1990

A survey of acceleration programs and selection criteria for intellectually gifted elementary children in selected Iowa school districts, 1989-1990

Christy A. VanDeventer
University of Northern Iowa

A survey of acceleration programs and selection criteria for intellectually gifted elementary children in selected Iowa school districts, 1989-1990

Abstract

Controversy continues in the realm of acceleration for gifted children. Acceleration is widely accepted and endorsed by experts in the field of talented and gifted education as a viable, valid, and necessary aspect in meeting the needs of intellectually gifted students (Aldrich, 1989; Bolenbaugh, 1980; Brody & Benbow, 1987; Daniel & Cox, 1987; Gohlke, 1979; Huffman, 1983; Kulik & Kulik, 1984; Pollins, 1983). However, it is an objectionable option for many educational policy makers and practitioners in the educational field and in local schools (Southern, Jones, & Fiscus, 1989).

A SURVEY OF ACCELERATION PROGRAMS AND SELECTION CRITERIA FOR INTELLECTUALLY GIFTED ELEMENTARY CHILDREN IN SELECTED IOWA SCHOOL DISTRICTS, 1989-1990

A Research Paper

Submitted to the

Department of Curriculum and Instruction

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Master of Arts in Education

Christy A. VanDeventer

University of Northern Iowa

August 1990

This Research Paper by: Christy A. VanDeventer

Entitled: A SURVEY OF ACCELERATION PROGRAMS AND SELECTION CRITERIA FOR INTELLECTUALLY GIFTED ELEMENTARY CHILDREN IN SELECTED IOWA SCHOOL DISTRICTS, 1989-1990

has been approved as meeting the research paper requirements for the Degree of Master of Arts in Education.

July 19, 1990
Date

William Waack
Director of Research Paper

July 19, 1990
Date

William Waack
Graduate Faculty Advisor

July 19, 1990
Date

Marvin Heller
Graduate Faculty Reader

July 20, 1990
Date

Roger A. Kueter
Head, Department of Curriculum and Instruction

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

A very special acknowledgement is due to my advisor, Dr. William Waack, who also served as the advisor for this paper. His guidance, encouragement, and patience are deeply appreciated. The time he spends with his students and the personal interest he takes in them is laudable.

Thank you also to Dr. Marvin Heller, who served as the second reader for my paper.

A special note of gratitude is extended to Joyce Taylor for her unique talents in the production of this paper.

And finally, I dedicate this work to my husband, David, and my daughters, Kaci and Kelli, of Algona, Iowa. Their support and encouragement have been invaluable.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM

Controversy continues in the realm of acceleration for gifted children. Acceleration is widely accepted and endorsed by experts in the field of talented and gifted education as a viable, valid, and necessary aspect in meeting the needs of intellectually gifted students (Aldrich, 1989; Bolenbaugh, 1980; Brody & Benbow, 1987; Daniel & Cox, 1987; Gohlke, 1979; Huffman, 1983; Kulik & Kulik, 1984; Pollins, 1983). However, it is an objectionable option for many educational policy makers and practitioners in the educational field and in local schools (Southern, Jones, & Fiscus, 1989).

Although acceleration need not comprise the total gifted program, an alternative such as this does meet a need that cannot be met with other provisions. Frequently, acceleration has been shown to be effective in meeting students' academic, social, and emotional needs (Brody & Benbow, 1987; Bolenbaugh, 1980; Gohlke, 1979; Kulik & Kulik, 1984). It also has been considered successful and effective when examined retrospectively (Brody & Benbow, 1987; Janos, 1987). However, research has shown that educational practitioners have very conservative sentiments regarding acceleration of students (Southern, Jones, & Fiscus, 1989), thereby necessitating a close examination of present

district practices. The writer has observed, through observation and experience, that similar sentiments exist in the State of Iowa.

Recently, the State of Iowa has joined other states in mandating some type of gifted education for all grade levels of gifted students. Funding is available through the Department of Education, and many programs are being implemented. However, the writer has discovered no formal study of the present status of acceleration programs in Iowa, either regionally or statewide.

Statement of the Problem

Since Iowa school standards now mandate programs for gifted and talented, it is necessary for educators and policy makers to examine carefully what school districts' gifted programs encompass. Are the programs meeting the varied needs of gifted students as the law intends, including acceleration needs? Daniel & Cox (1988) state that "between 20-25% of the students in our public schools can handle material about a year ahead of where their age would place them" (p. 73) and approximately 1-2% can advance 2 or more years ahead of grade level. This information would seem to indicate that acceleration of students through curriculum should be implemented to a greater extent than seems to be the case in most Iowa districts. We, as responsible educators, need to determine to what extent acceleration alternatives in educational

programming for gifted students are being provided and how the decisions for student placement in acceleration programs are made.

Therefore, the problem is to answer certain questions. To what extent are school districts responding to research supporting acceleration as a necessary option for making the best match between a gifted child's ability and achievement and the curricula which those students must learn? When students are accelerated within the educational system, on what basis is the decision made? What criteria are used in the selection of students for acceleration alternatives? Who initially recognized the student's need for acceleration?

Purpose of the Study

The purposes of this study were fourfold. Primarily, it sought to determine the types of acceleration programs for intellectually gifted elementary students currently implemented in all the Iowa public school districts in: Area Education Agency 3 (AEA 3), Area Education Agency 4 (AEA 4), Area Education Agency 5 (AEA 5), and Area Education Agency 12 (AEA 12). The study also sought to determine the extent to which acceleration programs are used, the criteria used in selecting or determining which students are enrolled in the acceleration alternative, and other factors which need to be considered when implementing acceleration programs.

In order to fulfill the purposes of this study, a questionnaire was designed to survey the public school districts in AEA 3, AEA 4, AEA 5, and AEA 12. It sought to provide information in four different areas.

First, the survey solicited information concerning the type of elementary acceleration programs being used in the district. Information collected from the questionnaire was used to answer the following questions:

1. What type(s) of acceleration was made available in public schools at the elementary level?

2. What percentage of the district's elementary students was accelerated in each of the acceleration programs the district provided?

Second, the survey sought to determine the initiators of the selection process as a means of determining who first recognized the student's need for acceleration. The information was used to ascertain whether the selection of a child for entry into an acceleration program was initiated by parent, teacher, standardized test scores, the student, administrator, counselor, or other methods as identified by respondents.

Third, the survey sought information identifying the criteria used in determining a student's qualification for entry into each acceleration program. The information collected was used to answer the following questions:

1. What criteria are used to determine if students qualify for acceleration programs?

2. When standardized tests are used in determining if a student qualifies for acceleration, what are the minimum scores most frequently accepted by districts?

Fourth, the survey instrument requested information regarding other concerns related to acceleration programs. The information gathered was used to answer the following questions:

1. In how many districts do accelerated students leave their regular attendance center in order to participate in the acceleration program?

2. Do schools provide counseling which helps the accelerated students with their social and emotional needs?

3. Does the acceleration program provide for continuous progress through the kindergarten to twelfth grade curriculum?

Definition of Terms

Gifted and Talented.

For the purposes of this study, the term gifted and talented shall be used to refer to the intellectually gifted student population of elementary age.

Intellectual Ability.

For the purpose of this study, the Iowa Plan of Action (1975) definition will be used. It refers to the

intellectually gifted child as one with an advanced aptitude for reasoning and conceptualization. The child's mental development is accelerated well beyond the average to the extent that he or she needs and can profit from specially planned educational services, unique materials, learning settings, and other educational services beyond those normally provided by the standard school program.

Acceleration.

Acceleration refers to the time element in education. Acceleration programs allow a student to progress through the curriculum at a more rapid pace than normal or at ages younger than conventional (DeHaan, 1961; Pressey, 1949).

Early Admission to Elementary School.

A child enters kindergarten or first grade at an age below that which is conventional.

Grade Skipping.

A child is moved ahead one or more grade levels or a part of a grade without having completed all the work of that grade, but having demonstrated that the skills were mastered.

Flexible Pacing.

In flexible pacing, a student completes the entire curriculum in less than normal time, rather than omitting part of the curriculum as is the case in "skipping." Flexible pacing places the student at an appropriate instructional level without changing his or her grade level

label, creating the best possible match between the student's achievement and instruction. Flexible pacing may be accomplished in several ways:

1. Students may be grouped, "clustered", with other bright students who cover the curriculum more rapidly thus providing continuous progress through the conventional curriculum.

2. Students may attend summer school or out-of-school classes enabling them to cover more content in a shorter time period.

3. Teachers may compact curriculum thus assuring student competency, yet allowing the student(s) to complete the entire curriculum in a shorter time period.

4. Students may attend concurrent or dual enrollment in classes of similar content areas. For example, a fourth-grade student might take both fourth and fifth-grade mathematics. (Daniel & Cox, 1988)

Acceleration by Content Area.

A child is placed at the appropriate level in a specific content area at which he/she excels.

