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Abstract

Schools have undergone constant and progressive change throughout our country's history. In many ways changes both past and present can be seen as addressing the issues of excellence or equity. Education reform in America today has been characterized by calls for massive and immediate systemic restructuring. Many efforts have been undertaken to correct long inadequacies in our schools. Often though, efforts have focused on the problem of low standards or unequal opportunities and provides insufficient attention to the other side.

Gifted education has long been recognized as an education of high, if not ideal, standards. Unfortunately, nearly all programs for the gifted are offered to a select few, often to only 3 to 5 percent of a school's population which usually disproportionately excludes children of underrepresented minorities. So while gifted education excels on the excellence side, it falls grossly short on the equity side.

The gifted program at Kahuku High and Intermediate School on the North Shore of Oahu, Hawaii has patiently created a program, not for gifted children, but for students who choose gifted education. Over ten years, the program has grown from about 75 students and four teachers to its present enrollment of nearly 500 (in a school of about 1800) and 17 teachers. It is now a dynamic example of how excellence and equity can be served in one program in one school.

This study explicates the evolution of the KHS GT-AP program. Of particular emphasis is its unique historical development which shows how a holistic and incremental approach to reform is required to make sensible and
responsible change. A study of the program demonstrates how each change over the last ten years was considered within the context of implications for the whole program and school.

An important aspect of the study is the qualitative and quantitative information that substantiates the claim by the KHS GT-AP staff that offering challenging opportunities to students results in astonishing achievement levels from a broad spectrum of the student population; levels at one time thought unthinkable by even the present staff. These achievements are accomplished by students who would qualify for most gifted programs across the nation and by students who might be considered for remedial programs and by students representing the whole spectrum of KHS's ethnically diverse student population.

Because of its unique circumstances and personalities, the KHS GT-AP program would be difficult to clone elsewhere. Nonetheless, several lessons can be gleaned from the study when the program is seen as a model for change; change that addresses both excellence and equity concerns.
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Preface

The sabbatical I was given in 1987-88 played a significant role in my decision to pursue a doctorate and to write this particular dissertation. It provided me with the time for reflection as well as the opportunity to pursue new perspectives and knowledge in the field of gifted education. This sabbatical had come midway through what would be nearly ten years in my association with the Kahuku High School gifted program.

While I did not take any specific course related to gifted education, the courses in history, educational philosophy, and social foundations of education greatly influenced my rethinking of gifted education and the Kahuku program. As I ruminated over the general movement of educational reform and its history, I began to realize how much I was really bothered by some of the inequities inherent in most gifted programs as we knew them, including the program at Kahuku.

Still, my studies produced a much more profound personal dissatisfaction with the overall state of American education which I could reduce to a failure to accomplish widespread success in excellence and equity issues. Coming out of the revelations of A Nation at Risk, it was obvious that standards of achievement in American schools were modest at best, and distressing at worst since too many classrooms across the nation simply left students unchallenged, uninterested and unmotivated. A suggestion to examine Adler's Paiadea Proposal in relation to curriculum proved interesting but inadequate. On the equity side, it did not take Kozol's Savage Inequalities to make me realize that the opportunity for a quality education was simply nonexistent for large segments of our school population. Even in many of our "better" schools, students who have never been given the opportunity to realize their capabilities
and to demonstrate their abilities have been left as a stagnant and undiscovered pool of academic talent.

I took these "revelations" back to Kahuku and began to suggest reformulations of the gifted program. I decided that part of the problem with many of the reform programs was that they either tried to start from ground zero or began with the equity side of the problem. Starting from scratch meant that success was often delayed or remote. Starting with the equity side often meant that high standards of achievement were compromised in the interest of reaching more students. If a "reform" could start with an existing program that had already proven successful for a small population and then attempt to extend that success to more students, it would stand a better chance of meeting both excellence and equity standards (or so I thought).

That was seven years ago. Two years ago, it came time for me to decide on a dissertation topic. While this particular topic was not my first choice, I had no problem switching to it when I realized that I had a wealth of ready information and a topic I felt was worth writing about. The staff, parents and students at Kahuku would surely be interested and might benefit by a detailed examination of the program.

But beyond a personal satisfaction and the school's edification, I truly believed that the Kahuku High School gifted program had redefined gifted education and can stand as a model for reform attempts elsewhere. This is not to say that the program can and should be copied. The Kahuku model provides only general guides which can be transferred to other situations: viewing change holistically; starting with a philosophical base; building on present success; starting with gifted education; constructing administrative and decision making systems; developing curriculum goals; etc.
To the interested reader of this paper, it was obvious to me that I had to provide strong evidence of the success of the program in addressing both excellence and equity. It may at times seem self-congratulating or cheerleading. This is not the intent. If I can't convince you that success in excellence and equity can be achieved in a single program, then I fall short in the primary purpose for this study. I'd like you to read the paper with the purpose of generating thinking or rethinking of your own situation or situations with which you are familiar. My sabbatical helped me to do that.

Finally, I need to admit that the resulting success of the program at Kahuku is hardly my success. I probably only provided the initial push in the Robert Maynard Hutchins vein of "The best for the best; the best for all." Part of the success has been serendipitous and the rest has simply come about through hard work on the part of many people who have bought into the idea of extending gifted education to many more students.

The following dissertation was undertaken with the intent of focusing on the Kahuku High School Gifted and Talented Program. Chapter 1 outlines the general mood of national reform and chapter 2 describes education for the gifted in America. These two chapters are meant to provide the context for chapter 3 which suggests that the KHS program creatively and dynamically addresses current issues of reform and gifted education.

The fact that chapter 1 and 2 provide historical and social background to the issues should not be taken as an indication that the focus of the dissertation is historical or social. While the paper develops around an educational foundations base, the intent of the dissertation is to suggest the KHS program as a viable alternative in the reform movement. The foundational aspects of the paper is important in providing an understanding of the complexity of the issues and the context within which the issues are couched. It would be difficult to
present the KHS program without the historical, social and philosophical reasons provided in chapters 1 and 2. But chapter 3 is clearly the focus; a presentation of the KHS program as a response to the difficulty of addressing both excellence and equity issues in general reforms, and in particular, reforms in gifted education.
Chapter 1
General School Reform

Introduction

... capable of expressing and establishing interrelationships between the content and conclusions of nearly all scholarly disciplines, The Glass Bead Game is thus a mode of playing with the total contents and values of our culture; it plays with them as, say, in the great age of the arts a painter might have played with the colors on his palette. All the insights, noble thoughts, and works of art that the human race has produced in its creative eras, all that subsequent periods of scholarly study have reduced to concepts and converted into intellectual property--on all this immense body of intellectual values The Glass Bead Game player plays like the organist on an organ ... On the other hand, within this fixed structure, or to abide by our image, within the complicated mechanism of this giant organ, a whole universe of possibilities and combinations is available to the individual player (Hesse 1969).

Hermann Hesse could very well have been describing the reformation of our modern educational system rather than a fictional academic sect of a bygone time. The Glass Bead Game required the player to consider and manipulate all facets of society in creating an infinite number of possible conclusions to the game. This passage from The Glass Bead Game might strike one as appropriately reflective of the process and parameters of education reform since the publication of A Nation at Risk in 1983.

At times some have reduced the ills of public education to a simple panacea such as "Give more homework". A family quoted in The Honolulu Advertiser described how much more satisfied they were with the education one son was getting at a private school than what their twins were getting at public school. One of the major issues identified was the three hours of homework the first son labored over versus the free time the twins had after school. On the other hand, parents of public school students will complain about the amount of homework when it approaches two hours per night. Does paying for private
education mean different standards of what is appropriate, especially in the eyes of parents? The article made some mention of the father realizing that the private school creates homogeneous classrooms but made no mention about the fact that teachers there teach only four periods (of eight) and class size rarely exceeds 17.

So what if we reduced class size to those standards? Will it guarantee public school success? It may be a start but hardly the whole answer. The experts of The Glass Bead Game understood that the winning of the game required that any manipulation of one facet of the situation necessitated ever widening adjustment to all other aspects of society. Thus the winner was the one that could best solve the problem in the context of all its ramifications. Is this the situation in education today?

It seems the major focus today in reforming education, especially secondary education, centers on either the pursuit of excellence in achievement or equity of opportunity. The major dilemma, of course, becomes whether both excellence and equity can be achieved in the same agenda and how to create reform in education within the context of the greater society's pressures and changes. Such is the basic problem of the modern Glass Bead Game.

**Early History of Reform**

It will first lend insight to briefly view the historical basis of the present movements in education. Beginning with Thomas Jefferson and ending with *A Nation at Risk*, America's education history illustrates the complexity of the evolution of today's system of education.

Jefferson's *Virginia Plan* for education initiated the debate over equity and excellence. He proposed that all children be given the opportunity for early primary education and that the best students, regardless of social (not ethnic)
background, be provided further education in a pyramidal process of educating America's brightest students. Jefferson's plan, while modest in modern terms, was a radical breach from the practice of education exclusively for the gentry. He envisioned an aristocracy based on merit which would be fostered by an opening of the system of education.

Education for the masses whether encouraged by the vision of Jefferson, Horace Mann or others did not take hold until well into the 19th century when the expansion of an urban working class changed forever the demographics of America from a primarily agrarian society to an industrial one. Primary public education became a distinct response by government to pressures not only to provide children with knowledge but also to mitigate social conditions brought about by industrialization.

Michael Katz (1987), with an apparent Marxist/structuralist view, sees early American public education as a means of cultural standardization of the increasingly diverse population by the more powerful class. Schools then inculcated modern work habits such as punctuality, regularity, and docility. He suggests that public school systems existed to shape behavior and attitudes and to alleviate social and family pressures brought about by industrialization.

Its structures evolved out of an attitude of noblesse oblige when schools in the early 19th century were led without elaborate organization, a professional staff or state control. Horace Mann reacted to the laissez faire state of public education with a call for professionalism of the systems, too loosely constructed as they were. Centralization of control in the form of bureaucracies resulted from the need to standardize both access to and the quality of schools, to differentiate functions and establish standards of expertise.

Many, of course, do not see the growth of education quite as insidious as Katz, pointing more to the goals of creating an educated populace in democratic
ideals and assimilating immigrants into the American culture. Given any perspective, one commonality emerges; American public education emerged as a perceived agency for the solution of virtually every major social problem.

Then in the late 19th and early 20th century American life evolved into its more modern form with women working more and procreating less, children going to school instead of working on farms (and fewer working in sweatshops), and an expanding middle class that reflected more disposable income, increased desire for more material goods and more leisure time. At the time compulsory attendance in schools only extended to primary levels but high schools became more common, 4.4 million enrolled by 1930 (Boyer 1983), and education came to be seen as that channel for the attainment of the "good life".

Dissident voices, such as John Dewey, contended that good schools were necessary but not a sufficient condition for the creation of a democratic social order (Ravitch 1985). Progressive educators, led by the ideas of Dewey, began in the 20th century to look at education for students as a quality of life issue. Students needed to be seen less in terms of a tabula rasa to be filled with knowledge than as vibrant individuals whose own experiences become the starting point for lifelong learning.

But, according to Katz (1987), Lawrence Cremin (1988) and David Tyack (1991), education from the 1920s to 1950 remained as it basically was earlier; teacher centered with some progressive movement in the elementary level but virtually none in high schools. While knowledge of progressive ideas and methodologies were widely known,

Teachers kept their classroom doors closed to such techniques because of the high price in energy that they, and not their superintendent or principal, had to pay in personal time, loneliness that might arise from introducing changes and making oneself different from colleagues, lack of tangible and explicit incentives to make such changes, and uncertainty of whether promised outcomes would indeed benefit children (Cuban 1984).
The 1960s ushered in a brief period of experimentation with informal education and alternative schools in reaction to general dissatisfaction with education from many sources. Academics worried about the teaching of basic skills and civil rights activists saw segregated and unequal education. This criticism ran counter to the basic tenet that public education existed to promote equal opportunity toward creating a literate populace ingrained with democratic ideals. Charles Silberman, in *Crisis in the Classroom* (1970), harshly declared that "by almost unanimous agreement, is the wasteland, one is tempted to say cesspool--of American education."

**Education Reform to 1980**

The 19th century promoters of public education argued that widespread schooling would alleviate five social problems: 1) crime and poverty, 2) cultural heterogeneity, 3) poor work habits, 4) idle youth, and 5) the anxieties of middle class parents about their children's future (Katz 1987). In part, Brown v. Board in 1954, in overturning the separate but equal doctrine which had dominated civil rights since the late 19th century, came in response to the realization in some quarters (especially with African Americans) that equity in educational opportunity meant greater chances of participating in mainstream America.

But history seems to show that there existed little connection between the extent of public education and the level of societal disorder. Schools have been more successful in taking youth off the streets and inculcating societal and institutional norms of behavior which resulted little from what teachers taught. Henry Perkinson, in *The Imperfect Panacea: American Faith in Education, 1865-1965*, stated

Throughout the history of American educational reform, one theme has remained constant: the grandiose and unrealistic expectation
that schools can solve America's social, economic, cultural, political, and moral problems (Katz 1987).

Ravitch (1985) more recently echoes the sentiments.

It is no failing to acknowledge that the schools cannot provide a remedy for every problem of our society nor for every troubled young person.

If our system of education cannot do everything, what can it do? According to Ravitch, critics often overlook some of the successes of our system. She suggests that the educational enterprise has become a victim of its own successes in view of past goals and achievements: 1) that teachers would have college degrees and pedagogical training, 2) that teachers would unionize, 3) that the federal government would support education, 4) that all children could be admitted to schools regardless of race or national origin, 5) that college would be accessible to all students of high achievement, motivation and ability, etc. Moreover,

Participation in formal schooling has grown sharply in recent decades. The proportion of 17 year-olds who graduated from high school grew from about 50% in 1940 to about 75% in the late 1960s. Similarly, the proportion of young people who entered college climbed from about 16% in 1940 to about 45% in 1968, at which time it leveled off. In no other country in the world does participation in formal schooling last as long, for so many people, as in the United States (Ravitch 1985).

Successes have also been evident in education for minorities: the graduation rates in 1950 were 50% for whites and 25% for African Americans; in 1979 they increased to 85% for whites and 75% for African Americans (Goodlad 1984).

Given success in the past, where does education go from here? A torrent of criticism levied at schools point to a widespread perception that whatever schools are trying to do, they are not doing well. The nation does not lack for experts who claim to know what to fix and how to fix it. The rest of the essay will address the contentious debate over what schools should be doing.
**A Nation at Risk**

The 1983 document, *A Nation at Risk*, represented the call to arms for the present movement of education reform. The National Commission on Excellence in Education sounded the alarm with the now oft repeated lines,

... the educational foundations of our society are presently being eroded by a rising tide of mediocrity that threatens our very future as a Nation and a people. What was unimaginable a generation ago has begun to occur--others are matching and surpassing our educational attainments.

The mediocrity unveiled initiated an outcry for higher standards. Deficiencies "uncovered" concerned the amount of homework, course requirements (especially in math, science and foreign language), the proliferation of minimum competency exams, open enrollments at the college level, and decreasing expenditures for textbooks. Recommendations by the National Commission tended toward the idea that more is better: more course requirements for graduation, increased admissions standards at the college level, more rigorous standards for grades, more time spent in school (lengthened day and/or year), more homework, better teacher training and increased salaries, and increased support and vigilance from the public.

In conclusion, the report, in a variation on the theme coined by former Harvard president Derek Bok, declared that excellence costs, but in the long run mediocrity costs far more. And while many of the report's findings were disputed and recommendations debated, the education community quickly mobilized itself to respond. Some educators personally found all the attention welcomed; since any attention, even harsh criticism, was better than the lack of attention that schools had been enduring for too long.

*A Nation at Risk* was quickly followed by *High School* (Boyer 1983) and *A Place Called School* by (Goodlad 1984) and the formation of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, the Holmes Group and the
various business roundtables around the country by the mid-80s. A plethora of ideas, schemes and directions emerged that make a sorting of concepts difficult and any full understanding of the present situation mind-boggling. The experts of the present Glass Bead Game haven't seemed to be able to agree on the goals or the rules.

On top of the introspection, American education has also been poorly compared to the education systems of Japan, Germany and Great Britain, our industrial partners. Similar issues surface: national standards, homework, the school year, national testing, and ability grouping (Unk 1992). Critics lament that in global comparisons among industrial nations, American students fare lowest in math, in the lowest third in reading comprehension and lowest in civic education (tied with Ireland). In defense of American schools, 75% of U.S. students graduate while Swedes graduate only 45-50% and Germans only 15% from gymnasiu nl which is their highest level of schooling. Top American students also compared favorably with top students of other nations (Boyer 1983).

One idea has emerged that most would agree upon. In the latter 1980s, nearly every slogan seemed to have the word "paradigm" in it. The education community seemed to have unanimously adopted the scientific structure of Kuhn and declare that old conceptions of education must make way for radically different thinking. According to Kuhn:

A revolution in science does not alter the phenomena themselves. Rather, it fundamentally changes the way in which they are viewed, the theories by which they are explained (Finn 1990).

Cuban (1984) points to five reasons that explain why the old paradigms of classroom teaching resist change: 1) dominant teaching practices endure because they produce student behaviors consistent with the demands of the larger society, 2) teaching the entire class one thing at the same time is efficient
and convenient given the time available, the mandated content and the need to maintain control, 3) there is a preference for stability and caution toward change that permeates the profession, 4) personal teacher beliefs weigh heavily in classroom environments, and 5) reform efforts have been mostly mishandled or irregularly supported.

There are some who feel that everything depends on the teacher. Others who feel that everything depends on the principal. There is also the perception that resources, teachers and practices are less significant than the home and community, perceptions supported by the 1966 Coleman and 1973 Jencks reports (Goodlad 1984). And in some reports, students lay most of the blame squarely on their own feet.

So what is it that we want schools to do? The Gallup Poll in 1988 showed that Americans would 1) pay higher taxes if applied directly to education, 2) slightly favor continued efforts to promote racial integration through education, 3) slightly oppose bilingual education, 4) oppose year-round schooling, 5) strongly feel small classes make a great deal of difference, 6) strongly support a national exam for graduation, and 7) overwhelmingly favor national testing for comparing schools. In respect to teachers, Americans feel very strongly that a) teacher education needs to attract more capable students, b) teachers should take periodic competency tests, c) national certification standards should be established and d) teachers should be able to earn merit pay. Finally, 88% said that developing the best educational system in the world is very important toward America's future strength (Elam 1989).

Again, what do Americans want high schools to accomplish? Quite simply, we want it all (Boyer 1983). But:

What parents, teachers, and students expect of schools is an important but insufficient criterion for determining what our schools should seek to do. To say that schools belong to their
communities means little until we define community. It is the responsibility of the state, presumably, to raise expectations for schools beyond only those of local significance so that they encompass national and, indeed, global awareness and understanding (Goodlad 1984).

Excellence

More and more, voices of the education community call for promoting the need to focus efforts in well defined goals. The movement to establish excellence as the major goal of American education has emerged as a capstone of many other goals which attempt to formulate and implement higher standards.

While the schools were devising ways to retain students by meeting demands for 'relevance,' the pendulum began to swing, and a new critique of the schools emerged, which assumed mass education as a given but focused on the issue of quality. If there was a single event that precipitated the new public mood, it was the revelation in 1975 that scores on the SAT for college entry had slipped steadily for a dozen years (Ravitch 1985).

The slippage of test scores forced educators and the public to identify the problems and causes plaguing the educational system.

Proponents of excellence criticize the shopping mall formula of the curricula of schools. A Nation at Risk proposed a common curriculum seemingly modeled in line with Japan and Great Britain. Still, the idea of a core curriculum as the basis for excellence in education essentially began with Robert Maynard Hutchins during his tenure as president of the University of Chicago which he developed through his friendship with Mortimer Adler. In the 1930s Hutchins abandoned the social sciences in favor of philosophy to provide a coherent basis of all intellectual pursuits (Dzuback 1990). He revived a rigorous core of liberal studies for undergrads that crossed department lines. Adler helped to extend the ideas of a common core of liberal education from the
university to public schools. This common core centered on instituting a *Great Books* curriculum promoting the art of reading, writing, thinking and speaking (Mayer 1993).

Hutchins used his philosophical bias to clearly state:

The prime object of education is to know what is good for man. It is to know the goods in their order. There is a hierarchy of values. The task of education is to help us understand it, establish it, and live by it. ... This is the education appropriate to free men. It is liberal education. If all men are to be free, all men must have this education. ... A liberal education aims to develop the powers of understanding and judgment (Hutchins 1953).

With Hutchins's and his own ideas, Adler (1982) created *The Paideia Proposal* which explicitly outlines a program of objectives and methodologies to meet achievement standards for all students; a single track system based on a single curriculum to "prepare every child to earn a living and live a good life. ... to preserve our free institutions." Adler also offers a list of *Great Books* that begins with Homer and Aeschylus and ends with Toynbee and De Chardin. Though not suggesting a specific list of books Boyer also favors a return to "great literature within a core of common learning (Boyer 1983). Of course, Adler realizes that *The Paideia Proposal* must be supplemented with basic and broad changes over a long period of time throughout the educational system for students to graduate in his image.

Ravitch (1985) also echoes Adler's concerns:

Technicization occurs when teaching emphasizes abstract skills over course content, when children are taught procedures but not a common core of knowledge. This tendency has been particularly invidious in the teaching of literature and history and has produced students who have mastered the basic skills but have little knowledge of great literature or of the major events, ideas, and individuals that shaped history.

Adler's proposal, while not as specific as Hirsch's *Cultural Literacy*, puts content back into the curriculum and makes specific changes in the scope of
studies and how it is delivered. In particular, two of the more controversial changes that *Paideia* makes are the elimination of all electives, vocational courses and extracurricular activities, and an undifferentiated curriculum for all students regardless of ability or background. There is a reliance on graduates of the system who, inculcated with *Paideia* values, would engender needed complementary changes in the social and economic structures of the nation. But there seems no suggestion of a specific assessment system to measure student achievement.

In *Paideia Problems and Possibilities* (1983) and *Reforming Education* (1988), Adler makes several concessions in the practical realities if not in the conceptual, in reaction to criticisms of *Paideia*. Among them are 1) allowance for regional modification of the required course of study, 2) that delivery of the curriculum cannot be consistent given the range of ability in the teacher corps, 3) that 100% success is not possible, and 4) the fact that any change will take years, possibly decades, longer than most would have patience for.

Thus, the weakness of Adler and those who tout excellence as the focal issue in education is that they generally ignore the variation of the clientele; the humanness of students, teachers and administrators, seeing them all interchangeable and essentially compliant and fully capable of adopting and achieving the *Paideia* agenda. Nowhere does Adler address why he thinks all students can learn the same curriculum taught in his identified three modes (didactic, coaching, socratic) when researchers have been making a strong case that people learn in at least seven different ways (as suggested by Howard Gardner). He ignores educators who are convinced that extracurricular activities, especially athletics, are often the prime motivating force behind a student's attendance in schools. His program clearly seems more suited for Japan's schools or Germany's gymnasiums.
Noddings (1993), most reknown for her ideas on caring, contradicts Adler in a similar way.

Because excellence is so often posited in opposition to equality, I would like to start with an exploration of excellence, and see whether I can develop something that will satisfy those who usually start with equality. ... I will attack the slogan 'All children can learn,' and I will also try to promote excellence as a concept far richer than equality for educational thought.

She suggests that schools should help students strive for excellence in noncollege "tracks"; that those who exhibit nonacademic abilities should be provided the opportunity to excel with those talents; that the present system (and by extension, Adler's) "prepares" excellence in the trades or arts through failure in academics.

Noddings thus argues for diversity in the curriculum and for earlier specialization. She stresses that a common curriculum can exist as a core that also allows pursuits important to substantial numbers of students and parents. Noddings emphasizes that attending to talents and interests provides for students that have:

- made their environment more beautiful,
- demonstrated their various talents,
- shared their knowledge,
- made things,
- expressed themselves,
- entered relationships of friendship and love,
- and in general grew as competent, caring, loving, and lovable people.

Equity

As Noddings points out, the excellence issue is often placed in opposition to equity. And alternately the equality issue reveals as much complexity and competing issues within it as within the excellence issue. One such critical issue is whether critics of schools advocate equity of opportunity or equity of results? Difficulties follow either interpretation.

Although guaranteeing equality of access is an advance over such practices as de jure segregation, it can be quite hollow if it merely
amounts to removing formal barriers to the choices students and their parents might make, as de facto segregation aptly illustrates. On the other hand, guaranteeing equality of results seems to demand too much, both in terms of the capabilities of schools and in terms of how it threatens to block the freedom that students and their parents might otherwise wish to exercise (Howe 1992).

Equity issues are closely related to issues of multiculturalism, desegregation and tracking. Each in turn comes with its own internal tensions.

In a democratic society promoting liberal education, multiculturalism creates the dilemma of treating students as equal individuals while recognizing their distinct identities within members of groups. Minority groups naturally have gained the most attention but even then minorities as a group are a widely disparate population that creates significant, often conflicting, implications for schools (ibid). There has also been the issue of gender equality since the late 1970s.

The nation's record on desegregation since Brown v. Board has been spotty. African-Americans have made some broad gains in graduation rates but some inner city schools have become so bad that they have been taken over by states and talk of for-profit organizations moving in has gained momentum.

A recent target of the equity movement, tracking is probably the scapegoat of every critic of the present system. Tracking seems to be blamed for nearly everything wrong with schools, as obviously illogical as this may appear. As previously mentioned, Cuban (1984) reasons that certain practices prevail through tacit and pragmatic approval of the establishment.

Equity concerns have engendered many schemes to reform both structure and content. Based on research of achievement and class size, one such scheme, the Orlich Plan, would supersede Brown v. Board mandated racial balance with small neighborhood schools based on class sizes limited to 13 to 17 pupils regardless of ethnicity. (Orlich 1991) The plan implies that
smaller classes, even when completely consisting of a single ethnic makeup, would show greater impact on student achievement than attempts to desegregate classrooms.

Curriculum considerations for equity key on a multicultural approach to course content. Proponents argue that:

First, no one group or culture should have a monopoly on knowledge, learning, and humanity. Second, educational equality requires the total reconceptualization of our views of American history and culture and of the ways they are taught and learned. Third, diversity is a characteristic of the human condition, one that education for equality and excellence must embrace unconditionally (Gay 1990).

The recognition that ethnic groups must be represented in course content is the keystone of multicultural considerations of equity.

A companion issue of multicultural content is multilingualism. Recent trends indicate that more school districts are adding immersion (such as in Hawaii and California) programs to bilingual and SLEP (Students of Limited English Proficiency) programs. As some school districts become inundated with immigrants, classrooms are being set up to provide second language instruction either totally or partially for both native and non-native speakers. Some research has shown that this approach can actually promote faster learning of English for speakers of a second language and of a second language for speakers of English.

The principle of equal educational opportunity can only be realized for cultural minorities by rendering educational opportunities worth wanting, and rendering educational opportunities worth wanting requires that minorities not be required to give up their identities in order to enjoy them (Howe 1992).
Means and Knapp (1991) criticize the dummy-down curriculum\(^1\) development for "at risk", "disadvantaged", or "educationally deprived" students who invariably come from poor or ethnic/linguistic minority families.

A fundamental assumption underlying much of the curriculum in America's schools is that certain skills are "basic" and so must be mastered before students are given instruction in more "advanced" skills, such as reading comprehension, written composition, and mathematical reasoning (Means and Knapp 1991).

Thus, students are relegated to curricula that do little for self-esteem.

Whatever the perspective, equity issues ultimately begin to blur with excellence issues. Excellence proponents want excellence for all students and equity proponents want all students to have equal access to an excellent education.

**Curriculum/Pedagogy Reform**

Is what and how we teach appropriate for today's society? Even if teaching methods and content were appropriate and effective 50 years ago, have societal changes necessitated radically different approaches? At the turn of the century, Dewey asserted that:

> In a democratic community children had to learn to be leaders as well as followers, possessed of 'power of self-direction and power of directing others, powers of administration, ability to assume positions of responsibility' as citizens and workers. Because the world was a rapidly changing one, a child could not, moreover, be educated for any 'fixed station in life,' but schools had to provide him with training that would 'give him such possession of himself that he may take charge of himself; may not only adapt himself to the changes which are going on, but have power to shape and direct those changes' (Westbrook 1992).

When conditions change, do basic educational goals remain unchanged?

\(^1\)This refers to a curriculum that requires the lowest or lower level of skill development from the targeted student population.
Though there has yet to be a serious push toward a national curriculum as in Japan and Great Britain, national standards for content areas have gained prominence.

When standards are set in place, a successful school is one that provides both excellence and equity—a challenging education for every child. ... Standards are the guarantor of excellence and equity in education (Ravitch 1992).

While the above statement by the former Assistant Secretary of Education may be debatable, the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics has recently developed national standards for the teaching of mathematics which more than 40 states have already adopted to provide a guide for math education.

Other content area groups are jumping on the bandwagon to do the same for their courses of study: the National Academy of Sciences, the National Endowment for the Humanities for American and world history, the National Endowment for the Arts. The goal of the efforts is to provide coherence for all members of a school community and guidance in curriculum development. It is also supposed to provide national frameworks for assessment, teacher education and textbooks (ibid.).

Of course, the standards are not enough. Howard Gardner's and other researchers' recent findings in multiple intelligences and learning styles are beginning to add pressure to more fully examine how the curriculum is delivered. Goodlad (1990) suggests that:

Regardless of considerable contrary rhetoric, we do not yet know enough about the varied ways humans learn to warrant a science of teaching specifically addressed to such variations. But we do know that differences in both the nature of what is to be learned and the ways learning occurs necessitate a broad and varied repertoire of teaching techniques: lecturing, demonstrating, coaching, tutoring, symbolically representing, role playing, and more. ... The guiding admonition to teachers should be: Exercise great caution in varying the curriculum to meet individual differences but be as creative as possible in varying the ways of teaching and the modes of learning.
Goodlad's view may be well taken. Given that individuals have different learning styles and that teachers probably have little expertise in identifying each individual's learning style, teachers should provide the broadest range of methodologies so that each learning style can be accommodated within the curriculum.

In many ways, while gifted education has come under serious criticism for its tracking type structure and for perceived elitism, in schools it is often only in the classrooms for the gifted that varied pedagogical delivery styles are exhibited. Some advocates of gifted education plead that rather than abolishing gifted programs, the rest of the school should adopt the methodologies of gifted education. Hank Levin, developer of the Accelerated Schools program says:

I started to do a lot of reading in the research literature, and in the literature on gifted and talented programs, and I was convinced that if we exposed all children to the richest experiences--but also connected schools, Dewey-style, with the children's experiences, their culture, and their community--we could bring kids into the mainstream. And we'd find that a lot of these kids were gifted and talented, even in the traditional sense (Brandt 1992).

**School Restructuring**

The locus of formal learning is essentially in the classroom and the community and school greatly impact what the teacher creates and what the students achieve.

However, discussions of the changes that are needed most often take place in the rarefied atmosphere of universities, foundations, and business round tables, where talking about the schools is abstract and intellectual work that is far removed from the social realities of schooling (Lieberman and Miller 1990).
Lieberman and Miller argue that reform should be seen as a broad continual steady progression of change supported by leadership, a shared vision, goals, resources, and collegiality. Furthermore, restructuring requires attention to four major issues: 1) administrative and teacher leadership, 2) the dilemma of process versus content, 3) balancing the needs of students and of teachers, and 4) achieving a balance between action and reflection. Hopefully, a change in how schools are organized will result in dramatic changes in the delivery of the curriculum and in the receptivity of students and then appropriate increases in achievement would follow.

Ted Sizer (1992), one of the gurus of school restructuring and patriarch of the Coalition of Essential Schools, has explicated his extensive thinking on what a restructured school would look like in *Horace’s School*. Structurally, the school would be divided into academically self-contained Houses which would be large enough for richness but small enough to create a sense of community. Decision-making would involve all teachers. The curriculum would be assessed by tests and exhibits created by each student with faculty advisement with the ultimate goal of creating habits in perspective, analysis, imagination, empathy, commitment, humility and joy. The four general content areas of *Horace’s* school would be: 1) communication and inquiry, 2) mathematics and science, 3) arts and literature and 4) history and philosophy. Teachers would use enlightened methodologies: personalized learning, Socratic “lecturing”, rigorous standards, collaboration, engaging and significant work and offer a curriculum that is connected, relevant, important, interesting and challenging (Sizer 1992).

Though *Horace’s School* doesn’t seem to be offering much that is terribly enlightening, its contribution is its total school approach; a conception of what an ideal school can look like. Its weakness is the lack of a description of
enabling steps; supporting incentives that would encourage and provide for change, especially those beyond the scope of the school administration. Still, Sizer focuses on the school. He offers a conception, workable or not, that school districts and administrators might choose to adopt in total or in part.

Levin points out:

We don't start by changing attitudes; we start by changing behavior: asking the staff to try things. And they've got to work them out. We don't tell them precisely what to do; we just outline general principles. But then—as the school begins to succeed—it takes on a life of its own (Brandt 1992).

This may imply that programs like Horace's need to create an environment of success that engenders further success and an enthusiasm for problem solving as a means to experience success.

Jim' Haas (1992), a principal of a junior high in Kansas, warns that the danger in school restructuring is that:

Ideas of merit tend to have demerits as well, relative to different goals. The fads fade, taking with them precious resources, and leaving a residue of confusion that obscures the nature of the dilemmas they were meant to resolve. ... Indeed, many of the actions we are encouraged to take are contradictory or mutually exclusive. ... In every case, students are at the mercy of fads, of the changing winds of political expediency, and of passing whims.

Haas voices much of the concerns of the frontline teacher. Efforts at changing classroom instruction is not new. In fact, change has been constant, but as he says, much of change is in the form of fads which blow through and sap the enthusiasm and energy teachers have for the next "bright idea". Such is the task of the school reformer; overcoming the pessimism, suspicion or weariness of the staff to create significant and lasting change at the school level.

And any effort at school reform cannot ignore the teacher.

A tennis shoe in a laundry dryer. Probably no image captures so fully for me the life of an adult working in an elementary, middle, or senior high school. For educators schoolwork much of the time is
turbulent, heated, confused, disoriented, congested, and full of recurring bumps (Barth 1990).

In a 1989 national survey by the NEA, less than half of the teachers surveyed want their son or daughter to be a teacher. Teacher education is presented with the dilemma of how to staff the nation's classrooms with a deserving portion of the "best and brightest" when the nation offers its rewards and its respect elsewhere (Haas 1992). Not only are ed schools having a difficult time recruiting the best students, but the "best and brightest" are leaving the profession and still others are simply "serving time" until something more lucrative, socially valued, personally fulfilling or less consuming comes along (Barth 1990).

Nor can we expect to attract the best and brightest into teaching when they have had twelve years of opportunity to observe first hand the daily frustrations and petty humiliations that many teachers must endure (Boyer 1983).

Even with morale seemingly low, the call has been for higher standards for certification and more rigorous teacher evaluation. Raising salaries, merit pay and career ladders are suggestions which cost money that while the public says it is willing to pay (see earlier re Gallup Poll), the money has not come forth and actually might do little in the overall scheme of school improvement.

Boyer has created an impressive list of teacher incentives from which enlightened districts or legislatures might pick beyond raising salaries: 1) every college recognize an outstanding teacher alumnus every year, 2) more sabbaticals, study leaves or exchanges, 3) extend the school year by two weeks with pay for professional development, 4) paid summer study terms every five years per teacher, and 5) a teacher travel fund. However incentives are packaged, the fact that teacher education students score lowest of all college students in entrance and other standardized test must be reversed.
There is, quite frankly, a lot of hypocrisy at work when colleges call for 'excellence in the school' while spending several hundred million dollars every year recruiting athletes and spending virtually no time or money recruiting prospective teachers (Boyer 1983).

