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Abstract

Iowa requires documentation of qualitatively differentiated curriculum for identified talented and gifted students by schools using allowable growth funding. In response to this directive, a local special education Individual Education Plan (IEP) documentation format was modified to a Personal Education Plan (PEP) format for gifted learners. Construction and refinement of the format developed over a seven year period. The use of the familiar IEP process seemed to afford credibility and was readily accepted by staff, parents, and administration. The PEP format held the program for gifted and talented to a high standard of accountability, and a six step model evolved from implementation. The importance of systematic diagnosis of needs and the prescription of defensible programming interventions was stressed. The model has proven to be a useful tool in writing effective PEPs and could be beneficial to other school districts.
Introduction

Teachers of the gifted and talented come from many diverse backgrounds. Each brings his or her own talent, strength, and perspective to the field. When I entered the field of gifted education, I had taught dance for 12 years in private business. I worked with special populations as both a dance instructor and volunteer. One undergraduate, semester-long, experience dealt with children having severe and profound disabilities. This adaptive dance/physical education course introduced me to the special education process for writing Individual Education Plans (IEPs).

I began working with gifted and talented students in grades 6 through 12 in 1989. It soon became apparent to me that the field of gifted and talented education was not, philosophically, very different from special education but lacked some of the documentation structure that special education found fundamental to program delivery. A documentation method existed, but I was in a quandary.

Iowa law requires the development of Personalized Education Plans (PEPs); and, as I worked with the format, I discovered that I was having some difficulty making it work for the student. Previous records were listings of student activities, most often assessed by the student with a short sentence by the teacher. Comprehensive learning goals, interventions and student progress did not exist. I knew that this format did not match my definition for a Personalized Education Plan, but wondered if it satisfied the expectations of other professionals involved in gifted and talented education.
As a result of my concern, I began looking for a model that reflected best practice. Unfortunately, my search of the field of gifted and talented education yielded few, if any, models of what I consider to be an effective PEP. Therefore, I turned to the field of special education and experimented with an adaptation of a local IEP format familiar to teachers in my school district. Within this documentation format exists a clearly defined diagnosis of need, articulation of measurable and observable goals, and the educational strategies to be used to meet those goals. Progress is monitored and delineation of responsibilities for staff is defined. During the past seven years, a model has emerged for me that has proven to be very effective. It is the model that this article will present.

Rationale for a Diagnostic/Prescriptive Approach

The fundamental reasons for establishing a PEP are based upon legal and ethical accountability. Explicit legal rules define the responsibilities described in the Iowa Code (Gifted 59.4[442], 1988). However, gifted and talented programs vary in their interpretation of the law and amount of documentation. This lack of standardization results in communication gaps when working with individual teaching staffs. It also results in relatively weak transfer of information among the various school districts. The PEP, therefore, is intended to provide evidence of student need, specify accommodations and monitor student progress in a way that will provide some of the needed standardization of documentation.

Legal Explications

"Provisions for Gifted and Talented Students, 12.5(12)" is the mandated
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guide for Iowa educators planning for the educational needs of gifted and talented learners (New Iowa Standards, 1988). The legal explications of the Standards (1988) include three criteria. First, a systematic and valid identification of learner needs determines appropriate programming. Second, this programming is to be qualitatively different from that offered in the standard classroom. Third, a process for evaluation must be established for program improvement and effectiveness (Gifted 59.5[442]).

Funding for gifted and talented programs was created by the Allowable Growth Formula, in order for Iowa schools to develop adequate programs (Gifted 59.4[442], 1988). Guidelines for the schools using this formula also require a PEP to be written for every identified student (Gifted 59.5[442]). The documentation of the student's growth on a PEP is to provide the vehicle for program defensibility, accountability, and evaluation (New Iowa Standards, 1988).