Delimitations and Limitations

The findings and conclusions of this study are subject to some delimitations and limitations:

1. The study is limited to the elementary grades, Kindergarten through Grade Six.

2. Another limit imposed is that research literature of only the past 10 years will be examined.

3. The intent of the study was to collect and organize information pertinent to the acceleration programs in elementary schools in public school systems in the Iowa regions of Area Education Agency 3, Area Education Agency 4, Area Education Agency 5, and Area Education Agency 12. Therefore, the generalizability of responses to other states, or even other regions in the state, may be limited.

4. The results of the study are limited to the extent to which questionnaires were returned by the identified school districts.

Summary

This chapter introduces the use of acceleration as a part of gifted programs. Because of the lack of formal study concerning acceleration programs for elementary students in Iowa, either statewide or regionally, the need for a descriptive study was identified. Finally, the purpose of the study, the definitions of terms, and the limitations and delimitations of this particular study were delineated.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The effectiveness of acceleration in programming to meet the needs of gifted students is evidenced throughout the literature. However, in practice, it is equally evident that acceleration is viewed warily.

This review of the literature regarding acceleration will be limited to the articles and research of the last decade. The review examines: (a) the academic effects of acceleration, (b) the social and emotional effects of acceleration, (c) the long-term effects of acceleration, (d) the criteria which have been used to identify students for acceleration, and (e) basic recommendations of experts regarding acceleration for gifted students.

To locate the related literature and studies, a search of the Educational Research Information Center (ERIC) was conducted on the CD-ROM Silver-Platter system available at the University of Northern Iowa. Information was retrieved from microfiche and various professional journals in the field of gifted education such as Gifted Child Quarterly, Roeper Review, and Gifted Child Today. Dissertation Abstracts International and a variety of professional books and textbooks were also examined as sources of information.

Literature Review

The history of acceleration is varied in the extent to which acceleration is practiced and accepted, but acceleration has always been an option in academic programming (Bolenbaugh, 1980; Coleman & Fults, 1985; Gohlke, 1979; Weitzel, 1989; Whitmore, 1980). Recent research specifies the students that participate in acceleration opportunities. Those students vary in degree of giftedness, specific content being accelerated, age, sex, and geographic location (Aldrich & Mills, 1989; Brody & Benbow, 1987; Huffman, 1983; Janos, 1987). However, there were no actual studies reflecting the use of acceleration alternatives in Iowa. Informal conversations with other Iowa educators of the gifted reflected only insignificant use of acceleration for gifted students in Iowa, especially at the elementary grade level. These same conversations, however, reflected success when acceleration was implemented.

Academic Effects of Acceleration

Despite a consensus among researchers and educators of the gifted supporting the academic effectiveness of acceleration (Aldrich & Mills, 1989; Brayman & Fiersel, 1987; Brody & Benbow, 1987; Daniel & Cox, 1988; Fox & Washington, 1985; Huffman, 1983; Janos, 1987; Kulik & Kulik, 1984; Proctor, Black, & Feldhusen, 1988; Saurenmen, 1980), it is a seldom used educational program for gifted students

(Daniel & Cox, 1988; Gallagher, Weiss, Oglesby, & Thomas, 1983; Southern, Jones, & Fiscus, 1989; Whitmore, 1980). This irregular use of acceleration through the years seems to be a reflection of cultural and social biases rather than research results (Bolenbaugh, 1980; Fox & Washington, 1985; Gohlke, 1979; Weitzel, 1989). The conservative view that most educational practitioners hold toward acceleration also is a reflection of the social and cultural biases (Southern et al., 1989).

Extensive evidence points to the academic effectiveness of acceleration (Bolenbaugh, 1980; Daniel & Cox, 1988; Gohlke, 1979; Janos, 1987; Kulik & Kulik, 1984; Pollins, 1983; Sawyer, 1983; Weitzel, 1989). Kulik and Kulik's (1984) meta-analysis of the effects of acceleration examined research that was quantitative and contained control groups. The matched control groups varied according to the individual studies: (a) 13 studies had same-age control groups, (b) 13 other studies had older-age control groups. Kulik and Kulik's study (1984) concluded that accelerants achieved significantly better than the same-age controls in 9 of the 13 studies concerning academic achievement of accelerated students. In the remaining four groups with same-age control groups, the accelerants were not significantly different from the control group. In 5 of the 13 studies with older-age control groups, the results showed that the accelerants were better achievers; they were

significantly better in two of the studies. The remaining eight studies with older-age control groups reported no significant difference. This positive evidence regarding the academic effects of acceleration is reflected in nearly all literature concerning education of the gifted.

Social and Emotional Effects of Acceleration

Evidence of the social and emotional effectiveness of acceleration, although somewhat contradictory, still reflects a very high rate of effectiveness (Braymen & Fiersel, 1987; Brody & Benbow, 1987; Coleman & Fults, 1985; Daniel & Cox, 1988; Huffman, 1983; Janos & Robinson, 1985; Janos, Fung, & Robinson, 1985; Lehman & Erdwins, 1981; Pollins, 1983; Saurenman & Michael, 1980). The contradictory results concerning the social/emotional impact of acceleration most likely are due to the fact that methodologies, operational definitions, and even populations have varied a great deal. This variety of approaches is exemplified in many ways. For example, many studies addressing acceleration and its affective effects on students address it from the perspective of the secondary gifted student or the adult (Brody & Benbow, 1987; Kulik & Kulik, 1984). Others have focused on mathematically accelerated (Brody & Benbow, 1987) or addressed the social/emotional effects after the students became adults (Huffman, 1983; Janos, 1987).

A variety of methods also have been used to measure social and emotional effects of acceleration. Brody & Benbow (1987) used questionnaires to gather information about student participation in extra-curricular activities, leadership roles, and their goals as a way of determining the social/emotional adjustment of the student. Other studies have used various instruments that measure self-concept or self-esteem (Janos, Fung, & Robinson, 1985; Lehman & Erdwins, 1981; Maddux, Scheiber, & Bass, 1982; Saurenman & Michael, 1980).

There also is a variety of acceleration programs to be found among the studies. Some of the studies did give the procedures for identifying those who were accelerated, but those also varied from study to study.

Lack of similarity from study to study has made it difficult to be precise in generalizing about the social/emotional effects of acceleration. Most studies, however, do conclude that accelerated students adjust socially and emotionally as well or better than nonaccelerated gifted students (Braymen & Piersel, 1987; Janos & Robinson, 1985; Janos, Fung, & Robinson, 1985; Pollins, 1983). A few show slight to significant negative social and emotional adjustment by accelerated gifted as compared to nonaccelerated gifted students (Kulik & Kulik, 1984; Maddux & Scheiber, 1982). Most of the adjustment problems seem to be associated with acceleration begun in

the adolescent years where adjustment problems are more common among all students. They especially affect the adolescent female (Eccles, 1985; Janos & Robinson, 1985; Werner & Bachtold, 1986). A few studies which address the accelerated elementary gifted student do agree that there are no significant social and emotional adjustment problems as a result of acceleration (Aldrich & Mills, 1989; Huffman, 1983; Lehman & Erdwins, 1981; Saurenman & Michael, 1980; Sonnenburg, 1983). These few studies vary in the selection of the samples studied and in the instruments used to measure affective effects of acceleration.

Long Term Effects of Acceleration

Janos's (1987) 50-year follow-up study of Terman's youngest college students and IQ matched agemates was an excellent long-term study of the results of acceleration. His study revealed that the early college entrants graduated from college 3 1/2 years earlier than the comparison subjects due to acceleration not only in college, but before eighth grade and during high school as well. Janos's results were:

> "entirely favorable to the younger students in terms of academic achievement and extracurricular activities in college. Afterwards, the younger students fared at least as well as the older ones. [The younger students] began professional careers earlier, and

earned higher ratings of success from the Terman project staff." (p. 57)

The Janos (1987) study also showed that the psychological adjustment and social participation were not significantly different from the control group of matched older-age students. However, advanced social maturity was a criterion in the recommendation of those students who were accelerated. Janos stated that Terman also provided a great deal of personal support for those early college entrants. Those factors could be significant in the success of the accelerated students social and emotional adjustment.

A second study that dealt with long-term effects of acceleration was Huffman's (1983) study of fourth-sixth graders as adults. It showed very positive academic, emotional, and social long-term results of accelerated programming. The study consisted of a survey distributed to 15 students who had participated in a 3-year acceleration program. Ten of the 15 completed and returned the survey. The instrument used a Likert scale with items concerning affective and social attitudes and development as well as academic items. Long-term peer involvement, social development, and self-confidence were rated positively. Cognitive characteristics that students rated high were memory, adjusting, imagination/creativity, inquisitiveness, brightness, retention, competitiveness, and learning fast. The mean of the high school class standing of the

respondents was within the top 2% of the class. Huffman concluded, "The class was beneficial and of such a quality that the program should be continued" (p. 253).