**Family and Community**

A veteran high school principal once promised an audience, "Let me control one thing and I'll run you a perfect school." What was that thing? "Let me choose the parents." School reform does not start with schools. It starts with families, with their communities, with the culture (Sizer 1992).

It is generally understood that school reform cannot occur in a vacuum. Recent efforts in school community-based decision-making (SCBM) point to movement to address this concern. The recognition that schools cannot do it all are forcing administrators to look beyond the walls of the school for community and community-based support. Adopt-a-school programs, community fundraisers, community-based learning sites and clean-up days are just the tip of the iceberg of an ever widening effort to both engage the broader community in school programs and extend the boundaries of the school into the community.

Schools are notoriously difficult to change. One major reason that this is so is their interconnectedness. ... everything is connected to everything else. ... which in turn can require changing successively larger rings of pieces increasingly farther from where one began (Raywid 1990).

Policy makers and practitioners concerned with American youth acknowledge the special and critical contribution of community organizations as resources that extend beyond family and schools. Their view recognizes the limitations of today's schools and families (Heath and McLaughlin 1991).

Heath and McLaughlin suggest that a program of youth activities during out-of-school hours is essential to supporting the work of the schools and engaging the students in enriching experiences rather than the destructive ones that youth might be left with and the police have to deal with. Rather than a problem
management approach, organizations need to perceive youth as resources to be developed; in other words, to extend the goals of the schools to the community at large.

Even as schools are faced with the task of "doing everything" and the recognition that that is impossible, teachers and administrators realize that school and teacher/counselor often fill the gap of home and parents for ever more students.

The result is the shifting onto the shoulders of the school system, which is in fact only one element of life, the burden of society's real, imagined, or misunderstood ills. This shifting of blame is a natural tendency among the public, who, as parents, employers, or students themselves, refuse to admit that they may well be part of the problem. ... There is no political mileage to be gained by pointing out that a key element in academic, professional, and personal growth and success of students is the home environment, the family. ... As the purpose of schooling is to enhance society through educating its diverse citizens, it is philosophically difficult to let the schools off the hook because changing home environments are not as conducive to supporting schooling as they might once have been (Belck and Jinks 1993).

What galls teachers most is that they are expected to know how to control student behaviors in the classroom, even if the parent has little or no control at home.

It is apparent from our data that creating in schools, particularly senior high schools, compelling environments for learning is exceedingly difficult. Peer-group interests other than academic were near the surface in all schools; in a few they had virtually taken over. Some parents looked to the school for the discipline and guidance of their offspring they felt unable to provide. Without the household as supporting partner, the school is seriously handicapped in both its educative and its custodial functions (Goodlad, 1984).

Schools have always been most successful when serving the ambitions of upward mobility and in the past, those who did not fit this profile were simply excluded. But now the choice available in the past to simply drop out of school and still maintain economic viability is no longer a real choice.
Belck and Jinks suggest that given the seemingly irreversible trend of family disintegration, schools may need to rethink their purpose. Thus, rather than bemoan the fact that parents expect too much of the school to teach their undisciplined children, schools may need to become "family" for the children. If this is an inescapable reality, the stakes in school reform will greatly increase and take on added urgency. Recent studies have implied that able teachers under favorable circumstances, constitute the single most influential element of a student's learning in school.

Choice

A democratic society cedes to citizens, parents, teachers, and public officials authority over education, but that authority is limited by the very democratic ideal that supports it (Gutmann 1990).

The above quote was probably not meant to support choice in education, but it may be appropriate since the concept of choice forms out of democratic ideals of personal freedom.

Both historical and contemporary social research show that attempts to change or radically improve the quality of schools by systemwide directives almost always fail. Reform from the top down simply does not work very well. What does work sometimes, as the effective school movement reveals, is reform undertaken at the level of the individual school. Change, many educators have begun to realize, proceeds best on a school-by-school basis, initiated by strong and effective principals, supported by teachers, parents, and students (Katz 1987).

Again, the above quote does not come from a choice advocate but the foundation of effective change which Katz describes might very well also prove to be the basis for choice. Logically, if change is initiated at the school level, then each school must necessarily end up differently. What one school community creates may be slightly or radically different from a neighboring school. Then given that schools may be effective but different, students and
parents (and teachers) should be given the choice of the school which best attends to their own perceived needs and interests.

That the described process already exists is well documented in several sites across the nation. One of the more publicized efforts is the New York City's District Four alternative schools founded by Deborah Meier and Seymour Fliegel among others. Says Fliegel, the former director and deputy superintendent of District Four schools:

We were the worst district of 32 districts in New York City. Believe me, failure can be a tremendous catalyst. You're willing to take risks (Brandt 1990/91).

In a city with an overall dropout rate exceeding 50%, 78% for Hispanics and 72% for blacks, the dropout rate at Central Park East headed by Meier is 3.1%. The founders of the program essentially "destroyed" the former schools in 1974 and created new structures from scratch, building slowly and keeping all "schools" small. There are now 56 schools in 20 school buildings. Each autonomous school has its own distinct flavor: four science and math schools, two performing arts, four open or progressive, a maritime, a sports, and a writing school as well as a school for students seriously at-risk.

Says Meier:

We created an environment that helps kids learn to be powerful people--learn to use their minds well. To do that, they need a first-class academic education. That doesn't preclude caring--it requires caring. But what we did was more than caring. We produced a really serious--academically, intellectually, personally serious--place for at-risk kids (Goldberg, 1990/91).

There have been nationally spotlighted examples of excellence and equity with the accomplishments of Jaime Escalante and Marva Collins who guided Hispanic and African-American children to incredible achievement levels. But rarely have there been examples of district-wide accomplishment like those of District Four.
An important ingredient to District Four's structure is that teachers also have choice. A District Four school develops out of the efforts of those administrators and teachers who share a common vision. Thus, the vision attracts the adherents, whereas, in most restructuring or reform programs, schools begin with the existing staff and the "reformer" must then convert the staff to the change. In nearly all cases, even change initiated from within a school, a vocal minority rises to oppose the change. This doesn't happen in District Four since people are recruited by the project; there's no need to convert them to the idea. The teachers there probably have a greater sense of ownership and stake in creating success than most teachers elsewhere.

Of course, choice also has detractors. They argue that schools of choice have not shown increases in student achievement and that claims of attitudinal changes would be difficult to verify. They also claim that schools of choice may actually exacerbate stratification because each alternative becomes a track of its own. Critics furthermore imply that there exists essentially very little difference in the nature of student and teacher work, the values and norms of the school and the way adults and students are organized (Heckman 1990/91).

But the most serious criticism of choice is the suggestion that not enough awareness of the choices permeates to those who it should most accommodate; that minorities or ghettoized populations are not made adequately aware of the schools and thereby do not participate. Thus, the alternative schools do not serve those who would most benefit and consequently fails on the equity issue.

Raywid (1990/91) replies to this criticism by pointing to neighborhood assignment to schools as the culprit that denies real access to equity. In addition, Raywid and others point out that those with financial capability already have the choice of private schools. Public schools of choice would extend that privilege to all.
An extreme view of choice would be to make all schools autonomous and allow a competitive free market structure to reign. These advocates back voucher systems and for-profit schools. Both are highly controversial though voucher proposals have appeared and will again appear on ballots put to voters and the for-profit education companies have made strong headway in Massachusetts, New Jersey and the city of Baltimore.

Put simply, "When people make choices, they are more motivated. (Educational Leadership Dec. 1990/Jan. 1991)"

In systems striving to promote "the full set of conditions that promote excellence", schools should be encouraged to differ from one another, and parents should be able to choose among them (ASCD Panel 1990).

If the U.S. is a nation that professes to value diversity, then diversity should be valued in the schools too. If it is a nation based on democratic ideals, then schools should provide for the freedom to choose. If national, state, or district standards or goals provide the broad framework for which schools can work within, each school can be allowed its own path to excellence and equity.

Excellence is indicated by conditions, practices, and outcomes in schools that are associated with high levels of learning for most students in all valued goal areas of the common curriculum. Equity is indicated when there are no systematic differences in the distribution of these conditions, practices, and outcomes based upon race, ethnicity, sex, economic status, or any other irrelevant grouping characteristic (Sirotnik 1990).

For many educators it would be difficult to endorse a common curriculum across the board. Schools might do better if allowed to formulate curriculum around needs and hopefully a common core emerges. It would furthermore be difficult to force equal representation across the board if it would interfere with a compensatory situation; e.g. an all-girls school or an all-black male inner city school. But within reasonable parameters, excellence and equity along the
lines of the definition by Sirotnik can both be attained through well-conceived choice structures.

**Conclusion**

The story of educational reform is far more than an occasional tinkering with pedagogy. Controversy over education has been a traditional means of defining national purpose and national progress (Tyack 1991).

Educational reform is on-going with star players and exemplary programs rising and fading. Charles Silberman, A.S. Neill and Summerhill, Robert Maynard Hutchins, and Lawrence Cremin are a few "stars" of the past. The heavy hitters now include John Goodlad, Albert Shanker, Ted Sizer, Mortimer Adler (who straddles both generations), Diane Ravitch, Jonathan Kozol, The Holmes Group, and The Carnegie Foundation. These will sooner or later be replaced by other "captains of change".

While these leading voices of reform set the tone for the nation's reform movements, change comes slowly and incrementally at the school level "where the action is". It is not that the leading voices don't offer much of value to ponder; much of what they propose exists only in conceptual form and the grounding of the ideas in actual practice is left to administrators, teachers and community leaders. More often than not great ideas are diffused in the translation from the conceptual blackboard to the harsh realities.

Says Sizer:

Consider the reasonable response to the widespread public interest in improving youngsters' ability to write clearly and correctly. The only way to bring this about is to have students write and to have teachers respond to their writing. Two brief pieces of written work per week seem a modest enough requirement. But multiply these two assignments by the absolutely minimal five minutes it would take for a teacher to give a meaningful response to each paper, and multiply this figure by the 150 students for whom many high school teachers are responsible. We have just
added a staggering 25 hours to the high school English teacher's workweek (Raywid 1990).

Also, in the great rush to promote particular agendas, the number of proposals mushrooms. Raywid (1989, 1990) suggests three categories of reforms that allow a sorting of the proposals in relation to intended effects. The first form includes pseudo-reforms which have little direct impact on classroom instruction; e.g. school building repairs, naming of task forces, the 2.0 rule for students in athletics and extracurricular activities. The second form covers incremental reforms which intend change for a particular group or activity; e.g. middle school, Chapter 1, at-risk programs. The final category is restructuring where change is fundamental and pervasive such as School Community Based Management (SCBM), schools of choice, and Horace's School.

It is, of course, within Raywid's third category that significant change will take place though both pseudo-reform and incremental reform will likely and necessarily accompany restructuring. Whether restructuring will take hold and produce significant changes is still to be seen. There certainly is enough politicking and policy-making in this regard.

A perusal of the front page of the February 9, 1994 issue of Education Week indicates the present state of reform. Bitter struggles are being waged in Kentucky and Alabama over reform legislation that has implications for the rest of the nation in program, financing and management. Another article outlines the struggle within the Holmes Group to agree on a finalized version of Tomorrow's School of Education which caps the research universities group's efforts at restructuring teacher education. Inside the weekly the Littlejohn High School board is considering dropping performance-based graduation requirements and returning to traditional ones. A national panel has adopted 81 standards for the arts. Hawaii's Project Ke Au Hou for DOE restructuring is
described and finally, an article summarizes a survey of 3,380 high school principals across the nation which suggests that

According to the survey, hundreds of schools are using cooperative-learning techniques, incorporating new national standards for teaching mathematics, and giving more decisionmaking authority to teachers and parents. But those efforts are spotty, and few schools are attempting systemic reform by taking on several changes at once. ... the findings are important because they point to a lack of consensus about how to restructure high schools. "There is a lot of activity, but there is not a clear vision as to what is necessary to restructure the schools," he said. "One can argue that this indicates we're not making much progress at the high school level." (Timothy Dyer, president of NASSP)

The articles are not surprising. In fact, it is what should be expected. Is rapid change, though possibly chaotic, desirable? Are differences of opinion celebrated in this country? Is there enough agreement about the Cause to initiate the Revolution? Will there ever be consensus and if not, how can there be progress without it? Actually there are models all over the country, each distinct and discrete. Some involve single teachers (Escalante and Collins), single administrators (Dennis Litzky in New Hampshire), or single districts but each model can be seen as a case study in itself which may or may not have direct implications for our nation's teachers and schools and may or may not be the catalyst to engineer lasting change elsewhere. But the debates that are raging over standards, goals, program implementation, philosophy, etc. ensures the nation that, if nothing else, there is a great perceived need for improvement across the board and that the education community is engaging in self-reflection and that change, though spotty, is occurring everywhere.

There lies the game board for the player of The Glass Bead Game except that in today's world, no winner has emerged. But a lot of people seem to be playing the game.
Chapter 2
Gifted Education

Introduction

With the present concern for attaining excellence in achievement while providing services equally, gifted education has come under tremendous scrutiny. Segments of the educational community have strongly voiced criticism of the inappropriateness of the tracking structures and elitist implications perceived in programs for gifted students. Advocates of gifted programs counter with the idea that gifted education is the only channel providing opportunities for students of high ability to realize their potential; “different goals for different children because different children have different needs” (Gwiazda 1983).

As within the arena of general reforms, solving the puzzles of gifted education resembles the playing of The Glass Bead Game. There are historical roots which go back as far as the birth of the nation and the development of what can be construed as the American character. The present controversies involve a broad spectrum of educational concerns and research agenda: equity, grouping, multiculturalism and ethnic representation, definitions of intelligence and multiple intelligences, program and curriculum development, counselling and gender bias, comparisons to other countries and evaluation.

Though the issues are diverse and the central theme complex, gifted education should be focused on the question of whether it can provide equal access to programming as well as delivering excellence in curriculum. Robert Maynard Hutchins stated: “The best education for the best is the best education for all. (Adler 1982)” Whether this can be done may spell the health or death of gifted programs in districts and schools across the nation as criticism and
budget constraints pressure decision makers to consider which programs need to be cut.

This chapter will take a look at the historical development and present state of gifted education and then at issues that define the distinctiveness and controversies of programs for gifted students; all interfaced with the issue of excellence and equity.

**History of Education for the Gifted**

Plato's Academy selected young men and women based on intelligence and physical stamina rather than on social standing. Prodigies in China during the T'ang Dynasty were educated in the imperial court (Colangelo and Davis 1991). History is fairly replete with examples of educational programs which sought to develop the intellectual, artistic and physical talents of children. As described in the earlier section, Thomas Jefferson envisioned a hierarchical progression of educational levels that would eventually culminate in the best and brightest children of all sectors of society screened by their own efforts and talents. Still, it wasn't until 1916 that American classrooms specifically catering to "gifted" children appeared in Los Angeles and Cincinnati. (ibid)

In fact, the inception of modern American gifted education is closely tied to the development of the I.Q. tests. In 1869 Sir Francis Galton, influenced by his cousin's publication of *The Origin of Species*, connected intelligence with heredity and in 1907 concluded that intelligence was wholly determined by heredity (Eby and Smutny 1990). Alfred Binet, director of the psychology

---

11 The definition of the term "gifted" is in itself controversial and open to several interpretations. Hereafter, the term will be used without the quotation marks which would otherwise acknowledge its ambiguous nature.
psychology laboratory at the Sorbonne then conceived the idea of mental age; standards of intellectual development against which children could be tested.

... he reasoned that older children would perform better on mental tasks than younger children and that what was needed was a set of tasks arranged in chronological order. Children of 7 years of age who performed at the 5-year-old level, for instance, needed special help, his 'mental orthopaedics', in small classes to enable them to improve. ... He avoided items like reading skills, which reflected schooling or rote learning and emphasized that he was not measuring intelligence, which was too complex to be measured, and that the results of his tests were purely diagnostic and did not represent innate or immutable qualities. He fully recognized that children from cultured homes who attended schools with small classes would most likely out-perform children from poor homes educated in large classes (Young and Tyre 1992).

So even though he believed that an individual could learn the tasks on which the tests were based and raise his or her "mental age", when Binet and Lewis Terman of Stanford University in 1916 developed the Stanford-Binet Intelligence Scale, psychologists in Europe and the U.S. used the Stanford-Binet test and interpreted the results as measurements of a fixed inherited human trait. (ibid; Colangelo and Davis 1991; Eby and Smutny 1990) This misadaptation of Binet's ideas became widely accepted in the twentieth century and was a factor in stratifying the educational system in America.²

In America, Lewis Terman became the leading advocate of Stanford-Binet scores as a measurement of innate, unchanging abilities and aptitudes. Based on his research, he concluded that gifted children scored a minimum of 130 on the scale (which became accepted as an IQ score) and that geniuses were measured at 150 and above. By 1922 Terman firmly believed that it was

²In 1919 multilevel schools appeared for the first time in a large city. Students in the Detroit school system were tested at the start of first grade and placed into X, Y, and Z sections accordingly (Kulik and Kulik 1992).
in the vital interest of America that its best and brightest children be discovered and nurtured. He initiated one of the longest and largest longitudinal studies ever taken as he and his team identified over 1400 California children (over 800 boys and 600 girls) with scores of 140+ on the Stanford-Binet (Colangelo and Davis 1991) who were followed in successive studies up until 1972 by associates after Terman's death.

Terman's goal was nothing less than to identify as many child geniuses as he could and follow them the rest of their lives. He wanted to see how these children turned out, if they succeeded, and if they failed, why they did so. His files have become one of the great icons of social science (Shurkin, 1992).

Through the results of his study, Terman made broad sweeping generalizations, much of which became accepted as fact about gifted children. In his 1959 book covering the study through the fifties, he concluded:

In the past 35 years we have watched the gifted child advance through adolescence and youth into young manhood and womanhood and on into the fuller maturity of mid-life. The follow-up for three and one-half decades has shown that the superior child, with few exceptions, becomes the able adult, superior in nearly every aspect to the generality. But, as in childhood, this superiority is not equally great in all areas.

The superiority of the group is greatest in intellectual ability, in scholastic accomplishment, and in vocational achievements. Physically, the gifted subjects continue to be above average as shown in their lower mortality record and in the health ratings. While personal adjustment and emotional stability are more difficult to evaluate, the indications are that the group does not differ greatly from the generality in the extent of suicide, and marital failures. The incidence of such other problems as excessive use of liquor (alcoholism) and homosexuality is below that found in the total population, and the delinquency rate is but a small fraction of that in the generality. Clearly, desirable traits tend to go together. No negative correlations were found between intelligence and size, strength, physical well-being, or emotional stability. Rather, where correlations occur, they tend to be positive (Terman, 1959).

Terman's study precipitated further studies of "gifted" children, the term Terman coined for his "Termites" (Eby and Smutny 1990). While the study has
been acknowledged as flawed and controversial, especially by more contemporary standards, it focused national attention on determining the proper educational structure for gifted youngster and set off heated debate about the definition of intelligence, the value of psychological testing and the roles of heredity and environment in determining intelligence; the nature vs. nurture issue (Shurkin 1992).

While Terman has been credited with initiating the study of gifted children, Leta Hollingworth, one of Terman's assistants has been acknowledged as the first advocate for gifted education (ibid). In 1926 her book Gifted Children: Their Nature and Nurture was the first major text on the psychology and education of the gifted and she established the first course on the gifted at Columbia University. Later, Hollingworth developed an experimental program for gifted children at the Speyer School in Manhattan and has had a broad and lasting influence as

the scientific pillar of the Women’s Movement, ... one of the first clinical psychologists in America and helped establish early standards for clinical practice, ... the author of major publications in adolescent psychology, mental retardation, learning disabilities, and testing, ... the foremother of the modern gifted/talented movement in the United States (Roweton 1990).

To some extent, Hollingworth and Terman were off a single mind: the belief that the education establishment needed to consider how children of high ability can be trained for their individual potential and for the benefit of society at large.

---

3Some of the controversies include the selection process, the possible bias toward boys, a racial imbalance among the children selected and differences in the interpretation of the results (Gallagher and Gallagher 1994; Shurkin 1992; Eby and Smutny 1990).

4Hollingworth was the only one of Terman's associates to have originally suggested a gender bias in sample population (Shurkin 1992).
As interest in gifted children grew, other researchers both expanded on and disputed the notions of Terman's studies. In the 1930s L.L. Thurstone, a University of Chicago psychologist, argued that an IQ score indicated ability in verbal skills only and suggested seven distinct "Primary Mental Abilities" as making up intelligence. J.P. Guilford, a California psychologist in the 1960s, created a test to differentiate 80 individual factors of intelligence and in the 1970s, David Weschler developed the Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children which has been widely used in screening for giftedness (Eby and Smutny 1990). Current intelligence theories are being formulated by Howard Gardner of Harvard and Robert Sternberg of Yale, who have both identified multiple intelligences as basic in all individuals.

On the political side, the launching of the Russian Sputnik satellites in the 1950s created an outcry to develop the talents of our nation's brightest students with the resultant National Defense Education Act that poured federal money into science and math education. In 1961 California became the first state to establish a formal program for gifted students called Mentally Gifted Minors (MGM) which identified students scoring in the top two percent of a statewide intelligence test (Fetterman 1988).

Later, Senator Jacob Javits of New York amended the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) to include language that allowed gifted and talented programs to be covered by the allocated funding which was approved by both chambers of Congress in 1970. Part of the funding in the legislation directed Dr. James Allen, the Commissioner of Education, to begin a study which was completed in 1972 by Sydney Marland, the subsequent U.S. Commissioner of Education. The congressionally mandated report, known as the Marland Report, came in response to pressure for federally financed programs for gifted and talented children (Harrington, Harrington and Karns 36)
The report defined gifted students as

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

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

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


The report suggested that using the stated criteria, an estimated 3 to 5 percent of the student population would be identified as gifted and talented.

While Javits continued his support for gifted education through 1991 by shepherding legislation to provide funding, the Reagan administration, after failing to abolish the Department of Education, moved to dismantle some of the agencies within it, including the Office of Gifted and Talented in 1982. Though gifted education lost its official status in Washington, A Nation at Risk included the statement that "over half the population of gifted students do not match their tested ability with comparable achievement in school." Furthermore, the report acknowledged that "most gifted students ... may need a curriculum enriched and accelerated beyond even the needs of other students of high ability." (Harrington, Harrington and Karns 1991; National Commission 1983)

In 1985 Educating Able Learners was published which culminated a 4-year study of programs for gifted students by the Sid W. Richardson Foundation.

After the Marland Report, most states and districts across the nation had
developed programs for the gifted and talented. The Richardson Study attempted to clarify what shape these programs were taking, with what result, and what recommendations could be made to help schools to better serve able learners (Cox, Kelly and Brinson 1988; Cox, Daniel and Boston 1985).

Today, gifted education is under tremendous pressure from those who see it as elitist (a longstanding criticism) and from those who believe that heterogeneity rather than ability grouping provides optimal learning environments for all students. Those who support gifted education also fail to agree on a wide range of issues, especially those concerning identification. The basic problem has been that while there is wide agreement that gifted education serves the purposes of providing excellence in education, it has been equally criticized for having fallen short in providing equity or equal access.

**Purpose of Education for the Gifted**

When the myths about giftedness are cleared away, when the arguments about elitism and egalitarianism are defused, we shall see more clearly that we need a much deeper and broader concept of giftedness and more rigorous social and educational policies to foster, identify and develop the panoply of talents of our children. For, in order to identify all gifted children, we must improve the education of all of our children, and in order that all of them are educated to realize their full potential as our most precious resource, we need teachers qualified, trained and provided with books and equipment in small enough classes to deliver the quality of service which alone can transform our education system (Young and Tyre 1992).

They're the best and the brightest--and they're bored. That's the conclusion of the federal government's first assessment in 20 years of education for the nation's smartest students (Kantrowitz and Wingert 1993).

The first quote from *Gifted or Able?*, while written by advocates of gifted education, speaks to the ultimate goal of American education; that is provide a quality learning environment so that all children have the opportunity to attain
their optimal potential. The second quote, from *Failing the Most Gifted Kids*, an article in a 1993 *Newsweek* issue, acknowledges that students with high intellectual potential often do not find school to be interesting and challenging places of learning.

In a variation on the excellence theme expounded by Robert Maynard Hutchins, the current guiding force in gifted education is that excellence in education must necessarily include education for the excellent (Beggs, Mouw and Barton 1989). Thus, the past twenty years (since the Marland Report) has seen gifted programs become a fixture in the educational systems of districts throughout the nation.

While realizing potential has been the banner of gifted education, another important aspect has been the development of critical thinking.

We need to become clearer about how to develop critical thinking in kids, how to nurture it, how to measure it. We need to help students learn how to ask a good, penetrating question, which may not even have an answer; how to nourish curiosity and inquiry; how to begin a process that will help people develop into lifelong learners (Lightfoot 1993).

One of the most important foundations of gifted curriculum is the infusion of critical thinking activities into the curriculum of the content area. Without it, the class can be driven simply by an accelerated curriculum more suited to an honors class and cannot be truly considered a class for gifted children.

Of course there is much more to gifted education than stated here thus far. More will be delineated later but at this juncture, it is important to establish the agenda that gifted education was supposed to fill in its inception: the realization of potential and the infusion of critical thinking. Few educators would argue with these two fundamental goals, yet programs for the gifted have increasingly come under criticism from advocates of egalitarianism and heterogeneity.
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To respond to this criticism, defenders of gifted programs have three options: 1) to simply ride the criticism through in hopes that the benefits of gifted education are obvious and that this wave of criticism lacks logic and sound research and will pass, 2) to argue that the rights of children in gifted programs would be denied without the presence of gifted education and these rights are as important as the rights of others, and 3) reexamine and redefine gifted education to be more egalitarian and heterogeneous. In some ways all three options are already in operation though by different advocates within the gifted education community.

Excellence and Equity Issues

Our nation has been ambivalent about how to treat bright students. There has been a historical waffling between striving for excellence and striving for equity. Must education provide for one at the expense of the other? Is Thomas Jefferson’s argument for developing a naturally selected aristocracy, or Andrew Jackson’s argument for no aristocracy the prevailing Truth? The nation has continued vacillating between the two philosophies with changing circumstances and concerns. In times of anxiety about national vulnerability, the nation initiates efforts toward identifying and developing a pool of essential talents. In more stable periods national priorities shift to addressing social inequalities (Goldberg 1986).

When excellence is a major concern, programs for the brightest receive attention and priority. ... When equity has been the primary concern, for example, in the 1960s and early 1970s, then gifted education becomes a minor issue. “Equity” is associated

---

5The basic argument of this dissertation will be that the last option is the most philosophically, and educationally “right” and can be demonstrated in an existent program--the gifted program at Kahuku High and Intermediate School.
with meeting the needs of average and, more typically, below average and disadvantaged students, who are perceived as needing help so they can become equal (Colangelo and Davis 1991).

If the above ideas are to be accepted, we can expect pressures toward equity since the nation finds itself in a period of economic, social and political stability.

The previously cited Newsweek article mentions the intensifying argument against gifted education.

In recent years, gifted programs have also been viewed as elitist–even undemocratic by those who promote mainstreaming of all kids. “It’s politically correct right now to say that a heterogeneous classroom is somehow equitable,” says James Gallagher, a University of North Carolina professor and president of the National Association for Gifted Children (Kantrowitz and Wingert 1993).

While Gallagher has voiced his advocacy through research and publication, others have sought to define its legitimacy in the courts. An Education Week article in March of 1994 covered a ruling by the Connecticut state supreme court that stated public school students do not have a constitutional right to gifted and talented programs. The court ruled that while special education is statutorily mandated, it applied only to children with disabilities and that programs for the gifted which fall under the aegis of special education is to be provided at the option of local school boards (Diegmueller 1994).

The Connecticut ruling suggests that gifted education must probably fight for its right to exist without constitutional force in a nation that holds suspect any activity that hints of intellectual superiority.

In American culture and in the cultures of other egalitarian nations, the balance between individual and even group excellence and equality is at best difficult to achieve. The tension is not as great in physical or psychomotor achievements as it is in the intellectual sphere. Athletic achievement, excellence, and superiority are recognized in American culture (Fetterman 1988).
In the United States, we are justly proud of our egalitarianism and our demand for equal opportunity for education for all, but we are equally proud of our goal of individualization, to fit the program to each child's needs. We have moved far toward providing access to education for all, but we are less effective in meeting the differing needs and abilities of individual children (Gallagher and Gallagher 1994).

On the one hand we applaud the individual who has risen from a humble background. We value and admire his or her talent and drive. On the other hand, as a nation we have a strong commitment to egalitarianism, as reflected in that might phrase "All men are created equal." (Colangelo and Davis 1991)

Educators are faced with the difficult task of fostering excellence and promoting equality. Usually there are trade-offs when one goal is stressed over the other. Gifted and talented programs have been seen as either a special privilege or special need depending whether one is a critic or advocate.

Advocates emphasize the need and excellence.

Gifted programs prepare future leaders, scientists, and artists. In addition, these programs help meet the individual needs of gifted children. The loss in unrealized potential of underserved gifted children is incalculable—in lost inventions, cures, discoveries, and dreams. Gifted programs help gifted students maximize their potential and increase the probability that they will make a productive contribution to society (ibid).

The implication is that a defined segment of the student population will be underserved by an educational system without gifted programs and the nation will suffer in the long run. Even an assumed critic such as Jonathan Kozol (1991) in Savage Inequalities recognizes that gifted programs do provide students

... with intensive and, in my opinion, excellent instruction in some areas of reasoning and logic often known as "higher order skills" in the contemporary jargon of the public schools.

Besides the egalitarian and elitist argument, the ambivalent reactions to gifted education can be summed up in three other categories: 1) there is an uneasiness in providing "more" to those who might already be blessed with
natural abilities, 2) according to historian Richard Hofstadter, an undercurrent of American hostility to intellectualism and (by extension) those seen as intellectually gifted although excellence in sports or the arts is okay, and 3) a belief that gifted students will make it on their own without any special help (Colangelo and Davis 1991).

**Grouping**

Much of the recent debate over gifted programs concerns the grouping issue: whether it benefits anyone, whether it is fair, whether it is justified. It may be hairsplitting to differentiate between ability grouping and tracking. The terms are often used interchangeably, leading to confusion, semantic debate and arguments over their use.

Grouping has definitely been an integral part of gifted programs ever since it was introduced as classroom practice over 100 years ago. Debate over its merits have persisted with teachers arguing the difficulty of meeting the needs of children of all abilities in the same classroom and others who denounce it as undemocratic and stigmatizing to children in lower tracks (Kulik and Kulik 1991).

... acceleration and grouping are the lightning rod issues that test the level of acceptance that gifted programs enjoy in a local school district. The greater the commitment to serving gifted students, the greater the acceptance of advancing and grouping them appropriately (VanTassel-Baska 1992).

---

6Ability grouping more precisely refers to situations where students are grouped for the short term by achievement or aptitude levels in specific subjects and tracking, the more pejorative term, implies students are placed in more permanent general groupings--high, average and low ability.
While the terms are often confused, within the gifted education community, only ability grouping is implied and used but studies by Oakes do not differentiate between grouping and tracking. The studies by Oakes and those of Slavin are what critics of grouping use as a basis of their arguments against all methods of grouping (Reis 1992; Kulik and Kulik 1992; Kulik and Kulik 1991).

Oakes and Slavin have argued that their research shows that no one gains in grouped structures and those assigned to the "lower" groups are more likely to lose academic ground than gain. Oakes further suggests that homogeneous grouping is discriminatory and unfair since it denies all students exposure to a common curriculum (ibid).

It is not the purpose of this dissertation to argue for or against grouping, except to now emphasize that those who advocate heterogeneity in all classrooms themselves come under attack from two sectors. The first is from researchers who feel that the conclusions of both Oakes and Slavin are faulty and that more careful analysis of the data provide contradicting evidence (Feldhusen and Moon 1992; Kulik and Kulik 1992; Reis 1992; VanTassel-Baska 1992; Kulik and Kulik 1991).

Effects of grouping also vary as a function of student ability level. Effects are clearest on higher aptitude students. They are smaller, but not negative, for middle- and low-aptitude students. ... The evidence is clear that high-aptitude and gifted students benefit academically from programs that provide separate instruction for them. Academic benefits are positive but small when the grouping is done as part of a broader program for students of all abilities. Benefits are positive and moderate in size in programs that are specially designed for gifted students. Academic benefits are striking and large in programs of acceleration for gifted students (Kulik and Kulik 1991).

There is further conflicting evidence over whether grouping affects self-esteem in the devastating way suggested by Oakes who suggests that "tracking contributes to differential school outcomes and unfairly sorts students for
subsequent social economic roles.” (Oakes and Lipton 1990) Studies by Kulik and Kulik (1992) actually show the overall effect of grouping is near-zero and that there may be slightly positive effects for lower ability students and slightly negative effects for higher aptitude students.

The other sector is formed by teachers who feel that teaching all students in the same class is possible but unreasonable with the time, training and effort it would take with the present demands upon the average teacher. Many teachers are even more concerned now that the issue has also extended itself in the opposite direction with the movement to place all special education students in completely heterogeneous classrooms.

Feldhusen and Moon (1992) further conclude that heterogeneous structures actually lead to lower achievement levels. They point to lower motivation levels in heterogeneous classroom as part of the cause. Whatever the reason, it is unlikely that grouping itself causes academic gains; the teaching and curriculum are necessary factors. (Rogers, 1991)

Critics also seem to hold a double standard since

... the same people who would inveigh against selection in education accept it in sport as readily as they accept it in medicine or entertainment ... The concept of levelling downwards is as unacceptable as promoting privilege. Do we want our doctors to be less well qualified and less numerous? Do we want all our children to be treated the same, irrespective of age, sex, abilities, all wearing the same uniform, eating the same food, for instance (Young and Tyre 1992)?

Why are public schools forced to conform to democratic demands, when nearly every other facet of our society is governed by merit? And even in education we already dedicate enormous energies and expenditures at the college level where there is little doubt that most major universities are schools for the gifted (Gallagher 1986). It takes some restraint to keep from throwing a jibe back at the critics of gifted education who in their own university classes would scream
against opening up the university doors to all students regardless of ability and aptitude. If “good” educational practices such as learning readiness, continuous progress and challenging levels of learning are emphasized for all students, a lockstep process of teaching would be difficult to maintain or justify.

Once again, the haunting question: Do democratic ideas imply equality of condition or equality of opportunity?

The belief that gifted education serves the privileged is not new to gifted educators; it remains as a powerful force undermining gifted programs today. The most common cry from detractors has long been that gifted programs are elitist. The negative reactions of parents and educators to gifted programs reflect a subtle paradox in American culture—the ambivalence inherent in democracy. Alexis de Tocqueville was one of the earliest analysts of American culture to recognize the dual nature of democracy. In *Democracy in America* (1899), he observed that “democracy breeds individualism” because each person progresses individually. At the same time, de Tocqueville recognized the powerful force of conformity that democratic rule imposed on the individual (Fetterman 1988).

Tocqueville predicted the problem bright students face in contemporary American society: they can as individuals pursue their own interests but are suspect if they are enabled to move beyond their peers. While we have no trouble providing special support to children of disabilities so that they may compete with their chronological peers, children in gifted programs are often seen as advantaged over their peers.

This discrepancy often provokes arguments in defense of individualism and egalitarianism, arguments often motivated by the democratic tendency toward conformity. Democracy in this case is defined as equality of ability rather than equality of rights—a view embedded deeply in the structure of the regular school system (ibid).

