addition to state-mandated policies, there is a formal written process in place in my district to identify twice exceptional students.	3 2.9%	12 11.5%	7 6.7%	47 45.2%	19 18.3%	6 5.8%	10 9.6%	2.62	1.52
13. There is a high rate of identification of twice exceptional students in my district.	1 1.0%	5 4.8%	14 13.5%	47 45.2%	30 28.8%	4 3.8%	3 2.9%	2.09	1.10
14. School psychologists in my district have the knowledge and training to identify twice exceptional students.	12 11.5%	37 35.6%	12 11.5%	14 13.5%	7 6.7%	2 1.9%	20 19.2%	3.91	1.48

15. Gifted and talented staff, IAT members, school psychologists, and other staff work together effectively to identify twice exceptional students in my district.	8 7.7%	32 30.8%	18 17.3%	25 24.0%	15 14.4%	4 3.8%	2 1.9%	2.99	1.30
16. Current methods of assessment in my district are effective for identifying twice exceptional students.	5 4.8%	31 29.8%	29 27.9%	26 25.0%	5 4.8%	2 1.9%	6 5.8%	3.23	1.20

Comments

- #15: School Psychologists do not have the information needed for identification...as well as classroom teachers
- #13: Communication between school psychologists/special education dept. with gifted education is rare. I was given a directive 2 years ago by the ESC administration, that I was NOT to use the services of the school psychologists for gifted needs. If a request came through a building principal for additional testing of a gifted child, I was to direct it to my immediate supervisor (asst. supt) for approval or denial. Since this directive was given, no requests have been made by the building principals. The bottom line is...when there is a state or federal mandate - with the money to implement - things happen. Identification of gifted kids is only happening because of HB282. Since funds and personnel are limited, we only do whole-grade level testing. Consequently, service is limited.
- As a district we feel that MH or DH students have enough on their "educational plates" without adding some sort of gifted instruction to the mix. Aren't their IEP goals set up as what is best for them and tailored to their individual needs? If they are, then that student is truly getting what they need, provided they have gifted identifications or not. Special ed. students get the same opportunities to be identified as the rest of the general school population.
- Assessment in this district is effective only in the area of Superior Cognitive Students
- Gathering resources (human and print) for use in appropriate identification procedures can be challenging.
- I had some teachers, as well as a principal, be upset with the fact that a 'low end special ed.' student was being tested for the gifted program as if it couldn't be a reasonable possibility.
- I have encountered several twice exceptional students in my career. However, I believe some LD/gifted kids remain unnoticed in the classroom because they perform at an "average" level; their disabilities can be masked by their giftedness and visa-versa. Sometimes it is difficult to make a case for identifying these students because what purpose would that serve? These students fit in neither our LD program nor our gifted program, and teachers and even parents seem satisfied that their children are performing on-level, even though they are capable of doing far superior work. In reviewing standardized test data on norm-referenced tests, I have found some kids with significant discrepancies between ability and achievement. I keep a running list of these kids and place them when if/when it would be appropriate. For example, a student who had lower achievement has improved dramatically in the last year and a half. So we have retested him, and he qualified and was placed in our cognitive gifted program.
- OLSAT and WCJ are invalid tests, which produce inaccurate results. These tests are used only if a student scores close on the Iowa and warrants additional testing. The state needs to look at more normed instruments to assess students besides the Iowa test of Basic Skills.