Nearly all of the long-term studies dealing with acceleration of students involved small sample populations. The population that was typically identified (IQs of 140 or more in the case of Janos's follow-up study of Terman's early college entrants) is, to begin with, a small portion of the normal population of a school district. The passage of time, however, decreases that sample even more. Nevertheless, conclusions drawn from the research with such small sample populations must not be ignored. It is the obligation of educators to meet those students' educational needs.

Criteria for Determining Acceleration

Criteria used in determining who will be accelerated varied greatly from study to study. When IQs were used as a determinant, they ranged from 120 to 135 as the lowest accepted score for entrance into an acceleration program (Aldrich et al., 1989; Braymen et al., 1987; Daniel & Cox, 1988; Janos, 1987; Portes, 1984; Sawyer, 1983; Sonnenburg, 1983). However, seldom was IQ the sole determinant. Other criteria were used as suggested by experts in the field of gifted education (Horowitz & O'Brien, 1986; Maker, 1982; Webb, 1982; Whitmore, 1980). These criteria included: intellectual ability; intellectual achievement, often

measured by high-ceilinged achievement tests or out-of-grade-level testing; social and emotional maturity; health and size; family and individual desire for acceleration. Also included in the decision in some instances was the ability of the school to provide continuous acceleration for the child.

Recommendations of Experts and Researchers

Many experts and researchers in the field of gifted education recommend acceleration overwhelmingly (Aldrich & Mills, 1989; Brody & Benbow, 1987; Daniel & Cox, 1988; Fox & Washington, 1985; Huffman, 1983; Janos, 1987; Kulik & Kulik, 1984; Proctor, Black, & Feldhusen, 1988; Saurenmen, 1980). They feel that, academically, it provides a valuable strategy for improving scholarship, reducing mental laziness, allowing for earlier completion of professional training, and reducing the total cost of education, particularly at the collegiate level.

Experts pose several questions that must be considered when implementing acceleration as an educational program alternative. Those questions as reflected by the literature are:

1. Is the student appropriately placed by well determined criteria in the acceleration program that is being offered?

2. Is counseling provided which helps the accelerated students with their social and emotional needs?

3. Does the acceleration program provide for continuous progress through the curriculum?

4. Does the acceleration program consist of content and product changes?

Portes's (1984) review of research evaluating preschool to third-grade gifted programs stated that both acceleration and enrichment techniques are effective if individualization occurs. He went on to suggest that early entrance and interage grouping should be employed, based on readiness criteria. Teachers in the regular and accelerated programs can be trained to be more aware of gifted students' needs so that the special services these students receive foster positive attitudes towards learning and positive academic growth.

Sawyer (1983) reflected that rigid syllabi and lock-step teaching of content curricula ignore real forces in the mind that promote development and learning. He stated further that those rigid strategies foster resentment in gifted children, particularly when drill continues after a skill is learned. Therefore, he recommended acceleration as an alternative educational program for those students.

Summary

In summary, extensive evidence points to the academic effectiveness of acceleration. Evidence of the social and emotional effectiveness of acceleration, although somewhat contradictory, still reflects positive results. Adjustment

problems seem to be most prevalent in adolescence, particularly female adolescents. Studies of long-term effects of acceleration consistently favored acceleration.

Experts and researchers support acceleration while, at the same time, they pose questions for educators to consider when implementing acceleration programs. Also, many educational practitioners are uncomfortable diagnosing and alleviating affective problems which they feel are associated with social and emotional effects of acceleration. Those concerns, however, have not been reflected in most of the acceleration research (Daniel & Cox, 1988; Gallagher, 1983; Southern et al., 1989). When these concerns are addressed, the literature seems to indicate that acceleration can become an accepted, viable strategy to be used along with the others in meeting the educational needs of our gifted students.

CHAPTER III

METHOD AND PROCEDURES

This chapter describes the methods and procedures used in this study. It contains (a) the statement of the problem, (b) a discussion of the population studied and the response rate, (c) the method used to collect data, and (d) the methods used to process and analyze the data collected.

Statement of Purpose

The purpose of this study was to determine the types of acceleration programs for intellectually gifted elementary students currently being used in identified public school systems in Iowa during the 1988-1990 school years. The study also sought to determine the extent to which acceleration programs are utilized, information regarding how identification of accelerated students was initiated, the criteria which were used to identify which students should be accelerated, and other factors related to the implementation of acceleration programs.

Population

This study obtained information from a finite population of 110 public school districts in Area Education Agencies (AEA) 3, 4, 5, and 12. The person initially contacted for information in each district was the superintendent of schools. The cover letter accompanying the instrument instructed the superintendent to forward the

questionnaire to the appropriate personnel if such information was not available to him/her. Appendix C contains a list of school districts to which the surveys were sent.

Instrument

A mail survey questionnaire was used to obtain data for this particular study for several reasons. First, because the survey involved a large regional population in Iowa, the mail survey was a relatively less expensive means than either the personal interview or telephone survey. Second, the Iowa Department of Education maintains an updated computer mailing list of school districts in Iowa with AEA affiliation listed. Third, since the survey contained some questions, the answers to which required some search, the mail format allowed for completion at the convenience of the respondent.

Because there is no formal listing of school personnel responsible for acceleration programs of gifted students, the survey was mailed to superintendents with instructions to forward the survey to other personnel with the necessary information when appropriate. This was deemed the most feasible strategy for obtaining a most accurate sampling of the acceleration programs for elementary gifted students offered by each district.

The formulation of the questionnaire and the collection of data involved a process which took approximately 3

months. After a review of the literature was completed, writing of the questionnaire commenced. Upon its completion, a draft of the instrument was informally reviewed by the Executive Board of Lakeland TAG (a group of teachers/coordinators of gifted programs in AEA 3 affiliated with Iowa Talented and Gifted) before being sent to the designated population.

The survey instrument was divided into five sections and printed on legal-size paper. It was designed so that when folded, a stamp and preprinted return address label were appropriately placed for return mailing. A cover letter also was printed and mailed with the instrument. The final copies of the cover letters and questionnaire appear in Appendices A & B.

Each of the first four sections of the instrument was designed to obtain information concerning a specific type of acceleration program. A definition of the particular type of acceleration headed each section. The first question was developed to obtain information about the number of students enrolled for each particular program alternative. The second question in each section was designed to solicit information concerning how identification of students for that acceleration program was initiated. The third question was designed to acquire information regarding the criteria used in determining student acceleration.

The fifth section was designed to obtain information concerning total elementary school enrollment and support provisions for acceleration programs. The first question requested the enrollment figure for the elementary level of the district. The next question procured information regarding attendance center logistics for acceleration programs. The third question obtained information regarding counseling services for accelerated students. The fourth question procured information about the continuation of such acceleration from the kindergarten to the 12th grade level of the curriculum. The fifth question provided the respondent with an opportunity to comment on any acceleration program the district might offer that was not addressed in the previous four sections. The last question requested the respondent's title/position so that the researcher could ascertain the source of information.

Data Collection

On April 30th, 1990, a final copy of the questionnaire and cover letter were sent by first class mail to the superintendents of the 110 public school districts in Area Education Agencies (AEA) 3, 4, 5, and 12. The initial return date was May 12, 1990, at which time 53 (48%) surveys had been returned. A second mailing of the questionnaire to nonrespondents took place on May 19, 1990. By June 15, 1990, an additional 29 questionnaires, totalling 82 (75%)

had been received. Those 82 questionnaires became the basis for the findings of this study.

Data Analysis

The replies of 82 respondents were used to summarize the findings. The data were tabulated by hand. The investigator also examined each returned questionnaire individually. It was reviewed from the viewpoint of the questions for which respondents could specify other answers and from the viewpoint of the questions that could contain multiple answers.

Since this survey was conducted for the purpose of making descriptive assertions about specific acceleration programs used by public elementary schools, the analysis of data involved the computation of frequency distributions and percentages and the use of ranking scales. The findings derived from an analysis of the tabulated data can be found in chapter 4.

CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS OF THE STUDY

The stated purpose of this study was to determine the types of acceleration programs for intellectually gifted elementary students currently used by 110 identified Iowa public school districts located in Area Education Agency 3 (AEA 3), Area Education Agency 4 (AEA 4), Area Education Agency 5 (AEA 5), and Area Education Agency 12 (AEA 12). The study also sought to determine the extent of use of acceleration within curricular programs, the criteria used to identify those students for acceleration, methods for initiation of identification, and related factors inherent to the implementation of acceleration programs.

To accomplish this purpose, questionnaires were sent to superintendents of 110 identified public school districts. Eighty-two (75%) questionnaires were completed and returned. Those replies were used to summarize the findings.