While definitive conclusions cannot be drawn with the evidence and arguments produced thus far, it seems fair to say that there are conflicting bodies of information on the issue and that neither side should be able to command direction over vast reform in curriculum that the movement toward
heterogeneity seems to imply. Both in field evidence and in philosophical salons, the argument over what is fair and just for students will probably continue. And the issue of grouping will likely persist within the debate over excellence and equity.

**Underrepresentation**

At the core of the equity issue in gifted education is the imbalanced representation of minority student populations among those selected for gifted programs. When Terman broke down his sample of children by ethnicity, 67% of grandparents were of British origin and 10.5% of Jewish origin. African-Americans, Hispanics, Syrians and Icelanders accounted for 0.1% each. Nearly all the rest were of other European background (Shurkin 1992). While Terman's sample was taken well before the minority influxes in California of the 1960s, 70s and 80s, it is not unrepresentative of most gifted programs even now.

On one hand Kozol points to gifted programs he saw as examples of what can be right about American education. On the other he criticizes those same programs because

In one such class, containing ten intensely verbal and impressive fourth grade children, nine are white and one is Asian. The "special" (special ed) class I enter first, by way of contrast, has twelve children of whom only one is white and none is Asian. ... In my notes: "Six girls, four boys. Nine white, one Chinese. I am glad they have this class. But what about the others? Aren't there ten black children in the school who could enjoy this also?" (Kozol 1991)

There's little argument that gifted programs rarely have proportional minority representation. Without equal representation one must assume that there are genetic deficiencies within certain ethnic groups or that students of all ethnic backgrounds and cultures do not have equal access to the programs
(Fetterman 1988). Unless there is an admission that the ethnic imbalance in programs for gifted students can be used to reinforce the genetic findings of Jensen and others (Howley 1986), attention must be shifted to questioning the selection procedures used in gifted programs which might be the cause of ethnic imbalances. Underrepresentation of minority groups such as blacks, Hispanics and Native Americans has equal opportunity implications.

The term equal educational opportunity is often associated with the socioeconomically disadvantaged, and discussions of this concept generally reach esoteric levels of abstraction. However, equal educational opportunity is a real issue in the daily lives of gifted children of all socioeconomic backgrounds in educational institutions throughout the United States. Gifted children are often denied the opportunity to develop their potential (Fetterman 1988).

One of the great difficulties of schooling in general has been the public's and legislature's unreasonable expectations that schools can solve social problems. Part of the unequal representation in gifted programs have to do with very substantial challenges that disadvantaged students come to school with. Children of ethnic minorities are often those with the greatest disadvantages whether it be a language difficulty due to recent immigration or a lack of school readiness due to poverty. Underrepresentation of minority groups in gifted programs are normally reflective of the same imbalances found in the rest of society (ibid).

California's present school systems have one of the most ethnically diverse student populations in the nation. Its GATE (Gifted and Talented Education) program shows an overrepresentation of whites and Asians and an underrepresentation of Hispanics and blacks (ibid). Figure 2-1 showing California's gifted population reflects the problem of equal opportunity for ethnic minorities in one of the states which has taken the lead in attempting to fairly represent minority groups in gifted programs.
In 1986 Fetterman described a threatened suit to cut back state funding for the Peoria school district due to Peoria's 0.4% enrollment of black children in its third grade gifted programs when blacks represented 40% of the general student population (Fetterman 1986). Accusations of racism had emerged. Some referred to the studies by Jensen which suggested genetic differences between races. Others argued from a cultural deficit stance since 72% of the black population lived in the poorer section of town where unemployment was high, the rate of single parent families was high, income was low, education levels of parents were low and the percentage of renters high. These ethnographic statistics were the opposite for whites. Fetterman (1988) concluded that:

Gifted enrollment statistics are a product of societal forces outside the classroom. These socioeconomic variables strongly influence this gifted program's enrollment statistics. Given such differences in Peoria, disproportional representation in a program geared toward high ability and high achievement is not surprising. A great number of social forces inhibit proper academic preparation of blacks in Peoria ...
An Education Week article recently reported that education officials in California have acknowledged that use of grouping was justifiable if used flexibly. Because students begin schooling "with a wide variety of cultural and familial experiences", no one curriculum method can serve them all. A teacher related that some of her students came to school "never having had a story read to them, never having been to a library, and not knowing the differences among colors, numbers, and letters." Many other students start school with little or no familiarity with English (Diegmueller 1994).

Still, even advocates of the gifted argue that programs must show more proportional enrollments than in the past. Most acknowledge that much room for improvement can be made with better identification procedures and a broader definition of giftedness.

Identification

The most controversial aspect throughout the short history of gifted education and throughout the nation has been over the identification of gifted students. It has taken on political implications. The identification criteria define which children are identified gifted. Access to gifted programs are contingent upon whether a student qualifies under the criteria set by the school or district (Adderholdt-Elliot, et al 1991). Rightly or not, in many cases gifted programs are seen by parents as the only avenue to quality education in public schools which then makes the screening process take on added dimensions.

The 1985 Richardson Study which surveyed the gifted programs of 1,600 districts, uncovered wide variations in screening procedures. The study recorded testimony by some coordinators who acknowledged that despite careful and stringent screening, some students who did not meet the criteria appeared to be brighter than some of those who did. Also children who move
schools faced the prospect of having their identifications changed based on performance on different tests or on a different set of criteria (Cox, Kelly and Brinson 1988).

Screening for gifted programs has long been dominated by test scores which came out of the Terman study and Stanford-Binet testing. Since the 1970s, screening for gifted students has been devised to identify 3-5 percent of the total student population which was the target population pronounced in the Marland Report to Congress in 1972. Giftedness has generally long been defined by IQ and seen as innate and immobile. Although the Marland Report described five areas (see previous history section) in which students could demonstrate high performance or potential for giftedness (Harrington, Harrington and Karns 1991; Eby and Smutny 1990), most school districts have limited their services to children to the general or specific intellectual categories which could be identified through cognitive testing.

Part of the reliance on cognitive testing, usually a single test, has been the considerations of cost and time. One major difficulty of using tests is that nearly all tests are developed to measure specific abilities, thus students may or may not be selected to participate in gifted programs depending upon which test is used in screening (Tyler-Wood and Carri 1991). Often aptitude and achievement tests are used interchangeably though the former measures general intellectual ability and the later measures specific academic ability (Richert 1991).

Recently, identification procedures and the definition of giftedness have come under renewed scrutiny. With pressure toward heterogeneous grouping and charges of elitism, research is now pointing toward a much broader definition of giftedness with identification expanded to include students with different intellectual strengths. Newer screening criteria have been developed
to seek 10-15 percent of the student population as gifted. The Richardson Study also concluded that recent research on identification practices generally agree that multiple sources of information should be used in making decisions about students (Cox, Kelly and Brinson 1988).

The Richardson Study, published as Educating Able Learners, avoided the use of the terms “gifted” and “talented”. Its use of “able learners” came in reaction to the wide range of meanings associated with “gifted and talented” and also because the directors of the study intended to encourage the expansion over the 3 to 5 percent student population normally served by gifted and talented programs (Eby and Smutny 1990).

One emergent criticism of traditional screening has been the same argument against most testing; that of cultural bias.

The criteria selected to identify the individual members of a group reflect the values of that group. On a broader level, the criteria will reflect the cultural context. American mainstream culture, however, is not a monolithic entity: its values reflect the heterogeneous quality of American culture. This diversity, although skewed toward the dominant elements of the culture, shapes the categories and criteria for the identification of gifted and talented students (Fetterman 1988).

Minority groups such as blacks, Hispanics and Native Americans have been underrepresented by 30 to 70 percent (Richert 1991). Fetterman (1988) adds that “Minority groups are legitimately concerned that tests reflecting the dominant culture put them at a competitive disadvantage.”

Environmental and cultural differences have strong influences on the development of a particular student’s abilities. Gallagher (1991) cites numerous studies which conclude that intellectual development is heavily influenced by both genetics and environment. He further suggests that this major attitudinal shift away from an inflexible genetic definition of intelligence will likely lead to an uncovering of potentially gifted students whose talents
"could not reach full crystallization because of the lack of opportunity to develop
basic intellectual skills."

As in most debates over grouping, Gallagher concludes, "It is somewhat
trite these days to announce that there is considerable heterogeneity within the
category of students we call gifted." This point is echoed by Gagné (1991) who declared:

When we speak of "giftedness" in general we refer to a group of
persons who are much too heterogeneous to be easily
characterized. Furthermore, research has shown that intragroup
variability among intellectually gifted people is much larger than
their commonalities.

Thus, "more enlightened" identification procedures are now based on a
definition of giftedness that includes multiple categories of intelligence and
program coordinators are moving to develop flexible assessment instruments
that depend less on cognitive testing. One of the first advocates of serving a
broader spectrum of the school population in gifted programs was Joseph
Renzulli. In 1977, Renzulli introduced the enrichment triad model which
advocated identification based on his Three-Ring Conception of Giftedness. He
suggested that giftedness be defined by 1) above-average ability, 2) task
commitment and 3) creativity. The intention was to provide enough flexibility in
selection procedures to extend opportunities to many more of those who
exhibited above average abilities (Renzulli 1988). In 1981 Renzulli expanded
the enrichment triad model to the revolving door model which was designed to
serve more students than the 3 to 5 percent in traditional programs by providing
various types and levels of enrichment and to integrate gifted curriculum with
the regular curriculum to foster more cooperation between teachers. He sought
to create a flexible approach to identification and programming, to defuse
concerns of elitism and bring enrichment to all segments of the school
population. Renzulli (1988) said:
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Indeed, my own work was a critical reaction against the firmly established tradition of a unitary conception of giftedness that was popularized by Terman’s early work, and the resulting dependence on IQ scores for making almost all identification decisions.

He later added:

We must reexamine identification procedures that result in the total preselection of certain students and the concomitant implication that these youngsters are and always will be “the gifted.” This absolute approach (i.e., either you have it or you don’t have it) coupled with the almost total reliance on various test scores is not only inconsistent with what the research tells us but arrogant in the assumption that we can use a one-hour segment of a young person’s total existence to determine if he or she is gifted (Renzulli 1991).

Renzulli, as well as many other advocates of gifted education, has been grappling with the question of whether giftedness is an absolute or relative concept. More people are now moving to the view that varying degrees of giftedness exist and that certain environments can be more effective in developing gifted behaviors than others. There is now a prevailing attitude that IQ scores are insufficient and often inappropriate measures of giftedness (Fetterman 1988; Renzulli 1988; Milgram 1989; Eby and Smutny 1990; Tyler-Wood and Carri 1991; Gallagher and Gallagher 1994).

Expanding on the idea of Renzulli’s gifted triad, some have redefined giftedness. Gagné defines *giftedness* as being distinctly above average in one or more of his four domains of human *aptitude*: intellectual, creative, socioaffective and sensorimotor. He also applies the term talent to being above average in one or more of his five fields of human *activity*: academic, technical, artistic, interpersonal and athletic (Gagné 1991).

Two noted psychologists who influenced Renzulli have further opened the field of intelligence research to the view of multiple intelligences: Howard Gardner of Harvard and Robert Sternberg of Yale (Renzulli 1988).
Gardner speculates that human intelligence is made up of seven discrete components. He believes that the developmentalist Jean Piaget, who thought he was studying intelligence, was really studying only the *logical-mathematical intelligence*—deductive reasoning, inductive reasoning and computation. Gardner feels that six other components can be identified: *linguistic intelligence*—syntax, semantics, pragmatics, and written/oral expression; *spatial intelligence*—the ability to form a mental model of a spatial world, to represent and manipulate spatial configurations; *musical intelligence*—pitch discrimination, sensitivity to rhythm, texture and timbre and ability to hear themes in music; *bodily-kinesthetic intelligence*—ability to solve problems or to fashion products using one's whole body or parts of the body; *interpersonal intelligence*—the ability to understand others' actions and motivations and to work cooperatively with them; and *intrapersonal intelligence*—the understanding of oneself, one's cognitive strengths, styles, feelings and range of emotions (Ford and Gardner 1991; Gardner 1988; Gardner 1983). The implication for schools is

These thoughts, and the critique of a universalistic view of mind with which I began, lead to the notion of an individual-centered school, one geared to optimal understanding and development of each student's cognitive profile ... not all people have the same interests and abilities; not all of us learn in the same way ... it is the assumption that nowadays no one person can learn everything there is to learn (Gardner 1988).

Yale psychologist Robert Sternberg suggests that intelligence testing was an elementary stage of intelligence theory; a *psychometric or measurement theory* which has dominated for the first half of this century. He calls the next stage of intelligence thinking as *information-processing theory* which attempts to understand how the brain works, much like that of a computer processing information. The last stage of Sternberg's chronology describes *systems theory*, a view of intelligence as an integrated whole consisting of parts of
various kinds, which includes Gardner's theory of seven intelligences (Sternberg 1988).

Sternberg's own theory of multiple intelligences, the *triarchic theory of intelligence*, considers intelligence in three parts: *conceptual or analytic* which is information processing and the ability to dissect a problem and understand its parts; *creative or synthetic* which is insightful and intuitive and deals with the application of information processing within and developing with new experiences and; *practical or contextual* which is the application of the other two parts to everyday, pragmatic situations.

To a great extent, Sternberg is in agreement with Gardner over the application of multiple intelligences in educational settings.

Our experience is that the teaching of intellectual skills does not eliminate individual differences. We will not end up with everyone performing at the same level. To the contrary, when we have trained both children identified as gifted and children not so identified, almost all the children will have improved, but the amount of difference at the end of training is about the same as the amount of difference at the beginning (Sternberg 1991).

Theories of multiple intelligences have changed the way intelligence is defined and consequently in the way giftedness might be identified. Douthitt (1992) concludes that: "... intelligence has many forms and manifestations, and definitions of the construct of intelligence have proliferated." If IQ measurements are seen as only a portion of a student's profile, more students would qualify for program services as different measurements are included in screening for the gifted.

In using conventional and traditional procedures to identify gifted learners, we may well provide special education to some nongifted and deny it to some gifted ... On the basis of their professional experience, educational administrators and teachers seriously question the stability of the phenomenon of giftedness and the validity of the tests currently used to identify it (Milgram 1989).
But new ideas of intelligence and giftedness may actually make screening more difficult. Accepting the idea of multiple intelligences implies that the different intelligences cannot be identified through traditional means of testing. Ultimately, to accurately measure a student's giftedness, a range of identification tools may be required to create a profile or matrix of that student's abilities.

Tests and other tools cannot determine who is and who is not gifted. The gifted label is applied to students who meet specific standards established by a group of people interested in gifted education. Tests and other tools serve to assist the process of assessing how a student performs on the predetermined criteria. ... Emphasis in the identification process, therefore, should be placed upon operationalizing the process by the careful determination of indicators of gifted behaviors, followed by careful selection of instruments designed to assist in measuring those identified behaviors (Hansen and Linden 1990).

Gardner suggests assessment of relative strengths (a profile of the range of an individual's own capabilities) and absolute strengths (a profile comparing the individual to a peer population) (Gardner 1991). Renzulli's identification system (figure 2-2) would use test scores to provide about 50% of the gifted and talented pool with the other 50% by teacher nominations and alternate and special pathways specifically designed by local agencies and schools which may include peer nominations, parent nominations, self-nominations and safety valve nominations (those students not uncovered by the regular process) (Renzulli and Reis 1991; Renzulli 1988).

Gallagher would use teacher nominations, test scores and also look at previously demonstrated accomplishments (Tyler-Wood and Carri 1991). Others argue that school projects and leisure activities outside of school are more valid indicators of giftedness than IQ scores (Richert 1991; Milgram 1989).
THE RENZULLI IDENTIFICATION SYSTEM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Test Score Nominations (99th %ile)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Teacher Nominations (92th %ile)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Alternate Pathways</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Special Nominations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Notification of Parents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Action Information Nominations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Figure 2-2](Renzulli 1988)

A simple identification mechanism pointed out by Colin and Tyre (1992) would be "to ask in the staffroom if anyone had bright kids in their class who were confounded nuisances." A less simple mechanism cited in a study by Denton and Postlethwaite requires identification of gifted students by urging teachers to 1) develop strategies that provide day-to-day clues by observing students in challenging tasks, 2) provide their own opportunities to work with individual students and small groups, 3) involve other teachers as second observers in the classroom, and 4) keep a longitudinal record of checklists and assessments to pass on from year to year (Colin and Tyre 1992).

Finally, in an effort to more equally represent disadvantaged and minority students in gifted programs, the National Research Center on the Gifted and Talented recently tested a 10 question peer-nomination form. As an example,
one question asks, "What boy or girl learns quickly but doesn't speak up in class very often?" Given twice (over six weeks) to 555 4th, 5th and 6th graders in Arizona and Texas, researchers found no significant differences between nominations of white and Hispanic students (Viadero 1994).

Whatever the identification instrument or process, one of the main reasons for newer instruments has been for greater accuracy in the inclusion of students given the current theories of intelligence. If identification is more accurate, it follows that gifted education would provide more equitable service to all students since students of minorities should be provided more equitable opportunities to be enrolled in gifted programs.

The discussion of issues related to defining and identifying the population of gifted ethnic and cultural minority students has drawn attention to the use of subjective processes such as case studies and parent, peer, community, and self-nomination. ... The validity of these processes will always be called into question. However, studies have shown that careful development of the items used in the process will lead to the identification of a larger pool of gifted minority students (Baldwin 1991).

Program

Once students are identified, it is critical that the goals of the program they're being subsequently offered are appropriately matched to the talents of students being screened.

There are few well-defined constructs of giftedness; there is often a discrepancy between definitions and criterion measures; and there is little relationship between selection criteria and the type of programming developed (Culross 1989).

What does a gifted program set out to accomplish? What does it look like? What is GT curricula? Obviously, proponents of gifted education believe that the education delivered by a gifted program is qualitatively different from the
program offered to other students. Nevertheless, gifted education may be guided by the same general principle which may guide all education.

If we want to help children to succeed at school and to enjoy it, it is not enough to avoid openly calling them failures. We must respect them as thinkers and learners--even when they find school difficult.

If we respect them and let them know it, then the experience of learning within a structured environment may become for many more of our children an opening of new worlds, not a closing of prison bars (Donaldson 1979).

The words of Margaret Donaldson imply that students can learn to learn and to think within a regular school setting. Gifted programs can be seen as alternative programs but most do not require very different environments. Still if the program does not deliver different services, it would be difficult to justify its existence. Renzulli (1988) realizes that:

so many mixed messages have been sent to educators and the public at large that both groups now have a justifiable skepticism about the credibility of the gifted education establishment and our ability to offer services that are qualitatively different from general education.

The Richardson Study lists 16 different program structures that were identified through the nationwide survey. In general most program types broke down into four different categories: 1) pull-out or resource programs where students (primarily elementary) received services outside their regular classroom; 2) enrichment programs where the regular teacher or a resource person provided services within regular classes; 3) accelerated programs where classes were structured to move students more quickly through a content area; and 4) full-time special classes where students are immersed in gifted curricula in some or all their content area classes (Cox, Daniel and Boston, 1985).

Whatever the structure, several commonalities characterize effective gifted programs. Renzulli would identify clearly delineated organizational
components: planning, needs assessments, staff development, materials selection, and program evaluation. Others would also add a well articulated philosophy, theoretical base or mission statement, a clear organizational and decision-making structure. (Renzulli and Reis 1991; Eby and Smutny 1990; Beggs, Mow and Barton 1989; Cox, Kelly, and Brinson 1988; Fetterman 1988; Kaplan 1988; Cox, Daniel and Boston 1985) Again, a gifted program probably reflects the structure of schools in general and, like schools in general.

Effective gifted programs are not rigid, nor are they static. A vital program is constantly evolving, responding to changing needs and circumstances and continual evaluation. Flexibility is imperative (Eby and Smutny 1990).

To ensure flexibility programs need to constantly be in touch with the mood and needs of its constituents. Better programs are administered by a coordinator or teacher rather than a school or district administrator. Better programs also have a high level of involvement from parent groups (ibid).

With a structure in place, the program must then deliver an appropriate curriculum. The term most often used in describing the curriculum of gifted education is differentiation. Part of the controversy in gifted education may be with this term. In general education, to differentiate has a connotation which implies that students are treated unequally. In gifted education it means something very different.

To customize the educational process means to tailor it to match the unique needs of each learner. The process of customizing education for gifted children is accomplished by differentiating the curriculum, individualizing the instructional process, and developing a creative classroom environment (Milgram 1989).

While GT educators would define differentiation in various ways, it is generally agreed that a differentiated curriculum provides for differences in students' learning styles and intellectual strengths and weaknesses (multiple intelligences), and contains cross-content activities which help to develop both
content knowledge and thinking skills. The Marland Report panel established that differentiated educational programs are characterized by 1) a curriculum that promotes higher cognitive processes, 2) instructional strategies that address content coverage and learning styles of the children and 3) special grouping arrangements appropriate to the particular children. It is basically a curriculum methodology designed to better match individual and group learning
needs, abilities and styles (Passow 1982). Differentiated curriculum might possibly be graphically characterized by figure 2-3 on the preceding page.

One of the arguments against heterogeneous classrooms is that most teachers would teach everyone with the same curriculum and methodologies that aim for the middle in the spectrum of abilities of the students (Gallagher and Gallagher 1994). Thus, all the students in a heterogeneous group may end up being taught alike and become a homogeneous group in its curriculum offering (Tomlinson and Callahan 1992). A differentiated curriculum attempts to insure that students in a GT classroom are allowed to learn in different ways from each other. Eisner in an Educational Leadership article, "What Really Counts in Schools" (1991), states that:

the genuinely good school does not diminish individual differences, it expands them. Virtue in the context of education is not achieved by bringing all children to the same destination; it is achieved by helping them learn how to become who they are. Variance, not homogeneity, is what counts in schooling, and we ought to design the environments and invent the activities that will make that variance possible.

According to June Maker (1989):

If content is selected and taught in a lock-step manner, gifted students cannot learn as rapidly as their capabilities allow, and they cannot make connections among ideas that can, potentially, change the direction or character of a field of study. All students can benefit when restrictions are removed from the learning process ... I want to emphasize that the principles advocated for selecting and presenting content for gifted learners may be appropriate for all children, are definitely appropriate for certain other children, but they are essential for gifted students.

Kozol’s retelling of a conversation with students a fourth grade gifted classroom may be particularly illustrative of Maker’s point. Said Kozol (1991):

I ask them what they’re doing and a child says, “My name is Laurie and we’re doing problem solving.
I ask the children if reasoning and logic are innate or if they’re things that you can learn.
"You know some things to start with when you enter school," Susan says. "But we also learn some things that other children don't."

I ask her to explain this.
"We know certain things that other kids don't know because we're taught them."

David expands on what the other two have said: "Everyone can think and speak in logical ways unless they have a mental problem. What this program does is bring us to a higher form of logic."

Curriculum models of differentiation have been proposed by various educators. Renzulli's gifted triad focuses on moving children from enrichment activities through thinking and research skills development to authentic problem-solving projects. Gallagher suggests content modification of the existing core subject areas: language arts, social studies, science and mathematics. Van Tassel Baska, Maker and Passow have formulated various other structures (Van Tassel-Baska 1986). Tomlinson and Callahan (1992) stress metacognitive processes and the development of convergent and divergent thinking skills.

The opposing sides of the hetero-homo debate probably agree that curriculum ideas should revolve around activities that 1) are connected to the curricular objectives, 2) are sequenced to aid skills development, 3) allow for multiple levels of thinking, and 4) aim at or above the ability levels of the majority of students (Gallagher and Gallagher 1994). These curricular objectives are generally agreed upon mandates in gifted education but are at times difficult to implement in a general classroom especially if the classroom is heterogeneously grouped.

Still, it is possible to institute these kinds of curricular objectives without a gifted program. For instance, the accelerated schools approach formulated by Levin (referred to earlier) is one "gifted" type program that is being implemented in general education classes across the nation. Basic tenets include high
expectations, achievement standards and deadlines at or above grade level, stimulating instructional programs, extended day programs, parental commitment, and comprehensive planning (Gallagher and Gallagher 1994; Brandt 1992).

In reality, gifted programs and the general program often overlap. While most may be functioning independently within the general program, there will likely be many areas in the description and function of both that will be very similar. It is thus imperative for the continued existence of a gifted program that advocates ably defend the value of the particularized functions of the program within the context of the larger school program (Kaplan 1988).

... enriched regular education programs could provide one service option for able learners of any ethnic background, an option compatible with some community values. However, it is critical that schools maintain special programs for the gifted along with excellence in regular education. ... Enriched regular classrooms must not become a substitute for improved efforts to identify and serve culturally diverse gifted children. Exemplary regular education programs can support identification efforts by nurturing gifted potential (Kitano 1991).

Advocates of gifted education are obviously convinced of the benefits that certain aspects of gifted education can bring to the general education classroom but strongly defend the need for separate and distinct programs for the gifted. The most compelling argument has been that the regular program in most public schools is inadequate for learners of high ability and it fosters an unequal system if it does not access students to a program which allows them to achieve to their maximum potential. Starko (1990) argues that "I would not eliminate gifted education programs until educational reform makes all classrooms golden."

Another argument suggests that gifted education sets a standard of curriculum excellence that can be a model for others. Tomlinson and Callahan (1992) cite Goodlad, Adler and Sizer as advocating curricula which have long
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been standards in gifted education. References to “reformed” curricula often sound like descriptions of present gifted programs. Eisner (1991) states:

When teachers transform the inevitably limited and schematic conceptions of school programs into the kinds of activities that genuinely engage students, when they create the environments that open up new vistas and provide for deep satisfactions, they make a difference in the lives that children lead. No curriculum teaches itself; it always must be mediated, and teaching is the fundamental mediator. ... the major dependent variables of schooling are not scores on standardized achievement tests, whether norm- or criterion-referenced: they are the kinds of ideas children are willing to explore on their own, the kinds of critical skills they are able to employ on tasks outside classrooms, and the strength of their curiosity in pursuing the issues they will inevitably encounter in the course of their lives.

This is an issue that may never resolve itself while gifted programs exist. Other educators will continue to suggest that gifted education is inherently elitist or violates equity sensibilities if allowed to be separate programs. Moreover, if gifted education can be beneficial to students in the general population, then it would seem logical for it to be offered to the general population.

**Students**

Who are gifted students? How are they different from students in the general classes? It is widely accepted that there is an ethnic imbalance within gifted populations and gifted students by the nature in which they are screened are those who perform well through testing. But, once ethnic backgrounds and scores on standardized testing are compared, the differences become far more subtle. Two aspects which have been given attention in the research community are issues of self-concept and gender.

The image of gifted students has often been characterized by glasses, playing chess, and dateless proms. Beliefs about the gifted abound: the close relationship between genius and madness, between creativity and
schizophrenia, and increased strengths in one area compensated by debilitating weakness in another. Many believe giftedness to be an accident of heredity (Young and Tyre 1992).

In a study of stereotypes adolescents attach to academic brilliance (Tannebaum 1962), it was discovered that being brilliant per se was no more (or less) acceptable than being average at school. But woe unto the brilliant adolescent who was described as studious or who got homework assignments in on time! Worse still, being brilliant, studious, and uninterested in sports was disastrous to one’s reputation. The teenagers were saying, in effect, that it is all right to earn the highest marks at school if those who earn them don’t show too much effort in climbing to the top and if they share America’s love affair with sports. Conversely, those students who are uninterested in sports but are interested in studying hard and handing in homework on time can curry favor with age-mates far more easily by being average in schoolwork than by performing brilliantly (Tannebaum 1991).

America’s “tyranny of the majority” first identified by Tocqueville seems to be alive and well in contemporary school-age America. Hofstadter (1963) has suggested that America has a traditional distrust of intellectualism; that it prefers the romantic notions of rugged individualism. This rugged individualism, now that there are no frontiers to conquer, seems to have been manifested in America’s preoccupation with sports and the test of true manhood on the athletic field. To be intellectual and unathletic is to be called a nerd; to be unintellectual and athletic is to be called a jock; to be intellectual and athletic is to be called a national hero. This distrust is illustrated well by Mlawer (1994) in an Education Week commentary titled ‘My Kid Beat Up Your Honor Student’ in which he condemns the use of honor rolls to recognize academic achievement.

The problem with the honor roll is that it can take none of this into consideration as it relentlessly ignores the different potentials, interests, and circumstances of children and their lives. Instead, it only treats as significant knowledge which can be quantified, measured, and ultimately ranked by school officials.

While Mlawer makes a valid point, one must wonder why he is not criticizing all other forms of recognition, few, if any, of which take into consideration individual
progress and circumstances. Why does he single out an academic accomplishment and not athletic or financial or artistic or humanitarian accomplishments?

Despite what may be historical and contemporary disregard for the intellect, Terman (Shurkin 1992; Terman 1959) concluded that gifted students grow up with more “success” in nearly all areas: scholastic achievement, career accomplishments, physical development, and personal adjustment. Terman further determined that gifted children read more, make numerous collections, cultivate many hobbies, are less inclined to boast or overstate their knowledge, are more trustworthy and more wholesome and there seems to be no negative compensation for their “superiority” (Gallagher and Gallagher 1994). Obviously, these findings recorded in the 1950s are now under serious challenge though much of it remains accepted research. If true, students identified gifted will lead fairly “successful” and enriched lives.

Still, one critical issue is how gifted students feel about themselves and whether gifted programs are integral in their emotional and intellectual development. While studies other than Terman have found that gifted students are more sympathetic/empathetic, generous, conscientious and truthful than other students, there’s substantial evidence pointing to social difficulties associated with being gifted or identified gifted in regular school settings (Luftig and Nichols 1991). Clinkbeard found that gifted students felt that students and teachers in regular classes have unfair expectations of gifted students.

The gifted students feel that other students expect the gifted to do all the work in group work situations; that regular teachers expect

7A more recent study by Sayler and Brookshire (1993) seems to confirm that gifted students actually had better than average athletic self-concept, helping to debunk the image of a gifted student as the klutzy nerd.
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consistently high grades and, to some extent, model behavior; that teachers and peers do not acknowledge the successes of gifted students, seeming to assume effort was not involved; that regular teachers grade gifted students “harder;” and that age peers are sometimes jealous or insulting (Clinkbeard 1991).

Colangelo and Kelly add that while many gifted students feel positive about themselves, they often feel that other students and teachers have negative views of them (Colangelo 1991).

While some of the above concerns are justified and some may have more to do with perceptions and perspective, it is clear that gifted students are not trouble-free, happy, fulfilled youth that some might imagine. In fact, Leta Hollingworth proposed the need for special counselling programs for gifted students in the 1920s (ibid).

She recognized their loneliness, their isolation, their imaginary worlds, their argumentativeness, their zeal for accuracy, their impatience with superficiality and foolishness, their desire to find like minds, their occasional resorting to “benign chicanery” and the healing power of their sense of humor (Silverman 1990).

Hollingworth identified 11 concerns associated specifically with gifted children: 1) finding enough hard and interesting work at school, 2) adjusting to classmates, 3) being able to play with other children, 4) not becoming hermits, 5) developing leadership abilities, 6) not becoming negativistic toward authority, 7) learning to “suffer fools gladly”, 8) avoiding the formation of habits of extreme chicanery, 9) conforming to rules and expectations, 10) understanding their origin and destiny from an early age, and 11) dealing with the special problems of being a gifted girl (ibid). Though Hollingworth was viewing gifted students within a 1920s educational context, it’s obvious that most of her concerns translate well into the contemporary setting.

Though long recognized as a need, it took until the 1980s to bring serious attention to counselling for the gifted. Some of the problems gifted students face are the same as those associated with many other students: task
commitment, homework, motivation, meeting standards. Kitano (1990) suggests that present gifted students face further problems with "perfectionism, hypersensitivity to the expectations and feelings of others, nonconformity, feelings of being different, an idealistic sense of justice, emotional intensity, and social isolation".

One common problem becomes magnified in the context of gifted students; that of underachievement. Because of the perceived high potential related to giftedness, gifted students who underachieve are seen as a tragedy.

Half of the gifted children in the United States do not perform up to their tested abilities. (National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1984) Although some of these students may reverse their underachievement patterns because of educational interventions or increasing maturity, some will underachieve for life. There are risks and pressures (Rimm 1987) that accompany high intelligence and that detour potentially high achieving children toward defensive and avoidance patterns (Rimm 1991).

It might seem a contradiction to point out that related to underachievement is the problem of low self-esteem. Though Terman and others who followed\(^8\) substantiated positive images of gifted students, low self-esteem is the most frequent characteristic found among underachieving gifted students. While they can acknowledge their high intellectual abilities, many do not feel able to live up to the expectations of family, counselors and teachers. Low self-esteem may be acted out in criticism of teachers or the school or in claims of not caring or not trying (ibid).

---

\(^8\)The Tidwell study in 1980 of 1,593 gifted secondary students in California supported many of Terman's findings. Students showed high self-concept, liked school and viewed themselves as happy though many felt unpopular among peers. Unlike Terman, Tidwell's study included a fair mixture of females and ethnic minorities (Gallagher and Gallagher 1994).
Low self-esteem leads the underachiever to nonproductive avoidance behaviors both at school and at home. For example, underachievers may avoid making a productive effort by asserting that school is irrelevant and that they see no reason to study material for which there is no use. Students may further assert that when they are really interested in learning, they can do very well. These kinds of avoidance behaviors protect underachievers from admitting their feared lack of productive ability. If they studied, they would risk confirming their possible shortcomings to themselves and to important others (ibid).

For these reasons counselling of gifted students should take on an urgency equal to that for at-risk youth. The National Commission on Excellence (A Nation at Risk) reported in 1983 that an estimated 20 percent of dropouts were gifted (Ford 1992; National Commission 1983). Counselling for the gifted has traditionally been confined to helping with college and career counselling. There has been a perception that gifted students, “being both bright and manipulative, will search out and use support systems on their own. No special services are necessary.” (Buescher 1991)

The significant difference between talents discovered, developed, and becoming substantially productive at the conclusion of the adolescent passage and those unknown, discarded, and lost en route can often be traced to a few trusting, caring and supportive adults (ibid).

Counselling and support systems become even more critical when gifted students of minority populations are concerned. Gifted minority students face even greater risk of underachievement due to the clash of cultures between their home and the school. Many must also overcome poverty and discrimination. Often high scholastic achievement is held in even more disfavor among minority students who might criticize achievers for “acting white” (Ford 1992).

The other major area in counselling of gifted students concerns the issues associated with gender.
Teachers who work closely with gifted students have long observed and lamented the failure of gifted girls to fulfill their early intellectual promise. They watch in frustration as the little girls who were once so eager to demonstrate their intelligence and creativity grow into teenagers who carefully obscure their achievements or who blithely pass up opportunities for special programming designed to nurture their talents (Kerr 1991).

Since Terman's study which found an imbalance of gifted males over females and Hollingworth's questioning of his findings (Shurkin 1992), gender imbalances have dogged gifted education though maybe to a lesser degree than of equity issues involving minority groups.

In terms of numbers, girls actually outrank boys in contemporary gifted programs especially in elementary and middle grade levels (Read 1991). Terman himself concluded that "gifted women were equal or better than their male counterparts in school achievement from first grade through college." (Reis 1991)

Nevertheless, girls, who seem to face inequitable instruction in classrooms anyway, face even more inequities in the gifted classrooms. Teachers who had negative attitudes toward gifted students, had even more negative attitudes toward gifted girls and, female teachers, more than male teachers, seem to discourage girls from loftier aspirations (Kerr 1991). Girls face codes of conduct and behavior that might ostracize them or brand them pushy or aggressive if they attempt to detract from their giftedness by being funny or "acting up", behaviors which are more acceptable from boys (Luftig and Nichols 1991; Eby and Smutny 1990).