Many school districts have interpreted "qualitatively differentiated" to mean anything that is different from the regular curriculum. However, the intention of the law is to provide students with specific programming in response to a diagnosed need. A gifted and talented student's educational need is created by potential or ability (Borland, 1989) which exceeds the regular curriculum. Therefore, it would appear that there should be a prescriptive response to meeting this educational need. Such a response represents the qualitative difference. Programming can be defended based upon appropriateness; and documentation can provide the structure.
Documentation for Accountability

Teachers of gifted and talented programs have shared some of their PEP models in discussions at the local and state level. Some of these models reflect a format which they use without any training or understanding of the PEP process (M. Smith, Equity Audit Team, Department of Education, personal communication, November 8-10, 1994). Some of the documentation shared at an Area Education Association meeting consisted of nothing more than scraps of paper listing activities or events (P. Thompson, Heartland AEA Roundtable discussion, personal communication, 1993).

The AEA discussion participants also included examples of a mass produced one-size-fits-all set of goals to be checked off in pre-determined boxes. This really is not a Personal Education Plan because it is neither personal nor differentiated. If the regular classroom in which the same-for-everyone-mentality is inappropriate for gifted learners, then the gifted and talented program with the same mentality is equally inappropriate.

Sadly, there are times when no documentation exists at all (M. Smith, Equity Audit Team, Department of Education, personal communication, November 8-10, 1994). Many programs suffer from frequent turn-over of unskilled teachers, unaware administrators, and underserved students. As a result, the program frequently may be reinvented to placate the law. In a sense, the district relies on the inability of an uninformed community and overloaded regulatory agency to overlook the situation (L. Wolf, Department of Education, ITAG discussion group, 1996). It becomes apparent from these discussions
that there exists a strong case for designing and using a standardized documentation procedure.

Overview of The Six Phases of A PEP Model

A comprehensive approach to developing a PEP involves much more than merely writing the plan. Analyzing the components affecting the PEP articulates the gifted and talented program within the educational system of the district (Borland, 1989).

Too, it must be pointed out that a program is defensible when essential information is represented in the documentation in a format that parents, staff and students can understand. I shall, therefore, present a brief overview of the six phases of my PEP model with an accompanying analysis for the purpose of explanation/clarity. I have used examples to guide the completion of forms as presented.

Phase 1: Need Assessment

The need assessment gathers relevant data defining the parameters of the student's abilities which will "fit" within the regular classroom. Relevant data consists of classroom curriculum, district demographics, available resources, expectations, and other related areas (Borland, 1989). A pool of students who demonstrate need that is beyond the regular classroom is identified. This phase also involves nomination of students by staff, parents, peers, and self. Need assessment should be completed each time a class enters a new building level, every three years, or in some other timely manner.

The teacher of the gifted and talented must fully understand the regular
program before he/she can assess need that go beyond what is offered.
Although no form for this evaluation is offered in the presented model, this
phase is necessary in order that the needs of gifted and talented students be met.

Phase 2: Data Collection and Identification

Additional need assessment methods are used to determine the extent
of student need and eligibility for services during the second phase of PEP
development. The identification procedures need to be designed so that they match the definition of the population they are serving. Parents may need to be contacted for their consent to test (see Figure 1) or to provide a portfolio if further information is warranted. All findings are presented in a written report to an advisory committee. Assessments should include multiple criteria and not be culturally or racially discriminatory (Gifted 59.5[442]).

Phase 3: Placement for Gifted and Talented Services

In the third phase, students are identified based upon a preponderance of need that goes beyond what the regular classroom can provide. After placement, a comprehensive individual assessment is made and documented by the teacher of the gifted program. Background information should include a statement of the present level of educational performance (Whitmore, 1985).

Student information is a vital part of the PEP. A well designed interview will, for example, give insights into the personality, interests, and characteristics of the student. If interest and learning style inventories are used appropriately, a student profile emerges. Out-of-level testing or other instruments can give additional insight into student ability. A prescriptive
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program serves the whole student, not merely a talent area.

Parents/guardians are notified of their rights, and their consent is needed to deliver services. Preliminary information (e.g., Heartland, 1996) about the nature of the PEP is given to staff, parents, and the student.