Respondent and School District Information

The questionnaire and cover letter were mailed to the district superintendent with instructions to forward the instrument to the person most appropriate to complete it. Question S of the survey solicited the respondent's title. Table 1 displays the data from this question. It shows that over 47 (57%) of the respondents were either superintendents or principals, while 33 (40%) were coordinators and/or

Table 1

Position Title of the Questionnaire Respondents

Position Title	Number	Percentage
	(n=82)	
Superintendent	33	40.3
Elementary Principal	14	17.1
Curriculum Director	0	0
TAG Coordinator	4	4.9
TAG Coordinator/Teacher	23	28.0
TAG Teacher	6	7.3
Other	2	2.4

teachers of gifted programs.

The elementary enrollment figures for school districts responding to Question N of the survey are displayed in Table 2. The enrollment of schools in the sample reflect the enrollment of school districts in the region as well as the State of Iowa. Over 64% of the districts show an elementary enrollment under 400. Of these 82 participating districts, 42 (51%) had no acceleration program. Forty (49%) of the 82 respondents provided at least one of the acceleration alternatives presented in the questionnaire.

Table 2

Elementary Enrollment of Participating School Districts

Elementary Enrollment	Number With No Acceleration	Number With Acceleration	Percentage Of Total Respondents
	(n=42)	(n=40)	(n=82)
Under 200	10 (23.8)	16 (40.0)	31.8
200-299	8 (19.0)	6 (15.0)	17.1
300-399	9 (21.4)	4 (10.0)	15.9
400-499	1 (2.4)	3 (7.5)	4.9
500-749	3 (7.1)	3 (7.5)	7.3
750 and over	2 (4.8)	5 (12.5)	8.5
No Response	9 (21.4)	3 (7.5)	14.6

Note. ( ) = percent.

It is interesting to note that while 31.8% of the 82 responding districts had an elementary population under 200, those same districts comprised 40% of the respondents of the districts stating that they offer some type of acceleration. Acceleration programs were reported in each school size category.

Question O in the survey requested information from districts as to whether students leave their regular

attendance center in order to participate in the acceleration program. The data revealed that 51 (62.1%) of the 82 respondents do not transport students to an attendance center other than that which they would normally attend. Six (7.3%) of the participants do transport students to another attendance center, and those 6 districts represent 15% of the 40 districts offering some type of acceleration. Twenty-five (30.5%) of the districts did not respond to this question because they do not offer acceleration programs in their districts.

Fifteen (18.3%) of the responding districts stated that they provide counseling services to accelerated students to meet their social and emotional needs. Forty-three (53.4%) do not provide counseling services for accelerated students. The 24 (29.3%) who did not answer Question P do not provide any acceleration programs.

Twenty-four (29.3%) schools reported that their district does provide continuous progress through the K-12 curriculum in their acceleration programs. Twenty-three (28.0%) reported that their district does not provide continuous progress through the curriculum in their acceleration programs. Of the 35 (42.7%) respondents who did not reply to Question Q, 30 (36.6%) do not offer acceleration at the elementary level in their districts.

Early Entrance

Twelve of the 82 (14.6%) responding school districts identified themselves as having established an early entrance policy which allows a child initial entry to kindergarten or first grade at an earlier than normal age. Six of these 12 school districts indicated that provisions for early entrance are made in kindergarten, and 3 districts stated that they provide an opportunity for early entrance in first grade. Early entrance was the only acceleration option offered by 2 of these 12 districts.

Only 4 districts of the 12 answering this section reported enrollment figures for early entrance during the 1989-1990 academic year. Table 3 displays those responses.

Table 3

Number of Students Enrolled Through Early Entrance, 1989-90

Respondent	Kindergarten Enrollees	First Grade Enrollees
A	2	0
B	6	6
C	1	0
D	0	2

Respondents also were asked to rank by frequency who or what initiated the identification of pupils to be accelerated through early entrance. The information for the 12 schools using the early entrance option is displayed in Table 4.

Table 4

Initiators of Identification for Early Entrance Ranked by Frequency

	Number of Districts Ranking Initiator as:						
Initiator	1st	2nd	3rd	4th	5th	6th	7th
Parent(s)	6	1	1	1	0	0	0
Teacher(s)	2	4	1	1	0	0	0
Standardized Test	1	1	2	2	1	0	0
Administrator	0	1	1	1	0	2	0
Counselor	0	1	1	0	2	0	0
Student (Self)	0	0	1	1	1	1	1
Other	0	0	1	0	1	0	0

Note. When respondent indicated several initiators, but did not rank order them, each was ranked as most frequent initiator (1st).

In the responding districts, parents were indicated as being the most frequent initiator of the identification process for early entrance. Teachers were often the second most frequent initiator, followed by standardized test scores. Administrators, counselors, and the student were initiators on a less frequent basis in these school districts. Other methods of initiating selection for early entrance ranked by the respondents were prior inclusion in a program for talented and gifted and teachers of the gifted.

Most of the responding school districts using the early entrance strategy establish multiple criteria to qualify a child for this type of acceleration. Two of the 12 districts use a single criterion: one uses percentile scores (Iowa norms) of achievement tests, while the other district uses a criterion which was not specified. Table 5 shows the criteria used by the responding districts.

Criteria used in identifying pupils for early entrance varied. Percentile scores (Iowa norms) of achievement tests were used in the selection process by 10 of the 12 respondents. Student grades (9 districts), ability test scores (8 districts), social/emotional maturity (8 districts), and student class participation (7 districts) were other identification criteria used by more than half of the districts. A student portfolio of products was the criteron least used by districts in the identification process. Four districts used criteria not included in the

Table 5

Specific Criteria Used to Qualify a Child for Early Entrance

Criterion	District												
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Iowa Percentile*	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X	X	X	10
National %ile*	X	X				X	X	X				X	6
Ability Test	X	X	X				X	X		X	X	X	8
Social Maturity		X	X		X	X	X			X	X	X	8
Student Grades	X	X	X			X	X	X		X	X	X	9
Portfolio		X	X				X						3
Participation		X	X		X	X		X		X		X	7
Other		X	X	X						X			4

Note. * = Percentile scores from achievement tests.

survey instrument. They include student reading level and interviews with parents.

The question concerning criteria also requested specific minimum qualifying percentile scores for the standardized tests used in the identification process. Seven of the 10 respondents using percentile scores (Iowa norms) of achievement tests shared their specific minimum qualifying scores. Two districts used the 97-99 percentile range; 2 districts used scores in the 94-96 percentile range; while 2 others placed minimum scores in the 91-93

percentile range. One district used a minimum score in the 88-90 percentile range.

Five of the 6 districts using percentile scores (national norms) for qualifying achievement test scores reported their specific minimum scores. Two districts used minimum scores in the 97-99 range. Another 2 districts placed minimum scores in the 94-96 percentile range. The fifth district reported using the 88-90 percentile range as their minimum qualifying score.

Specific ability test score percentiles were reported by seven of eight districts using them as criteria. Three districts' minimum qualifying scores were in the 97-99 percentile range. Another 2 districts used scores in the 94-96 percentile range. Two other districts stated that they used intelligence quotients (I.Q.) of 154 and 120, respectively.

Grade Skipping

Twelve of the 82 (14.6%) responding school districts identified themselves as having established a policy which allows a child to skip a grade, or part of a grade, without having spending time in that grade. Grade skipping is the only acceleration alternative offered in 4 of the 12 districts. Seven of the 12 districts reported the number of specific cases of grade skipping for the academic years of 1988-1989 and 1989-1990. Those enrollment figures, together with responding districts' elementary population, are

displayed in Table 6. Of the 7 districts reporting specific cases of grade skipping, only 1 district had more than one student who skipped a grade in a given academic year. The elementary enrollment of that district was 2598.

Table 6

Number of Students Skipping Grade Levels During 1988-1989 and 1989-1990 Academic Years

District	Population	1988-1989 Grade						1989-1990 Grade					
		1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6
1	175	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	79	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
3	132	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
4	141	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
5	2598	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0
6	210	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
7	137	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
Total	3472												

In the academic year 1988-1989, three students were accelerated by grade skipping out of a total elementary population of 3472 in the 7 responding school districts. In 1989-1990 five students were reported by the participating districts as being accelerated through grade skipping.

Together those figures are less than 0.2% of the elementary population of those responding districts.

Respondents also were asked to rank by frequency who or what initiated the identification of pupils to be accelerated through grade skipping. The information for the 12 school districts using the grade skipping option is displayed in Table 7.

Table 7

Initiators of Identification for Grade-Skipping Ranked by Frequency

Initiator	Number of Districts Ranking Initiator as: 1st	2nd	3rd	4th	5th	6th	7th
Parent(s)	7	1	1	1	0	0	0
Teacher(s)	3	4	2	0	0	0	0
Standardized Test	1	1	1	2	0	0	0
Administrator	0	1	1	1	1	0	0
Counselor	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Student (Self)	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
Other	0	1	0	0	0	0	0

Note. When respondent indicated several initiators, but did not rank order them, each was ranked as most frequent initiator (1st).