A related issue for gifted girls is how giftedness is perceived. Male attributes tend to dominate the profile of skills and achievement considered

---
9Terman's study group of 1,444 children consisted of 831 boys and 613 girls (Shurkin 1992; Terman 1959).
successful attainment of goals. Components of humanness which are more
female oriented such as aesthetic awareness, sensitivity to societal rather than
financial benefits, and caring may need to be included to provide a more
rounded view of giftedness (Reis 1991). Girls should be provided opportunities
to express themselves in more female ways that can be seen as desired
achievement and help to alleviate problems of low popularity and negative
perceptions by peers (Luftig and Nichols 1991).

Comparative Views

A review of international programs also highlights our need to
shake ourselves out of a national compalcency about the gifted.
We need to compare our efforts with those of other nations and
then work to revitalize existing programs (Fetterman 1988).

Much of the current criticism of American education comes in comparison
to the achievement levels of students in other industrialized nations. But while
critics of American education point to lower achievement levels in math, science
and other subjects, to a large degree, American education has led the way in
programs for the gifted.

Because of the tracked system of education in countries such as Japan
and Germany, gifted education has not been given as much attention outside of
the United States. In Europe, only fairly recently has gifted education become a
legitimate field of study with the establishment of the Center for the Study of
Giftedness at the University of Nijmegen in 1988, Europe’s first university center
for gifted research. The center then organized the Ninth World Conference on

An overview of European policies shows a wide range and degree of
attention given to gifted education. Countries like France and Switzerland show
nearly a total lack of research in the gifted. On the other hand, Spain and the Netherlands have fairly well-developed programs and active research agenda in gifted education. Advocates of gifted education in Great Britain worry about the recent introduction of a national curriculum which they fear will inhibit the development of children who have the potential to work beyond the median range of the student population (Freeman 1992; Mönks, Franz J., et al 1992).

In some ways, European educators voice many of the same concerns as American educators in respect to gifted education.

Whereas Western European educators wonder at the Eastern European dislike of testing children, Easterners are astonished to discover Western resentment against the nurturing and promotion of talent. ... while Western Europe has been strongly inclined to academic theory and research, Eastern Europe has led the way in devising practical teaching for excellence, with consequent world distinction in many areas, such as the performing arts, sport, mathematics, and physics. ... But in the capitalist West, even as in the ex-communist countries, there are still some latent inhibitions against the encouragement of excellence, undoubtedly stemming from the once widespread privileges of social class and money (Freeman 1992).

Many countries face particular problems in selling the idea of gifted programs. The most difficult and pervasive problem is the perception of elitism; that gifted programs recreate the colonial us/them system. The problem is compounded in developing countries which have fairly recently overthrown the yokes of colonialism. The idea that certain segments of the school population will get “special privileges” conflicts with newly born perceptions of egalitarianism; that somehow education for the gifted is undemocratic (Awaya 1988).

The second most persistent problem is economic. Funding for gifted programs is almost nonexistent in developing nations and sparse in even some Western industrial nations. Many programs in these countries are run on shoestring budgets, voluntary donations, university support or tuitions (ibid).
Part of the difficulty in developing gifted programs in Europe emerged in the 1991 conference. More than in the U.S., there is little agreement as to what constitutes giftedness though there is some consistent accord that giftedness is multidimensional. With disagreement over definition, schools cannot begin to identify gifted students. This coupled with a fairly rigid school system that determines school entrance and advancement strictly by birthdate, has led most systems to provide for gifted children within the regular school program.

In the eyes of advocates for gifted education, this is problematic. Most European educators defend mixed-ability classes but also push for standardized curricula which often cannot effectively accommodate different learning and teaching styles. Furthermore, differentiation which would allow individualization is often beyond the understanding of teachers (Mönks, et al 1992).

At the other extreme, Chinese educators are highly conscious of gifted education. They use early examinations to sort out gifted children and place

---

Consideration must be given to the fact that many European school systems sort students into tracks at fairly early ages so the term mixed-ability takes on a different meaning than when used in the U.S. For instance, only students from the top 25% are selected to attend the Netherlands gymnasia (Freeman 1992). Also, considerations about multi-ethnicity in gifted/selective schools are given more serious attention in the U.S. than in Europe. Says Freeman, president of the European Council for High Ability, "... we too readily categorize children, often for reasons which have nothing to do with their abilities, but rather their social behavior and accent."
them in special schools called Children's Palaces\textsuperscript{11}. But unlike American counterparts, Chinese educators of the gifted believe students should be taught to think and act in certain ways.

In discussions with Chinese educators, they appeared somewhat baffled by the United States emphasis on quality of thought and reasoning. They were particularly curious about our endeavor to give meaning to learning and our emphasis on teaching students to analyze, criticize and synthesize (Sisk 1992).

The Chinese though, excel in the arts and children develop professional skills as part of their pre-college education, facets not common in American students (ibid).

The value of examining other educational systems comes in concurrent self-examination; a view of self within the context of others. Scanning systems in other countries makes obvious that contextual possibilities and limitations allow or inhibit the development of programs. While tracking is under harsh criticism in America, there's no formal national sorting system. Gifted education may be seen as more imperative for American schools since few public schools select students according to tests or performance. Still, many European countries seem to be looking to the U.S. for policies and programs concerning the gifted even though many of these same countries have just as strong a commitment to equity and excellence (and as much difficulty realizing both equally).

\textsuperscript{11}The Shanghai Children's Palace (the original founded in 1947) began as a welfare center to teach poor children reading and writing during the war. It now offers self-selected studies in over 80 subjects (McGreevy 1985).
Program Evaluation

With the recent trend toward accountability in education coupled with the pressure to move to heterogeneous grouping and tight budget situations in many districts, the onus on the advocates and teachers of gifted programs to prove that gifted education is necessary and effective has increased. Previously, it was enough to show that gifted students did better than students in the regular classes which with close scrutiny, only proved to some that gifted students were not harmed by gifted programs since there is a perception that they are expected to do well in most situations anyway.

The need for program evaluation in gifted education has grown out of a general concern on the part of decision makers for greater accountability in all aspects of education. In the past, innovation in education and especially efforts to help youngsters with unusual needs such as the gifted and talented were looked upon with a strangely philanthropic attitude. We accepted the notion that innovative efforts equalled innovation itself—that sincere and honest attempts to improve the education of gifted students were de facto indicators of favorable results (Renzulli 1984).

The problem involved with evaluating gifted programs is similar to that which afflicts evaluations of any program: finding appropriate instruments which fit the particulars of situationally unique programs. Still, many educators involved with gifted education have failed to collect any data, being occupied to a great extent with arguing for its necessity and defending its existence along with running the day-to-day operations which often attain school-within-a-school magnitude. Lack of data can spell the demise of gifted programs when decision makers face budget and policy choices. Bill payers are demanding to see the benefits from the dollars being spent; program accountability is being assumed (Beggs, Mouw and Barton 1989).

Purcell (1993) documents the pressure to eliminate gifted programs. She suggests the following reasons: 1) the reform movement which has had a
subtle effect of moving toward standardizing the curricula and eliminating
grouping, 2) negative comments from both without and within gifted programs
by parents, over identification, teachers over elitism and students over
expectations, 3) district budget crises and the elimination of vulnerable
programs and 4) in some cases, the poor quality of the programs.

It is difficult to specify evaluation models except in broad terms such as

In order to continue justifying why there are separate programs for
gifted students, evaluations of and research concerning
programming for the gifted need to provide some evidence that
programs for the gifted are not only qualitatively different from the
normal curriculum, but are designed to meet the unique
educational needs of the gifted, e.g., their capability of learning at
a faster rate and of achieving a higher level of understanding
(Carter 1992).

To get information about how programs meet the needs of gifted students,
evaluators can either use attitudinal data from surveys, case histories, and
testimonials or assess student outcomes. Both can be done by using
comparative studies where the students of gifted programs are compared to
students in nonprogram settings or to students in an alternate gifted program.

Another approach, the multiple outcome assessment, takes the goals of the
program and measure the actual outcome of each goal against the desired
outcome (ibid).

Renzulli (1984) suggests:

Within the general decision making purpose of program
evaluation there are a number of more specific objectives which
help to give direction to the actual design of an evaluation. An
evaluation is scarcely worth the paper it is written on if it does not
provide relatively specific information that supports the
maintenance, modification, or termination of particular program
components. Thus, an evaluation should be 'diagnostic' in the
sense that it pinpoints by careful examination the circumstances
and conditions that result in identifiable changes in performance,
attitude, or other indicators of program effectiveness.
He further proposes that the evaluation should be able to:

1. To discover whether and how effectively the objectives of a program are being fulfilled.
2. To discover unplanned and unexpected consequences that are resulting from particular program practices.
3. To determine the underlying policies and related activities that contribute to success or failure in particular areas.
4. To provide continuous in-process feedback at intermediate stages throughout the course of a program.
5. To suggest realistic, as well as ideal, alternative courses of action for program modification (Renzulli 1984).

Renzulli has even developed a comprehensive matrix which specifies multiple sources (students, program teachers, parents, student selection committee, non-program teachers, consultants, principal and coordinator, and secretaries) of data and four key features (student growth, levels of thinking and classroom conditions, attitudes toward program and identification procedures) (Renzulli 1979).

A key feature missing in the above suggested evaluation instruments is the demographic background of the student population. In the present climate emphasizing multiculturalism and equity, educators promoting excellence cannot overlook how programs meet the concurrent criteria of student needs and fairness. Without a fair representation of the varied segments of the general student population, programs for the gifted will continue to be criticized as unjustified, elitist and undemocratic.
Conclusion

Gifted education goes back to the earliest educators. In fact, in the past, education only meant education for the gifted or at least education for the elite. Only the privileged, the rich, the noble, the connected, had access to education which was normally provided by mentors (Socrates, Plato, Aristotle, Confucius, Lao-Tzu, etc.) or by priests and monastic monks. This was education from the Greeks through the Renaissance (Awaya 1988).

Egalitarian education and America have become synonymous. Gifted education has seemed ill-fitted in a country that promotes equality and education for all. Education that helps to promote the skills and achievements of individuals has been confronted by those who perceive themselves as defenders of democratic ideals.

The advocates of gifted education have had to justify individualism over egalitarianism, not an easy task. Rice (1985) states that in all education:

> the real goal of teachers is the individual development of each student ... that ... the main purpose of any program is to develop talent to fullest potentiality ... Talent must be treated as a personal asset.

The players of the gifted education Glass Bead Game must contend with the basic issue of the quest for the highest achievement in both excellence and equity. The nation and the education community seems to have defined the issue as polarized fields. An argument, of course, can be made that efforts in both directions can be conducted simultaneously. Enormous energies and expenditures are dedicated to education at the college level. There is little doubt that most major universities are schools for the gifted (Gallagher 1986). On the other hand, the community college system offers education for all.

In the public school system there is no reason to separate facilities for the gifted and talented and others just as the handicapped-exceptional-challenged
students are integrated into the general school population. The best should be demanded from all students regardless of their level of academic achievement or potential. This may sound obvious and simplistic but there is a fairly pervasive practice of teaching for homogeneity. Passow (1985) proposes a need for

> deepening our understandings of what constitutes an adequate and appropriate learning experience for a particular individual, when and how that experience can and should be accelerated, when and how that experience can and should be enriched in depth and/or breadth.

But gifted education runs into great difficulty fending off criticisms of elitism; failure in the equity side. The historian, Hofstadter, (1963) has suggested that suspicion of the intellect is part of this nation's basic character. Notwithstanding, advocates of gifted education have traditionally fought more to justify its needs and accomplishments rather than remedy the problem of minority underrepresentation.

Alternately, the movement for heterogeneous grouping faces the concern of teaching developing into a dummied-down curriculum for the middle or worst, for the lowest level of skills. Can teaching in a heterogeneous environment ensure that the standards are high for everyone? That too has historically not been demonstrated. Education in this nation has never before faced this present situation: trying to teach all in an increasingly large and diverse student population.

The future for gifted education seems to be in finding an avenue to meet the diversity of students and developing programs that justify its existence within a democratic society. This problem exists in many parts of our society, but in education, an avenue for excellence already exists; that avenue has now to be widened to allow more, if not all, to access it.
Chapter 3
Kahuku High School GT-AP Program

Introduction

The Kahuku High and Intermediate School is located on the North Shore of Oahu, in a former sugar plantation town whose school presently serves students within one of the largest single school districts in the state. The 1980 census designated the Kahuku communities as an economically depressed area (Kahuku High and Intermediate School 1991). Since the closing of the plantation in 1971, industry in the area has been limited to two tourist sites (the Polynesian Cultural Center and Turtle Bay Hilton), Brigham Young University-Hawaii, and some farming. Many adults commute over 30 miles to work in Honolulu.

The school, established in 1897, presently serves a student body of over 1800 from grades seven to twelve. In 1992 the student population broke down into the following ethnic distribution:

- Asian or Pacific Islander: 72.6%
- Caucasian: 24.4%
- All others: 03.0% (ibid)

The majority of the category for Asian or Pacific Islander is students of Hawaiian or part-Hawaiian ancestry followed by those of Samoan, Tongan and other Pacific Islander ancestry with those of Japanese, Chinese and...

---

1 The school district stretches from Sunset Beach to Kaaawa, nearly 26 miles of populated coastline.

2 Hawaiian and part Hawaiian students represent 44% of the total student body.
Filipino ancestry making up a smaller portion. Most of the Caucasian students have parents who work at Brigham Young University-Hawaii in Laie or are from the Sunset Beach area, many being children of former '60s and '70s surfers.

Many of Kahuku students represent the first members of their families to graduate from high school. ... The children in all these areas are generally less sophisticated than their counterparts in Honolulu. They lack many of the opportunities-monetary, social and cultural that are more readily available to students in more affluent areas (ibid).

Though maybe not as sophisticated as city students, Kahuku students exhibit a warmth and innocence typical of growing up in an isolated community and makes teaching there possibly more enjoyable.

This chapter will examine the Kahuku High and Intermediate gifted program as a possible example of meeting both excellence and equity concerns. The issues and concerns brought up in the first two chapters will be reexamined in the Kahuku program context. A brief history will outline the evolution of the program to its present form, a long and often slow version of The Glass Bead Game. All of the issues and policies will be shown to have either equity or excellence implications with the result, a program that remains basically faithful to the purposes of gifted education but meets concerns about elitism and fairness. The result is a redefining of education for the gifted; gifted education opportunity for all students. Thus, maybe Robert Maynard Hutchins was not dreaming the impossible dream when he suggested “the best for the best; the best for all.”

History of the Kahuku GT Program

With the Marland Report in 1972 and subsequent legislation pushed through by the sponsorship of Jacob Javits, education for the gifted and talented was given official standing and funding across the nation. Hawaii began
elementary pull-out programs in the mid-1970s and secondary schools followed suit by the early 1980s.

In 1984, legislative provisions for gifted education in Hawaii's schools was signed by Governor Ariyoshi. The bill stated in part that

All children and youth have the right to develop their potential to the fullest. Recognizing this right, the department of education accepts the obligation to assist all students to develop their potential and recognizes that this goal can best be accomplished by providing appropriate educational opportunities.

The department further recognizes the wide range of interests, motivations, and talents among students and believes that this diversity must be considered in the design and delivery of educational opportunities. ...

The department therefore acknowledges the necessity to identify gifted and talented students in various areas of giftedness and talent in every school and to make available appropriate educational opportunities, ... (State of Hawaii 1984).

While the bill not only established gifted education in Hawaii, it also outlined general definitions, administrative bodies, identification procedures, placement and programming. Still, many programs floundered with unclear goals, minimally trained staffs, and inconsistent identification instruments and procedures. The program at Kahuku High and Intermediate was one of those. Up until 1985 the KHS3 GT program operated somewhat like an honors program4. In fact, no gifted courses existed prior to 1985-86. The inception of the program actually began in 1982-83 with a single course, Advanced

3From here on, Kahuku High and Intermediate School will be referred to as Kahuku High or KHS for brevity's sake.

4The school and DOE do not keep detailed records more than five years old. Aside from transcripts and graduation certificates, most records are destroyed, making data collection about enrollment and courses in past programs difficult. Information about the KHS GT program prior to 1985 is based on secondhand information, with reliance on recall rather than hard copy data.
Placement English Literature. AP U.S. History was added the next year and AP Calculus in 1984-85.

Approximately 75 students participated in the inception of the GT part of the program for the 1985-86 school year. They had been selected the previous year solely on the basis of teacher recommendation ("Who are your most outstanding students and which do you think should be in a GT class?") Enrollment in the program that year was so low as to necessitate the 7th and 8th grade students combined into one class and the 9th and 10th graders likewise. There were only four classes: two in social studies, one Advanced Placement (AP) English and one AP U.S. History. The one coordinator was given one period off from her regular teaching duties to coordinate the program. The district office had provided the school with one full-time employment (fte) allotment out of which the coordinator and GT and AP courses were funded.

The guiding force for the program was the five-year plan which had been developed by the coordinator by the end of 1985. The plan outlined the addition of courses until all core subject areas would be represented by 7th grade GT courses to 12th grade AP courses. But the plan did not stipulate the development of screening procedures, policies, curriculum or teacher training. Teachers were placed in positions and essentially provided no special instructions except to make the courses challenging.

The following year, 1986-87, saw the program grow according to the five-year plan with the splitting up of the combined enrollments, the addition of English classes, 10th grade social studies, 8th grade math and science, art and AP Calculus. Approximately 100 students were then enrolled among 13 sections of courses, with some students enrolled in as many as three classes.

One significant curricular development was the combination of English and social studies for the 9th grade students. This came in response to the
realization that an interdisciplinary approach was an appropriate curriculum for gifted students. This was provided in only one grade level because it was specifically requested by the teacher and allowed by the principal on an experimental basis.

Probably the most significant change came about with the appointment of a new coordinator who, by the end of the school year, had recruited a parent advisory group, developed screening criteria, formed a screening committee and initiated a counselling and probation component. These developments allowed clear standards and procedures and provided a broader structure in policy decisions.

By the 1987-88 school year, enrollment had doubled over 1985 to about 150 students. This represented a bit less than 10% of the student body in grades 7 to 12. A 10th grade English, 9th biology and 9th geometry had been added and the art class was divided into art I for intermediate and beginning art students and art II for high school and advanced students.

With more defined responsibilities, expanding enrollment and program offerings, two periods were given to the coordinator. Much of his time was taken with collecting screening data and counselling students who were not performing well in class.

In the same year, the Parent Advisory Board was formalized and a probation policy was enacted. The probation policy required all GT students (except in the art program) to maintain a 3.0 grade point average in core classes (English, social studies, math and science) whether they were enrolled in four GT classes or one. Grade checks at mid- and end-quarter were collected on every student.

The next year, a sabbatical for the coordinator, saw enrollment grow to 175 students and the addition of 11th grade English and 10th grade algebra.
The interim coordinator suggested an open enrollment policy for the Advanced Placement courses with the idea that college credit should be open to all students. This was adopted for registration of the following year's students.

Upon return of the coordinator from sabbatical, the Kahuku GT program took a turn into what has evolved into its present form and philosophy. The basic change was to view the GT program as a total program. A newsletter called *Nerd News* was created and program-wide activities, Model United Nations and Geek Week, were initiated.

But these were small parts of the major shift in perspective which was an investigation into open enrollment for entrance into the program. 1989-90 necessitated two sections of 7th grade GT English and social studies. Every year screening for incoming 7th graders had been a difficult process because students were coming in from five different feeder elementary schools and while the criteria was standard for all applicants, the teacher evaluations varied widely from school to school. To make entrance opportunities equitable across the board, open enrollment was discussed in the Parent Advisory Board as a possible solution.

The screening process itself was becoming more and more difficult as more students began to apply for the program. The filling of available slots became much more competitive than before and the screening committee increasingly became uncomfortable with making decisions which at times have been seen by parents or teachers as critical to a child’s education. The coordinator and Parent Advisory Board undertook the study of the identification instrument and procedure as a major focus for the year.

By 1990-91, the 275 students, an increase of 50 over the previous year, were enrolled in fewer GT courses as the math department had decided in 1989-90 not to offer any GT math classes. Open enrollment was authorized for
all applicants to the 7th grade, eliminating any input from the feeder school teachers (except recommendations for non-GT students) and increasing 7th graders from two to three sections in English and social studies.

Other developments included formalizing all policies governing the GT-AP program through the Parent Advisory Board and the formation of a student board as an adjunct to the Parent Advisory Board and a council for resolving student issues and planning student activities. The major issue under study for the year was how to continue sensible growth with the pursuant demands for competent staffing.

With the open enrollment policy in force, the 1991-92 program enrolled about 325 students, again including three sections of 7th grade English and social studies and additional sections in 8th grade English and social studies and science. The increase in 8th graders came as a result of the previous year’s three sections of 7th graders.

Major changes once more emerged during the year. The most significant was the result of the decision made the year before to have all 7th, 8th and 9th graders in English and social studies with one teacher (teaching both English and social studies) which had been the case with only the 9th graders since 1986-87. Another significant development was the approval of *The KHS GT-AP Handbook* by the Parent Advisory Board which set in writing all policies and procedures guiding the program. A third program-wide activity, Consitutional Convention, was initiated and students were integrated into all facets of the decision making process including the screening of applicants. Finally, two coordinators were given a total of three periods to run the program which had quite nearly developed into a school-within-a-school.

The over 400 students in 1992-93 included 120 7th graders and additional sections of 9th grade English/social studies and 11th grade English.
Advanced Placement English Language was added with a modified screening for all applicants to AP courses as the popularity of the college level classes began attracting students often with limited credentials.

The major issue of the year concerned the replacement of the coordinator of seven years. The role and responsibilities had grown so enormously over the years that a full-time coordinator was called for. The problem was that there was no one with enough experience who wanted the job. Eventually, three teachers agreed to split the job with each taking one period of coordinating.

In 1993-94, 475 students were enrolled in the KHS GT-AP program. This represented over 25 percent of the student body. Also significantly, nearly 600 students had applied for the '93-94 program which corresponded to about one third of the 1800 total KHS students. The program encompassed 38 sections of coursework including nine sections of AP courses and was staffed by 16 different teachers, three of whom were also coordinators.

This year (1994-95) over 150 students, 50 percent more than the total GT-AP enrollment in 1986-87, attended the 10 hour fourth annual Constitutional Convention at the Turtle Bay Hilton hotel. GT-AP enrollment has approached 30% of the KHS student body even while many changes go on throughout the school and state. The program has withstood the problems of growth, the criticisms of elitism and the movement to heterogeneity. By all indications, the KHS GT-AP program is healthy, productive and a vital element of the school community. A closer look at each of the important factors leading to this present state will follow.
The Excellence Side

*The Kahuku High School and Intermediate School GT-AP Program Handbook* (1992) states that the program

has grown into a large multi-faceted entity since its infancy nearly a decade ago. The total program reflects the structure and functions of the total school program with the courses, a parent advisory group, a student council, student activities, a newsletter, a counselling and probationary component and administrative duties.

It is the point of this dissertation to dissect this program in order to discover what makes its proponents declare that it is a new kind of gifted program; that it has gone far to bridge the gap separating efforts to achieve excellence from efforts to achieve equity.

As the above excerpt from the handbook intimates, the gifted program at Kahuku cannot be simply described. The success of the program has been an evolution of the many facets toward a well-coordinated, well-articulated entity. Some were deliberately and carefully nurtured; others were stumbled upon or the results of reacting to problematic situations. The goals that have been established, though lofty in retrospect and in total, were the result of that fairly long evolutionary process, which sometimes involved purposeful tinkering and at other times involved "mutation". And obviously, like a Glass Bead Game, adjustments in one aspect of the program engendered a ripple effect of changes throughout.

We have always had extraordinary aspirations for the role that schools would play in our society. We have expected that schools would make society healthy and coherent and strong; that they would educate everyone. It is hardly surprising that no one single institution--the school--would have been able to fulfill all our aspirations. And it is not surprising that we have felt disappointment and disenchantment, even cynicism, when schools have not matched our extraordinarily high expectations (Lawrence-Lightfoot 1993).
Though many would agree with Lawrence-Lightfoot that society makes unreasonable demands on schools, the program at KHS makes no claim to meeting all aspirations of society. One of its strengths is the consensus on goals and limitations.

Before explicating those goals, a reference to the cynicism in the Lawrence-Lightfoot quote might be appropriate here. In 1986, a parent who was in the process of trying to register his son in the KHS GT program, lamented to the GT coordinator that he had taken his son out of a very good school on the mainland and now had to enroll him in one of the worst schools in Hawaii. He had gotten his information from local acquaintances and people who had once lived in Laie. Six years later, in 1992 another parent in the same situation claimed to be excited about enrolling all his children at Kahuku High and Intermediate because of the rave reports he had heard about the school even before arriving here.

The difference that occurred over the six years had a lot to do with the philosophy that was adopted for the KHS GT-AP program. This philosophy is basically a commitment to excellence.

Essentially, the philosophy breaks down into four major parts. The first, probably most responsible for the change in the community attitude illustrated above, is the guarantee that students graduating through the GT-AP program will be prepared for college studies. It was determined that parents and students had to be confident in the quality of the curriculum. Thus the promise

---

5Many of the staff at Brigham Young University-Hawaii regularly network with staff at Brigham Young University in Provo. They also frequently exchange positions between universities and thus, many mainlanders from Utah come to the North Shore with a lot of information about the schools in the area.
of students acquiring skills and knowledge is made publicly and teachers acknowledge their commitment to college preparation.

Advanced Placement

The curriculum for college preparation was created when the teachers decided to articulate the 7th to 10th grade coursework to culminate in Advanced Placement (AP) courses in the 11th and 12th grades. Since AP courses end with national exams in May, it was felt that students and teachers would have clear curriculum goals in this respect. Thus, the content and skills taught in grades 7 to 10 were in part geared for what AP work required.

"If you set high standards at the upper years, you force improvements down" to make prerequisite and introductory-level courses more challenging," argues Janice Weinman, the College Board's executive vice president for programs (West 1994):

While some may argue that this is simply another example of teaching to a test, this situation has some clear differences. Some of the most important skills taught "to the test" are 1) a wide range of critical thinking skills requiring argumentation and support, judging relevance, evaluating data and ideas, synthesizing material, etc., 2) clear, concise, and organized writing, and maybe most important, 3) study habits which students need to be able to support very intense and challenging preparation for the test.

What worked best, in the minds of students who thought about it years later, was simply hard work. Escalante, Jiménez, and the core of other Garfield teachers who began to push the Advanced Placement program spent so much time with students—early morning, nutrition break, lunch, after school until dark—that they could not be ignored.

Inside most American teenagers, including those at Garfield, lurks a visceral respect for honest labor (Mathews 1988).

All of the skills learned and then required for the AP exams provide the vehicle for college success. The hunch was that most parents (for their children) and
students really would like an opportunity to go to college despite the rhetoric of
denial that often emanates from them. The AP program provides a testing
ground for them while the student is still in the safe environment of high school.
And the GT program provides the preparation for the AP classes at Kahuku.

The changes that most people talk about are minor: extending the
school day a little, more rigorous standards for teachers, getting
parents more heavily involved, and developing school-based
management. Nobody talks about holding anybody in the system
accountable for performance, including the students.

... Teachers must be held accountable for the quality of
instruction they deliver and the performance of their students. ... Students need to be held accountable for their behavior and
their performance in schools (Dolly 1992).

Ultimately, the AP exam holds everyone in the program responsible for the
students' preparation. Since preparation begins in the 7th grade with emphasis
on study skills and habits, and moves through the other grades for content
background and skills development, no one teacher takes credit or blame for
the performance of the students at the AP end.

Moreover, AP requires the students to be responsible for their own
learning; to develop intrinsic motivations that have little to do with grades or
parental pressure.

It is easy to ignore the effort and discipline involved in achieving
success and to attribute the results to inherited abilities, to the
predestination of genes. It is equally fallacious to put attainment
down solely to hard work, favoured circumstances or an over­
weaning drive for success. One of the key factors in achievement
is that in the process of becoming self-motivated, children learn to
be disciplined⁶ (Young and Tyre 1992).

---

⁶Since the exam itself is not required of students who take AP classes, students
who take the exam (which are the vast majority) have chosen to undertake the
rigorous studying necessary. The extra study sessions and effort are options for
the students rather than requisites in the grading for the courses.
A student who has been well-provided with the opportunities for content acquisition and skills development and who has worked hard, will do well in AP coursework and will be prepared for college entrance. The program guarantees it.

**Standards**

Along with the commitment to AP preparation, the second part of the philosophy, has been the creation and accountability to high standards. General standards at the program level give teachers, students and parents a clear understanding of what is required and what accomplishments they can expect.

Teachers and administrators, hence, find themselves facing a student population, a large proportion of which is ill-equipped and ill-prepared for education of high standards. The easiest recourse has been to reduce those standards. ... As the standards decline (there are many exceptions to this pattern, but not enough), the more upwardly-mobile parents scrape up money made already scarce by the high living costs; they make a considerable sacrifice to send their children to private schools (Rapson 1980).

Early on in the program when the first parent from the mainland denigrated the school (possibly with just reason), many children from the elementary school were being transferred to private schools for 7th grade. It was disheartening to constantly lose some of these students to Punahou or Iolani or St. Louis (private schools in Honolulu) knowing parents were making the financial sacrifice and students were spending up to three hours a day on the bus.

The flight of public school students to private schools is fairly prevalent in Hawaii. Says Rapson (1980) about Hawaii schools:

They leave for a number of reasons, but a chicken-and-egg cause-and-effect pattern operates. The students leave because educational standards in the public school are much lower than in the private schools. Parents who want their children to get a good
education and perhaps go on to college conclude they have little choice but to get their offspring into the private schools. The more who leave the public school system, the more that system suffers a decline in educational standards. The greater the decline, the greater the exodus, the greater the exodus, the greater the decline, and so on.

Statistical data bears this trend out for Hawaii's school population.

Nationally, 10.4 percent of students are in private schools; in Hawaii this number is 15.5 percent or about 33,000 students. According to data from the Hawaii Department of Education reported in The Honolulu Advertiser on October 10, 1993, 19 percent of Hawaii's students in grades 7-12 are in private schools (Lai, Morris, Thomas Saka and Selvin Chin-Chance 1994).

The establishment of a program with high standards took on a sense of urgency. One of the most visible means of doing this was the establishment of a GPA standard for the program. In 1987, the probation policy was officially adopted. The KHS GT-AP Handbook states:

... students new to the program (except for 7th graders) are automatically put on a probationary status. Secondly, any student having been admitted conditionally or off the waiting list is monitored. Lastly, all students who fail to earn a 3.0 GPA in core courses each quarter are put on probation. Parents are notified by mail of any probationary action (Kahuku High School 1992).

The progress of students on probation was monitored regularly by the program coordinator. Parent conferences, grade checks and study halls or tutorial sessions might have followed. Dismissal from the program came as a last resort but normally, students facing dismissal chose not to apply or were screened out for the next year's program.

The 3.0 standard also worked in a student's favor. Getting straight B's in English/social studies, math and science (whether all or only a portion of the students' core classes were in the GT-AP program), meant that the student would automatically be allowed to enroll in the following year's GT-AP courses without going through any screening. This clarified for students and parents the expectations and what it took to maintain standing in the program.
Of course, standards do not mean merely maintaining grades. The curriculum which teachers had articulated from grades 7 to AP, requires mastery of basic skills. Advanced achievement in reading, writing and computation are expected by grade 10 before entrance into AP. Critical thinking stands at the head of the KHS differentiated curriculum model (see Figure 2-3, p. 66). Students cannot maintain a 3.0 GPA by dismissing the substantial amount of homework required. Summer assignments are given. Major projects are assigned every semester.

As far as academics are concerned, the KHS GT-AP program removed most reasons a parent would choose to send his or her child to a private school.

Even if a parent favors the egalitarian principle of public education and opposes the elitism of private schools, as I do, it is not easy to use one’s own child as a guinea pig if the educational standards in the public schools are too low ...

The only way to keep the ambitious students in the public schools is to keep educational standards high. The schools must therefore aim higher and ask more of the students (Rapson 1980).

This attitude voiced by Rapson is understandable. The public schools cannot simply lament the flight of students to private schools. Thus six years after the unflattering remarks by the first mainland parent, the second mainland parent had clearly gotten a different image of what Kahuku High had to offer.

Holistic View

The third aspect of the philosophy concerns the idea of offering a total package; the creation of a school-within-a-school. Says Lawrence-Lightfoot (1993):

I think that education needs to be intimate; that is what nourishes both teachers and students in their work. If the institution is large, it needs to be divided up so that students feel an allegiance to something small and coherent; so they feel known by their teachers.
Also:

... do something which has not been done by educational reformers before. Instead of dickering with the system for philosophical, psychological, sociological or political reasons, we argue for a pragmatic and holistic approach (Young and Tyre 1992).

The program evolved slowly by the addition of one program, service or activity upon another. Each change was made in reaction to a real program concern and with understanding of the implications for the total program.

The first addition, and maybe the most important, was the formation of the parent group which has evolved into the Executive Board. The parent group began as a small coterie of interested and involved parents who were given the opportunity to make decisions on screening criteria and procedures and other policy issues. They were called the Parent Advisory Board and presented their recommendations at meetings where all parents, teachers, students and school staff were invited. By 1992, both students and parents joined teachers and the coordinator on the Executive Board of the program which approved The KHS GT-AP Handbook. The parents have been instrumental in assisting with activities, screening, and acting as a support group for the program. No policy decision is made without Executive Board input and approval.

A significant reason for including parents in the structure of the program has been for the effective pressure parents can place on schools to effect change or, as in the case of GT programs, maintain worthy school programs. The movement toward heterogeneity is an example where parents put pressure to maintain the program. KHS has moved to a middle school structure in the 7th grade, creating teams of students and teachers. There was a lot of talk of

---

7 All policy decisions and changes now go first to the Executive Board and then are presented at semi-annual open meetings for final approval before being put into the handbook.
having the 7th grade completely heterogeneous, thereby eliminating the 7th grade GT classes which has been serving as the gateway to the rest of the KHS GT-AP program. The Executive Board led the efforts to meet the concerns of those developing the 7th grade team program. Their lobbying success kept the 7th grade GT classes.

The next significant change came in 1989 with the initiation of an array of student activities. The 9th grade class began the first issue of Nerd News, the newsletter that has ever since highlighted GT classes, students, and activities. It also became the vehicle for communicating with the students and parents. Eventually, Nerd News attained a circulation of over 600 and has been mailed all over the state and even on occasion to the mainland.

Another activity that began that year was the KHS Model United Nations. Initially required of all GT 9th graders, it has become a two day event attended and staffed by nearly 150 students of Kahuku and other schools. Kahuku students have also sent delegations to the statewide Model UN and even planned and staffed the 1993 state event.

A third activity, Geek Week, was introduced in 1989-90. It has been a weeklong offering of activities at the end of the school year that combines a showcasing of student work and achievement and a rewarding of students for their yearlong efforts. One full day is spent off-campus for a full day of fun “nerd”

\footnote{There was one compromise that required that separate teachers teach English and social studies. Like in a Glass Bead Game, this has already had some negative effects for the GT program that the proponents of the teams do not see as a major problem. Actually the most serious consequence of the new 7th grade program has been the loss of control by the KHS GT-AP program in curriculum and staffing.}
type activities. Parents are invited for a night of student presentations, displays and up to 200 awards. Students also collect pennies all week as votes for Nerd King and Queen and their court.