- Once again a general malaise for the gifted and the program as a low district priority do not allow for success in this area. I am sure that statistically there should be more twice exceptional students.
- Recently professional development for our school psychologists has addressed this topic briefly, and some psychologists are enthusiastic about working to address the need for changes in the assessment system through a focus group of curriculum, assessment, administration, coordinators, teachers and psychologists. We need good information and research on assessment best practices in this area to bring to the table for these discussions.
- Some of our schools and psychologists are more willing than others to try and help our twice exceptional students.
- Students are screened regardless of their inclusion in a subpopulation. I am not sure that an additional policy would need to be written if accommodations are followed when the screening takes place. If a student's disability prohibits normal testing administration, the environment could be restructured to accommodate any already identified disability.
- Teachers are made aware of characteristics at referral time. They still don't find them without major discrepancies in learning / social behavior.
- The district team works together. However, due to the fact that gifted students with learning disabilities are usually able to earn passing grades, places them at the bottom of the assessment and served list for special education. They still have a WEP but we do not have the manpower or money to properly serve them. I believe there is confusion on the definition. Our gifted students on IEP's are identified for medical reason--bipolar, ADD, etc. I am not certain that is considered twice exceptional or if it refers to gifted students with learning disabilities. As mentioned earlier, those students who are on IEP and WEP are served through a group effort. For example, the gifted intervention specialist attends the IEP meetings and communicates with the special education specialist.
- The only time school psychs have identified gifted students and brought them to the attention of gifted staff is when the students have been ED. I am not sure how well versed the psychs are in areas beyond superior cognitive.
- There is always more we could do to effectively identify and serve these kids and more staff training would certainly help.
- These cases are very rare in my district. The psychologist does not give them high priority.
- We are working to expand our use of assessments for students who we may be missed in the identification process. Training in this area would be valuable.
- We monitor all of our students and look for any discrepancies. We do not need another unfunded mandate trying to force districts to make students twice exceptional. We have a situation now that is quite possible that the mother has Munchausen by Proxy syndrome, and the problem is, that once accused, the research shows that the parent becomes even more dangerous to the child. She has this child using a special chair; hearing aid with transmitter, cane, and glasses. The child does not need any of this stuff. We are going to have more cases like this the easier you make it for parents to label their child just so they get attention. It is a crime. I know our district, as well as most others will do what they can do meet the needs of their children. However, we cannot keep spending more than we have for students who do not need these services. We need to spend it on the children who REALLY are twice exceptional. I have had many in the past and they have been served well.
- We screen all our students in 2nd grade, but we have dropped the Otis-Lennon testing that we used to do in both 4th and 6th grade. Now it feels to me like your one big chance to be identified is 2nd grade. At that age I'm not sure how reliable the scores always are.

- With the focus on state high stakes tests, many districts are eliminating nationally-normed tests and relying on referrals for gifted assessments. It is hard to find psychologist time to individually assess children who are at-risk learners.

Services and Impact

	SA	A	N	D	SD	NA/ No Response	D/K Don't Know	Mean	Standard Deviation
17. There is a formal system in place in my district to meet the needs of and deliver both gifted and disabled services to twice exceptional students.	7 6.7%	23 22.1%	13 12.5%	40 38.5%	11 10.6%	6 5.8%	4 3.8%	2.87	1.32
18. Classroom teachers, special education teachers, gifted and talented staff, and other staff work together effectively to meet the needs of and deliver services to twice exceptional students.	8 7.7%	35 33.7%	21 20.2%	23 22.1%	8 7.7%	8 7.7%	1 1.0%	3.16	1.16
19. IEPs reflect the needs of twice exceptional students where appropriate in my district.	6 5.8%	39 37.5%	15 14.4%	16 15.4%	8 7.7%	6 5.8%	14 13.5%	3.62	1.43
20. Teachers, school psychologists, gifted and talented personnel, and other staff receive the professional development they need to understand and address the needs of twice exceptional students in my district.	2 1.9%	11 10.6%	9 8.7%	57 54.8%	20 19.2%	5 4.8%	0 0.0%	2.17	0.95
21. Programs currently in place in my district have had a significant positive impact on the education of twice exceptional students.	3 2.9%	24 23.1%	26 25.0%	24 23.1%	10 9.6%	12 11.5%	5 4.8%	3.01	1.26

22. Programs currently in place in my district address the social and emotional needs of twice exceptional children, in addition to their educational needs.	2 1.9%	19 18.3%	20 19.2%	32 30.8%	18 17.3%	10 9.6%	3 2.9%	2.62	1.25
---	-----------	-------------	-------------	-------------	-------------	------------	-----------	------	------

Comments

- #20: Teachers and GIS do but others do not
- #21 & #22: No programs exist to specifically meet the educational or social/emotions needs of twice-exceptional students.
- As I said earlier, there are some parents and a few teachers (usually young teachers) who think Asbergers equals gifted. We always need to have continuous education.
- As staff cuts continue, I fear there will be less effort to identify and serve twice exceptional students. The manpower of the gifted staff will be more limited and the special education exceptionality will become more dominant.
- For question 21, our programs do have a positive impact but "significant" might be too strong since these students still struggle.
- Gifted service providers are rarely invited to participate in IEP meetings. There are pockets of attempts to serve twice exceptional students, but the key word here is EFFECTIVELY work together. There is work being done.... but not effectively. There are some good anecdotal cases of effective intervention for brief periods, but it is not sustained across learning environments.
- I have only had a few twice exceptional students in my program over the years. I do feel they did benefit by the services. However, I do not feel that the identification was correct in most cases.
- I think that we need to be concerned about the gifted regular population before we try to broaden our horizons and look at other populations. There are many regular gifted students out there that need help and are not getting it. Students that have a special education label are already getting enough attention and money from the state. I think that if the schools are doing their jobs with the IEPs then that should be enough.
- It is my opinion that the model of service we employ does not best serve the social and emotional needs of any gifted students - twice exceptional or not. The teachers do the best they can with the time that they have.
- No programming
- Often focus is on weakness not strengths.
- One of the districts that I work with is cognizant of the twice exceptional student and the teachers, guidance counselors and principals work with the intervention specialist to identify and accommodate their needs. However, the other two districts are not nearly as "on board" with these issues. The major driving factor in appropriate identification and services is parent involvement and advocacy.
- Some of our schools are better than others in the same district.
- The numbers of twice exceptional students in my districts are small so the IAT/IEP teams work together to form an individualized plan. This is working because the gifted staff and general administration support it since it is in the best interest of the students. However, this is not a policy and could change with different administrative points of view.
- The service provided in buildings run by the more savvy principals is informal, but effective, especially regarding our autistic.