Phase 4: Staffing and Writing the PEP

During Phase 4, staff, parents, and the student give input in the design of the PEP. The guiding question is: What will both hinder or help this student in reaching his/her potential? [italics added] The parents and student, together with involved staff, attend an PEP staffing to analyze the assessment information and define educational needs and concerns. Strength areas in specific academic areas may be addressed by compactions or acceleration in the regular classroom. Teachers choose appropriate curriculum and give consideration to the learner's interests and thinking styles. Affective, as well as cognitive, needs are considered.

Affective needs include monitoring and interventions for areas such as underachievement, perfectionism, stress management, understanding giftedness, and social skills. These social and emotional areas are not a "by-product" of the student's ability, but rather an integral part (Delisle, 1995). With this additional information considered, the PEP reflects the uniqueness of the whole student in the current setting.

Statements of the instructional goals are then developed (see Figure 2). Long term instructional goals include statements of terminal behaviors. Goals are global and a beginning point from which more specific objectives are derived. The goals are intended to reflect growth in skills or knowledge that will
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take place during the entire academic year. These goals should encourage the student to surpass stated expectations.

Next, the Instructional Objectives are defined (see Figure 3).

Instructional objectives specify student behaviors that are observable and measurable. Included are three elements: (a) descriptive—what will the student do; (b) conditional—under what conditions will the student perform; (c) evaluative—what will indicate success?

Additional factors affecting relevance and clarity can be addressed in specific questions: Is the objective relevant to the student's chronological age? Does it reflect specific abilities and identified needs? Would the objective transfer to future success in a functional environment? Are there available resources to implement the objective? Is the objective properly sequenced, grammatically correct, and easily understood? Does the objective result in a comparable interpretation by all who read it? Instructional objectives should reflect performance criteria and the method of measurement.

Anticipated time lines for meeting the criteria and the amount of time the student will receive services should also be stated (see Figure 4). Interventions, methods, and materials used should also be listed. The responsibilities of educational staff are outlined, along with the names of the individuals attending the staffing. The parents/guardians and student verify the PEP with their signatures.

Phase 5 Implementation, Progress Monitoring, & Revision

Once the PEP is written, on-going communication and assessment are vital. Review dates must be frequent, and progress on instructional objectives
must be recorded (see Figure 4). Revisions or modifications of
strategies/materials should be made when appropriate (Whitmore, 1985).

**Phase 6 Evaluation**

Review of the PEP should be made annually in relation to individual
growth and ongoing demonstration of need. Evaluation should also reflect
program effectiveness. Reevaluation to establish needs for additional or
continued services should occur prior to entering a new building level or every
three years. Written notification should be made if there is a change in
services. (see Figure 5). Parents/guardians have the right to examine all
information concerning identification, placement, and evaluation of their child.

**Conclusion**

Advantages of the PEP described in this article include the familiarity of
the local district with the special education format, the legality and specificity of
the documentation, and the place of gifted/talented on the continuum of special
needs due to ability. I have found this model to be effective with staff, parents
and students. The gifted and talented program merges with the total school
program and the charges of "elitism" disappear when services are viewed as a
need instead of a privilege.

Disadvantages include the time spent on paperwork, teachers lacking
education on writing effective PEPs, and, finally, the possibility of inappropriate
strategies for students with disabilities being applied to gifted and talented
students (Dettmer, 1994).

The greater amount of time spent on the paperwork may seem an
inconvenience to teachers who have precious little time to spare. However, the
defensibility of a well-designed education plan ensures the quality of programming. The IEP has been, and continues to be, a functional component of the special education program. In the end, the time invested in the PEP may allow teachers to work smarter, not harder.

Teachers who lack the skills to write a tenable PEP need to learn the skills. Teacher effectiveness is often directly related to the professional preparation and educational background appropriate to the field of gifted and talented education (Borland, 1989). Ongoing inservice education for the use of PEPs should be provided.

Students can be educated during the interview or as part of class time. Meetings with staff can be one on one, in team groups, or during a scheduled briefing. Parents can be informed by correspondence, brochures, an open house, and/or a special orientation night. A brief explanation of the process and forms during the PEP staffing is also helpful.