Constitutional Convention came about in 1991-92. Like Model UN, students form delegations and present resolutions which they attempt to usher through committees and a general assembly. Con Con, annually held at Turtle Bay Hilton, has been attended by up to 200 students, several from Kailua and Castle high schools, for a one day session of 12 hours.

The activities have been developed for two significant reasons. Nerd News and Geek Week were instituted for the previously stated reasons but also to combat the negative stereotype of GT students. Up until then, more than a few students resisted applying for the GT-AP program because of the image of "nerd" or "geek" held by the general student population. Both terms were perceived as social death sentences whether real or not. The idea behind Nerd News and Geek Week was to diminish the pejorative nature of the terms. It was felt that if GT students could call themselves nerds and geeks, they would feel less embarrassed when someone else called them nerd or geek.

"This place doesn't really value academic excellence. At least the kids don't. Serious students here are given a hard time. Kids don't respect them. They call them nerds, geeks," the young English teacher complained.

The first student smirked. "They deserve it." The fact that this student was herself on the Honor Roll made the comment ripe. "Why?" Horace asked.

"They're so into themselves. They have all the answers ..."

"Grade grubbers," added the second student.

---

Some of the activities are a nerd fashion show, geek ball (volleyball where 4-5 pairs of students are tied at the ankles), bug and toad races, a brainteaser competition, orange hockey (hockey sticks are nylon stocking tied at the waist with an orange in it--no hands are used), an egg drop contest, etc.
The first student: "They're full of facts. They think they know everything. They stay to themselves."

"The students who are called nerds are often the self-absorbed, fact-filled ones. Their peers find them helpless, backward, inept, unconnected ..."

"That's my point," the first student persisted. "Geeks are geeks because they're so ... just full of facts. They're not real people ..." she gorp (Sizer 1992).

The above imaginary dialogue created by Sizer can point out how students use the labels "nerd" and "geek" to concoct a whole range of prejudicial images of students who do well in school.

Geek Week was also meant to show that being geeks could be fun. The organizers of the first Geek Week even dared to sell buttons on campus which read "Homework is Cool", "Nerds have more Fun", "Nerd Nation", "Have You Hugged a Geek Today?", etc. Over 300 buttons sold out in two days.

The other major reason for the activities, especially Con Con and Model UN, was to present students with opportunities, not only to plan and coordinate their own programs, but to involve students in activities which required a public demonstration of the skills and knowledge they were learning in classes. While the activities were actually simulations, they were authentic enough to give students a sense of applying classwork in real world situations. It was also an activity which the students ran on their own and participated in with minimal teacher direction and orchestration.

The final aspect of creating a total program has to do with governance and staffing. Nearly all decisions concerning the program are made within the program in accordance with procedures outlined in The KHS GT-AP Handbook. The coordinator, a vital element of the program, acts as the hub through which all decisions on curriculum, screening, policies, placement, budget, and staff development channel.

The gifted and talented program coordinator is the driving force behind each of the individual gifted and talented programs.
operating in the state's school districts. These individuals are generally characterized as energetic, dedicated, enthusiastic, technically proficient, and resourceful, and they must possess these traits. Most of them occupy this position on a part-time basis: Approximately 62 percent hold this position for 25 percent (or less) of their time, and another 19 percent function in this capacity for 26 to 50 percent of their time (Fetterman 1988).

The above description can be applied to all of the six coordinators that the KHS GT-AP program has had. None occupied the position with more than two of the seven teaching periods. The coordinators act as the administrative arm of the "school". According to The KHS GT-AP Handbook the coordinator must

1) act as a liaison between the school and district and follow through on district requirements, i.e. budget, project plans and evaluation,
2) act as a conduit and catalyst for initial and continued training of teachers,
3) work with the school administration, counselors and registrar to coordinate the program within the larger school framework,
4) conduct the screening process, compile the screening data, coordinate the efforts of the screening committee and follow through on the notification of students and parents,
5) ensure the correct placement of students in all GT and AP classes in September and throughout the year,
6) coordinate the parent advisory group which helps with policy, discusses parent and student concerns and comprises part of the screening committee,
7) supervise the publication of the GT newsletter written by and for students and which also disseminates vital information from the coordinator to students and parents,
8) monitor and counsel students who are new to the program or are performing at less-than-potential (according to teacher assessment and GPA),
9) advise a council which coordinates activities for GT-AP students, and
10) create and update a GT-AP handbook that explains the total program (Kahuku 1992).

The description of the duties of the coordinator is helpful in understanding that the scope of the program goes far beyond the activities in the individual classrooms.

Undoubtedly, the program could not be as broad in scope nor as large in population without the coordinators and the support of the administration,
teachers, parents and students. The full breadth of the program has enabled those within the program to maintain control of it. If vice-principals or counselors or department chairs who were not part of the program made decisions on the program, those closest to the students (teachers, parents and other students) could be subsumed by those “higher up”. As Lawrence-Lightfoot urges, successful programs or reforms should begin with the thinking that

A more holistic view of good schools is something about pedagogy, the craft of teaching, the process of learning, how this is shaped by the organizational structure of schools, and how the social system of classrooms creates certain constraints and opportunities for teachers.

And that

The context of particular environments offer unique challenges, opportunities, and barriers to successful schooling (Lawrence-Lightfoot 1993).

And it is the evolution of that particular environment which has become the KHS GT-AP program. And it is the program that those involved see as offering unique challenges and opportunities (and barriers in some cases) found rarely outside of the program.

Deborah Meier of New York District Four’s schools of choice states:

I don’t think all small schools are good by a long shot. But small schools can be where you start changing the way your schools are. You can’t change education all at once (Scherer 1994).

The KHS GT-AP program reflects the sentiments of Meier. It is also recognized that size is related to control. Meier might well have added that a good small school is one that is responsive to those who have a stake in it; that stakeholders get involved in the decisions and operations of the school. It is suggested here that the KHS GT-AP is like a good small school described by Meier.
One key to reducing the "size" of the KHS program has been to link English and social studies into one curriculum with one teacher. Besides the benefits of an integrated curriculum, the teacher sees half the number of students, thereby giving each student twice as much attention. The students feel a greater sense of community as they spend more time with each other and with fewer teachers.

Choice

The final important philosophical component contributing to excellence in the program involves choice. John Dolly, dean of the University of Hawaii's College of Education states:

We must remember that the public schools in Hawaii, like those in the rest of the country, are monopolies, not likely to change quickly. It's time to make schools compete. Let's open the system to allow greater flexibility at the school level and greater decision making for parents. The success of several centers of excellence in our high schools illustrates that schools have the potential to be creative and supportive of students (Dolly 1992).

While Dolly is referring to choice between schools, KHS GT-AP offers a choice within a school. And Dolly and most other advocates of choice within the education community do not favor the kind of choice championed by President Bush and Secretary of Education Alexander's interpretation which includes vouchers for students to attend private schools (Clinchy 1991; Kozol 1991). Again there exists an attitude among some of the influential that private schools can do a better job of educating youngsters than the public schools. Some suggest that it is because the public schools have been running up against an impossible task--creating success in schools that attempt to treat everyone as if they were all one amorphous person. Seymour Fliegel, the former deputy superintendent of District 4 in New York City, states that the aim of his school district there was
to create a public school system that—instead of trying to fit all
students into some standardized school—has a school to fit every
student in this district. No one gets left out, no one gets lost. Every
kid is important, every kid can learn if you put him or her in the
right environment. But since kids have this huge range of different
needs, different interests, and different ways of learning, we’ve got
to have a wide diversity of schools” (Clinchy 1991).

Even with examples of successful choice programs as in New York’s
District Four, choice is controversial in education circles.

Choice is a dread word to educators, conjuring up nightmare
visions of market discipline, consumer sovereignty, and
accountability. Choice means an environment in which individual
consumers—clients—would actually be free to abandon schools
that are failing, an environment in which teachers and principals
could escape from the tender mercies of senior administrators and
school boards. ...

Yet it is precisely what the American public says it wants. In
poll after poll, support for “choice” has been high and consistent;
indeed, only among “leaders” is support for choice nonexistent or
even lukewarm. Among the rank and file, support for choice is
wide and deep (Doyle 1991).

... parents and others welcome the relief and flexibility that
unrestricted school choice may herald. ... Skeptics rightly caution
that people can make bad choices. Distance could be a prime
consideration in school choice, and the lure of a successful sports
program might be more compelling than that of a school’s library
or science labs. ... Choice with its foundation in diversity, runs
squarely into the concept of national standards, with its foundation
in uniformity (Sewall 1991).

Helen Green, an 81 year old, a teacher only since she was 53,
suggested in a letter to Education Week that choice should be extended to the
classroom. Children who behave should be given the choice as to how they
will use their time. She says:

My experience with troublemakers in California, inner-city
Chicago, and Sarasota, Fla., has proved to me many times over
that children will do what we want them to do if we give them
reasons and let them choose, instead of treating them like slaves
(Green 1994).
Choice involved with the KHS GT-AP program is related to the philosophical base expressed by Fliegel and Green and is in agreement with the sentiments by Clinchy, Doyle and Sewall especially in their arguments concerning parental support of choice\(^{10}\). The Kahuku program makes it clear to students and parents that they make a conscious choice to enroll in the program and the students' own efforts determine continuance in the program. The coordinators and teachers go through great length to make sure students and parents are notified about the opportunity to enroll and what is expected of students in the program.

Choice is therefore inevitable, ... choices that we make for ourselves, and for the people who are under our charge, might-as well be informed choices. An individual-centered school would be rich in assessment of individual abilities and proclivities. It would seek to match individuals not only to curricular areas, but also to particular ways of teaching those subjects (Gardner 1988).

It is an important first step toward excellence when students and parents choose the program especially when the curriculum is demanding, the standards high and the continuance in the program is dependent upon both effort and achievement. Yet, it is quite understandable and not judgmental if students and parents choose not to enroll or choose to withdraw. Debbie Meier, a co-developer with Fliegel in New York District Four schools of choice, says:

... all the members of the community should have at least an initial choice about being at that school, and they should know the rules for getting out if they should want to leave. ... it is a community. When you join it, you can't say, well, I don't buy into the norms. Kids are aware that the school is designed by the people who are there (Scherer 1994).

\(^{10}\)A 1991 poll by the Planning and Evaluation Branch of the Hawaii Department of Education showed that public school parents favored choice by a 71.8 to 27.5 percent margin with 0.7 percent undecided or had no opinion (Hawaii DOE 1991).
The concept of buy-in feeds into motivation that, in this case, does not come from the school as much from the students themselves, their peers in the program and their parents who participated in the decision. Excellence in the program would not be possible without the motivation to do well by the students.

Gifted children need the security of this rational discipline and their parents and teachers need to encourage the development of their self-discipline and self-motivation without the excesses of obsessiveness which may sometimes arise. This concept of discipline provides a framework in which we can ensure that a balance is kept between those activities about which children are enthusiastic and those which are essential to their progress and all-around education and maturity but about which they are less keen (Young and Tyre 1992).

Joan Kernan Cone, an Advanced Placement English teacher in the Richmond (Calif.) Unified School District, experimented with an “untracked” AP class. Though many were skeptical that students who weren’t in the top percentiles of SATs could handle the work, Cone (1992) found that

Opening up AP English to all students who were willing to commit to a rigorous summer and yearlong regimen of writing and reading allowed me to study firsthand what happens when students are given choices in their schooling. I discovered that students with combined SAT scores around 700 can learn with students whose combined scores hover around 1,300; that students with SAT verbal scores of less than 500 can earn a 4 or 5 on the AP test; that students with SAT verbal scores as low as 300 can pass the University of California Subject A exam. I discovered that students of differing abilities can discuss sophisticated literature and can respond to one another’s writing in ways that lead to thoughtful revision. I discovered that giving students the chance to elect to work at the highest academic levels empowers them to see themselves as learners (Cone 1992).

Choice can obviously be a powerful impetus for excellence in achievement. And when nearly a third of the students choose the most demanding curriculum in the school, the program must be providing something the students see as valuable and the results should reveal achievement beyond the expectations of even the students themselves.
Still, there is no implication that the KHS GT-AP program is for all parents and students. There have been several instances where parents have withdrawn their children from the program because of the emphasis on academics and the pressure for achievement. Marva Collins, nationally recognized teacher and founder of Westside Prep in Chicago, states:

Parents set their own expectations for their children, and they have to decide whether a particular school or teaching method suits their needs. Not all parents like the Montessori approach. Not all parents favor the Suzuki method of teaching children a musical instrument. So I didn't expect every parent to be satisfied with Westside Prep. I couldn't be all things to all people, and I didn’t try to be (Collins and Tamarkin 1982).

Essentially, the staff, students and parents of the KHS GT-AP Executive Board have agreed on the mission of the program. Once that mission was communicated to the school community, the members of the program dedicated themselves to protecting the boundaries of the program from being infringed upon by demands which would dilute the effort that is being expended toward the success of the present program.

That the program cannot be all things to all people is understood and efforts attempting that would be an exercise in futility. The limited scope of the program allows those that choose the program to be exactly clear about what they are choosing.

The Equity Side

Once a program has accomplished a reputation of excellence, the next and more difficult task becomes establishing a framework for equity. The Kahuku GT-AP\textsuperscript{11} did not begin with the program necessarily concerned with

\textsuperscript{11}KHS GT-AP stands for Kahuku High School Gifted and Talented and Advanced Placement program. Some people, even on the Kahuku staff,
equity issues. It was not until the program was well-defined in its curriculum that attention was given to reaching underrepresented groups on the campus.

Improving standards of excellence for student and teacher performance while at the same time insuring equality of educational opportunity in the school system continues to be a major concern for school policy makers (Marcoulides and Heck 1988).

As previously stated, the KHS GT-AP program is one of choice. Thus when equity is discussed, it is equality of opportunity that is clearly meant; not equality of treatment. But since the program maintains high standards in its curriculum and in student achievement and guarantees college preparation, equality of treatment is somewhat realized but only within the program. Still, student and parents choose the program and thus opportunity is the operant word.

Homogenization attempts to create justice by equal treatment of unequals. We believe this approach is inherently unjust to the most and least able. Justice is achieved not by equality of treatment, but by equality of opportunity. With sensible grouping practices, all children are given equal opportunities to participate in advanced and differentiated classes designed to meet the special learning needs of the most able (Feldhusen and Moon 1992).

The reasoning of Feldhusen and Moon is taken a step further at Kahuku. Open enrollment at the 7th grade gateway and liberal screening procedures thereafter allows all parents and students the opportunity. Thus, the KHS GT-AP program goes further than even more "enlightened" programs which might offer the program to only 10 to 15 percent of the school population.

question whether the program is really a GT program since without screening students are never identified as "gifted". This is not an issue within the program.
Polynesians

At Kahuku issues about equity concern the representation of Polynesians, in particular Hawaiians, Samoans and Tongans. Polynesians in general have been underrepresented in the KHS GT-AP program since the program was initiated. Statewide, 22 percent of the public school population is native Hawaiian but only 11 percent of students in GT programs are Hawaiian (Sing, et al undated). At Kahuku, statistics on ethnic distribution were not kept and attempts to determine distribution by looking at old class lists would provide grossly inaccurate results due to the rate of intermarriage in Hawaii\(^{12}\). Still, it is generally accepted among the teachers who have been with the program for more than five years that Polynesian students have been underrepresented in the program.

Some would assert that gifted programs should be able to attain equal distribution of all ethnic groups. It has been reported that the underrepresentation of minority groups may be as much as 30 to 70 percent nationwide (ibid.). The representation figures also extend to college enrollment where Hawaiian students comprise a little over nine percent of the University of Hawaii system and only about five percent at UH-Manoa (Hammond 1992).

While this situation is quite recognizable in Hawaii and across the nation, Kitano (1991) states:

\(^{12}\)Some estimate that nearly 65 percent of marriages in Hawaii are interracial. Thus, it is impossible to accurately determine ethnicity by surnames. At a local birthday party, all the children had Japanese last names; Takara, Nozawa, Watanabe, Ueoka, Morita and Awaya. Takara was half African American, Nozawa was half Caucasian, Watanabe, Ueoka and Morita were part Hawaiian.
Unfortunately, the research literature on multicultural education in general is sparse and on culturally diverse gifted children virtually nonexistent.

Reid (1983), who has studied Maori and Polynesian cultures, echoes Kitano's sentiments.

There remains much, much more to be learned about both similarities and differences in conceptions of giftedness, not only in European and Polynesian cultures, but also amongst the various Pacific Island cultures, collectively 'Polynesian'.

The reasons for the imbalance are fairly obvious but also steeped in controversy. Part of the problem has to do with factors outside the control of the schools. Low socio-economic status associated with minority groups have been directly linked to low school achievement. Poverty, single parenting, poor health, crime, drug abuse and lack of material comforts are often found in communities which have a high percentage of minority populations. That high academic achievement is more difficult to find in the schools of these communities is not surprising. Says Fetterman (1988):

Schools are continually being asked to solve social problems, and they can either be change agents or promote the status quo. Unquestionably, schools have a role to play in the social arena; however, their power should not be overestimated. The discrepancy between the representation of ethnic groups in the larger student population and that in the GATE program mirrors larger social and economic discrepancies in our culture. The burden of proportional representation cannot be placed solely on the shoulders of the educational system. Many social problems must be addressed before we can realistically expect to see dramatic change in our schools.

So what can be done? What are realistic goals? The difficulty in setting goals is that there seems to be very little evidence of what can be accomplished. Instead of setting an unrealistic goal such as full representation, or simply

\[^{13}\text{GATE is the acronym for Gifted and Talented Education in the state of California.}\]
guessing at what might be accomplished, programs might better concentrate on developing procedures which encourage broader representation of students.

If broader definitions of giftedness are adopted and related identification instruments developed, a more fair representation should emerge (Fetterman 1988; Sing et al undated). The Center for Gifted and Talented Native Hawaiian Children on the Big Island of Hawaii uses a definition which would include more students of Hawaiian ancestry.

In order to allow for diverse ways of exhibiting gifts and talents, the Center uses a broad, defensible definition of gifted which includes general intellectual ability, specific academic abilities, creativity, leadership, and visual/performing arts. Generally, native Hawaiians have manifested their gifts and talents in areas such as leadership, psychomotor, and the arts more than in the areas such as general intelligence or academic achievement (Sing et al undated).

Reid (1983) would reiterate the same needs in relationship to all Polynesian groups.

... while there can be no doubt that gifted and talented children can be found in all ethnic groups, the fact is that unless special efforts are made to identify and nurture minority group youth, employing other than the common criteria and traditional approaches, they remain an untapped source of potential intellectual and creative talent.

Some of the cultural patterns of Polynesian groups might also contribute to their underrepresentation. Reid (ibid) cites the Maori belief that parents' obligation for their children's education is relinquished once the children enter school. He also suggests a Polynesian reticence in acknowledging personal accomplishments or nominating another or self for anything that would set individuals apart from the group. Finally, he says that people need to recognize that in most Polynesian families, there is no tradition of academic achievement and homes lack the educational basics of middle class families--books, reference materials like encyclopedias and dictionaries--as in most low SES
households. Yet, most Polynesian parents would express high value on education; many Samoans and Tongans move to Hawaii and elsewhere in the U.S. for the educational advantages afforded to their children.

At Kahuku, a very real problem was the lack of a significant number of Polynesian students in the GT program. This was in itself a reason for other Polynesian students to stay away. Says Reid (ibid):

... identification and selection procedures which are going to make children feel 'different' or that single them out as being in some way 'superior' or 'better' in comparison with their age and class peers, or that may result in them being withdrawn for some period of the school day for accelerated and/or enriched instruction, even for something as flexible as Renzulli's 'revolving door' strategy, will have little appeal for Polynesian students. They are highly unlikely to volunteer for inclusion in such programmes, should they even consider themselves candidates, which is doubtful given our knowledge about their poor image of themselves.

Thus, given the academic goals of the program, how could the KHS GT-AP program attract and accommodate more students of Polynesian background?

One question that has not been given serious consideration at KHS has been the development of a more multiculturally sensitive curriculum. The required state curriculum includes Hawaiian studies in the 7th and 11th grade. Furthermore, KHS has a student body which is quite active in cultural activities, especially since many of them have part time jobs or their parents work at the Polynesian Cultural Center which is located in Laie. So, since the program is set up to focus on college preparation it makes no overtures to cultural studies though students who wish to pursue cultural studies within the flexible curriculum are encouraged to do so. A differentiated curriculum, when

\[14\]

and thus provides a channel for students of underrepresented minorities to enter post-secondary education where they are even more underrepresented.
operating effectively, can easily accommodate a wide range of interests and learning styles. Collins (1982) states:

I'm opposed to teaching black English because it separates black children from the rest of society; it also implies they are too inferior to learn standard language usage. How many black youths are cut off from the job market because they do not have a command of the English language. ... Instead of teaching black pride, I taught my children self-pride. All I wanted was for them to accept themselves.

While some decry the poor socio-economic state of minorities, they cannot then also advocate creating an educational system that is more culturally sensitive but might perpetuate weak preparation for the most viable ladder for economic advancement--a college degree. When teachers, students and parents clearly agree that students will be prepared for college and work in a concerted effort toward that end, the chance of success is nearly assured. The KHS GT-AP program makes that demand and then delivers on the promise. All parties are disciplined toward that end. Says Collins (ibid), "The concept of self-determination goes hand in hand with self-discipline."

Thus, the answer within the program to attracting more Polynesian students was not to make the curriculum more culturally relevant. It lay in creating an environment that was academically rigorous, college preparatory and sensitive to individual students with whatever backgrounds they had. Part of the reasoning for giving more attention to the individual than to group characteristics can be summed by Kitano (1991).

... attributing achievement behavior to differences in cultural variables is overly simplistic. Such attributions fail to consider within-group differences as well as complex societal and ecological phenomena. ... Within-group variability must be considered in efforts to identify appropriate instructional strategies as well as factors underlying achievement differences. Often ignored, marked diversity exists within cultural and ethnic groups.
Counselling

The process used in the KHS GT-AP program to enroll more students of Hawaiian and other Polynesian ancestry came with three major developments. The first was to implement counselling, the second to institute continuous progression and the third became the open enrollment policy.

Counselling was instituted in 1987 in response to the realization that creating demands upon students also meant that students must be supported so that they can reasonably meet those demands. Initially, it was enough for the "counselor" of the program\(^\text{15}\) to track the students through periodic grade checks. Eventually, a more elaborate system of tracking the students developed--a probationary system, working with parents and school counselors and contacting students regularly to diagnose concerns and problems and to work on solutions. Noddings (1993), a national spokesperson for caring in education, states:

> How children feel--whether they are happy, engaged, realistically confident, eager for experience--matters. ... Attention to the quality of life in schools ought not to be paid solely in the name of learning. ... An excellent system of education will attend to both the quality of present experience and its role in preparing students for a bright future.

The role of the program counselor is multifaceted. Essentially, he/she is charged with the welfare of the students while keeping the goals of the program in mind. An important aspect of the role is to give students the perception that the program is small enough to care for them individually. The size of the school or program may have a lot to do with the quality of learning taking place there (Sizer 1992). In an article called "Catchers in the Rye", Yatvin suggests

\(^{15}\)Part of the coordinator's job has been dedicated to counselling students and communicating with parents.
that not enough is done to catch students who fall through the cracks of the system; there are not enough Holden Caufields.

We need small schools or schools that are divided into small community units; classroom time, space and organization that allow personal relationships to flourish ... Within such a framework, educators are able to catch children who stray too close to the edge (Yatvin 1994).

At times students simply need to work through temporary personal concerns; at other times they may be in need of cheerleading, ego-boosting, or a reality check. Learning will not take place until the student is open and responsive to the activities of the classroom. Sizer contends that while schools must show respect for individual students and have the expectation that each can succeed

Much of learning depends on a student's disposition. He will try hard if it seems worthwhile to try hard, if the people whom he respects believe that trying hard is a good thing, if the community supports that kind of effort, and if something inside himself impels him to try hard. It is easy for him not to try hard. The opportunities for procrastination and for diversion are legion. He knows--as do his teachers--that the decision to use his mind is entirely up to him (Sizer 1992).

Echoes Collins (1982):

I felt it was as important to deal with attitudes as with any of the academic subjects. In fact it is probably more important. Without the right attitude, everything else is wasted.

While all teachers in the program need to deal with students' attitudes, it has been important for the students to feel that one person in particular was specially designated to reach out to them; to try to understand them; to help them work through difficulties; to advocate for them when called for.

With Polynesian students, it has been found that the counselor needs to understand their reticence to openly appear aggressive or ambitious. Many must be provided with the least obtrusive route to apply for the program; the practice now being that students need merely check off the GT or AP classes on
the registration cards to be put on the list of applicants. In many cases, the counselor must check with students to encourage them to continue in the program. In some cases, Polynesian students who are not in the program but have been recommended by teachers or by their test scores or GPAs, must be aggressively encouraged to apply. While most students find the process of application very simple, it seems to be a risky effort among the Polynesian students.

A case in point is Student A, a Polynesian boy, who was identified in the 7th grade as capable of GT work. He refused to apply for the program until his 9th grade year when he was convinced to at least apply for the science class in 10th grade. It was not until his 10th grade year that he decided to apply for the other GT-AP courses. He quickly excelled in the AP US History class and has become one of the most active students in planning and coordinating Constitutional Convention and Model United Nations, even wearing a black graduation robe when he chaired committee sessions. When recently asked why he resisted applying for the GT program, he couldn’t remember being asked and added, “I wasn’t in GT in elementary school.” It had long been obvious that Student A had the potential to do GT-AP work but he needed to be convinced of it. He also needed help to overcome the inertia created by being comfortably cloistered in work that required only a modicum of effort on his part as well as help to overcome his not wanting to appear better than his ethnic peers; being in GT was not something he really gave much serious thought to.

Another difficult role in GT-AP counselling is overseer of gender equity but contrary to much of the national focus on gender research, the KHS GT-AP

\(^{16}\)All students apply every year. The details of the process will be explained in a later section.
program seems to have a much more difficult situation with boys than with girls. This applies across the curriculum: English, social studies, math and science. Girls greatly outnumber boys in the program, even in Advanced Placement math and science classes. Boys more frequently drop out of the program or don’t make the 3.0 GPA. Girls dominate the GT-AP awards given in the subject areas at the Nerd Night awards ceremony and are usually the valedictorians at graduation. 17

Some gifted high school male underachievers are neither academic nor social failures; yet they have significant lags between ability and achievement, socially and academically. It is generally estimated that 10-15% of the intellectually superior children in our country are underachievers, and that male underachievers outnumber female underachievers at a rate of about 3 or 4 to 1. These predominantly male underachievers exhibit an attitude characterized by a desire to "do only enough to get by at a level adults will accept" (Wolfle 1991).

A fair amount of research has been dedicated to the physical, social and emotional development of boys, especially during the pubescent years of the 7th, and 8th grades in school (ibid; Alvino 1991). Boys in the KHS GT-AP program are most likely to disappear from the program (for whatever reason) after the 7th grade and continue to drop out until the 9th or 10th grades when many thereafter return to the program. Alvino cites research that points to several difficulties boys have in gifted programs.

17The 1995 graduating class was led by 10 valedictorians (any graduating senior with a 4.0 GPA or better becomes a valedictorian). Of those ten students, two were boys; their best representation in recent years. Also to note was that all ten were GT-AP students even though many GT-AP students grumble about how tough their courses are compared to students taking general courses. (see Appendix B page 204 "Why I Don't Want to Be in G/T". 
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Because early education is influenced by a predominance of female teachers\(^{18}\), who may tend to value above all else conformity and obedience, Loeb and Jay suggest that "academic success, and particularly when the results in being labeled 'gifted', may foster feelings of self-doubt, weakness, and lack of control in the young boy". In a national study of school districts with gifted programs (Read 1988), boys and girls cited peer pressure most frequently as the main discourager to participating in the program. ... As Piirto observes, "The stereotype of the 'nerd' haunts the academically able gifted boy and he isn't respected unless he's also athletic." ... In fact, Lundberg (1987) says this is a more serious concern for gifted boys, as they enjoy a narrower norm of peer acceptance.

In particular, Hawaiian and other Polynesian boys seem to be more likely to drop out or stay out of the program than Asian or Caucasian boys. A recent effort to stem this trend was taken by the coordinators and teachers with encouraging results. Hopefully, students like Student A will enter the program earlier and remain so their potentials can be fully realized.

Overall, the GT-AP counselors and teachers have noticed that it is becoming more common to see positive changes in attitude among students who began the program in the 7th grade with grave doubts about their own qualifications to enroll in the KHS GT-AP program. In talking to students over the course of their tenure in the program, the program counselor will often encounter the following attitudinal evolution:

- I'm not a GT student. I don't belong in the program. It's too hard for me.
- I'm just in the program.
- I'm in the program but anyone can get in.

\(^{18}\)The KHS GT-AP program has been dominated by women teachers. In fact, the greatest proportion of male teachers in the program at any one time has been two out of 15. Still, there is no evidence that this directly contributes to the imbalance of female students over males.
The work is for GT students but I can do the work.
• Maybe I belong in the program.
• I do GT work. It's not hard if I try.
• I'm a student in the GT-AP program (and I belong).

The attitudinal transition does not come quickly. With their cultural background that shuns positive self-appraisals, Polynesian students often require sustained efforts by teachers and coordinators to help them to overcome self-doubts and resistance to being seen as "nerds" and "geeks". Boys in general have needed more direct contact with the GT-AP and school counselors and more involvement by their parents.

Screening

The major change that allowed the program to be more responsive to equity issues came with the philosophical shift in the identification of students. Essentially it has been a shift from the view of selecting students based on past performance to a view of allowing students to prove themselves capable of performing in a gifted program.

The change evolved out of a more traditional mode of screening which in a sense has come full circle. In 1986 the first formal screening process was developed in response to the questionable practice of "no screening"—screening by teacher recommendation which merely meant soliciting a list of students who were "fit" for a GT class. The '86 screening formalized the process to justify the services provided to the selected students. By the '87 screening period, the matrix for screening of each student included the following:

- (OLSAT) Otis-Lennon School Ability Test score
- (SAT) Stanford Achievement Test score
- (TRR) Teacher Recommendation Rating score
(GPA) Grade point average in core classes (Kahuku 1992)

This was in keeping with common practice recommended by both state specialists and national braintrusts in gifted education, i.e. Renzulli, Kaplan, Gallagher, etc., who were calling for identification based on more than IQ scores. The Richardson Study which surveyed more than 1000 school boards revealed that the most frequently used identification techniques were

- teacher nominations 91% of school boards
- achievement tests 90%
- IQ tests 82%
- grades 50% (Ramos-Ford and Gardner 1991)

The decision at Kahuku was to use all the above.

While an art component existed that had its own screening criteria, the general GT program was concerned only with academic giftedness which was correctly reflected in the matrix data collected. One of the existing problems in many programs has to do with identification that is mismatched with program (Richert 1991; Starko 1990). The definition of gifts and talents in both national and state legislation includes creative, leadership, psychomotor, performance and visual arts abilities (State of Hawaii 1984; Hawaii State Department of Education 1981; U.S. Commissioner 1972). It was felt at KHS that these other aspects of GT could be adequately addressed by other programs in the school (the powerful athletic teams, the nationally reknown band, the student government, and excellent choir). There was a conscious decision to narrow the scope of program to ensure that goals were reasonable and attainable.

The final version of the screening matrix and the process which evolved was carefully developed with input from research, the administration, parents and teachers and approved by the Parent Advisory Board. It was realized that
fairness in identification was critical due to the implications of designating students as gifted or not gifted.

The issue is a political one. Not only are extra funds\(^{19}\) made available for the creation of enriched and accelerated programs for the gifted, thus enhancing their educational futures and perhaps career prospects; but those who fall short of the established criteria of giftedness are often perceived as being denied access to such programs along with the expectations and opportunities that they provide. Hence, any identification process is liable to be steeped in controversy (MacRae and Lupart 1991).

The 3.0 rule

It was shortly after the screening process was approved and implemented that a consistent and problematic situation arose. During the actual screening process the members of the screening committee could see only the matrix scores and students were simply designated with an identifying number. Only the coordinator knew who was actually being considered at any given moment. In a review of results, students were at times found to be dropped from the program but were performing quite capably in class. Their scores in the lower stanines on the SAT or OLSAT put them at a disadvantage against other students who had higher test scores. In the screening process the committee automatically accepted any student meeting the minimum score in three of the four matrix items. Those minimums were stanine 7s in the OLSAT and SAT, a 22 out of 30 on the TRR and a 3.0 GPA in core classes. Students who met only two of the four criteria were put into the screening pool and

\(^{19}\)The KHS GT-AP program has received between $1000 and $1800 in funds from the district office which was double the allocation over other schools since KHS is both an intermediate and a high school. The money, often divided up, has amounted to less than $50 per teacher per class period. At other times, the money has been used lumpsum to buy program-wide materials and equipment.
decisions were made on a case by case basis to fill the spaces left available for the class. It was often students who tested poorly that fell into this category since their aptitude test (OLSAT) and their achievement test (SAT) scores might both be under a stanine 7.

Discussion of the problem resulted in the first major doorway for many students who did not test "gifted", in particular, students of Polynesian ancestry. The Parent Advisory Board decided to amend the screening process to allow students currently in the program who maintained a 3.0 GPA in their core classes to pass through without screening. Thus, once students got into the program and performed to this minimum standard, "more capable" students applying to the program could not "push" them out.

A critical case in point developed around Student B for whom the change was particularly critical. Student B was a Western Samoan citizen who had been in Hawaii since she was in elementary school and spoke English quite well. She had been in the GT program in the 7th and 8th grade upon recommendations from her elementary school teacher. But for her 9th grade year, she was screened out as the popularity of the program began attracting more and more applicants. While her GPA was well above 3.0 and her TRR was in the high 20s, her test scores were a 5 and 6 stanine.

When the approved list was finalized and Student B was not on it, teachers argued that it would be travesty to drop a student who was obviously showing capabilities not suggested by her test scores. A special dispensation was made in her case and the screening was consequently amended through the Parent Advisory Board.

Student B eventually became one of Kahuku's outstanding students. She took several leadership positions both within the GT program and with the student government. She passed the AP US History exam with a score of 4 (out
of 5) and was selected the Windward District’s Sterling Scholar finalist in the Speech category. She was a national winner of a Discover Card scholarship during her junior year and ended her high school career with a resumé of activities, awards and honors that spanned three typewritten pages, much of it directly related to her involvement in the KHS GT-AP program.

The 3.0 rule gave students a clear goal and avenue for continued enrollment in the program. It assured students who got into the program that they would remain in the program as long as they worked to its standards. And finally, it allowed those students who had poor test scores to essentially forget them once they were in the program.

Open enrollment

When open enrollment was initiated in 1990-91, the avenue to enter the GT program widened for students with poor test scores. The screening committee had actually by then adopted a very liberal view of the identification process. More and more convinced that the program had developed into a gifted education program rather than a program for gifted students, the screening committee with the blessing of the Executive Board20 began weighing the GPA and TRR more heavily than test scores when both test scores were under stanine 7.

One such student was Student C. Student C was not a 7th grade GT student even though by then there was an open enrollment policy in effect. She

20The Parent Advisory Board became the Executive Board in 1991-92 when students were included.
applied for the 8th grade program with a 4.0 GPA\textsuperscript{21}, very high teacher ratings but stanine 4s on both her OLSAT and SAT tests. She was given the opportunity and although her grades slipped to 3.3 in the 8th grade, she worked harder than any student in the class and survived. In her 9th grade year, she became one of the four editors for \emph{Nerd News} from her class. While she may not attain the heady accomplishments of Student B, Student C has proven that hard work can overcome weaknesses in tested skills.