In the responding school districts, parents most frequently initiate the identification process for grade skipping. Teachers are the second most frequent initiators, followed by standardized tests and administrators. Counselors and students were listed as initiators on a less frequent basis. Also reported to be an initiator of the identification process in one district was the teacher of gifted.

Most of the responding school districts using the grade-skipping strategy establish multiple criteria to qualify a child for this type of acceleration. Table 8 displays this information.

Table 8

Specific Criteria Used to Qualify a Child for Grade Skipping

Criterion	District												
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Iowa Percentile*	X	X	X			X	X	X	X		X	X	9
National %ile*		X				X				X	X	X	5
Ability Test	X	X	X		X	X	X	X		X	X	X	10
Social Maturity	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	11
Student Grades	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	11
Portfolio	X				X	X	X				X	X	6
Participation	X			X	X	X	X			X	X	X	8
Other	X					X							2

Note. * = Percentile scores from achievement tests.

Criteria used in identifying pupils for grade skipping varied. Social/emotional maturity and student grades were used in the selection process by 11 of the 12 respondents. Ability test scores (10 districts), percentile scores (Iowa norms) of achievement tests (9 districts), and student participation in class (8 districts) were other identification criteria used by more than half of the responding districts. The student portfolio of products and percentile scores (national norms) of achievement tests were the criteria least used in the identification process for grade skipping; however, they were used in almost half of the districts. In two instances, reading level was added as an identification criteria.

The question concerning criteria also requested specific minimum qualifying percentile scores for the standardized tests used in the identification process. Five of the 9 respondents using percentile scores (Iowa norms) of achievement tests reported using scores in the 97-99 percentile range. Of the 5 school districts using percentile scores (national norms) of achievement tests, 3 stated that they used scores in the 97-99 percentile range for identification for grade skipping. Five of the 10 districts using ability test scores reported that the minimum score used for grade skipping was in the 97-99 percentile range.

Flexible Pacing

Twenty-one (25.6%) of the 82 responding school districts identified themselves as providing for flexible pacing. For the purpose of this study, flexible pacing could take any one of four types: clustering; summer school or out-of-school classes; compacting of curriculum; and concurrent/dual enrollment. Seven of the 21 districts use flexible pacing as their only acceleration program. Table 9 displays the types of flexible pacing the districts offer.

Eleven districts reported using clustering for acceleration in the classroom. Clustering is the sole flexible pacing option offered by 6 of those 11 respondents. Two districts offer summer school or out-of-school classes as an acceleration alternative. One of those 2 does not provide any other form of flexible pacing. Compacting of curriculum by individual teachers is used by 13 districts. In 7 of those 13 districts, compacting is the only type of flexible pacing used. Three districts offer concurrent/dual enrollment; and, for 1 district, that is the only type of flexible pacing provided.

Respondents also were asked to rank by frequency who or what initiated the identification of pupils to be accelerated through flexible pacing. The information for the 21 schools using flexible pacing options is displayed in Table 10.

In the responding districts, teachers most frequently

Table 9

Flexible Pacing Program Alternatives Offered by Districts

Types of Flexible Pacing	Number of Districts
	(n=21)
Clustering	11
Alone	6
With other flexible pacing options	5
Summer school/out-of-school	2
Alone	1
With other flexible pacing options	1
Compacting	13
Alone	7
With other flexible pacing options	6
Concurrent/dual enrollment	3
Alone	1
With other flexible pacing options	2

initiate the identification process for flexible pacing. Standardized tests were often the second most frequent initiator, followed by parents. Administrators, counselors, and the student were initiators on a less frequent basis in these school districts. Also reported to be initiators of the identification process for flexible pacing options were

Table 10

Initiators of Identification for Flexible Pacing Ranked by Frequency

Initiator	Number of Districts Ranking Initiator as: 1st	2nd	3rd	4th	5th	6th	7th
Parent(s)	2	3	2	0	0	1	0
Teacher(s)	13	4	0	0	0	0	0
Standardized Test	4	1	1	2	2	0	0
Administrator	1	1	1	2	1	1	0
Counselor	2	0	1	1	0	0	0
Student (Self)	2	1	3	1	1	0	0
Other	3	0	0	0	0	0	1

Note. When respondent indicated several initiators, but did not rank order them, each was ranked as most frequent initiator (1st).

teachers of the gifted.

Most responding school districts using flexible pacing establish multiple criteria to qualify a child for this type of acceleration. Table 11 displays this information.

Criteria used in identifying pupils for flexible pacing varied. Student grades were used in the selection process

Table 11

Specific Criteria Used to Qualify for Flexible Pacing

Criterion	District											
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
Iowa Percentile*	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
National %ile*					X			X			X	X
Ability Test	X	X			X			X		X	X	X
Social Maturity	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X		
Student Grades	X				X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Portfolio	X			X	X	X		X			X	
Participation	X			X	X	X	X	X	X	X		
Other	X				X							X

Table 11 cont.

Criterion	District									
	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	Total
Iowa Percentile*	X	X		X	X		X			15
National %ile*			X							5
Ability Test				X						8
Social Maturity	X			X		X	X		X	14
Student Grades	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	16
Portfolio		X					X	X		9
Participation			X	X		X	X		X	13
Other				X				X		5

Note. * = Percentile scores from achievement tests.

by 16 (76%) of the 21 respondents. Percentile scores (Iowa norms) of achievement tests were used by 15 (71%) districts; social/emotional maturity by 14 (67%) districts; and student participation in class by 13 (62%) districts. A student portfolio of products (43%), ability tests (38%), and percentile scores (national norms) of achievement tests (24%) were the criteria least used in the identification process for flexible pacing. Five districts used criteria not included in the survey instrument. These criteria include parent/teacher conferences, creativity test scores, abbreviated achievement tests, and pretests in reading and mathematics.

The question concerning criteria also requested specific minimum qualifying percentile scores for the standardized tests used in the identification process. Eleven of the 15 respondents using percentile scores (Iowa norms) of achievement tests reported specific minimum qualifying scores. Four districts used scores in the 97-99 percentile range. Three respondents used the 94-96 percentile range. Four other districts used the 88-90 percentile range.

Specific minimum percentile scores (national norms) of achievement tests were reported by only 3 of the 5 districts using these scores for identification. One district minimum was listed in the 94-96 percentile range; 1 district minimum was listed in the 91-93 percentile range; the third reported

the 88-90 percentile range as the minimum acceptable range for flexible pacing.

Specific minimum ability test scores were reported by only 4 of the 8 districts using these scores for identification for flexible pacing. One district reported the minimum score used for flexible pacing was in the 97-99 percentile range. One district's minimum was in 94-96 percentile range. The third district used the 91-93 percentile range as its minimum. A fourth district reported using 88-90 as the minimum acceptable percentile range for identification for flexible pacing.

Content Area Acceleration

Twenty-seven (32.9%) of the 82 responding school districts identified themselves as having acceleration in specific content areas. The content areas listed in the questionnaire were mathematics, reading, language arts, science, and social studies. For 7 of those 27 districts, content acceleration was the only type of acceleration provided.

Table 12 presents the enrollment figures for elementary acceleration by content area. Twenty of the 27 respondents accelerated pupils in the mathematics content area. Sixteen of the 27 responding districts accelerated students in the reading content area. Only 4 districts indicated that they accelerate students in the science content area, but those districts listed no specific enrollment. Those 4 districts

Table 12

Students Accelerated by Specific Content Areas (1989-90)

District/ Elementary Population	Number of Students by Specific Content Areas				
	Math	Reading	Science	Language Arts	Social Studies
1 / 37	N.E.	N.E.	N.E.	0	0
2 / 79	N.E.	N.E.	N.E.	N.E.	N.E.
3 / 118	2	2	0	0	0
4 / 120	0	0	0	1	0
5 / 120	4	4	0	1	0
6 / 132	1	1	0	0	0
7 / 140	1	0	0	0	0
8 / 141	6	0	0	0	0
9 / 175	0	2	0	0	0
10 / 175	N.E.	N.E.	N.E.	0	0
11 / 176	1	0	0	0	0
12 / 180	2	0	0	0	0
13 / 185	1	6	0	0	0
14 / 200	4	0	0	0	0
15 / 233	0	1	0	0	0
16 / 265	3	0	0	0	0

(table continued)

Table 12 cont.

District/ Elementary Population	Number of Students by Specific Content Areas				
	Math	Reading	Science	Language Arts	Social Studies
17 / 280	0	0	0	0	0
18 / 385	7	0	0	0	0
19 / 400	0	20	0	0	0
20 / 375	N.E.	N.E.	N.E.	N.E.	N.E.
21 / 480	0	18	0	0	0
22 / 661	0	45	0	0	0
23 / 700	N.E.	0	0	0	0
24 / 800	N.E.	0	0	0	0
25 /2598	4	179	0	0	0
26 /7000	3	3	0	0	0
27 /7428	N.E.	N.E.	0	0	0
Totals	____	____	____	____	____
23,583	39	281	0	2	0

Note. N.E. = No enrollment figures reported, but district indicated content acceleration in subject area.

omitted specific enrollment figures in all the content areas. Four districts also indicated acceleration in the language arts content area, with 2 reporting specific enrollments. Two districts indicated that there is acceleration in the social studies content area, but they presented no enrollment figures. It is interesting to note that only 322 (1.4%) students of a total elementary population of 23,583 in the population studied are being accelerated in content areas.