- Twice exceptional students make up a very small population in the district. There is not a specific program available to this population. Students would be accommodated in the regular classroom through service with intervention specialists.
- Until disparities between special education and gifted education with regards to funding and mandates are changed, there will not be a significant change in how twice exceptional students are serviced. The reality is that those who are just gifted are woefully underserved as well. The ratio of special education personnel (teachers and aides) to gifted personnel is about 50 to 2, and we have about the same number of students identified as gifted as we have identified as special ed.
- We have a small student population and do not have many twice exceptional children.
- We have a wonderful program at our intermediate and primary but the high school and middle need work. We do not address the social and emotional issues of gifted at these schools.
- We have not ID'd even one twice exceptional student in the time I've been with the district, so am not sure how effectively any of the above would function.
- We have only begun to address the needs of these children. The special education department does a good job with IEP management when gifted is part of it. The teachers are clueless how to implement. Professional development is needed.
- WEP reflects the needs of twice exceptional students where appropriate in my district.
- While I have had only one student identified as twice exceptional in the past 5 years, all attempts to offer the student gifted services in the specific academic area were disregarded. In conversations with the principal, I was told twice that "we don't 'double-dip'" and the discussion was closed. Attempts to encourage the regular classroom teacher to offer independent studies and/or alternatives to written products were ignored. The focus of the student's educational experience continues to be on the disability only.

Parental Involvement

	SA	A	N	D	SD	NA/ No Response	D/K Don't Know	Mean	Standard Deviation
23. In my district, there is a high level of parent involvement in the education of twice exceptional students.	6 5.8%	25 24.0%	16 15.4%	29 27.9%	11 10.6%	11 10.6%	6 5.8%	3.04	1.38
24. In my district, parents generally understand the meaning and significance of their children being twice exceptional.	2 1.9%	30 28.8%	16 15.4%	29 27.9%	13 12.5%	5 4.8%	9 8.7%	3.06	1.43
25. In my district, parents want their twice exceptional children to receive services for their disability.	11 10.6%	51 49.0%	10 9.6%	5 4.8%	4 3.8%	11 10.6%	12 11.5%	4.03	1.17

26. In my district, parents want their twice exceptional children to receive services for their giftedness.	12 11.5%	53 51.0%	9 8.7%	7 6.7%	4 3.8%	9 8.7%	10 9.6%	3.97	1.15
27. In my district, parents work collaboratively with the schools to ensure that the needs of their twice exceptional children are addressed.	7 6.7%	29 27.9%	30 28.8%	11 10.6%	9 8.7%	11 10.6%	7 6.7%	3.38	1.29

Comments

- #26: The discussions regarding services, as promoted by the schools, directly relates to where the funding is - in special education NOT gifted education. #27: Parents of twice-exceptional students become discouraged because their child's gifted needs are not being met at the elementary or, especially the middle school. When their child enters high school, they feel there are opportunities with honors, AP, and PSEO courses...IF, their child's needs regarding their disabilities have been recognized and addressed. It is particularly difficult in small, rural schools due to the few students known to be twice-exceptional. My gut-feeling is that more times than not, the schools sort of turn their backs on these kids by calling them social misfits and calling their parents "pushy." As one parent said to me, "We stopped fighting with the schools, stopped supporting levies and bond issues, cheered the day our child graduated, and hoped and prayed he'd find a better road to travel in the real world with our support."
- As mentioned above, one district has parents that are very proactive and demand services. The other two are lacking the home-school collaboration.
- Even though we have had inservices for our county's school counselors, have published a guidebook for affective needs of G/T students, including a chapter on Twice Exceptional students, I've seen no adjustments to addressing the needs of these students.
- Exceptions are noted above- but we do everything by the book and then some.
- For the small number identified.
- I am also the parent of two gifted children who have attention deficit that affects their ability to focus, but showing no other symptoms. Same school district - different buildings. Very different level of cooperation. Teachers of younger students "believe" that it is possible that bright kids could have difficulty focusing in a classroom or remembering directions given orally. Much less with high school honors students. They just need to "get organized".
- I could use info on best practice for id of twice exceptional.
- I don't believe that parents know how to address this need with district personnel. When they are told their child qualifies for special education, they are usually frustrated about how to meet the superior cognitive needs while receiving special education. Teachers have told them that the student can't be both....and they believe what teachers tell them.
- I think that the parent of special education students are concerned with making sure that the child can survive in the regular world and are focused on the regular classroom curriculum. We have only a handful of students that are twice exceptional and they are provided service just the same as the other identified gifted population.