The open enrollment policy gave more students like Student C the opportunity to allow their efforts rather than test scores to show their abilities. This goes back to the issue of trying to identify the many kinds of student abilities and learning styles which contribute to academic success and which often cannot be measured without extensive, time consuming and expensive testing and measurement. Thus, the members of the Richardson Study concluded

... that many kinds of abilities must be recognized, that identifying unusual abilities and helping those abilities to flourish are different parts of the same process. They also concluded that we need to keep entrance requirements fairly modest and tentative and allow the educational programming itself to select students with unusual talent and motivation (Cox, Kelly and Brinson 1988).

Because of the open enrollment policy, GT classes currently include one third of the 7th graders or a little over 100 students. Since the inception of open enrollment, the program has continued a steady growth to where it has now surpassed 500 students or over 25\% of the student body. This fact in itself is an answer to accusations of elitism.

\textsuperscript{21}Information on student's enrollment, test scores, GPAs, and TRR have been extracted from a GT-AP database that began with students who entered the 9th grade in 1986.
One unfortunate outcome of educational reforms trying to foster "excellence" has been the reinforcement of elitist programs that serve as few as 2 to 5% of students.

... No one knows how many students have gifted potential, since no one has made an effort to elicit giftedness from all students. While programs for the gifted, by definition, cannot serve all children, serving fewer than 25% of students will exclude too many students with gifted potential (Richert 1991).

**Developmental view**

The open enrollment policy and the more liberal view of identification which underlies the 3.0 rule can be justified if giftedness is seen in a developmental view. This view would suggest that the conditions of giftedness in students can be nurtured through curriculum and programming even though the conditions may not have been demonstrated in past achievement.

A developmental view of giftedness has taken on more credence as advocates respond to growing criticisms. The thinking here includes environment as a critical factor in the manifestation of giftedness in individuals. Horowitz (1987) states:

> We tend to think of giftedness in a developmental sense as being equated to precociousness. But this is too simple and ultimately not useful. Children who give no early hint of giftedness in a particular domain but later show extremely gifted performance may represent a variety of combinatorial circumstances ... similarly gifted children may thus be the result of quite different combination of circumstances.

Given all the controversy and difficulty involved with identification, a developmental view which uses the most liberal screening procedures seems to provide the answer. In this vein, rather than seeking students who demonstrate the characteristics of giftedness as a precondition to admission, program coordinators would do better to seek students who might develop gifted qualities when presented with a nurturing environment. There seems to
be a slowly emerging departure from the practices of the past 20 years which
has been predicated on the belief that

... the purpose of identification is to select only those students who
truly demonstrate the condition. Taken together, these dimensions
have established a paradigm under which being gifted is a fixed
condition demonstrated by only a small percentage of students. ... Once a student has been identified as gifted, the next step of the
paradigm is placement in the gifted program, a special
instructional opportunity presumably commensurate with the
characteristics and needs of the gifted (Trefinger 1991).

Whereas:

It is evident from research that many of the cognitive skills
(e.g., memory, critical thinking, creative thinking, problem solving,
inferences and deductions, analogies, and decision making) and
affective skills (e.g., motivation, persistence, confidence, task
attention, and metacognitive skills) traditionally associated with
intelligence can be nurtured through direct instructional
intervention. The dimensions of ability emphasized in defining
who is (and who is not) gifted are thus not best present or absent
in any person over time and in all circumstances (ibid.).

Concludes Trefinger (ibid):

Instead of an emphasis on “programs for the gifted.” I believe we
need more diverse and varied programming for giftedness.--
programming for giftedness or encouraging gifted behaviors.

Echoes Renzulli (1988):

... the contributions of Sternberg, Gardner, and Bloom have
caus ed me to shift emphasis from the traditional concept of “being
gifted” (or not being gifted) to a concern about the development of
“gifted behaviors” in those youngsters who have the highest
potential for benefiting from special educational services. This
slight shift in terminology might appear to be an exercise in
heuristic hair splitting, but I believe that it has significant
implications for the entire way that we think about the concept of
giftedness and the ways in which we should structure our
identification and programming endeavors. We must reexamine
identification procedures that result in a total preselection of
certain students and the concomitant implication that these young
people are, and always will be “the gifted.”

The above is an extensive citation and elaboration of the point but the
whole basis of this dissertation hinges on the establishment of the KHS GT-AP
program as being, not only unique and forerunning, but also the answer to bridging the gap separating excellence and equity. The program has been faithful to the high standards and challenging curriculum of gifted programs, yet has adjusted its screening process so that students are provided with the opportunity to demonstrate gifted behaviors\(^{22}\) rather than being screened on the basis of clear and past demonstration of those behaviors. The change can simply be seen as a shift from achievement to potential (Gallagher and Gallagher 1994).

Thus, rather than seeking new and possibly more complicated forms of identification instruments, the KHS GT-AP community decided to offer a gateway into the program where there is no instrument at all. Nearly all the gurus of gifted education are now urging the use of more "enlightened" identification instruments to replace older methods that have proven to be clearly inadequate (Gallagher and Gallagher 1994; Colangelo and Davis 1991; Tannebaum 1991; Ramos-Ford and Gardner 1991; MacRae and Lupart 1991; Cox, Kelly and Brinson 1988; Renzulli 1988; Costa 1984).

Says Costa (1984):

*We must teach them (students) to value intelligent and rational action. To do so, however, we must provide the conditions for the behaviors of intelligence to be practiced and demonstrated. We must believe that all students can continue to grow in their ability to behave more intelligently. We must have faith that all humans can become increasingly more gifted than they are presently capable of demonstrating.*

\(^{22}\)This even implies just simply working hard and overcoming and strengthening innate weaknesses in cognitive skills.
Evaluation

All the description of the KHS GT-AP program and its merits will serve no purpose unless there is a clear assessment of its effectiveness. Since there has been no ongoing psychometric or longitudinal study, it is somewhat difficult to construct quantitative data at this time. Still, there might be enough in combination with qualitative information to provide enough evidence that the program is accomplishing where other programs have fallen short.

It might first be helpful to begin an assessment of the program comparing it to the findings of the Richardson Study which attempted to nationally determine the substantiveness of the programs.

"Substantial" programs were those that offered at least three content areas, could report a specific number of students completing at least one course each year, and reported that 10 percent of those students or more scored a 3 or above (a passing grade) on the Advanced Placement test.

"substantial" programs also tended to have supervisory staff for gifted/talented programs, a written philosophy and goals, and a special budget (Cox, Daniel and Boston 1985).

According to the conditions outlined in the Richardson Study, the KHS GT-AP compares well in the following ways: 1) The program offers four present content areas: English/social studies, science, art and earlier also math. 2) Nearly all students who enter the program stay for the year and enrollment, course and class counts are recorded yearly. 3) AP exam pass rates have usually come in at around 70% for the English Literature, English Language, US History and US Government exams. Pass rates in Chemistry and Calculus

---

23The study did not attempt to judge quality. Rather it tried to determine the level of commitment to the programming which was designated “presence” and “substantial” (as the stronger offering) (Cox, Daniel and Boston 1985).
have been under 25%. 4) At least one coordinator and the Executive Board oversees the program; the coordinator(s) with the day-to-day administration and the Executive Board with decisions in policies. 5) The GT Handbook articulates the philosophy, program and policies. 6) And finally, the small budget allocated by the district is supplemented with school funding via the regular budget system and some discretionary funds are available through "creative" funding.

In another vein, Kaplan (1988) lists the following program standards that provide benchmarks in assessing the quality of the program:

a) Statement of specific goals and objectives.
b) Clear decision making process.
c) Monitoring of program standards.
d) Clear understanding of the program limitations.
e) Documented expenditures.
f) Check on the perceptions of teachers, parents and students.
g) Staff training opportunities
h) Statement of philosophy

For the KHS GT-AP program, goals, limitations, and philosophy are articulated in the GT Handbook. The coordinator(s) is charged with monitoring the program and expenditures and promoting staff development. And the Executive Board is involved with decision making and keeping a check on the consciousness of the program community. Thus, in all aspects, without going

---

24 Part of the difference in pass rates have to do with the flux in staffing for math and science. Math is also not part of the GT program, offering AP Calculus only. The difficulty with science has been a lack of an articulated program hindered by staffing changes and a more dynamic curriculum.
into much detail, the program holds up well under scrutiny if using Kaplan's program benchmarks.

Still, the most significant criteria that is held up by the KHS GT-AP coordinators to indicate the success of the program has simply been the increased number of students choosing to apply and enroll in the program. As shown by figure 3-1 below, enrollment has steadily increased throughout due primarily to the 7th grade open enrollment policy and the addition of new courses. This steady growth ended in 1994-95 because of a reduction of one section of 8th graders (from three to two) and reduced numbers in the art program which has struggled with the many other choices students have and the fact that students don't really need a GT class to continue to develop their skills in art. The 1993-94 numbers represented approximately 26 percent of the
total student population, whereas the program numbers in 1985-86 were about 6 percent of the school population.

**NUMBER OF SECTIONS OF KHS GT-AP COURSES**

1984-1994

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>No. of sections</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>'84</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'85</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'86</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'87</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'88</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'89</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'90</td>
<td>22*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'91</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'92</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'93</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'94</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*math was dropped as a GT option

The next chart (figure 3-2) shows the growth in the number of sections between 1984 and the present. This is actually even more dramatic since most GT-AP students take more than one GT-AP course. Also implicit in the growth in the number of sections is the number of teachers required to staff the program.

Obviously, this type of dramatic growth in a program that emphasizes challenging and college preparatory work, requires a 3.0 GPA and implicitly expects students to enroll in Advanced Placement courses, is quite astonishing. In a time when educators are decrying the apathy of students in caring about their own education, the students at Kahuku seem to be increasingly motivated to attempt a difficult program of college prep academics. More students apply
for the GT-AP program than the highly respected KHS junior varsity and varsity football teams and in fact, more students are enrolled in GT-AP than play sports within in one of the most sports minded communities in Hawaii.

### KHS GT-AP STUDENTS OLSAT STANINE SCORES
(grading classes of 1991-1997)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>stanine</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>no. of students</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of total</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3-3

Additionally, if the claim in the program is that test scores play a minor role in the selection process (none for the 7th grade), then students in the program should exhibit a wide range of results in standardized testing. The following charts reveal the distribution of OLSAT scores for all GT-AP students found in the data base who have had at least one GT-AP course. Figure 3-3 shows the distribution of scores beginning with the records of students inputed between the first year (1991) the data base was started and extending to the graduating class of 1997. Since open enrollment began in 1990-91, the chart shows 7th and 8th graders who came in under this policy and the rest under the liberal but old admissions policies. The next chart, figure 3-4, shows the scores from among students graduating between 1995 and 2000. Only the class of

25 All students who apply for the program are given the OLSAT. All students in the program in the 7th and 9th grade years are also tested. This has been done for both screening purposes (though most students are never screened) and as a check on the philosophy of keeping the program from being exclusive.
1995 was admitted under the old screening process; all other students with open admissions.

**KHS GT-AP STUDENTS OLSAT STANINE SCORES**
(graduating classes of 1995-2000)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>stanine</th>
<th>3*</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>no. of students</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of total</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*one student with stanine 2

**Figure 3-4**

There is an expected and noticeable downward shift in the distribution of scores and the percentage of those scores. As more students entered the program through the open enrollment policy, more students with OLSAT scores in the four to seven stanines showed up in the data collection. Most of these students would be considered average students with those scoring at stanine four considered below average. The students with stanine three scores would normally be checked for eligibility to remedial programming (and, in fact, a few students eligible for Chapter 1 remedial reading and SLEP programs have

**CHANGE IN OLSAT STANINE SCORES COMPARING Figures 3-3 and 3-4**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>stanine</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>no. of students</td>
<td>+5</td>
<td>+24</td>
<td>+40</td>
<td>+35</td>
<td>+28</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of total</td>
<td>+1%</td>
<td>+4%</td>
<td>+5%</td>
<td>+2%</td>
<td>-1%</td>
<td>-6%</td>
<td>-5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 3-5**
been enrolled in GT-AP). When the information is compared (figure 3-5), it's evident that the program has been able to continue to attract and enroll the students with stanine scores of eight and nine (who would be admitted to nearly all programs for the gifted), but their percentage representation within the total program has decreased. On the other hand, there has been a significant increase in numbers and percentage representation of students scoring at all lower stanines.

An obvious conclusion reached is that the program has been able to bring in fairly substantial numbers of "average" students who are rising to the challenge of a demanding program of courses that culminates in college level work. Additionally, the program can accommodate "below average" students whose motivation and work ethic becomes the driving force behind what might be termed overachievement.

**Evaluation—Excellence**

While using the Richardson and Kaplan criteria sheds good light on the KHS GT-AP program, other criteria might prove more useful. In terms of data concerning excellence in the program, AP enrollment and exam pass rates, college entrance statistics, and student awards and scholarships may show the program worth.

*AP Enrollment and Exam Pass Rates*

The program first began with AP courses in the 1982-83 school year. Since statistics were recorded in the program files, the following numbers demonstrate the growth of the AP part of the program:
The year 1993-94 was the first for two sections of the same course when an extra section of AP US History and AP English Language were needed to accommodate the number of students who registered for the courses. This occurred even after a change in policy which required students to have earned a GPA of 2.5 or higher and at least a B in the content area course for which they were applying. This was instituted because of the number of students applying who had GPAs and content area grades which indicated a lack of seriousness and when spaces for the classes became at a premium, an open enrollment policy for AP courses could not be sustained. This increase in enrollment also came about before increased GT enrollments in the lower grades reached the 11th grade when students usually begin enrolling in AP courses.

The concomitant factor along with increased AP enrollments is the pass rates for the exam. Since the exam is given nationally, this should be one indicator used to compare the KHS GT-AP program with others within the state and across the nation. Few schools can approach the incredible AP Calculus

\[26\text{Thus, to get in 11th grade AP US History, a B is required in 10th grade history.}\]
success of Garfield High where, under the guidance of Jaime Escalante, well over a hundred students have taken the exam in a single year with pass rates about 75%. Still, KHS seems to do a credible job; its English and social studies students in the last 10 years consistently score at pass rates higher than the national and state levels. This must be comprehended with the consideration that the exam is not required and neither is it seen as a basis of success of a teacher’s and students’ efforts. Rather, the writing, reading and thinking skills involved in preparing for the exam are much more emphasized than preparing for and passing the exams. Figure 3-7 provides information on KHS AP exam pass rates.

KHS PASS RATES FOR AP EXAMS 1986-1994

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eng. lit.*</td>
<td>?%</td>
<td>9-19</td>
<td>8-12</td>
<td>12-17</td>
<td>15-17</td>
<td>10-13</td>
<td>11-18</td>
<td>5-6</td>
<td>6-6</td>
<td>76-108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>calc.</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>1-3</td>
<td>1-1</td>
<td>4-5</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4-12</td>
<td>7-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. gov.</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>15-18</td>
<td>13-18</td>
<td>17-23</td>
<td>12-19</td>
<td>13-17</td>
<td>17-17</td>
<td>87-112</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eng. lang.</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>9-11</td>
<td>13-19</td>
<td>22-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chem.</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>0-0</td>
<td>0-8</td>
<td>0-8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*exams passed - exams taken  
% pass

Figure 3-7

The following are national pass rates (with + or - 1% fluctuation per year):
The drop in U.S. History scores in 1989 came in the first year of a replacement teacher when the former teacher went on a sabbatical. The following year was the first year that two sections of U.S. History were opened. These situations underscore two constant considerations in the program. First, trained staff is a critical and continual need and second is the importance of a well-articulated program leading to AP courses. The data on pass rates\textsuperscript{28} must also be seen with the idea that students have been encouraged to attempt the exams even though the exams are of secondary focus in the courses; the primary focus being the acquisition of college level skills in reading, writing and thinking.

The success of the students in AP classes and in the exams must be taken in context of the total program. In reviewing the curriculum required in an AP course, it was obvious that it would take well developed skills in reading, writing and thinking to pass the exam. Students would also need depth of knowledge and a high degree of self-discipline. These prerequisites became the foundation for articulating the rest of the program from the 7th to 10th grades.

Besides the overall pass rates, students like Student B are fairly common; those who come in with average standardized test scores and score 3s and 4s on the AP exams. Student D may be an outstanding example of

---

Calc.: 77%; U.S. Gov.: na%; Chem.: 68% (note: the significantly higher Hawaii rates which remain higher even when counting only public schools).

\textsuperscript{28} Another consideration is that many students without any GT background (the preparation for AP) began choosing to enroll in AP courses. Approximately half the students who receive nonpassing scores in the exams fall into this category although they comprise only about 20% of the classes.
allowing a student's own motivation to override judgments based on standardized test scores. Student D scored at stanine 3 on the OLSAT (an aptitude test) and 5 on the SAT (an achievement test) but was admitted into the AP US History course and earned a 3 (a passing score) on the exam. He went on to take the AP Government exam and again scored a 3, and with these successes in hand, earned scholarships to go on to college.

An addendum to some of the successes in passing the AP exam is that some students who don't pass the exams and many who don't even take the exams (it's optional), still later fare much better than those students who don't attempt the courses. An example would be Student E, a football player of Hawaiian ancestry, who was not enrolled in GT classes and took his only AP course in his senior year. He struggled through the US History class barely getting C's but still opted to take the AP exam and went to all the study sessions. Student E scored a 1 on the exam, the lowest possible score but enrolled the following year at Brigham Young University-Hawaii. During one of his frequent visits back to his high school campus he remarked to his AP teacher that he was taking an American History course in college and regularly scored the highest in the class on exams, a fact that surprised even him. He was especially proud to say that other students were looking to him as the "nerd" of the class.

College Admission

Another indicator of the level of excellence attained by the students in the KHS GT-AP program might be reflected in the number and percentage of students admitted to four year universities upon graduation. This may be a bit premature in that while admission rates are very high, the first class admitted through open enrollment has yet to graduate and will do so in 1997. Also, the first class to require more than one section of a GT class (because of increased
1994 SUMMARY OF KHS SENIOR EXIT PLANS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All Students</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Post High School Plans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-yr. college</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-yr. college</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>trade or bus. school</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>military</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>work</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>marriage</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>travel</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>undecided</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no reply</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GT-AP Students Only</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Post High School Plans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-yr. college</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-yr. college</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>trade or bus. school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>military</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>marriage</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>travel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>undecided</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no reply</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figures for all students taken from Summary of Senior Exit Plans which was documented by James C. Peacock, senior counselor at KHS. Figures for GT-AP students were compiled through interviews with teachers and counselors.

Figure 3-8

enrollment due to the liberalizing of identification procedures) will graduate in 1996. Still, one can conclude that the raised consciousness toward academics which emanates out of the GT-AP program infects the whole campus and as friends, brothers and sisters believe that college entrance is the next logical step, more and more students look toward continuing their education after high school. Figure 3-8 shows what the 1994 graduating seniors had planned to do when surveyed in June, 1994. This is to be compared with Kailua High School which has similar proportions of Polynesian and Caucasian students but a
higher proportion of Asian students (who have high college entrance rates)\textsuperscript{29}. According to a Kailua High counselor, only about 15\% of Kailua High seniors opted for college (2 and 4-year) out of the graduating class of 1994. Thus, compared to Kailua and the statewide total of 17.5\% (Hammond 1992), Kahuku's numbers (58\%) must be seen as phenomenal. Yet, Stanford Achievement Test scores show that Kailua students actually do a little better than students at Kahuku as shown in figure 3-9. There will be no debate about the value of standardized testing here, since the point is Kahuku students, especially those graduating through the GT-AP program, go on to college at rates far exceeding percentages statewide and in comparison to schools of similar socio-economic and ethnic mixtures.

It has been the firm belief of those associated with the KHS GT-AP program that a "rising tide lifts all boats" approach advocated by Gallagher and Gallagher (1994) would work at Kahuku. Some would advocate putting major effort into pushing up from the bottom by giving extra help to those in need through remedial work or alternative programming. Others advocate attending

\textsuperscript{29}Japanese students have a 28.2\% enrollment rate in college compared to 13.0\% for Caucasians and 9.4\% for Hawaiian students with a statewide rate of 17.5\% (Hammond 1992).
to the “forgotten” middle who are often ignored when funding and programming is allocated. The KHS GT-AP thinking has been that it’s possible to pull from the top; that raising the ceiling sets higher standards and promotes the opportunity for the school and all students to rise up to higher levels.

Of course, none of the efforts by those involved in GT-AP are operating in a vacuum. College enrollment is a high priority among the counselling staff, teachers and other support staff who help students with applications, scholarships and College Boards. The fact that many athletes are able to receive scholarship offers further encourages students to think about continuing their education.

Awards, Honors, Scholarships

Another way of trying to determine the level of excellence attained by the students of the KHS GT-AP program might be to look at their achievements in the form of awards, honors and scholarships.

Three years ago, the 10th grade GT English/social studies teacher, Teacher A, decided to enter her class in the inaugural national Bill of Rights competition called We The People. The contest required a whole class to demonstrate their individual and collective knowledge of the Bill of Rights, history, current events and related court cases. Students were graded on a prepared presentation and then on extemporaneous answers to questions posed by the judges. The Kahuku students won the state competition although they were the only tenth graders among the junior and senior competitors. They then went to Washington, D.C. to compete nationally and again were the youngest competitors from the 50 states.

Given that it was the first year of competition, the Kahuku victory was seen by some as a fluke so in the second year of competition, expectations of a
repeat performance were somewhat subdued. Expectations were also tempered in view of the fact that Teacher A had two classes which had to compete against each other and only one could go on to the state competition. A school run-off resulted in one class being chosen over the other and surprisingly again won the state competition and went on to the national competition in D.C. for the second consecutive year. While neither team won the national competition, reports from the DOE chaperones attested to the Kahuku students' impressive showing against teams from the other states.

Why did Teacher A choose to compete against seemingly formidable odds? Well, actually she was following in the tradition of KHS GT-AP teachers and students before her who set precedences of accomplishments that few other schools might be able to match.

The start of the tradition of achievement at KHS might have begun with students in 1987 who found they were as prepared and knowledgeable, if not more so, than other students from Hawaii and around the country attending the CloseUp program in Washington, D.C. CloseUp is a weeklong immersion into government and current issues where students attend workshops, simulations, lectures and seminars with nearly 200 other students from around the country. In every case since 1987, KHS students extensively and intensively prepared for the program and returned impressed with their own abilities and skills. It presented them with the thinking that a small school on the North Shore of Hawaii could produce students who were every bit as good as any other school in the nation. Since 1990, the AP Government class has become the preparation for CloseUp and participation has increased from the two students in 1987 to nearly 20 who recently had to fundraise almost $1600 apiece to cover the costs of the trip.
Over the last few years, KHS students have accumulated increasing honors for the program and school. Among the more prominent or prestigious are the following:

- The first student representative on the Board of Education in 1989-90 and the 1995-96 student representative
- The only public school National Merit Scholar in 1990
- The winner and runner-up in both the district and state Spelling Bee in 1992
- Yearly district winners and runners-up and a state winner and runner-up of the Citizenship Bee who competed in D.C.
- The most total finalists in the Hawaii State Sterling Scholar competition of any public school over the years (seven in one year)
- The state winner of the *We the People* competition for the two years it has been run in Hawaii
- Senate Youth Leadership Award through the U.S. Congress
- Four selections to the Freedom Foundation’s leadership seminars at Valley Forge
- The most participants of any school to the Summer Program for the Enhancement of Basic Education (SPEBE) at the University of Hawaii
- Three selections to the Hugh O’Brien Leadership Conference
- State and national speech contest awards

The following is a list of the 1992-93 academic scholarships and awards won by the 1993 KHS GT-AP graduates:

- UH Regents Scholarship (2)
- State Sterling Scholar Runner-up (2)
- State Sterling Scholar Finalist (3)
- State and District Citizenship Bee Winner
- State and District Citizenship Bee 2nd Place Winner
- District Citizenship Bee 3rd Place Winner
- *Star Bulletin* Scholarship
- Byrd Scholarship
- William Randolph Hearst State Senate Youth Scholarship Winner

The list was compiled by the KHS scholarship committee for announcement at the 1993 graduation ceremonies. Numbers in parentheses indicate multiple recipients.
- Presidential Scholarship to the University of Idaho
- Kamehameha School Bernice Pauahi Bishop Estates Scholarship
- Brigham Young University Provo full tuition
- Cornell University ($16,000 grant)
- Elks Foundations Most Valuable Student Award (2)
- Ellison Onizuka Award
- Ray A. Kroc McDonald's Award
- Tylenol Scholarship
- State Daughters of the American Revolution Good Citizen Award 3rd Place
- Soroptimist Scholarship
- Hawaii Community Scholarship (4)
- Marion Maccarrell Scott Scholarship
- American Saving Scholarship (2)
- Windward District HSTA Scholarship
- Western Undergraduate Exchange Award (2)
- Dr. Hans and Clara Zimmerman Foundation Scholarship (3)
- Hawaii Veterans Memorial Scholarship
- State Samoan Association Scholarship State Finalist (2)
- Hawaii Building and Construction Scholarship
- Tongan Society of America Scholarship (2)
- Longs Drugs Scholarship
- Mamoru and Aiko Takitani Scholarship
- Teaching as a Career Scholarship
- Janice and Ben Gromet Fund for Disadvantaged Children Scholarship
- UH Band Talent Award
- Friends of Kaneohe Library Scholarship (2)
- John A. Burns Scholarship
- Vernon Honda Scholarship
- Rene Mansho’s Michael Stibbard Memorial Scholarship
- Alex Santiago Scholarship Award
- Lion’s Club Scholarship
- Resource Training Incorporated Scholarship
- PTSO Scholarship Award
- National Honor Society Scholarship
- Verdetta Piilani Kekuakalani Scholarship
-(6 of 6) KHS Valedictorian Awards (all earned 4.0 GPAs or above)
• (2 of 2) KHS Leadership Awards
• (2 of 2) KHS Service Awards
• (1 of 2) KHS Activities Award
• (2 of 2) KHS Scholar Athlete Awards
• (1 of 2) KHS I Dare You Award
• (3 of 3) KHS Outstanding Seniors Awards
• $200,000 of Brigham Young University scholarship awards (not necessarily GT-AP students)

The following is a partial list of the competitions won by all KHS GT-AP students during the 1993-94 school year:

Hawaii Education Association Writing Competition open to grades 9-12
  2nd place poetry
  honorable mention poetry
  2nd place short story
  2nd place essay
  honorable mention essay

Hawaii Education Association Writing Competition open to grades 7-8
  2nd place junior poetry
  honorable mention junior short story

Language Arts Showcase
  1st place senior essay
  2nd place junior essay
  1st place poetry
  honorable mention literary criticism
  honorable mention essay
  honorable mention humor

Windward Community Arts Council
  1st place poetry
  1st place music

World War II Essay
  1st place

PRAISE

[31] The list was compiled from recall by the KHS GT-AP coordinator and another teacher and from copies of letters of contest results.
Evaluation—equity

Proving the KHS GT-AP program promotes excellence in the education it provides is the easier part of the evaluation of the program. Proving the KHS

32The 1995 results of this same competition (505 entries in grades 7-12 statewide) are as follows: 8th grade—1st (3rd place in regional), 2nd and 3rd place; 9th grade—1st and 3rd place; 11th grade—2nd place (Fleet Reserve Association 1995).

331995 results of the district competition of History Day showed KHS GT-AP winners in every category entered: 1st place senior research paper; 1st place senior display; 1st place senior performance; 1st place senior media project; 1st place junior research paper; 1st place junior display (Kahuku High School 1995).
GT-AP program also addresses equity comes down to showing that students from a broad spectrum of the general school population are well represented in the program.

ETHNIC DISTRIBUTION
KHS GENERAL STUDENT POPULATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>34.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part Hawaiian</td>
<td>27.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaiian</td>
<td>23.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3-10

As stated previously, KHS has an ethnically diverse population with a large percentage of Polynesian students made up of Hawaiian, Samoan, Tongan and other Pacific Island groups. While percentages can be neatly shown, ethnic counts in Hawaii are difficult to pin down since so many of the youngsters are of mixed ethnic backgrounds. At Kahuku the percentage of mixed race students might be as high as 50 percent. Figure 3-10 shows the percentage breakdown of the general student population at KHS.

34The percentages were drawn from data collected by KHS in September, 1994 for a district report. Information was collected via a survey given to the students who checked off their own ethnic identity. Other than Part-Hawaiian, other racial mixtures could not be gleaned from the raw data and the original data designated Samoan as a separate category and all other Polynesian students were put into an Other category. For figure 3-10 Samoans and other
These numbers must then be compared to the ethnic breakdown within the KHS GT-AP program as shown by figure 3-11\textsuperscript{35}. There obviously is some disparity as shown in figure 3-12. The questions are whether the disparities can be logically explained, how much disparity is tolerable and how much improvement in representation has occurred over the years.

The first question might be addressed with a reference to socio-economics. Many of the Asian and Caucasian students are children of middle class parents who work at the Brigham Young University-Hawaii campus. It probably goes without saying that children brought up in middle class settings have educational advantages over those raised in homes with less material comforts. That many Asian and Caucasian students have parents connected

Polynesians are included as one category and Other includes African-American, Native American, Hispanic and Portuguese.

\textsuperscript{35}This information was compiled through a questionnaire completed by 287 GT-AP students in May of 1994. (see Appendix A for questionnaire and results)
with an educational institution also adds to the likelihood that their numbers in KHS GT-AP might be inflated beyond their representation in the general student population.

**ETHNIC DISTRIBUTION DIFFERENTIAL BETWEEN KHS GENERAL POPULATION AND KHS GT-AP STUDENT POPULATION**

![Figure 3-12](image)

Furthermore, as stated earlier, KHS has a high percentage of students receiving subsidies for lunch and bus transportation. The 1980 Census classified the KHS feeder communities as economically depressed areas. This is reflected in the 65 percent of adults in the communities who have not completed high school (Kahuku High School 1992). A high percentage of the parents described above are Hawaiians, Part-Hawaiians and other Polynesians. Thus, it is unrealistic to expect a high academic program to have a one-for-one relationship with the general student population. The school alone simply cannot bear the burden of proportional representation unless the social and economic situations of the constituents are first addressed (Fetterman 1988).
The answer to the question on toleration is probably quite subjective. Still, this can be looked at several ways that may lend credence to the impression that the KHS numbers fall within quite acceptable bounds. For one, no ethnic group forms a percentage majority of the general population or the GT-AP population. While Caucasians are the largest single group in the GT-AP program, they still comprise less than one third of the total. Thus, nearly every classroom will be attended by a well-mixed complexion of students.

On the other hand, when all the Polynesian groups (Hawaiian, Samoan, Tongan, etc.) are collectively counted this group would then account for 62.2 percent of the general student population. Though 43.9 percent of the GT-AP population is nearly 19 percent lower, the Polynesian students still form a substantial proportion of the GT-AP program and outnumber Caucasian students 126 to 90.

Also, if the numbers are taken in isolation, 126 students of Polynesian background is a substantial number in any GT-AP program in Hawaii. There is probably no other public school that can match that number and no private schools, except for the Kamehameha Schools, have admitted Polynesian students to become over 40% of the enrollment in a high academic program; not lolani; not Punahou.

Finally, if the numbers are viewed over the years, a trend of increased enrollment of underrepresented minorities in KHS GT-AP emerges. While at times the percentage representation fluctuates, the selected totals show (in figure 3-13) a steady if not dramatic increase in the numbers of Hawaiian and other Polynesian students.36 The years were selected for significant junctures

---

36The numbers were extracted from best guess information on ethnicity from the data base by teachers who have had the students.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>H-PH</th>
<th>OP</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>O</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* These students were never enrolled in a GT course, but did enroll in an AP course since the AP part of the program went to open enrollment before the GT 7th grade did.

H-PH = Hawaiian-Part Hawaiian, OP = Other Polynesian, A = Asian, F = Filipino, C = Caucasian, O = Other

Figure 3-13

in the program. The first two years reflect information on graduates who enrolled in the KHS GT-AP program while conventional screening methods were in practice. But a significant insight can be made with the data on the students who came in through the open enrollment policy of AP. Nearly half the Polynesian students graduating through the program in 1991 and 1992 had taken advantage of open AP enrollment though they may previously not have been admitted to the GT program based on their matrix scores.

The other two years were selected to reflect the impact of open 7th grade enrollment. The graduates of 1995 were selected because they were the last class to be enrolled without full open enrollment, although an additional 7th grade section was opened up for them to accommodate more students because
of more liberal screening criteria. The class of 1996 then will become the first to
go fully through the program after being admitted through open enrollment.

In comparison, the numbers between the first two years and the last two
are obviously significant. Many more students of Polynesian ancestry are being
enrolled. A comparison between the two last years also shows the impact of
open enrollment as 1996 Hawaiian and Part-Hawaiian students actually equal
Caucasian students in number and percentage. With the other Polynesian
students added, Polynesian students comprise nearly one-half of the program
for the class of 1996. For the class of 1995, their combined total was still fewer
than that of Caucasian students.

Part of what makes the figures significant is that there seems to be a
correlation between students who take at least one GT or AP course and
students going on to college. Counselor A who has been instrumental in
couraging and helping students to apply for college claims that over the past
three years, up to 50 percent of KHS graduates intend to go to four-year
colleges and 35 percent to two-year colleges. She also says that many of the
other 15 percent also express intent to pursue college once they have fulfilled
family obligations. If true, the 85 percent total is astounding in comparison to
the 45% national figure (Ravitch 1985), even if some of the KHS students
change their minds after June (when the survey is taken) and don't attend
college. Half of the 50 percent who intend to enroll in a four-year college would
still be an impressive figure.

Some might question whether a large portion of the 15 percent might be
those of Polynesian ancestry. In response it is probably reasonable to assume
that even if all 15 percent were Polynesian (which Counselor A recalls is fairly
distributed among ethnic groups), it would still put quite a large number of
Polynesian students in college. Some believe that college entrance is neither a
culturally sensitive or appropriate measurement of success for a high school and those who might question this may have other measures. But when a college education is widely accepted to provide greater chances of socio-economic improvement, it would be hard to deny the students of Kahuku.

Conclusion

In conclusion to this section on excellence and equity a few anecdotal comments might strengthen some of the ideas presented.

Student F

Student F, a Tongan student, was enrolled at KHS until her 8th grade year. She had been admitted to the KHS GT-AP program through the 7th grade open enrollment. Before her 9th grade year, Student F’s family moved to the Kailua High School district. She took with her letters of recommendation to the GT coordinator at Kailua and was accepted into the program there. Student F has since had no problems with the academics and in her 10th grade year has become a leader in her class, taking leadership roles and even trying to teach her whole grade level the alma mater. As a matter of fact, student F tested at stanine 5 in the OLSAT and SAT which would likely never have been adequate to get her into the GT program at Kailua or any other school.

Student G

Student G, a student of mixed-Hawaiian ancestry, was not in a GT class for her 7th and 8th grade years. In 8th grade, she was enrolled in a regular English class taught by one of the GT teachers, who emphasized GT work in all his classes. After receiving A’s through the year and producing some outstanding work, she was encouraged by her teacher to apply to the GT
program for 9th grade. Though her test score was low (stanine 4) and her overall GPA in core classes was not very high, her recommendations helped get her on the waiting list to be enrolled in September should space be available. The 9th grade at KHS is especially tough since students are required to begin preparing for the class during the summer by compiling a global current events folder of 100 items. When Student G finally received word during the first week of school that she would be placed in the 9th grade GT class, she already had her folder done! Had she not been placed, her work would have counted for naught. She later became a Nerd News editor and had her work featured two years in a row in a Honolulu Star-Bulletin special student section.