Respondents also were asked to rank by frequency who or what initiated the identification of pupils to be accelerated through specific content areas. This information is displayed in Table 13.

According to the collected data, teachers most frequently initiate the identification process for content area acceleration in the responding school districts. Parents were the second most frequent in initiating the selection of students for content acceleration, followed by standardized test scores. Other less frequent initiators of the identification process were administrators, counselors, and the student. One district reported the teacher of the gifted as the most frequent initiator in the identification process for content acceleration, an initiator not listed in the survey instrument.

Most responding school districts using acceleration in specific content areas establish multiple criteria to

Table 13

Initiators of Identification for Content Acceleration Ranked by Frequency

Initiator	Number of Districts Ranking Initiator as: 1st	2nd	3rd	4th	5th	6th	7th
Parent(s)	5	4	3	1	0	0	0
Teacher(s)	19	4	1	0	0	0	0
Standardized Test	3	4	1	1	1	0	0
Administrator	1	3	2	2	1	0	0
Counselor	2	0	1	0	0	0	0
Student (Self)	2	1	1	1	1	1	0
Other	1	0	0	0	0	0	0

Note. When respondent indicated several initiators, but did not rank order them, each was ranked as most frequent initiator (1st).

qualify a child for this type of acceleration. The criteria used in identification for content acceleration by the respondents is presented in Table 14.

Of the 27 districts reporting the criteria used in identifying students to be accelerated in content areas, only 2 used a single criterion. One district used percentile scores (national norms) of achievement tests; the

Table 14

Specific Criteria Used to Qualify for Content Acceleration

Criterion	District													
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
Iowa Percentile*			X	X				X	X	X	X			
National %ile*				X				X		X		X		
Ability Test	X			X		X				X		X		
Social Maturity							X	X	X	X				
Student Grades			X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Portfolio								X		X				X
Participation		X			X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Other	X													

Table 14 cont.

Criterion	District													
	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	Total
Iowa %tile*		X					X	X	X	X	X	X	X	14
National %ile*			X					X			X			7
Ability Test		X					X	X			X			8
Social Maturity		X		X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	14
Student Grades	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	23
Portfolio	X				X		X			X	X	X		9
Participation		X		X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X		20
Other	X											X		3

Note. * = Percentile scores from achievement tests.

other district used student participation in class as the sole criterion to qualify for content acceleration.

The single, most frequent criterion was student grades, with 23 (85%) of the responding districts listing it as one of the criteria. Twenty (74%) of the respondents report the use of student participation in class as a criterion for content acceleration. There are 14 (52%) districts that use percentile scores (Iowa norms) of achievement tests. Fourteen (52%) districts also report using social/emotional maturity of the pupil as a criterion in identification for content acceleration. The student portfolio of products (33%), ability test scores (30%), and percentile scores (national norms) of achievement tests (26%) were less frequently used as criteria in the identification process.

The question concerning criteria also requested specific minimum qualifying percentile scores for the standardized tests used in the identification process. Ten of the 14 respondents using percentile scores (Iowa norms) of achievement tests reported specific minimum qualifying scores. Four districts used scores in the 97-99 percentile range. Five respondents used the 94-96 percentile range. One district reported using the 91-93 percentile range.

Specific minimum percentile scores (national norms) were reported by 4 of the 7 districts using these scores for identification. Two districts' minimum qualifying score was

the 97-99 percentile range. Two other districts listed the 94-96 percentile range as their minimum acceptance level.

Specific minimum ability test scores were reported by 5 of the 9 districts using these scores for identification for content acceleration. Two districts reported the minimum score used was in the 97-99 percentile range. Three districts' minimum was in 94-96 range.

Comparative Summary

Table 15 compares the data reported on the implementation of four types of acceleration used by school districts responding to this questionnaire. It shows the number of districts who have reported use of each type of acceleration, the most frequent initiator of identification by type, and the type of criteria most frequently used for identification. It is interesting to note that specific content area acceleration is used by the most districts (27), followed by flexible pacing (21 districts), and early entrance and grade skipping (12 districts, respectively). Parents were the most frequent initiators of the identification process for grade skipping and early entrance, while teachers were the most frequent initiators for identification for the flexible pacing and content acceleration alternatives. Test scores and student grades were the criteria used by more districts in qualifying for acceleration alternatives, except in grade skipping, where

Table 15

Comparative Data Concerning Acceleration Program Options

Acceleration Types	Number of Districts	Most Frequent Initiators	Criteria for Identification*
Early Entrance	12	Parents	1. Iowa percentiles
			2. Student grades
Grade Skipping	12	Parents	1. Student grades and Social maturity
			2. Ability test
Flexible Pacing	21	Teachers	1. Student grades
			2. Iowa percentiles
Specific Content	27	Teachers	1. Student grades
			2. Class participation

Note. * = The two most frequently used criteria are listed in order of their frequency.

social/emotional maturity of the pupil was a criterion just as frequently used.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND IMPLICATIONS

Summary

This study was undertaken to determine the types of acceleration programs for intellectually gifted elementary studnts currently implemented in all the Iowa public school districts in Area Education Agencies 3, 4, 5, and 12. It was based upon the perceived need to discover, within the limits of a finite sample: the extent to which acceleration is offered as an option by districts, the initiators of the idenitification process for each acceleration type, and the criteria used to qualify a child for that program option. This need arose because of the rapid growth of gifted education programs and the disparity of those programs from the viewpoint of what they offer and the extent to which it is offered.

A questionnaire designed by the investigator was mailed to the superintendent in each of the 110 Iowa public school districts in Area Education Agencies 3, 4, 5, and 12. Eighty-two (75%) of the population surveyed (110) returned the instrument for inclusion in the study.

The questionnaire solicited information about each of four acceleration options: early entrance, grade skipping, flexible pacing, and content area acceleration. The information requested included the number of students

enrolled for each acceleration option, how identification of students for that program was initiated, and the criteria used to qualify a child for that acceleration program. A fifth section to the questionnaire was designed to obtain information concerning the respondent's title, total elementary enrollment, and support provisions for the acceleration programs.

Respondent and School District Information

Of the responding eighty-two districts, 42 (51%) had no acceleration program. Forty (49%) of the 82 respondents provided at least one of the acceleration alternatives presented in the questionnaire. It is interesting to note that while 31.8% of the 82 participating districts had an elementary population under 200, those same districts comprised 40% of the group which stated that they offer some type of acceleration. It is important to observe that acceleration programs were reported in every school size category; this indicates that school enrollment need not be a deterrent to providing acceleration programs.

The data revealed that 62.1% of the 82 respondents do not transport students to an attendance center other than that which they would normally attend. However, the fact that 6 of the 40 (15%) responding districts providing some type of acceleration option do transport students to an alternative attendance center indicates that transportation need not be a deterrent to providing acceleration programs.

While researchers in the field of acceleration recommend counseling be provided to accelerated students (Janos, 1987; Pollins, 1983; Proctor, Black, & Feldhusen; 1988; Webb, Meckstroth, & Tolan, 1982; Whitmore, 1980), only 15 (18.3%) of the 82 respondents stated that they provide counseling services to accelerated students to meet their social and emotional needs. This would seem to infer that perhaps there is a student need that districts are not meeting at this time, or that districts have not perceived any social and emotional concerns by accelerated students.

Twenty-four (29.3%) of the 82 participating districts reported that their district does provide continuous progress through the K-12 curriculum in their acceleration programs. Twenty-three (28%) districts do not provide this continuity through the K-12 curriculum, suggesting that there may exist a lack of articulation of acceleration programs in a number of the participating schools.

Early Entrance

Only 12 (14.6%) of the 82 responding school districts identified themselves as having established an early entrance policy which allows a child initial entry to kindergarten or first grade at an earlier than normal age. Only 4 of those 12 districts (4.9% of the 82 total responding districts) reported actual early enrollment figures for the 1989-1990 academic year. This suggests that, while districts may have a policy for early

enrollment, very few students actually use this acceleration option.

When identification for early entrance was initiated, it was parents who most frequently began that process. Though multiple criteria were used by 10 of the 12 districts, percentile scores (Iowa norms) of achievement tests were the most frequently used criteria for qualifying a student for the early entrance option.