The use of inappropriate special education strategies applied to gifted and talented students can be avoided with clarification of terminology and procedures (Dettmer, 1994). This has never been a problem for me, and I have not found any of the disadvantages to be significant in practice. I believe the advantages outweigh disadvantages, once teachers become proficient in the use of student PEPs.
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PART II

TYPE OF STAFFING
___ Original ___ A Restaffing ___ Three-year __ X An Addendum

PUPIL: (Last) Johnson (First) Eric (Ml) --- Gender: M F Grade: 11

Legal Parent(s) Tim & Mary Johnson Address: 219 N. 8th, Adel, IA Ph: (H) 993-5154 Ph: (W) 993-4514

Guardian/ Parent(s) Address: Ph: (H) Ph: (W)

District/Building Student Attends: High School Special Services Currently Receiving: Advocacy, Special Opportunities/ Seminar

Parent Notification of Staffing: yes Date: 10 / 25 / 92 By: phone/MKD Date of Staffing: 11 / 2 / 92 Teacher(s): Wilden, Desenberg, Bolluyt, Phillips, Heitz, Smith, Baumberger

EVALUATIONS CONDUCTED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EVALUATIONS CONDUCTED</th>
<th>BY</th>
<th>DATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CoGAT</td>
<td>Middle S.</td>
<td>4/89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ver-145, Quan-134, Vis-140</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITED (10th grade, IA norms)</td>
<td>High S.</td>
<td>11/91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voc- 98, Rg T- 97, Lang T- 99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exp- 97, Math- 95, Core- 98, Comp- 99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACT (9th grade, through ISU)</td>
<td>Drake</td>
<td>12/90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Parent Consent: Mary Johnson

Date of Parent Consent: 10 / 26 / 92 Starting Date: 10 / 27 / 92

Date of Placement/Termination: 11 / 2 / 92

PRIMARY ABILITY(S): Language, reading, writing

PROGRAM RECOMMENDATIONS:

Compaction of composition class, acceleration of Spanish IV, test out of appropriate courses. Align required courses for early graduation.

JUSTIFICATION FOR RECOMMENDATIONS: (Short term sequence will be with the provider, if not in the student file.)

Student motivation, interest and abilities are commensurate with this recommendation. Parents and teachers support the suggested modifications.

Persons present at meeting: Eric Johnson Tim & Mary Johnson Mary K Desenberg Misti Baumberger
Linda Bolluyt Eric Heitz Penny Wilden Pat Phillips Jake Smith

Distribution: (1) Student file (white) (2) Teacher (yellow) (3) Parent (pink)
Figure 2. The Program Review/PEP, part III (1 of 2), sheet details concerns and links diagnosis of need in conjunction with the need assessment with appropriate instructional goals.
**Program Review/Personal Education Plan**

**Part III**

**Pupil:** (Last) Johnson  (First) Eric  (M) D  Gender: M  F

**District/Building Student Attends:** High School  
**Grade:** 11  
**Date of Meeting:** 11/2/92

**Teachers:** Wilden, Desenberg, Bolluyt, Phillips, Heitz, Smith, Baumberger

**Strengths:** Verbal Language, Language Arts, Performing Arts

**Interests:** Reading, Writing, Foreign Language, Art, Music, Theater

**Present Levels of Educational Performance** (Which describe the student's educational needs/behaviors of concern and describe the student's academic and nonacademic strengths/weaknesses. State goal behavior.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Concerns</strong></th>
<th><strong>Annual Goals</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spanish - wishes to go deeper &amp; harder, faster pace</td>
<td>Add AP level work, accelerate through work for extra time to explore foreign exchange opportunities,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cultural studies and prepare for the AP test.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French I - below ability level, low interest</td>
<td>Drop class 2nd quarter to free time for test-out preparation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composition - underchallenged, repetitive</td>
<td>Compact material, substituting harder work and freeing time to test out of subjects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early graduation for early college or foreign exchange experience.</td>
<td>Schedule required courses for the remainder of the year. Schedule test-out for 1-3 courses (American History, Government, Economics) in order to continue high interest electives and lessen course load of second semester.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 3. The Attachment to PEP describes an instructional goal (long term) and the instructional objectives (short term) for reaching the goal. Evaluative information is recorded on this form.
**PRACTICE PLAN:**

**ACTION TO BE TAKEN:**

- Teacher will assign only essential assignments to demonstrate student competency, at a level commensurate with the student's abilities. Student will check with the teacher at the beginning of class and have the option of involvement in special events or activities. The student will work independently in the library.
- The student will use the teacher as a resource and the teacher will grade the student work.
- The student will be able to use additional time to study for testing out of other course work.
- The student will continue writing in his journal as part of the assigned work.