Student H

Student H, a present 11th grader, is of Chinese-Hawaiian ancestry. In the 8th grade, he had the same teacher Student G would later have. But Student H was a very different case. In fact, he was eligible for Chapter 1 coursework (in which he was enrolled as a 7th grader) since his test scores (stanine 3) fell within the remedial range. Still, in consultation with his mother (who wanted him challenged more), the teacher convinced them that if Student H worked hard, he could get through this "GT" like course. Unlike Student G, Student H struggled and did not perform at the top of the class, though when it came to registration time, he checked off the 9th grade GT class! He did not get in to either 9th or 10th grade GT but he is presently in the 11th grade GT English class and the AP US History class! That Student H will standout in

37It’s not clear whether Student H actually followed through on his initial application to 9th grade GT or whether he applied for 10th grade GT at all.
either class is doubtful but the fact that he has persevered after a lofty goal he seemed to have set for himself is amazing.

Student I

Student I was a GT student from the 7th to 9th grade when she asked to switch to regular classes at midyear, citing the work being too much and too hard. In both her 8th and 9th grade year, she performed just well enough to continue in the program but was constantly on probation for grades lower than a B. In counselling sessions, she constantly complained about not liking the classes and not feeling that she belonged in them. Finally, halfway through 9th grade, she and a friend secured the consent of their parents (which is a requisite for both admission to and dropping from the program) and their schedules were changed. So Student I and her friend became two more Part-Hawaiian students that could not be retained past two and a half years. This year, her 11th grade, finds Student I enrolled in the 11th grade GT English class along with the same friend. Actually, this is a fairly common occurrence for Hawaiian-Part Hawaiian students; being admitted, struggling, dropping out and then applying for readmission. It is one reason that the number of Polynesian students in the program at any one time might not reflect a true picture of how the program reaches underrepresented minorities; that the number derived by counting students who have taken at least one GT-AP course over time may be more accurate.

Student J

Student J entered the 7th grade at KHS as a fairly recent Southeast Asian immigrant. She was not enrolled in the GT program but was recommended for it after two weeks of school by her 7th grade teacher. After
switching her into the GT class, the SLEP (Students of Limited English Proficiency) teacher questioned the change since she felt Student J was still very much in need of the special language class. At a subsequent meeting between the SLEP teacher and the GT-AP coordinator, it was decided that Student J would remain in the GT class on a trial basis. She never got very comfortable in the class, but stuck it out with the GT counselor's encouragement. She was glad when the year ended and chose to register for a general English class for 8th grade. Student J is presently in the 10th grade GT English/social studies class which participates in the Bill of Rights competition. When asked why she didn't apply to get back in after her 8th grade year (she was in the same class as Student G and did as well), she replied that she felt she needed another year "to get herself ready".

Different conclusions may be reached after reading the above anecdotes. One point of agreement might be made; the KHS GT-AP program seems to have appeal to students with varied backgrounds, motivations, and skills, who find their own way to adapt to the program's rigorous demands.

Survey

In May of 1994, a survey of over 600 KHS students was taken to collect data about students' attitudes about school and the KHS GT-AP program. The surveys were given to nearly 300 GT-AP students, about 120 advanced students, and 160 general students\textsuperscript{38}. The purpose was to get a general

\textsuperscript{38} Students in 8th, 9th and 10th grade English and social studies are placed according to teacher recommendations into general (Y level) and advanced (X level) classes besides those in special education and GT-AP. The general/Y
impression about how students felt about some of the critical issues involved in the program.

It might be important to note that the survey was never construed to be a definitive evaluation of the program. The following coverage of the results is presented to add the student voice to the evaluation of the program outlined up to this point. While a copy of the actual survey and all the results can be found in the appendix, the following are a few selected issues that might provide a view of student appraisal of the KHS GT-AP program.

1) Do students feel the classes are challenging?
2) Do students feel they are learning?
3) Do students feel classes are providing for basic skills?
4) Do students feel classes are providing for thinking skills?
5) Is it okay to be called a nerd?/get good grades?
6) How do students feel about being in the GT-AP program?
7) Were present GT students in GT programs in elementary school?

Most of the questions get to students' perceptions about what they are doing in classes and their attitudes toward academics and the GT-AP program. The accompanying charts provide information about those students' perceptions of the curricula at Kahuku.

level designation roughly corresponds to students with stanines 3, 4, and 5 with advanced/X level stanines 5, 6, and 7. Grades 11 and 12 students are all placed in heterogeneous classes unless they are enrolled in AP courses or 11th grade GT English. Students in 7th grade are either in GT or heterogeneous classes. For tabulation of the survey results, students in heterogeneous classes were counted in the general category.
On the whole, how do you find your classes at Kahuku?
(challenging; somewhat challenging; not challenging)

The survey asked students whether they found classes on the whole challenging, somewhat challenging or not challenging. This question was not specific to the GT-AP program. What is most significant about the charts is not the conclusion that GT-AP students (part A) seem to have more challenging work than students in the general curriculum classes (part B and C). What might be more important is that former GT students found the curriculum the least challenging (part D). This suggests that students who have been exposed to GT classes find the general curriculum less challenging than those who had never been in a GT class.

The charts in figure 3-14 can also be contrasted with figure 3-15 which clearly illustrates how GT-AP students feel about their GT-AP classes. It is understood that GT-AP students often take most of their core classes within the GT-AP program and that core classes tend to be the most demanding classes. This fact skews the data but what should be apparent is that the curriculum clearly provides students with work that they feel at least meets their capacities and capabilities.

Some of the most damaging criticisms of public schools concern the lack of challenging work, especially for the more capable students. This forces parents to choose between continuing in the public school or paying for private school which they feel will provide their children with a “better” education. Parents’ perceptions are nearly totally developed through what their children come home from school with. If students feel challenged, then parents will likely feel more confident that the school is meeting the educational needs of their

---

39The survey was filled out by 41 former GT students.
KHS STUDENT PERCEPTIONS OF CURRICULA

GT-AP STUDENTS A

- Challenging: 2%
- Somewhat Challenging: 47%
- Not Challenging: 51%

X LEVEL STUDENTS B

- Challenging: 9%
- Somewhat Challenging: 30%
- Not Challenging: 61%

Y-LEVEL STUDENTS C

- Challenging: 15%
- Somewhat Challenging: 27%
- Not Challenging: 58%

FORMER GT STUDENTS D

- Challenging: 13%
- Somewhat Challenging: 10%
- Not Challenging: 77%

Figure 3-14

KHS STUDENT PERCEPTIONS OF CURRICULA:
GT-AP STUDENTS ON GT-AP CURRICULA

- Challenging: 20%
- Somewhat Challenging: 4%
- Not Challenging: 78%

Figure 3-15
children. At KHS students on the whole seem fairly satisfied with the level of work they are presented with but GT-AP students overwhelmingly find the work in the GT-AP program challenging.

**KHS STUDENT PERCEPTIONS OF CURRICULA:
HOW MUCH THEY FEEL THEY ARE LEARNING**

![Figure 3-16](image)

**On the whole, how do you feel you are learning at Kahuku?**

(a lot; some; not much)

Data collected concerning how much students feel they are learning at Kahuku yielded very similar results (see appendix for full survey data) to the above data concerning how challenging the curriculum was. Approximately two thirds of GT-AP students felt they were learning a lot (through their full schedules as well as through their GT-AP classes only)\(^{40}\) compared to about

---

\(^{40}\)The data shows little difference between asking GT-AP students to rate their learning in general and to rate their learning in GT-AP classes solely. This lack of difference was probably due to the fact that when students rated their
half for students in the X and Y level classes. Former GT students again expressed what could be seen as the most dissatisfaction with how much they were learning. An implication could be made that students exposed to the GT-AP program had higher expectations of the curricula and of themselves and found that the general education classes did not provide enough.

**On the whole, do you think you are being pushed to improve in the basic skills of reading and writing?**

(Yes, definitely; somewhat; no, not much)

It is important that students in all programs obtain a firm foundation in basic skills. Whether the general program or vocational program or gifted program, a basic goal of education is student achievement in basic skills. In gifted programs, emphasis is often placed on the enrichment activities with the assumption that bright students don't need instruction in reading and writing.

This is a situation that is explicitly avoided in the KHS GT-AP program for three reasons: 1) the program doesn't admit only "bright" students; 2) many "bright" students have been in programs where basic skills were not emphasized and come to the program lacking in that area; and 3) the guarantee of college preparation means having basic reading and writing (and thinking) skills.

The survey results shown in figure 3-17 suggest GT-AP students perceive that they are receiving a fair amount of instruction in basic skills; that learning in general (this question came before the other), it necessarily included considering their GT-AP classes as well as all their other classes. They were not rating their learning in general classes separately from GT-AP classes but did rate GT-AP classes separately in the later question.
these skills are not being ignored in favor of enrichment type activities. The results further show that former GT-AP students are the most likely to feel basic skills are not adequately attended to in the curriculum.

On the whole, do you think you are being pushed to improve your thinking skills?

(Yes, definitely; somewhat; no, not much)

Until recently, thinking skills development had been the bedrock of gifted education and given only token attention in the general curriculum. In practice, gifted programs have traditionally been charged with thinking skills development often to the absence of basic skills development. Still, without direct attention to critical thinking, problem solving, creative thinking, etc. a program cannot justifiably be called a gifted program.
Figure 3-18 shows that all KHS students feel there is substantial instruction in thinking skills throughout the general curriculum. But, the skewed response from students in the GT-AP program obviously reflects the conscious attention to thinking skills in the curricula.

On the whole, if a person at Kahuku was called a "nerd", that person should feel

(Insulted; not insulted)

As stated earlier, a major hurdle in the development of the KHS GT-AP program was the resistance of students to be seen as "brainy" by others in the school. "Nerd" and "geek" were pejorative names which were used to shame students into hiding or avoiding academic achievement. It has taken a conscious effort by the program and school staff to minimize the teasing and booster the general attitude that academic achievement is valued. "Nerd" and
"geek" have been specific targets because of their widespread usage on the campus and the common understanding of the students of their connotative nature. Thus, Geek Week and Nerd News were instituted.

Evidence of the nature of the original problem surfaced three years ago when several parents of new GT students voiced concern about the name of the newsletter at a parent meeting. They could not understand how a program could allow such a name to be used since some of these new students had come from the mainland or other schools where the term "nerd" was used in a demeaning manner. Explanation of the history of Nerd News and Geek Week was needed to allay these parents' uneasiness though the issue has continued to resurface as each new group of students enters the program41.

41See the appendix for reprints of recent articles in Nerd News which debated the issue of the name of the newsletter. Many of the younger students (7th
Figure 3-19 suggests that the campaign to diminish the impact of name calling (nerd and geek) on campus has had widespread success since less than a fourth of students feel "nerd" is an insulting name. Moreover, there is no difference between GT and nonGT students and former GT students who might be thought to be the most sensitive, seem to be the least sensitive.

On the whole, how do you feel about the GT program at Kahuku? (check all that apply)

a. I'm happy I'm in GT or I regret being in GT now
b. It's hard, but I can handle it or It's too hard
c. I'm doing well or I'm doing poorly
d. I hope to continue in GT or I'd like to quit being in GT

e. none of the above applies to me

It's important to determine how GT-AP students in general feel about their own attitudes in regard to the program. Their responses can be a window into their self-esteem and can indicate whether the program has a positive or negative effect on the students' perceptions of their abilities and accomplishments. At the minimum this information can suggest students' general feelings about their participation in the GT-AP program.

The responses to the question shown in figure 3-20 suggest that the students are quite happy with the program, find they can handle hard work, are doing fairly well and want to continue in the program. The two sections which show the most negative response, it's too hard (12%) and I'm doing poorly (13%) are counterbalanced by the responses I regret being in GT (8%) and I'd grades especially) wanted the name changed. The older students (juniors and seniors) defended the name.
KHS STUDENT PERCEPTIONS OF GT-AP: PERSONAL ATTITUDES

Figure 3-20

Like to quit (7%) being significantly lower. It shows that though students find the program difficult and some struggle to keep up, few regret their participation or would prefer to enroll in the general program.

Were you in a GT program in elementary school?
(yes; no)

This final question culled from the survey is not one that measured student attitudes but provides further information on the type of student enrolled in the program. In most school complexes, the GT students in the elementary schools (and only the GT students) are screened for GT in the intermediate schools. Often fewer than half those students are admitted and sometimes, fewer still are admitted into the high school program. The practice has been followed to screen the students at each level so that only "the best" and most "deserving" students come out the funnel at the far end. In many programs,
KHS GT-AP STUDENT BACKGROUND: PARTICIPATION IN ELEMENTARY GT

Figure 3-21

being skipped over for GT at the elementary level closes the opportunity to enter the program at any point later.

The Kahuku program has allowed access to students who had never been thought of by the elementary school staff as "GT material". If, as the KHS program seems to suggest, many more students are capable of performing adequately in GT programs than are being identified and accommodated, many students are being inadequately challenged and developed.

Figure 3-21 shows that nearly forty percent of the students in the KHS GT-AP program had never been in an elementary GT program. What is also evident and maybe somewhat surprising is that the breakdown among GT-AP students and former GT students is nearly identical. Students with no elementary GT backgrounds do not leave the program in disproportionate numbers. Thus, it seems that whether a student has been in a GT program in elementary school or not, bears little, if any, influence on the probability of success or continued enrollment in the KHS GT-AP program.
Uniqueness

Behind the achievements and success of every school lies a unique combination of circumstances and people. The KHS GT-AP program is no exception. Critical factors and players made vital contributions to the success of the program: the principal, the school structure, the schedule, the parents and community. While it is possible the program may have been successful without some small part, the level of success in this school could not have been achieved without every part coming together to create an entity much greater than the sum of the individual parts.

The Principal

School success can rarely occur without the principal being a vital factor. Kahuku has been blessed with two principals who were so in synch that it has seemed that the school has been guided by one person for the last 15 years. Many schools go through regular changes in leadership with each change bringing in different directions and philosophies. Principal A was principal during the inception of the GT-AP program and Principal B has been principal for the last ten years. Both have been curriculum oriented and both demanded high standards of teaching and learning, and worked tirelessly to create a total school environment dedicated to the academic and social development of the students.

Principal B continued much of what was begun with Principal A. Under Principal B's guidance the school was one of the first Hawaii schools to be recognized a National School of Excellence. She herself has won several awards including the Milken that gave her $25,000, much of which she spent on the school and teachers. The quality that may make her somewhat the exception in principals is that she (and Principal A) allows teachers great
latitude in putting innovative ideas into practice. One such idea has been her support of the GT-AP program. While they have not always been in total agreement, she has worked well with the GT-AP coordinators and parent advisory board. The program staff has always been confident that when presented with ideas that promise benefits to the students, Principal B would do whatever in her power and budget to support the endeavor.

A couple of recent examples concerned Model United Nations and Constitutional Convention, two major activities sponsored by the GT-AP program. When KHS students attempted to participate in the State Model United Nations, they were met with resistance by the University of Hawaii Peace Center director of the event. Principal B personally pledged to the students that they would be allowed to participate and took it upon herself to see to it, making personal calls to all the necessary powers-that-be. As a result, the KHS students were allowed to participate and eventually shepherded two of the three resolutions\(^42\) that were approved by the General Assembly which was made up of delegations from about 15 other schools, both public and private. The Constitutional Convention situation also called for Principal B's intervention when management of Turtle Bay Hilton Hotel\(^43\) denied gratis use of its facilities after having provided the meeting rooms for the previous three years. Principal

\(^{42}\)As a humorous sidelight, the Kahuku students also claim that they "allowed" the other resolution to pass only because the sponsor of the resolution was a former KHS GT student who now attends St. Louis High School, a private school in Honolulu.

\(^{43}\)Many schools in Hawaii have been "adopted" by Hawaii corporations or individual hotels. Kahuku's benefactor has been Turtle Bay Hilton which is located about three miles from the school.
B could not get the facilities free but did get it at nominal cost and helped to find the funds to cover those rental fees.

In examining successful schools, Lightfoot (1993) states:

... principals were very politically astute. ... a 'buffer' between the larger system and his teachers. In some sense, he saw himself as protecting the autonomy of the school, and managing it so that the teachers would not feel the bureaucratic intrusions. He wanted to give the teachers the space and freedom to focus on teaching and learning.

The School Structure

Very few secondary schools in Hawaii presently include both intermediate and high school levels on the same campus. The 7 to 12 grade level structure of Kahuku affords some programmatic advantages that are difficult to realize when dealing with separate intermediate and high school campuses.

The most important advantage that a consolidated campus creates for the KHS GT-AP program is the opportunities to develop a more complete program. There are three obvious benefits: meeting opportunities, a continuum for students, and one administration.

The inability to provide time and opportunities for articulation has always been a barrier to coordinated efforts between intermediate and high schools. Meeting and exchanging information and ideas between the faculty of two schools (any two schools) rarely occurs. In fact, attempts were made in the past to provide opportunities for the GT teachers of each of the five elementary feeder schools to meet with the KHS GT-AP coordinator and teachers. After four or five meetings, it simply became too difficult to coordinate and the meetings ceased to continue. With a single intermediate and high school campus, weekly or meetings-as-necessary are easily facilitated. With meeting
time comes articulation, program development and coordination. The KHS program is much more successful because the program effectively encompasses grades 7 to 12 rather than trying to coordinate two separate programs in a complementary manner.

The second benefit is providing students with program continuum. Students often have to make difficult adjustments when going from intermediate to high school. Eighth graders have no clue about what they will have in the following year except for registering for their ninth grade classes and maybe visiting the high school campus for a day. The transition between eighth and ninth grade seems to be more difficult than going from sixth to seventh grade.

This problem is less pronounced, if it exists at all, at Kahuku. Eighth graders in the KHS GT-AP program participate in Model United Nations as pages, recorders and secretaries. They participate in Geek Week. They receive Nerd News which is written and published by ninth graders. They see the ninth graders' biosphere models. In many ways, KHS' GT eighth graders look forward to ninth grade rather than fear an unknown and "threatening" experience. It is possible for KHS GT students to not notice any difficulties making the transition from intermediate to high school.

Moreover, the staff of the GT-AP program is familiar with the students as they move from one level to the next. In fact, for a time when the program was smaller, it was possible for some students to have had the same teacher in eighth, tenth and twelfth grades. The coordinator and program counselor also track students from 7th grade to graduation. Intermediate students with difficulties do not have to be "rediscovered" when they move to high school.

The final major advantage of having the intermediate and high school on one campus is that the staff of the GT-AP program deals with one administration. Different administrators have different philosophies, goals and
ways of doing things. This can create insurmountable difficulties when trying to coordinate efforts in one program that spans two schools.

As previously mentioned, the KHS GT-AP program has been fortunate to have one administrator overseeing both the intermediate and high school levels who has also been very supportive of the program. This has been critical in policy making, in budgetary concerns, and in dealing with students, parents and the community. Consistency is a vital factor in the smooth development of a program and this is possible and probable at Kahuku.

An additional administrative advantage is the fact that the GT program itself is administered by one body. The intermediate and high school levels have one coordinator and one executive board. One set of policies and procedures covers all students. This has undercut many difficulties faced by other schools. Teachers, students and parents have a clear understanding of the program that spans 7th to 12th grade.

Another structural consideration at Kahuku is the seven period schedule. Instituted five years ago over heated debate among the faculty and continued after its trial period with overwhelming support from students and parents, the seven period schedule has greatly enhanced the GT-AP program by providing flexibility in the students' programs toward two ends.

The first benefit of seven periods to students in GT-AP is the ability to work around scheduling conflicts. GT-AP students are encouraged as program policy to enroll in a broad range of coursework. Fine arts and voc-tech courses are especially promoted. In the usual six period schedule, GT-AP students normally take English, social studies, math, science and foreign language for their college prep courses. Normally, they are also required to take physical education, health, and guidance courses. This leaves very little opportunity to squeeze in a ceramics, chorus, keyboarding, or auto mechanics classes. With
the seven period schedule, students have at least one period to schedule a class that they are not pressured to take because of DOE requirements or college entrance requirements. At KHS many GT-AP students opt for band which gives them opportunity to travel and engage in the many band competitions for which the KHS band is well known for winning.

The second benefit is that it allows the program to make some demands on the students that would not be possible in a six period schedule. One requirement of the program is that students who take two or more AP courses are required to also enroll in a study hall scheduled specifically for them. Visitors to the two study halls would be surprised to see the intense studying which goes on in these classes with very little teacher supervision at all. Juniors and seniors enrolled in demanding schedules with AP courses find this study time during school when they can work with other students immensely valuable. Another usage of the seventh period has been to provide study time or “slack” time for GT students who are struggling with their studies. In conference with parents, those students are encouraged to drop a course to open up a slot where they would have their personal study hall with one of the GT-AP teachers. Teachers then enroll the student as a “teacher’s aide” though the student’s first priority is to use the time to study. Nearly every GT-AP teacher will enroll from one to five students in this manner through the year.

44Like the football team, the KHS marching band is widely known both in Hawaii and on the mainland, having been invited to march in the Rose Bowl and Holiday Bowl and having won nearly every competition it enters. It was even invited to Japan and only travels every other year because every year would be too much of a financial burden on the school, parents and community.
The People

Although the unique combination of people which contribute to a successful program is rather a given factor, it is worth mentioning that KHS seems to have more outstanding individuals than its share. The contributions of visionary individuals, hardworking implementers and a supportive community are the essentials to making change and achievement possible.

As previously stated, Principal B has won numerous awards, both locally and nationally. The GT-AP staff at one time or other has had one Teacher-of-the Year district finalist and two state finalists, a Milken winner, a Sallie Mae45 winner and an Oceanic and a BYU Excellence in Teaching Award winners.

Some innovations began with one person. The coordinator from 1984 to 1993 began teaching the combined English/social studies classes, pushed for the 7th grade open enrollment, and became the spokesperson in the community and state for the philosophical basis of the program. Entering local and national competitions began with teachers and eventually became a natural part of the program. Teacher B was instrumental in setting aside study hall time for students, especially seniors, to apply for scholarships and to put together portfolios.

Additionally, a multitude of hardworkers staff the program every year. Teachers must be of higher dedication than most other teachers to attend additional meetings and workshops. They are also required to write district reports and keep up with grade checks and screening sheets. Moreover, teachers are expected to create interdisciplinary units, help with Con Con, Model UN, and Geek Week and help their students compete in the numerous competitions that students enter yearly. All this comes over and above the

45The Sallie Mae is a national award given to outstanding first year teachers.
usual demanding work a teacher normally does. In a way, the demands of
teaching in KHS GT-AP insures that only the better teachers continue to staff the
program.

Finally, the program has been fortunate to attract the efforts of a
supportive community. Parents have for ten years, played a key role in the
development of policy and facilitation of activities. Some parents have been
direct contributors for nearly all those ten years. The program has also reaped
the benefits of a close relationship with Brigham Young University-Hawaii.
Expertise and facilities have been made available to the program and individual
students. BYUH faculty members have spoken in classes and served as
facilitators and judges in program activities and have hosted Model United
Nations for six years and Geek Week's off-campus day for three years. The
Mormon Church has also made some of its facilities available for various
activities.

While the philosophy, policies and procedures of the KHS GT-AP
program can be duplicated, the actual implementation of such a program
becomes vitally dependent on unique factors that allow it to happen and other
factors that make it happen. These factors cannot be the same everywhere and
it is certainly recognized that they have been significant in the success of the
program at Kahuku.

Difficulties

While the KHS GT-AP program has attained a considerable degree of
success, this is not to say that the achievement has been attained without
overcoming some difficulty. In the course of development the program has had
to address past and ongoing concerns from the faculty, community and
administration. Additionally, there are serious problems looming on the horizon
as the program continues growth; growth which creates even more complex situations and issues.

The original difficulty was convincing students at KHS that it was all right to be "smart", that academic achievement would not be denigrated as the realm of social outcasts called nerds and geeks. As previously described, certain aspects of the program were created to specifically develop an attitudinal change in the students. The students in the program needed to be able to feel better about their own efforts and accomplishments. The students not in the program needed to be able to feel that getting into the program would not mean the end to their social standing in the school. Once these efforts became successful through Nerd News, Geek Week, Nerd Night, Model UN and other activities, enrollment increases generated its own momentum whereupon the program now finds itself with growth as its major problem.

The most consistent problem which has and will continue to plague the program has involved finding and keeping faculty which have the disposition and aptitude consistent with the intent and purpose of the program. The most recurring problem has been replacing GT-AP teachers who leave the school. One year, four out of 10 GT-AP teachers transferred to other schools. This took expertise and training out of the program and created difficulties with the smooth continual development of the program. It is no surprise that the GT science program has had difficulty developing a well-articulated curriculum that engenders student interest and achievement. Only one teacher in the department has been with KHS GT-AP for more than three years and no one is presently teaching a GT or AP course he or she has been teaching for more than two years. In the three years of its offering, the AP chemistry course has yet to have a student pass the exam and only eight have even attempted it. It takes at least two years to develop an AP curriculum. The AP Chemistry class
has had three teachers in three years, thereby making it nearly impossible for the teacher to fully comprehend what teaching an AP course entails.

Besides the basic problem of staff turnover, teachers don’t always understand or buy into the philosophy of the program. When asked for a course syllabus of the GT course instead of the general course, teacher C replied, “I do the same thing, but I give more work.” The exam for teacher C consisted of writing out the definitions of 100 terms given during the semester. Students of teacher D lodged complaints about grading inconsistencies, unreasonable amounts of work, and favoritism nearly every year the AP course was taught by this teacher. Teacher E thought that GT students were stereotypically arrogant brats. Teacher F taught the GT in much the same way as the general class; with lots of worksheets and seat work.

At times the performance of certain teachers so seriously affected the students and the program that the coordinator (who had very little power in the assignment of teachers) on two occasions approached the principal with the drastic step of requesting that teachers be denied assignment of GT or AP courses. In one case, the teacher continued teaching the course and in the other case, another teacher in the department chose to teach the course.

With continual growth as the prediction for the program, recruiting more teachers and replacing those that leave will remain a constant concern. While the requirements that teachers teach both English and social studies and attend

---

46 Staff assignments were ultimately controlled by the principal but most assignments were decided within the content area departments. Since the KHS GT-AP program was not a department and did not have its own staff (except for the coordinator), staff assignments were beyond the control of program.
workshops and inservicing have somewhat controlled who teaches in the program, nearly every year desperate situations have necessitated recruiting a willing teacher who may have only marginal qualifications to teach a GT or AP course. On the whole though, the program has been fairly fortunate to attract and keep very able teachers who have perpetuated the high standards and philosophical base of the program.

Besides the problems stemming from teachers within the program, many teachers on the KHS staff do not understand or do not approve of the concept of the program. Some teachers have openly criticized the inclusive philosophy, declaring that students who aren't "gifted" shouldn't be in the program. Others criticize the whole idea of gifted education, citing the movement to heterogeneity and accusations of elitism. Others simply don't like students in their own classes who have been encouraged to challenge the thinking and practice of others, even teachers. Though very few teachers have directly challenged the right of the program to exist, some teachers in the program have been often confronted by negative remarks directed at the program, teachers and students. A particular example was the criticism directed at the coordinators of the program because of the coordinating periods during which they did not teach but administered to the total program. One coordinator of the KHS GT-AP program was even told he should not be able to vote on a new schedule for the school since he did not teach a full schedule of classes. Another coordinator was constantly questioned about what she did and how she was "rewarded" with the "period off".

Another situation creating difficulties has been related to the very nature of large comprehensive high schools and the role of the principal. To exist as a definable entity within the myriad of departments, programs and offices at Kahuku High and Intermediate, clear and reliable information and commitments
must be forthcoming. This has always been difficult to achieve when initial commitments and agreements are confronted with later competing demands on the principal. One such recurring problem has been with staffing and teaching lines which are impacted by budgetary and departmental concerns. Additionally, the principal cannot always be fully apprised of the policies regarding the program and at times can make decisions contrary to program policy. Parents especially have used the tactic of going to the principal after getting unsatisfactory response from the program coordinator. In one such case the principal approved a schedule change for a student (whose parent was an employee of the DOE) that enabled that student to take GT English without concurrently enrolling in GT social studies. This transpired during the summer when communication between the program coordinator and principal could not be easily facilitated. While several other previous requests\(^{47}\) for the same exemption had been turned down, the parent chose to appeal it to the principal who made the decision with neither the knowledge of the parent’s initial conversation with the coordinator nor the understanding of the ramifications of the exemption. Situations like these are understandable in such a large enterprise. Still, they create difficulties beyond the already demanding

\(^{47}\)Normally, the requests for exemption have come about due to scheduling conflicts with an elective course that the students would like to take. The usual response has been that the program does not make exceptions because the English/social studies curriculum is considered a single entity and cannot be divided. This problem has diminished as more sections of each GT class have been added with the increase in enrollment.
responsibilities of administering such a large program and can only be diminished with constant communication, the time for which is often a luxury.

The fact that the KHS GT-AP program does not exist as a department also creates some problem. Decisions, especially concerning staffing, are made at the department level and then approved by the principal. Besides staffing though, decisions in departments have had serious impact on the program. One such decision came about when the math department decided to discontinue GT math classes. This has had serious repercussions since many students who were in GT math were in no other GT class. This diminished the opportunity for the program to reach larger numbers of students on the campus. Another decision concerned the move to middle school teams for 7th grade. A committee of teachers with administration approval decided to create teams of four teachers (in English, social studies, math and science) who would teach 100 students in common. The original intention was to integrate all students into completely heterogeneous groups of 100. Much of the planning and discussion went on within the small group of planners. Communication with the rest of the school, especially with those in the GT-AP program, was at times not totally forthcoming. While the implementation of the teams seems to have occurred fairly smoothly on the whole, the GT 7th grade English and social

48 The program is administered by teachers who also have teaching responsibilities (by choice since no teacher has been willing to totally and solely commit to the administrative tasks of the program--they'd all rather teach).

49 After discussions within the KHS GT-AP Executive Board, a committee of parents and a student met with the principal and the committee chair. Eventually a commitment to designate a team of 100 students for a GT team was worked out.
studies classes are split now between two teachers (Teacher D and Teacher F) who have done very little coordination and integration of their content areas.

Many of the decisions and policies of the KHS GT-AP program have come about with the politics of the school in mind. Existing within the framework of the larger school has been a constant consideration. For instance, the school is given two positions by the Windward District Office for the GT-AP program. The positions which equal 14 class periods can be used for coordination and designated GT or AP classes, especially if the class enrollment falls below the DOE standard of 26 students. While the coordinator can justifiably use the 14 periods to provide GT-AP teachers with smaller class sizes or with extra preparation periods (both done in other schools), only three periods have been used for coordination and four others to cover low enrollment classes (normally AP chemistry and AP calculus, etc.). The other seven periods have been "given" back to the school to not only reduce class sizes for all teachers (although the overall impact is small) but also to avoid the perception that the GT-AP teachers get special treatment. While most GT-AP teachers will attest to the fact that GT-AP classes take more time and effort than other classes (more because of teacher-imposed standards than actual curricular demands), many

---

50 The Windward District allocates two full time positions to Kahuku High and Intermediate School to implement gifted education. Because KHS has a seven period schedule, the two positions break down into 14 periods which can be split up and used at the discretion of the program coordinator and approval of the principal.

51 While only seven periods of the allotment are actually used by the KHS GT-AP program, the coordinator still has to write up planning and evaluation reports for all 14 periods to the district office.
other teachers feel that teaching the "good" students is somehow easier. So it has been important for the political climate of the school and for the continued support and growth of the program to keep class sizes close to regular classes (in fact, GT-AP classes have often been larger) and for teachers to teach full loads. This unwritten policy has to be balanced off with the realization of the heavy demands placed on GT-AP teachers and accommodations have been made that would not openly countermand the policy. One way has been to put a directed studies period in a teacher's classload which is used as a study hall by students who have AP courses.

Still, maybe the most serious problems lie ahead. If the program continues to grow in enrollment and expectations, it will be very difficult to maintain a high level of commitment to the present policies and standards. More and more teachers will have to be brought in and as this is a constant problem now, larger numbers will put pressure on the commitment to curriculum differentiation, activities, inter/intra grade level articulation and academic standards.

With the 15 faculty and enrollment surpassing 500 students, delivery of the full range of programmatic services has put a strain on the coordinators and teachers. It is foreseeable that policies may either be changed or circumvented out of necessity to make the administration realistically manageable. Already Geek Week has been cancelled for two years due to the lack of faculty support. Counselling of students has diminished to conducting of midterm and quarterly grade checks. Nerd News has gone from monthly to quarterly.

Also looming over all of Hawaii's education community is the budget crisis facing the state. There has always been an understanding that gifted programs are especially vulnerable to the budget axe if repetitive examples on the mainland are an indication of what happens in similar situations. What
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would happen if the district allocation was completely cut? Would the school administration save the coordination periods that would at minimum be necessary to continue the program?

Change may be necessary and it may signify program maturity and progress. With more students and a more representative population, counselling may be less necessary now than when far fewer Polynesian students chose GT-AP. Attracting and keeping students in the program may be less of a problem now that so many are in the program and more students are applying of their own volition. *Nerd News* may not be as necessary now as when it is imperative to communicate new policy decisions to parents and to publicize the activities and interests of students. *Geek Week* may not be the reward it once was nor might it be necessary to contribute to student pride and stress relief. The successes of the present program may be enough to sustain the momentum to carry the program on to further development and successes.

Hopefully, the coordinators, faculty, administration and the KHS GT-AP Executive Board are effecting thoughtful change; change brought about by changing circumstances and change that improves the program. Hopefully, the changes will not be engendered out of administrative shortcuts necessitated by the lack of time and human resources. Ultimately, it is hoped that changes will not force the KHS GT-AP program to lose its hold on equity and excellence that which differentiates it from all other programs (maybe across the whole nation).
Conclusion

The American educational reform frenzy is at a peak right now. If trends in history are to be heeded, the more radical ideas may have been played out and efforts at massive restructuring will probably give way to less structural change and more effort at changing classrooms and teaching. Every so often, American educators need be confronted with radical ideas such as deschooling society (Illich in 1971) or the bell curve (Hernstein and Murray in 1994); cries to dismantle the educational system which jolt reformers into realizing that more sensible methods of bringing changes to the classrooms of the nation's schools are required.

In a very general perspective, much of the current reform movement can be seen as a tension between striving to make our schools vessels of excellent achievement and striving to make access to quality education available to all students. With all the factors and conditions which affect the outcome of education, adjustment or change, elimination or addition of some part of the educational environment creates a rippling effect of changes throughout the system. Thus, as educators attempt to raise standards or promote equality, they become players of a modern Glass Bead Game in trying to create whole systems that provide all students with quality educational opportunities. A Nation at Risk and subsequent treatises on educational reform have called for broadbased changes to the delivery of education opportunities to the nation's students. The problem has been that most reformers cannot point to clear examples of how this is to be done.

On the excellence side, gifted education has long been accepted as providing students with a high quality curriculum.
... the field of gifted education, by virtue of its principles and practices, has the opportunity to provide educational leadership in expanding views of intelligence, attention to underserved populations, a broadened view of democracy in education, differentiation and individualization of instruction, and varied instructional models and strategies (Tomlinson and Callahan 1992).

But scathing criticism created recently by research into tracking and the subsequent movement to heterogeneous classrooms has focused attention on the apparent inequities in the student populations of programs for the gifted. Publications of research by Oakes and Slavin have led to generally accepted beliefs that suggest that tracking before grade 10 or so does little for the better students and tends to harm those who are not academically advanced. If, in a restructured system, teachers and parents at a local school were to cling to conventional wisdom and to continue with a practice such as tracking, their efforts would not necessarily result in better education for the students (Tye 1992).