Grade Skipping

Only 12 (14.6%) responding school districts identified themselves as having established a policy which allows a child to skip a grade, or part of a grade, without having completed the work of that grade. Seven of those 12 reported actual numbers of students skipping grades during the last 2 academic years. In 1988-1989, only three students were accelerated out of the total elementary population of 3472 in the responding school districts. In 1989-1990, only six students were accelerated out of the total elementary population of 3472 in the responding school districts. This number (0.2%) is well below the 1-2% of elementary students that could advance 2 or more years ahead of grade level according to Daniel and Cox (1988). Daniel and Cox also state that "20-25% of the students in our public schools can handle material about a year ahead of where their age would place them" (p. 73). The

grade-skipping data of this study do not seem to reflect the findings of their research.

Parents were the most frequent initiators of the identification process for grade skipping, followed by teachers as frequent initiators. Multiple criteria were used by all the districts with grade skipping as an acceleration option, with social and emotional maturity and student grades being the most frequently used criteria.

Flexible Pacing

Twenty-one (25.6%) of the 82 responding school districts identified themselves as providing for flexible pacing. This demonstrates that flexible pacing is a more frequently used type of acceleration. Eleven districts used the clustering option, 2 districts offer summer school or out-of-school classes as an acceleration alternative, 13 districts used compacting, and 3 districts used concurrent/dual enrollment as acceleration options. Fifteen of those districts offer only one of the listed flexible pacing options. This data seem to reflect that, while all the alternatives are used to some extent by schools, none of them is used to a wide extent across the region.

Teachers are the most frequent initiators of the identification process for flexible pacing. This is logical because the pacing decisions, at least in part, must be based upon diagnostic decisions made about curricular mastery by students. This is supported, too, by the data

which show that student grades are the most frequently used of the multiple criteria used by districts to qualify students for flexible pacing options.

Content Area Acceleration

Content area acceleration is the most frequently used type of acceleration provided by districts. This is reflected by 27 (32.9%) of the 82 responding districts.

Mathematics is the most frequently (74% of the responding 27 districts) accelerated content area. However, of the 23,583 elementary students in the districts responding, only 39 (0.17%) are actually accelerated.

Reading is the second most frequently (59% of the responding 27 districts) accelerated content area. Though fewer districts reported accelerating the reading content as compared to the mathematics area, more students are accelerated in reading than in math. There were 281 (1.1%) of the 23,583 students in the responding districts accelerated in the reading content area.

The science, social studies, and language arts content areas are rarely accelerated. In fact, only 3 districts accelerate in the science area, 3 in the language arts area, and 1 in the social studies content area.

These findings would seem to suggest that the grouping which is frequently implemented at the elementary level in mathematics and reading may facilitate acceleration in those content areas. An additional consideration may be that the

scope and sequence of the reading and mathematics skills are better articulated, or perhaps more sequential, than skills in the other content areas.

Teachers are the most frequent initiators of the identification process for content area acceleration. This is logical because the acceleration decisions, at least in part, must be based upon diagnostic decisions made about mastery of curriculum by students, a task of the content teacher. This is supported, too, by the data which show that student grades are the most frequently used of the multiple criteria used by districts to qualify students for content area acceleration. The student's class participation was also a very frequent criterion in qualifying a student for content acceleration.

Conclusions

The summary of the findings yield, in effect, a composite picture of the use of acceleration used by public school districts in Iowa Area Education Agencies 3, 4, 5, and 12. A number of tentative conclusions may, therefore, be drawn from an analysis of the descriptive data found in this study.

First of all, acceleration need not be deterred by the size of a school district. Elementary schools with populations below 200 provide acceleration alternatives, as do elementary schools of each population category. Transporting to an alternative attendance center also need

not be a deterrent to providing acceleration; as some schools do, indeed, manage to transport their students.

Second, one can draw the conclusion that there may be a need for better counseling services to meet the social and emotional needs of accelerated students, as reflected by the few districts that provide that service.

Third, one might conclude that there is a need by many districts for better articulation of the acceleration program through the K-12 curriculum. In 23 (28%) of the 82 responding districts continuous progress in the K-12 curriculum was not provided for accelerated students.

Fourth, while each type of acceleration was offered by some districts; content acceleration and flexible pacing, which are most easily accommodated in the regular classroom, were most frequently used. Teachers were also the most frequent initiators of the identification process for each of these alternatives. Student grades were the most frequently used criterion in qualifying students for content area and flexible pacing acceleration. This suggests that perhaps schools are more comfortable making the decision to accelerate students when student performance can be evaluated by the teacher in the classroom. These options also may be more acceptable because the pupil would still be with age peers a majority of the time, thus reducing possible emotional and social adjustment problems.

Fifth, even though early entrance and grade-skipping alternatives are less frequently used as acceleration alternatives, nevertheless, they are used by Iowa school districts. From this study one might draw the conclusion that the infrequency of the use of these alternatives may be because they are considered radical methods of acceleration due to the fact that the child is not with age peers for any part of the school day. Since parents were the most frequent initiators of the identification process for early entrance and grade skipping, it would apprear that parents need to be the primary advocates for these types of acceleration for their children because they are the most familiar with their child's abilities and maturity.

However, it is also clear that the simple act of parental initiation of the identification process cannot be the sole means of identification. The percentile scores (Iowa norms) of achievement tests that are most frequently used in qualifying students for early entrance suggest that student ability must still be demonstrated in a standardized test in addition to parental advocacy. In grade skipping, social maturity and student grades are the most frequently used criteria to qualify a student for this acceleration option once parents initiate the identification process.

Sixth, one can draw the conclusion that Iowa schools, like acceleration programs in the research literature, use quantitative methods (e.g. percentile scores, Iowa norms in

particular, of achievement tests and student grades in class) to qualify pupils for acceleration programs. Subjective criteria, such as social maturity and class participation, generally are less widely used.

Finally, it can be concluded that, although opportunities for acceleration of the intellectually gifted child are provided by school districts in the Iowa Area Education Agencies 3, 4, 5, and 12; the actual number of accelerated students is well below that recommended by experts and researchers in the field of gifted education. Also, it should be noted that there was a large number of districts (51%) with no acceleration options provided to students.

Recommendations

From the conclusions reached by this study, the following recommendations can be made:

1. There is a need for the public school districts in the Area Education Agencies 3, 4, 5, and 12 to broaden their use of acceleration program alternatives to meet the needs of gifted elementary students. Because the State of Iowa mandates that each school district provide a comprehensive, qualitatively differentiated program for students identified as gifted, all programming options must be examined to best meet students' needs.

2. It is further recommended that districts already using acceleration options increase the number of students

using those options. Gifted student abilities are often above the curricular level at which they are being taught.

3. Recently, Iowa school standards have mandated that counselors be provided at the elementary level. It is recommended that those counselors unite with educators of the gifted in meeting the social and emotional needs of those students who are accelerated, particularly students in early entrance and grade-skipping options who may be more vulnerable to adjustment problems because they are not with age peers for the whole school day.

4. It is recommended that school districts encourage, if not actively solicit, parent nominations for acceleration alternatives provided by the district. Parents are most familiar with their child's abilities and maturity.

5. It is further recommended that districts and educators be educated through inservice and college courses about the types of acceleration and how they may be implemented in their local district. Lack of information by districts or individuals may be one reason for hesitancy in implementing acceleration alternatives.

Implications

The information derived from this survey presents many avenues of related research which might be undertaken. Some suggestions follow:

1. Devise a replicative statewide descriptive study that compares the findings of this study concerning

acceleration programs offered in AEAs 3, 4, 5, and 12 with districts across the state.

2. Implement a replication of this study in 5 to 10 years to ascertain any changes in the use of acceleration program alternatives as a result of the maturing of the gifted programs organized as a result of the recent mandates for gifted programs in Iowa.

3. Construct a descriptive study that examines elementary school administrators' and teachers' perceptions regarding acceleration alternatives, criteria to be used for identification for acceleration, and concerns relating to acceleration of pupils.

4. Implement a study that would ascertain how the educational backgrounds and experiences of school administrators and teachers affect school policy concerning acceleration provisions for elementary pupils.

5. Conduct follow-up studies of pupils who have been accelerated to provide data regarding the success of acceleration programs.

References

Aldrich, P. W., & Mills, C. J. (1989). A special program for highly able rural youth in grades five and six. Gifted Child Quarterly, 33(1), 11-14.

Bolenbaugh, M. C. (1980). Education of the gifted: Enrichment and acceleration. Unpublished master's paper, University of Northern Iowa, Cedar Falls.

Braymen, R. K. F., & Fiersel, W. C. (1987). The early entrance option: Academic and social/emotional outcome. Psychology in the Schools, 24, 179-189.

Brody, L. E., & Benbow, C. P. (1987). Accelerative strategies: How effective are they for the gifted? Gifted Child Quarterly, 31(3), 105-110.

Coleman, J. M., & Fults, B. A. (1985). Special-class placement, level of intelligence, and the self-concepts of gifted children: A social comparison perspective. Remedial and Special Education, 6(1), 7-11.