**PROGRESS UPDATE:**

- Mon., 3rd hr.
- 12/2/92

**PERSON RESPONSIBLE:**

Wilden
Figure 4. The Program Review/PEP, part III (2 of 2), outlines the procedure of monitoring progress and delineates responsibilities. Verification of the PEP is signed by the parent/guardian and student.
### Extent of Participation in:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject/Activity</th>
<th>Req. Ed</th>
<th>Mod</th>
<th>TAG</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Composition</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2nd quarter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish IV</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2nd quarter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French I</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Drop 2nd quarter</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Related/Support Service:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Estimated Time</th>
<th>Schedule*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Counseling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progress monitor</td>
<td>30 min.</td>
<td>Mon., 3rd hour</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Describe modifications for Regular Education Participation:

(Include those collaboratively planned)

Composition class for the remainder of the semester will be compacted on a unit by unit basis with the student reporting to class for attendance and to receive information. The student will work independently in the library on class assignments, finishing the assignments and then working on material that will enable the student to test out of subjects the following semester. If a special event or activity is occurring in the classroom, the student will remain. The student has the option to choose to participate in some assignments (such as writing a children's book). In Spanish IV, the student will accelerate on a unit by unit basis, adding AP level work and cultural explorations with the additional time. The student will receive a pass/fail grade and the classroom teacher will assess the student's progress.

### Primary Needs: Language Modification

### Estimated Duration of This Plan

From 11/2/92 To 1/17/93

### Verification of PEP

Parent: [Signature]
Date: 11/2/92

Parent: [Signature]
Date: 11/2/92

Student: [Signature]
Date: 11/2/92

Distribution: (1) Student file (white) (2) Teacher (yellow) (3) Parent (pink)
Figure 5. The Parent Notice of Change In Services... may be warranted based upon evaluation and/or demonstrated need.
DEAR PARENT(S)/GUARDIAN: Beginning this school year the school is planning to make the change(s) described below in the GATE services being provided for your child. They will become part of your child's current PEP. Please review this information.

TYPE OF CHANGES RECOMMENDED: (X)

- Pull In
- Resource Room
- Compacting of Regular Curriculum
- Classroom Extension
- Acceleration
- Advocacy
- Special Opportunities (Competitions/Seminar...)

Termination of Services:

1. No further service is needed at this time; reassigned to the regular school program on a full-time basis.

2. No further support in the area of ______________ is needed.

3. No further services are required. This student will graduate from this school.

4. Will this student continue to receive services? NO YES; if so, in what area? ______________

DESCRIPTION OF CHANGES: RE: State Mandate 12.5 (12)

(a) Give a description of the action proposed or refused by the district.

Eric will be accelerated in Spanish IV through the rest of the year in order to free up time for AP level work. He will drop French I, and compact English Composition. With the additional time, Eric will work on testing out of 1-2 subjects. The goal is to make him eligible for early graduation.

(b) Give an explanation of why the district proposed or refused to take the action.

Eric is currently underchallenged in the three areas mentioned above. He wishes to start college early or to have the option to do college level work. He is also currently exploring the option of involvement in a foreign exchange experience. In order to meet these goals, he needs to finish his requirements for graduation next semester.

Attach additional information page(s) if more space is needed. If you have any questions, please contact me as soon as possible. Attach Educational Staffing Report/Personal Education Plan that document the change(s) in services.

Signature: 
Date: 11/2/92 Phone: 993-5555 Delivered to parents via: Mail

Distribution: (1) Student file (white) (2) Teacher (yellow) (3) Parent (pink)
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