The gifted education community was slow to pick up on the coming storm but now the debate has reached major proportions as advocates of gifted education have begun to realize that gifted students are increasingly likely to receive all, or nearly all, of their education in regular classrooms. In many school districts, separate programs for the gifted, including pullout programs, are being curtailed or phased out (Willis 1995).

The critics of gifted programs advocate heterogeneous classrooms where all students receive the differentiated curriculum previously reserved for gifted students. They suggest that high achievers can help the slower students and also be models for others to emulate.

On the other hand, advocates of gifted programs argue that teachers are ill-trained and often unable to provide a curriculum that meets all the ability levels in a truly heterogeneous classroom. They further suggest that mixing
children of different ability levels in the name of democracy creates victims out of high ability students whose individual potentials are stagnated (Henig 1994).

In a partial compromise, Oakes and Lipton would allow leaving honors classes in place but adopt an open admissions policy rather than admitting students only through strict screening criteria (Reis 1992). But Reis counters that:

This result seems to be the saddest of any of the "new provisions for special needs" offered by Oakes and Lipton. What type of fast paced advanced content can be offered if some or many students in the class cannot keep up with the pace? How does this help the self-esteem of students who cannot do the work and who fail the tests? What kind of a choice does this offer teachers: maintain high standards by providing advanced content and fast paced instruction and watch students fail? or, slow down the pace, water down the content to meet the needs of those who can’t do the work and essentially, change the purpose of the honors or advanced placement class? What about appropriate standards? What about our elusive pursuit of excellence? What happens to students who need the type of content offered in these classes that can no longer get it because an open admission policy has resulted in a slowing down of the curriculum?

**And this is where the Kahuku High and Intermediate Gifted and Talented and Advanced Placement program comes in.** As the debate over ability grouping vs. heterogeneous grouping continues, the KHS GT-AP program has quietly and continually plotted a course that does exactly what Reis contends cannot be done and what Oakes and Lipton have failed to show can be done.

Considerable effort by writers in the field is being expended in debates as to which are the single best program models, rather than in the development of practical inexpensive program models that could serve more students (Richert 1991).

Maybe it is for the national spokespersons to highlight the issues and for local schools to show what can and cannot be done. The KHS program had addressed all of Reis’s concerns well before Oakes published her research. This is a gifted program that maintains high standards and extends its
curriculum to students of nearly all ability levels. Teachers need not "dummy down" the curriculum and students are finding out themselves that they are capable of much more challenging work than they or previous teachers had thought. Advanced placement pass rates have remained steadily above the national norm even as more students are being admitted into the GT program. Contrary to what Reis would predict, the brightest (but just as often, simply the most hardworking) KHS GT-AP students have increased their achievement levels as evidenced in direct competitions with the best local and national students.

When reduced to its simplest terms, maybe the KHS GT-AP program becomes an issue of choice; an alternative for teachers as well as students. Ted Sizer concludes:

Well, first remember that a major sector of Americans have always had choice. Those who are the wealthiest can pick where to live on the basis of the quality in the public schools. If it's good for the rich, it's good for the poor.

As a teacher, I would always prefer to teach kids who elected to be with me. Having taught classes like mandatory freshman English and also basic courses that students elected to take, I think my relationship with the students was better when they had some choice. I was also a principal of a school of choice, and it changed my whole relationship with the parents. I had to be much more attentive to the parents, because my budget depended on their support.

If you look at the Coalition schools that have really been on the move, they have been disproportionately schools of choice. Because nobody has to go there. Choice encourages people to experiment. People call it risk-taking: to me, nothing is riskier than leaving high schools the way they are. But the burden is always on those who favor choice (O'Neill 1995).

The KHS GT-AP program has continued to expand beyond most people's expectations because more and more students and parents are choosing it. They are choosing challenging work. They are choosing college preparatory work. They are choosing interesting work with high standards. And above all
students (and parents) are consciously choosing a direction they want their education to take.

Perhaps this is most clearly indicated by the recent registration period which saw parents of ten private school students registering their children at Kahuku; some actually visited classes before taking their children to the library to take the OLSAT to be screened for the GT-AP program¹.

In an earlier quote, Rapson was cited as pointing to the drain of more able students from the public schools to private schools as a trend that needed to be reversed before public education in Hawaii could be seen as a legitimate avenue for a quality education. The fact that Kahuku has been able to do this might be an indication that providing quality educational opportunities in a public school setting is very possible. It doesn't happen overnight and the creation of such a program might take the skill of a Glass Bead Game master, but Kahuku seems to have shown that a public school dedicated to high standards can extend quality education to a wide spectrum of students.

¹Information from the Kahuku registrar's office indicated that the ten students came from Iolani (1), Trinity Lutheran (2), Sunset Beach Christian (3), St. Andrews Priory (1), Hanalani (1) and Ho'ala (2). The Iolani student and one of the Trinity Lutheran students registered as district exceptions (which mean that they do not reside in the geographic district served by KHS and must apply for an exception to enroll).
Appendix A

General Survey

Name

Years spent at Kahuku High and Intermediate
( ) 7th  ( ) 8th  ( ) 9th  ( ) 10th  ( ) 11th  ( ) 12th

Sex
( ) male  ( ) female

Ethnic background (CHECK OFF ONE ONLY)
( ) Hawaiian/part Hawaiian
( ) other Polynesian/part Polynesian
( ) Asian/part Asian
( ) Filipino/part Filipino
( ) Caucasian
( ) other

Age

Years lived in Hawaii

Other than on the Mainland, where else have you lived?

1. On the whole, how do you find your classes at Kahuku?
a. ( ) challenging  ( ) somewhat challenging  ( ) not challenging
b. ( ) interesting  ( ) somewhat interesting  ( ) boring
c. ( ) difficult  ( ) somewhat difficult  ( ) easy

2. On the whole, how do you find your teachers at Kahuku?
( ) excellent  ( ) fair  ( ) poor

3. On the whole, how do you think Kahuku is preparing you for your future?
( ) very well  ( ) somewhat well  ( ) not well

4. On the whole, how much do you feel you are learning at Kahuku?
( ) a lot  ( ) some  ( ) not much

5. On the average, how much homework do you do per night?
( ) over 2 hours  ( ) 1 to 2 hours  ( ) less than 1 hour  ( ) none

6. On the average, how much homework are you assigned per night?
( ) over 2 hours  ( ) 1 to 2 hours  ( ) less than 1 hour  ( ) none

7. On the whole, do you think you are being pushed to improve in the basic skills of reading and writing?
( ) yes, definitely  ( ) somewhat  ( ) no, not much
8. On the whole, do you think you are being pushed to improve your thinking skills?
   ( ) yes, definitely  ( ) somewhat  ( ) no, not much

9. On the whole, does the staff here show they care about how you are doing?
   ( ) yes, definitely  ( ) somewhat  ( ) no, not much

10. On the whole, if a person at Kahuku was called a "nerd", that person should feel
     ( ) insulted  ( ) not insulted

11. On the whole, would it be okay for others to know you had good grades in a hard class?
     ( ) yes  ( ) no

12. On the whole, how would you describe your attitude toward coming to school?
     ( ) I like coming  ( ) I just do it  ( ) I dislike coming

13. On the whole, what is your parents' attitude toward your work in school?
     ( ) very interested  ( ) somewhat interested  ( ) not very interested

14. On the whole, how do you feel about being a student at Kahuku?
     ( ) happy  ( ) okay  ( ) unhappy

15. On the whole, how would you rate Kahuku?
     ( ) very good  ( ) fair  ( ) poor

16. What is your most memorable school-related experience?

17. What class/course has given you the most satisfaction? Why?

18. Do you intend to attend a four year university?
     ( ) yes, definitely  ( ) not sure  ( ) probably not

19. What job would you like to be doing in ten years?

FOR ALL GT-AP STUDENTS ONLY

20. In which grades have you been in at least one GT or AP course?
    check all that apply
    ( ) 7th  ( ) 8th  ( ) 9th  ( ) 10th  ( ) 11th  ( ) 12th

21. Were you in a GT program in elementary school?  ( ) yes  ( ) no

22. On the whole, how do you find your GT classes at Kahuku?
    a. ( ) challenging  ( ) somewhat challenging  ( ) not challenging
    b. ( ) interesting  ( ) somewhat interesting  ( ) boring
    c. ( ) difficult  ( ) somewhat difficult  ( ) easy
23. On the whole, how do you find your GT teachers at Kahuku?
   ( ) excellent ( ) fair ( ) poor

24. On the whole, how do you think GT is preparing you for your future?
   ( ) very well ( ) somewhat well ( ) not well

25. On the whole, how much do you feel you are learning at Kahuku?
   ( ) a lot ( ) some ( ) not much

26. On the whole, how do you feel about the GT program at Kahuku?
   (check all that apply)
   a. ( ) I'm happy I'm in GT OR ( ) I regret being in GT now
   b. ( ) It's hard, but I can handle it OR ( ) It's too hard
   c. ( ) I'm doing well OR ( ) I'm doing poorly
   d. ( ) I hope to continue in GT OR ( ) I'd like to quit being in GT
   e. ( ) none of the above applies to me

27. If you were to drop out of GT, for which reason(s) would it be?
   (check up to three)
   ( ) The GT classes were too hard for me to keep up
   ( ) I tried but I just couldn't get good grades
   ( ) I could have worked harder but I didn't
   ( ) Circumstances outside of school that made it too hard to continue in GT
   ( ) Other classes/activities in school made it too hard to continue in GT
   ( ) I did not like the GT teachers
   ( ) I did not like the work we did in GT
   ( ) I felt embarrassed to be in GT
   ( ) I felt uncomfortable with the other students
   ( ) I don't think I'm smart enough
   ( ) I needed a break from GT and I'd like to get in again later
   ( ) Other

FOR GT-AP JUNIORS AND SENIORS ONLY

28. Briefly describe how your school experience would have been different if you had not been in the GT-AP program. You may write a paragraph or list.

29. Were there any years at Kahuku when you were not in the GT-AP program?
   ( ) yes ( ) no, I've been in GT-AP since 7th grade
   If yes, explain why not and why you applied to enter or re-enter.

30. What do you feel are the strengths of the GT-AP program?

31. What do you feel are the weaknesses of the GT-AP program?

FOR STUDENTS PREVIOUSLY IN GT, BUT NOT NOW ENROLLED

20. In which grades have you been in at least one GT or AP course?
   check all that apply
   ( ) 7th ( ) 8th ( ) 9th ( ) 10th ( ) 11th ( ) 12th
21. Were you in a GT program in elementary school?
   ( ) yes  ( ) no

22. Which of the following describe your situation that led to not being enrolled in GT this year? (check all that apply)
   ( ) The GT classes were too hard for me to keep up
   ( ) I tried but I just couldn't get good grades
   ( ) I could have worked harder but I didn't
   ( ) Circumstances outside of school that made it too hard to continue in GT
   ( ) Other classes/activities in school made it too hard to continue in GT
   ( ) I did not like the GT teachers
   ( ) I did not like the work we did in GT
   ( ) I felt embarrassed to be in GT
   ( ) I felt uncomfortable with the other students
   ( ) I don't think I'm smart enough
   ( ) I needed a break from GT
   ( ) Other

23. Did your parents encourage you to stay in GT?
   ( ) yes  ( ) no

24. Did your GT teachers encourage or help you to stay in GT?
   ( ) yes  ( ) no

25. Did the GT counselor encourage or help you to stay in GT?
   ( ) yes  ( ) no

26. Did your friends encourage you to stay in GT?
   ( ) yes  ( ) no

27. Which of the above discouraged you from staying in GT?
   ( ) your parents  ( ) your GT teacher  ( ) your GT counselor  ( ) your friends

28. Would you like to take a GT or AP course in the future?
   ( ) yes  ( ) no
   If yes, why?

SURVEY RESULTS

GRADE/SEX/ETHNICITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>GT-AP</th>
<th>GEN</th>
<th>FGT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7th</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8th</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9th</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10th</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11th</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12th</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MALE</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEMALE</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GT-AP:
- presently enrolled

GEN (general):
- not enrolled in GT-AP

FGT (former GT):
- formerly enrolled
HAWAIIAN 62 134 17  (includes part Hawaiian)
POLYNESIAN 64 96  8  (Polynesian but not Hawaiian)
ASIAN    44  17  4
FILIPINO  12  8  4
CAUCASIAN 90  44  9
OTHER    15  13  2

1a, b, c. On the whole, how do you find your classes at Kahuku?

1a.                              GT-AP   GEN FGT
challenging                     133  86  5
somewhat challenging            143 180 30
not challenging                 7  37  4
no response                     6  16  4

1b.                              GT-AP   GEN FGT
interesting                     91  80 11
somewhat interesting            154 165 20
boring                          29  56  8
no response                     14  18  4

difficult                       77  59  3
somewhat difficult              179 210 29
easy                            20  40  7
no response                     16  18  4

2. On the whole, how do you find your teachers at Kahuku?

excellent                       130  84  6
fair                            151 217 31
poor                            7  35  3
no response                     1  4  2

3. On the whole, how do you think Kahuku is preparing you for your future?

very well                       123  83  9
somewhat well                   155 196 27
not well                        12  35  5
no response                     1  4  2
4. On the whole, how much do you feel you are learning at Kahuku?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>GT-AP</th>
<th>GEN</th>
<th>FGT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a lot</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>some</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not much</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no response</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. On the average, how much homework do you do per night?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>GT-AP</th>
<th>GEN</th>
<th>FGT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>over 2 hours</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 to 2 hours</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>less than 1 hour</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>none</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no response</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. On the average, how much homework are you assigned per night?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>GT-AP</th>
<th>GEN</th>
<th>FGT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>over 2 hours</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 to 2 hours</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>less than 1 hour</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>none</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no response</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. On the whole, do you think you are being pushed to improve in the basic skills of reading and writing?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>GT-AP</th>
<th>GEN</th>
<th>FGT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>yes, definitely</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>somewhat</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no, not much</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no response</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. On the whole, do you think you are being pushed to improve your thinking skills?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>GT-AP</th>
<th>GEN</th>
<th>FGT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>yes, definitely</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>somewhat</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no, not much</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no response</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. On the whole, does the staff here show they care about how you are doing?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>GT-AP</th>
<th>GEN</th>
<th>FGT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>yes, definitely</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>somewhat</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no, not much</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no response</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
10. On the whole, if a person at Kahuku was called a "nerd", that person should feel

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>GT-AP</th>
<th>GEN</th>
<th>FGT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>insulted</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not insulted</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no response</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. On the whole, would it be okay for others to know you had good grades in a hard class?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>GT-AP</th>
<th>GEN</th>
<th>FGT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>yes</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no response</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. On the whole, how would you describe your attitude toward coming to school?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>GT-AP</th>
<th>GEN</th>
<th>FGT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I like coming</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I just do it</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I dislike coming</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no response</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. On the whole, what is your parents' attitude toward your work in school?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>GT-AP</th>
<th>GEN</th>
<th>FGT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>very interested</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>somewhat interested</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not very interested</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no response</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14. On the whole, how do you feel about being a student at Kahuku?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>GT-AP</th>
<th>GEN</th>
<th>FGT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>happy</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>okay</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unhappy</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no response</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15. On the whole, how would you rate Kahuku?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>GT-AP</th>
<th>GEN</th>
<th>FGT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>very good</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fair</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>poor</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no response</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16. What is your most memorable school-related experience? (results not included)
17. What class/course has given you the most satisfaction? Why?  
(results not included)

18. Do you intend to attend a four year university?  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>GT-AP</th>
<th>GEN</th>
<th>FGT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>yes, definitely</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not sure</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>probably not</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no response</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19. What job would you like to be doing in ten years?  
(results not included)

FOR ALL GT-AP STUDENTS ONLY
21. Were you in a GT program in elementary school?  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>GT-AP</th>
<th>FGT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>yes</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no response</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

22. On the whole, how do you find your GT classes at Kahuku?  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>GT-AP</th>
<th>GEN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>challenging</td>
<td>222</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>somewhat challenging</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not challenging</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no response</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>difficult</td>
<td></td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>somewhat difficult</td>
<td></td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>easy</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no response</td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

23. On the whole, how do you find your GT teachers at Kahuku?  

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>excellent</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fair</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>poor</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no response</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

24. On the whole, how do you think GT is preparing you for your future?  

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>very well</td>
<td>202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>somewhat well</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not well</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no response</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
25. On the whole, how much do you feel you are learning at Kahuku?
a lot 204
some 87
not much 6
no response 2

26. On the whole, how do you feel about the GT program at Kahuku?
I'm happy 200 I can handle it 210
I regret being in it 24 It's too hard 35
no response 59 no response 44

I'm doing well 184 I hope to continue 192
I'm doing poorly 37 I'd like to quit 19
no response 68 no response 54

27. If you were to drop out of GT, for which reason(s) would it be? (check up to three)
(results not included)

FOR STUDENTS PREVIOUSLY IN GT, BUT NOT NOW ENROLLED

22. Which of the following describe your situation that led to not being enrolled in GT this year? (check all that apply) (results not included)

23. Did your parents encourage you to stay in GT?
yes 35
no 7
no response 2

24. Did your GT teachers encourage or help you to stay in GT?
yes 25
no 16
no response 2

25. Did the GT counselor encourage or help you to stay in GT?
yes 16
no 25
no response 2

26. Did your friends encourage you to stay in GT?
yes 19
no 22
no response 2
27. Which of the above discouraged you from staying in GT?
parents 5
GT teacher 5
GT counselor 3
friends 4
no response 24

28. Would you like to take a GT or AP course in the future?
yes 33
no 9
no response 1
NERD NEWS reprints (copied as printed)

All articles were written by 9th grade KHS GT students except for "Nerd News: We Get No Respect" which was written by the 9th grade GT teacher.

The Hetero-Homo Issue

"The Heterogeneous Spell" (volume 6 issue 1)

A frog’s leg, a bat’s wing, a large freckled nose and other awful things. Ehhehehe! A witch cackles as she mixes the ingredients in her black caldron together to make her evil spell. But if she mixes the wrong ingredients, the spell won't come out right and could backfire.

Heterogeneous classes are a hot issue for schools. Many feel that the mixing of all levels of classes is a good idea; but most GT classes feel this mixture of ingredients won't come out right.

How do you feel? Do you think combining a range of students from general to GT in heterogeneous classes will work?

Some positive outcomes of this could be: those students who need the extra educational stimulation and positive peer influence, would have it available. Therefore, they could excel to higher levels.

There are also many possible negative outcomes of heterogeneous classes. Without the proper teachers and curriculum, this could be taking away the GT students' right to progress.

GT-AP teacher MRS. L. SMITH has said, "If every teacher was properly trained it could work, but the teachers are not prepared to face the challenges of such a class."

She also feels that in these classes, the GT students would continue to do well, but not be able to reach the level of excellence that they are presently attaining.

GT student, ANONYMOUS #5, concludes that GT students are in GT because they are smart and want to be there. This person also feels that grades would rise because the work would be a lot more challenging.

GT students SARA CHASE and ANDREW MILLER feel that if we were taught a general level, we would be held back and unable to reach our potential.

AP Gov. student JASON TOLLESON says, "I don't like heterogeneous classes because we wouldn't be challenged. The material is a lower level. You could spend three weeks learning how to write an essay."

Our principal, MRS. ALBERT, believes that if students knew the expectations in these classes were at a GT level, they would give more effort. She feels grades would rise because all students are capable.

Both MRS. ALBERT and MRS. SMITH feel that Kahuku's GT program is actually quite heterogeneous. Where some schools take only students with only 8 & 9 stanines, Kahuku's GT program includes students that have four to nine stanines. This could prove that when placed in an atmosphere where
students are self-motivated and anxious to learn, some can succeed at a GT level.

Maybe if in the beginning, the witch had placed a freckled toe in the jar with the freckled noses, the toe would adapt and evolve almost like a freckled nose. Then when placed in a spell as a freckled nose it would work. In other words, if students began from the beginning of school with GT curriculum, they could adapt to this level. There might be a need for some tutoring, but it all basically comes down to student motivation.

Personally, I hope we keep homogeneous classes because students are placed in a level where they can do their best and excel at their own pace. I am happy to be part of GT.

Rebecca Underwood

"Heterogeneous Grouping" (volume 4 issue 6)

I support Mrs. Albert's efforts to "move the middle" and create a higher standard for the students but I don't think heterogeneous grouping is the answer. Not only are the teaching styles different but the attitude and atmosphere towards learning differ. I think that there are better ways to improve a student's learning quality.

Heterogeneous grouping takes students of different learning levels and different thinking styles and puts them into one class. Teachers teach something and expect students to learn. But if part of the class learns by "hands-on" experiences, part learns by memorization, and another by discussion, what do you do?

In my point of view, GT students aren't gifted in brains but understanding. Once they understand a concept they can usually figure out what will happen in a given situation. They can grasp ideas as opposed to memorizing facts in a book. This requires a whole new teaching style to take things a step further and use them in creative enrichment projects. This teaching style doesn't only work with GT students. You can (it has been done) use the same curriculum taught in more detail or at a slower pace and the lower level students will do just as well as the GT students.

The GT motto is "The best for the best, the best for all." I think the GT program has the best known teaching styles and ideas. But even near perfection is no accident, and most teachers aren't willing to put in the extra hours that GT teachers do that are required for such quality. When this attitude is reflected in the students, it lowers their self-esteem, which in turn lowers their performance and GPA.

Kimberly Miller

The Gender Issue

"Why Are There More Girls Than Guys in GT?" (April, 1991)

Have you ever noticed that there are more girls than guys in your G.T. classes? Well, I've always wondered about this so I took it a step further. I asked a bunch of guys who were in advanced classes, "Why aren't you in G.T.?" They were very cooperative in answering, but they all wanted to remain anonymous.
1st guy- “I don’t think I would be able to handle. I would probably get kicked out anyway!”
2nd guy- “Nah, I don’t want to.”
3rd guy- “Because I’m not that smart. I’m not a nerd. I don’t even know how I got in advanced.
4th guy- “I don’t want to because there’s too much homework.”
5th guy -“Because I’m a drop too fast for advanced, but I’m a drop too slow for G.T.”

Then I asked a couple of guys who were in GT this question, “Why do you think there are more girls than guys in your GT classes.” There were some very interesting responses.
Sofala Pula- “Girls are brought up better than boys.”
Daniel Marler- “Cause most boys don’t care about their grades.”
Luke Pignolet- “Because all of the boys don’t want to show off.”
Jeremiah Moeai- “Because boys are rascals and girls listen more.”

Next I asked some girls who are in GT classes, “Why do you think there are more girls in the class than there are boys.” Here are their answers.
Amber Allred- “Girls seem to make the effort to learn more.”
Lavinia Vimahi- “I think boys don’t want people to think that they’re smart.”
Lara Kaanga- “Cause girls are just smarter.”
Juneko Jackson- “Because a lot of boys are ashamed to be in GT, but they shouldn’t be.”
Linsey Crisler- “Girls mature faster than guys which means they care more about their academic status, therefore, they stay in GT longer. The reason they care is probably because their brains mature faster as well.”
Haunani Goldsberry- “Boys just don’t make the effort. They think that all of the fun comes in college, but sometimes, they never get there.”
Pualei Oleole- “I guess because there are more intellectual girls than there are guys.”
Cecily Day- “Girls just have more incentive to work harder.”

These are the opinions of some of the students in both advanced and GT classes.

"Female Supremacy" (volume 4 issue 6)

Hello, my name is Jared Lau. I feel that the female supremacy in GT classes is overwhelming. Not only are there more girls in GT, but the girls have the nerve to say that they are not only mentally but physically superior to males in every way. There just seems to be no end to their bragging about themselves. They call us males dumb and unintelligent. Well, it takes one twice as dumb to know that.

I have learned from personal experience with girls that they are stubborn, cruel, and sadistic when torturing males about their stupidity. Can’t they keep their high and mighty feelings to themselves!? I guess they didn’t learn how it felt to be the one on the receiving end.

Females are not all bad, (I must admit) when they are not trying to manipulate everyone around them. I mean that if females are so smart, then why do they have to assure themselves all the time by telling the whole world!? 

Jared Lau
"What Is a Nerd?" (volume 4 issue 2)

What do you think a nerd is? How do you think nerds on the mainland are treated compared to the way nerds here at Kahuku are treated? Here are responses from some of our GT 9th grade students:

Beth Frederick, 9th grade, Eng/SS/Bio
I think a nerd is someone who can tell you anything you want off the top of their heads, and they get 9.9's on their SAT tests.

On the mainland, I think nerds are treated really low class, and here it is sort of the opposite.

Interviewer: (Don't cheat, Beth! You're describing yourself! By the way, what was your SAT score? A perfect 100, of course! Nah, just kidding Beth!)

Beth Frederick

Amber Grigsby, 9th grade, Eng/SS/Bio
"A nerd is someone like me! (Nah, I wish!) Seriously, I think a nerd is someone who is involved in no extracurricular activities, and misses Beverly Hills, 90210 to study for their History test.

I think that nerds are better off here than on the mainland, judging from personal experience. (Ha, ha, ha)"

Interviewer: (Well Amber, then what was the reason you moved here? You did come from the mainland, didn’t you?)

Alma Tarampi, 9th grade, Eng/SS/Bio

Now let’s see what Alma, spelling champion and class “A” nerd, has to say:

"I think a nerd is someone who stays up all night trying to be the best he/she can be.

Kids on the mainland are probably treated like dirt and have to wait until college to make something of themselves (No offense).

Kids here are treated better than on the mainland, because we have different minorities here and they strive to be better than all the rest."

Interviewer: (Great, NERDY answer, Alma!)

In conclusion, I found out that Kahuku students all have basically the same feelings and ideas about how nerds here at Kahuku school, and on the mainland are treated, and what their idea of a “basic nerd” is. That’s it for now.

Maria Kritikos

"Would You Date a Nerd" (volume 4 issue 5)--abridged

If I were to date a nerd, he would have to be cute, a gentleman, intelligent (of course), have a good sense of humor, and a nice personality. Most nerds nowadays fit that description.

If you were to date a nerd, How and Why would you date one? Well, I asked several students this question and these are some of the responses I got.

Juneko Jackson (Gov’t, Eng., Calc.)
I would go on a date with a nerd because he could be really good looking, plus he’d be smart. There are plenty of fun nerds out there. The stereotype of a nerd being geeky isn’t true. Anyone could be a nerd. There are millions of nerds in disguise that would make great dates.

Kamling Navalta (DS)
I agree with Juneko.
Tupou Naeata (AP lang.)

The reason I would date a nerd is because nerds nowadays are hella fine. The definition of a nerd has changed as time passed. In the past a nerd was one with glasses, high water pants pulled all the way up to your waist, a minority with no life. But now in the “90’s”, a nerd is one not only with brains but one with steel. He has looks, muscles, attitude, the works. Nerds got it made! Girls nowadays are smarter. They don’t only look for the looks, even though that comes first to many people, but they also look for the brains. Nerds also got smarter, by using their brains to get muscles. They figured out that just as their brain is exercised in school, their muscles can be exercised as well.

R.U.A. Lusa

Nerd News Controversy

"Is The Nerd News Too Nerdy?" (volume 5 issue 2)--abridged

I think that the name “Nerd News” is way too nerdy! I also know that many people agree with me. Just the other day I asked some people if I could interview them, and they said that they didn’t like being called a “nerd” or a “geek” and that there was no way they’d be in the Nerd News.

The past GT coordinator is the one that named the Nerd News, and insisted on keeping the name. Well, as you all know, he is gone, so what’s keeping us from changing it? As far as I can see-NOTHING!

I asked some people for suggestions on a new name and this was the most popular answer: GT/AP News
It’s simple, to the point, and most importantly—not NERDY!!!

I also sent surveys to all the GT/AP English/Literature classes. Here are the responses I received:
YES to changing the name 114 (votes)
NO to changing the name 102 (votes)

Looks like there is a slightly larger amount of people that would like to change the name. In my opinion, it’s the Seniors and older students that don’t want to change the name, but the majority of 7-11 grader (especially 7-9 graders) do want to change the name because they feel like the name is cutting them down. The Seniors have had their chance to be called “nerds”, but the newcomers do not want to be called “Nerds”.

Mandy Kehoe

"Nerd News: We Don’t Get No Respect... but it’s still worth it!" (volume 5 issue 3)—abridged

My ninth grade news staff was surprised—nay, overwhelmed—by the deluge of letters supporting this publication’s name: the infamous “Nerd News.” Out of the 80+ responses we received, only about five wanted a new title without the word “nerd” in it. (Their new suggestions were even more outrageous, however) Although the feeler survey in November’s issue showed a slight preference to changing the title—primarily from our younger GT’s—the energetic responses from our tried and true scholars cannot be ignored. Therefore, the Nerd News—as is—will continue to summarize, provoke and advertise the pulse of GT for 1993-1994.

M. Tahauri
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"Why I Don't Want to Be in G/T" (volume 1 issue 6)

This year, being in G/T was fun. I enjoyed the projects, assignments, and being in the class. The only problem was all of these classes had projects, assignments, and they were all very hard.

I think that if maybe next year I'm not in G/T my burden will be lightened and my grades will improve. Another thing is, I won't be stressed out.

My last reason for not wanting to be in G/T next year, is people in general classes are getting 4.0's with ease and I think it's not fair that I struggle while they cruise. I'm not complaining about the work, but I think we should be recognized for doing harder work.

Sini Taufa

"Moving to Hawaiian G/T Classes" (volume 3 issue 2)

Moving to Hawaii has been a great experience for me. The school system was very different in California. The advanced classes at my former school were called G.A.T.E.; Gifted and Talented Education. G.A.T.E. had many good aspects but I think that Kahuku High School's G/T program is better. The difference between the two programs is that G.A.T.E. is very impersonal. Class sizes were often up to thirty-four and thirty-five. With such a large class, we did not receive very much one-on-one teaching.

My teacher in Vista, California had a very monotonous schedule which consisted of a lecture from the textbook, a lot of homework every night, and frequent tests and quizzes. This method of teaching taught us but offered no fun, variety, and creativity in learning.

From what I have observed so far, Mr. Awaya has a lot of variety in his class. One thing that I enjoy is the nick-names, although I am not very fond of mine; O Yellow Anal. It has been an experience for me to be in Mr. Awaya's class. In G.A.T.E. we did not have a newsletter, so writing this article was new to me also.

Leo Loa

"From Advanced to G/T" (volume 3 issue 2)

Have you ever had a night when you were bombarded with homework and you're still up at 1:00 am? Then suddenly, in a moment of despair, you wished that the people in advanced classes could be put through the same torture you're put through?!?! Well, in a way, this has become a reality. I talked to some new high school G/T AP students who have worked their way into "torture".

I got some opinions of some new students as they strive to stay in G/T after their first quarter as a G/T student. Ninth grader Yoichi Soma said that there was almost no homework in advanced classes, but in G/T, he's kept busy constantly. I asked if his grades were the same, and he replied, "I went from two A's, to a B and a C, a very high CI"

One thing Maggie Toelupe likes about G/T is, "Although the work is harder, and it takes a lot of work, it's fun, and you don't only do book work." One things she hates is her namagram. Maggie has very recently been moved from the 9th grade advanced class into G/T as of the beginning of 2nd quarter.
Kenneth Safsten, a ninth grader, says, "G/T work is more intense than advanced braddah (slang)." He compares G/T with a tiger brazire. Go figure! His grades went from two B's to two A's.

Eric Aiu, a tenth grade G/T student says, "We do the same work as advanced, but we go at a faster pace. The teachers are also biased." He says that he does not like having all the same people in all his classes. He also complains about all the work, but he says that advanced students shouldn't be pushed to do harder work because that's what separates the advanced from the G/T.

Leilani (Katie) James, an eleventh grade AP student says, "The work is totally hard, and I have no time to watch Madonna, (her idol)." Strike a pose!

Sharon (Lilia) Kekauoha, senior in AP classes says that the work is very hard and extremely intense.

Of all the high school G/T and AP students I've talked to, they all seem to agree that it is harder and faster than advanced classes. But they also seem to agree that it is fun and worth all the sleepless nights spent doing homework.

"New Geeks on the Block" (volume 4 issue 3)—abridged

Stop! I know what you are thinking of, the band group named "NEW KIDS ON THE BLOCK". Well, you're wrong!! I'm talking about the geeks who are new here in KHS.

You probably know the new students in your GT class by now, since this is the second quarter. But do you know them well? Maybe you only know their names and what they look like. Did you ever talk to them? Well, if you didn't, read this article to find more about them.

After asking them questions about themselves, I decided to ask them about their G.T. classes.

This is what Jared Underwood said, "G.T. here is different from mainland classes because they are harder."

Kaina said he wouldn't know because he wasn't in G.T. in the mainland.

Candice said "I was told before I moved here, that schools here were easier. I found that, that's a big lie!"

Robert likes this school a lot better than the one on the mainland.

"Cooperation Vs. Competition" (volume 5 issue 1)

Are we moving in the right direction in this Gifted and Talented Program? As a newcomer, I can only raise the question because I don't have the answer.

To answer the above question, we must examine both a successful and an unsuccessful Gifted and Talented Program. A successful program needs to work with the entire student body by cooperating and interacting among each other. This can take place by exchanging various viewpoints and helping one another by building up creative interests and talents. This type of program will draw in and rub off energetically throughout the entire school. An unsuccessful program is exactly the opposite of a successful program. It will promote great competition, not only between the student body and the GT program, but also within the GT program. This can produce severe results for the entire school.
If we strive to become a successful program, Kahuku will have one of the best GT programs in the state.

Max Burroughs

"Evaluation of Class: A.P. US History" (volume 1 issue 6)

The one word evaluation of Mr. Awaya's A.P. US History would have to be HELL. This is the hardest and most demanding class ever invented.

There is not that much work to do, but everything you do takes a long time and requires a lot of thinking. The tests are really tricky and the research projects are tiring. There is no way you can wait till a day before something is due to do it, because you'll never pass the class. As soon as you learn that something is due, start doing it. Use your time wisely.

This is not a class to cruise in. If you take this class you better be ready to work. It will be worth it. By the end of the year you'll be a hundred percent smarter.

Jesse Amatore

The Principal

"2 Minutes with Mrs. Albert" (October 1990)

I had the privilege of interviewing the person who turned Kahuku High School completely around. I asked her about the G.T. program. This is what I got from Mrs. Lea Albert.

Q: What do you think of the GT program and Mr. Awaya?
A: Well, I think the GT program is marvelous, and I think Mr. Awaya is marvelous. He is able to bring out so many good things in his students. He's innovative, very creative, and if he ever leaves Kahuku, I'm going to get really mad!

Q: What do you hope to see the GT program do for students?
A: Bring out the best, the very best in the students. Also help you to get along with everyone, with all kinds of people.

Q: Could improvements be made and if so, what?
A: The only improvement I saw would be that everyone involved in GT realizes that everyone on this campus has a gift of some kind. We all need to work together to bring those gifts out, whether they're in academics, music, athletics, leadership, socialization, whatever.

Q: What did you think about the first Geek Week and Nerd Night?
A: I thought it was wonderful. I was thrilled. It was a real negative thing to be academic when I was in high school and one of the things that I think Geek Week and Nerd Night did was to celebrate the intellectual. I like that. It's okay to carry books at Kahuku High School. It's cool.

Q: Would you like to see more activities like that?
A: I'd love to see more activities, especially those that would encompass a wider range of young people. But I also think you folks are already doing a lot, and I don't want you to overdo it.

Q: Do you have anything else to say about the program?
A: Just that I'm real pleased with it. Real pleased!

There you have it, folks and we're pleased that you're pleased, Mrs. Albert!

Y.S.B.
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