- Most parents want their child pulled from the gifted services and want to deal with the disability. Often we teach the same classes and the schedule does not work.
 - Our parents of twice exceptional students are very knowledgeable and cooperate with us to find the best service options for the students. Their support is wonderful.
 - Parent involvement is strongly linked to special education identification. As I mentioned previously, some gifted/LD students are not identified, so parents are unaware of their options. We do our best to accommodate the needs of twice exceptional students in our gifted programs by working with kids, parents and families. The reality, though, is that we cannot provide the same level of service for the gifts of these students as we can for their disabilities.
 - Parental pushing and demanding makes things happen.
 - Regular classroom teachers have not been willing to recognize the needs of the twice exceptional children or work collaboratively with parents to meet those needs.
 - The parents are very challenged at home with these students and appreciate help from the school. It is a frustrating circumstance to have a child with an IQ over 140 who is barely getting by academically.
 - The parents of the aforementioned student were notified about their child's gifted identification but never responded in any way. All parent-teacher meetings dealt with the student's IEP only.
 - There does not seem to be a great need for this at the current time in the district. After analyzing the data of gifted identified students, I found about .002 percent of the entire student population would be identified as twice exceptional.
 - Very often the child's giftedness masks the disability and vice versa, so that parents, teachers, schools, don't realize the strong needs of the student.
 - We do not have enough parents in this category to generalize.
- **Additional Comments**
 - As I stated earlier, I think that the state should focus on getting the regular gifted programs in order before they go looking for more to do. Many districts are cutting their gifted programs in this area because it is not financially efficient to keep them. The money that my district is provided by the state barely covers our identification measures. The rest of our program is provided for by the district. I think the push needs to continue in what can we do for all gifted kids and the twice exceptional will be covered under that "umbrella".
 - I believe that twice exceptional students can and should be served in their areas of giftedness while their other academic needs are being addressed. If the regular classroom teacher (and the special ed. teacher, for that matter) are willing to offer differentiated assignments within the regular curriculum, any disabilities can be addressed so as to allow the student a degree of success which s/he is unlikely to achieve without accommodation.
 - It has been very difficult to address the concept / issue of twice exceptional students given the lack of understanding that is pervasive in educators, both at the administrative and classroom levels. The gifted community probably has more information and understanding than the special education community. We need to get those two groups on the same page if we are to be consistent in the message to the educational community as a whole.
 - It is hard to know if you are missing students who may be gifted, not only because of special needs issues, but also because of cultural/economic issues. However, the effort of the state to "cast a wide web" is sure to help us identify and serve more students with special needs.

- It is my understanding that if a student is making "passing grades" they are not eligible for spec. Ed. services. This should never be. The state needs to make gifted services mandatory, thereby insuring these students the help they deserve.
- Our district gifted department explores different service options to meet the needs of the twice exceptional children. Our current service plan for gifted children is a pull-out program. This plan has met resistance from regular classroom teachers who do not want twice exceptional children out of the regular classroom for gifted services.
- Thank you for addressing this issue.
- This is a field in which I'm interested, but as I said before, we've not ID'd any students in this group since I've been with the district. I have limited exposure to several through their parents or other schools, but don't know how effectively my district could address the issue.
- Though we have successfully served several SED students in our programs, it is much more difficult to serve those who are LD/gifted. These students suffer not only educationally, but emotionally, trying to figure out who they and who their peer group is; sometimes they are struggling learners and sometimes they are gifted in their thoughts and ideas. The student I mentioned above (comments under #16) is doing well in our gifted program. I am also working with parents, teachers and the psychologist to understand more about his visual processing difficulties and how we can help him. I regret that we could not serve him last year, but his parents even feel that he would have struggled too much in the gifted class, which would have been far too frustrating for him. Thank you for taking the time to study concerns with twice-exceptional children.
- We have no children in our district that have been identified twice exceptional, and to my knowledge, never have.
- We need the following: 1. Mandates and funding for gifted identification and service. 2. School board policies that address gifted service and acceleration. 3. Mandated pre-service and in-service for all educators on gifted issues and twice-exceptional needs. 4. Collaboration among all educational parties...special ed., gifted ed., administration, teachers, school psychologists, etc. when it comes to twice-exceptional students' needs and developing and communicating a plan with the parents and students.