Daniel, N., & Cox, J. (1988). Flexible pacing for able learners (Report No. ISBN-0-86586-183-8). Reston, VA: The Council for Exceptional Children. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 298 725)

Eccles, J. S. (1985). Why doesn't Jane run? Sex differences in educational and occupational patterns. In F. D. Horowitz & M. O'Brien (Eds.), The gifted and talented: Developmental perspectives (pp. 251-300). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Fox, L. H., & Washington, J. (1985). Programs for the gifted and talented: Past, present, and future. In F. D. Horowitz and M. O'Brien (Eds.), The gifted and talented: Developmental perspectives (pp. 197-222). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Gallagher, J. J., Weiss, P., Oglesby, K., & Thomas, T. (1983). The status of gifted/talented education: U.S. surveys of needs, practices, and policies. Los Angeles: The National/State Leadership Training Institute on the Gifted and Talented.

Gohlke, F. L. (1979). Acceleration and gifted education. Unpublished master's paper, University of Northern Iowa, Cedar Falls.

Horowitz, F. D., & O'Brien, M. (1986). Gifted and talented children. American Psychologist, 41(10), 1147-1152.

Huffman, S. (1983). Evaluation of MAA program for 4-6 grade students by its participants as adults. Education, 103(3), 252-255.

Janos, P. M. (1987). A fifty-year follow-up of Terman's youngest college students and IQ matched agemates. Gifted Child Quarterly, 31(2), 55-58.

Janos, P. M., & Robinson, N. M. (1985). Psycho-social development in intellectually gifted children. In F. D. Horowitz & M. O'Brien (Eds.), The gifted and talented: Developmental perspectives (pp. 149-196). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Janos, P. M., Fung, H. C., & Robinson, N. M. (1985). Self-concept, self-esteem, and peer relations among gifted children who feel "different." Gifted Child Quarterly, 29(2), 78-82.

Kulik, J. A., & Kulik, C. (1984). Effects of accelerated instruction on students. Review of Educational Research, 54, 409-425.

Lehman, E. B., & Erdwins, C. J. (1981). The social and emotional adjustment of young, intellectually-gifted youth. Gifted Child Quarterly, 25(3), 134-137.

Maddux, C. D., Scheiber, L. M., & Bass, J. E. (1982). Self-concept and social distance in gifted children. Gifted Child Quarterly, 26(2), 77-82.

Pollins, L. D. (1983). The effects of acceleration on the social and emotional development of gifted students. In C. P. Benbow & J. C. Stanley (Eds.), Academic precocity: Aspects of its development (pp. 160-178). Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Portes, P. R. (1984). A review of programs for young gifted children. Louisville, KY: University of Louisville. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 282 377)

Proctor, T. B., Black, K. N., & Feldhusen, J. F. (1988). Early admission to elementary school: Barriers versus benefits. Roeper Review, 11(2), 85-87.

Saurenman, D. A., & Michael, W. B. (1980). Differential placement of high achieving and low achieving gifted

pupils in grades 4, 5, and 6 on measures of field independence, creativity, and self-concept. Gifted Child Quarterly, 24(2), 81-85.

Sawyer, W. W. (1983). Some thoughts on education and mathematics. Gifted Educational International, 1(2), 65-69.

Sonnenburg, T. I. (1983). Differentiating programs for academically gifted elementary students. (Report No. PS 013814). South Bend: Indiana University at South Bend. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 233 813)

Southern, W. T., Jones, E. D., & Fiscus, E. D. (1989). Practitioner objections to the academic acceleration of gifted children. Gifted Child Quarterly, 33(1), 29-35.

Webb, J. T., Meckstroth, E. A., & Tolan, S. S. (1982). Guiding the gifted child. Columbus: Ohio Psychology
.

Weitzel, J. (1989). Acceleration as a qualitatively differentiated educational program for the highly gifted learner: Its positive and negative effects. An Unpublished master's paper, University of Northern Iowa, Cedar Falls.

Werner, E. E., & Bachtold, L. M. (1986). Personality factors of gifted boys and girls in middle childhood and adolescence. Psychology in the Schools, 6(2), 177-182.

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

APPENDICES

Appendix A

Initial Cover Letter

April 30, 1990

DEAR SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS:

Gifted programs have been mandated in Iowa schools recently. Yet, there are few regulations regarding the type of programming offered these students with special needs. There also is a lack of hard data concerning the programming for these students, especially in regard to accelerative programming for elementary gifted students.

In order to gather data about acceleration in Northwest Iowa programs for elementary gifted students, and to provide the opportunity to make useful recommendations, I am conducting this survey as a part of my M.A.E. degree requirements at the University of Northern Iowa.

I ask your cooperation in completing the enclosed questionnaire. It should require only a small amount of time to complete since not all of it will be applicable to your school district. If this information is unavailable to you, please forward the survey to the individual best able to complete the instrument. Results will be reported as totals only and your individual district will not be identified. Please reply as soon as possible; within one week if you can.

I appreciate your cooperation in our attempt to provide a differentiated education for all of our students.

Thank you.

Sincerely yours,

Chris VanDeventer
M.A.E. Candidate, Education of the Gifted
University of Northern Iowa

Enclosure

Follow-up Letter

May 19, 1990

DEAR SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS:

About three weeks ago you were asked to participate in a survey in regard to academic acceleration of gifted elementary students. I have not received completed surveys from all designated public school systems. A high proportion of responses is needed as soon as possible in order to draw meaningful conclusions concerning accelerated programs for the population of elementary gifted students.

A copy of the survey is enclosed in a stamped self-addressed format. Your responses will be kept confidential. Thank you so much for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Chris VanDeventer
M.A.E Candidate, Education of the Gifted
University of Northern Iowa

Enclosure

Appendix B

Questionnaire

Acceleration of Elementary Students
in AEA 3, AEA 4, AEA 5, and AEA 12 Iowa Public Schools

PLEASE READ EACH SECTION OF THIS QUESTIONNAIRE AND FILL OUT THOSE THAT APPLY TO YOUR SCHOOL DISTRICT.

For the purposes of this survey, acceleration refers to the time element in education, that is, progressing through the curriculum at a more rapid pace than normal or at ages younger than conventional.

I. EARLY ENTRANCE is defined as a policy allowing students to enter a school earlier than the normal age.

A. At what level(s) is the provision for early entrance made?
_____(1) Kindergarten _____(2) First grade

B. How many students entered these levels last year due to early entrance policy? STATE THE NUMBER YOU ENROLLED.
_____(1) Kindergarten _____(2) First grade

C. In the majority of cases of this type of acceleration, who/what initiated the selection of students to be accelerated? RANK BY FREQUENCY WITH #1 BEING THE MOST FREQUENT.
_____(1) parent(s)
_____(2) teacher(s)
_____(3) standardized test scores
_____(4) student him/herself
_____(5) administrator
_____(6) counselor
_____(7) other - please list _____

D. What specific criteria are used in qualifying a student for this type of acceleration? MARK ALL THAT APPLY.

_____(1) achievement test scores (IOWA percentiles).
CIRCLE THE MINIMUM SCORES FOR QUALIFICATION.

99-97 96-94 93-91 90-88 87-85 other

_____(2) achievement test scores (NATIONAL percentiles)
CIRCLE THE MINIMUM SCORES FOR QUALIFICATION.

99-97 96-94 93-91 90-88 87-85 other

_____(3) ability test score (Percentile or equivalent)
CIRCLE THE MINIMUM SCORES FOR QUALIFICATION.

99-97 96-94 93-91 90-88 87-85 other

_____(4) social/emotional maturity
_____(5) student grades
_____(6) portfolio of student products
_____(7) student's class participation
_____(8) other (please specify)_____

II. GRADE-SKIPPING is defined as a child moving ahead one or more grade levels or a part of a grade without having completed all the work of that grade.

E. Which grade levels have been skipped by students? LIST THE SPECIFIC NUMBER of students who have skipped each level in the past two years.

(1) First grade - 1988-89 ____, 1989-90 ____
(2) Second grade - 1988-89 ____, 1989-90 ____
(3) Third grade - 1988-89 ____, 1989-90 ____
(4) Fourth grade - 1988-89 ____, 1989-90 ____
(5) Fifth grade - 1988-89 ____, 1989-90 ____
(6) Sixth grade - 1988-89 ____, 1989-90 ____

F. In the majority of cases of this type of acceleration, who/what initiated the selection of students to be accelerated? RANK BY FREQUENCY WITH #1 BEING THE MOST FREQUENT.

_____(1) parent(s)
_____(2) teacher(s)
_____(3) standardized test scores
_____(4) student him/herself
_____(5) administrator
_____(6) counselor
_____(7) other - please list _____

G. What specific criteria are used in qualifying a student for this type of acceleration? MARK ALL THAT APPLY.

_____(1) achievement test scores (IOWA percentiles). CIRCLE THE MINIMUM SCORES FOR QUALIFICATION.

99-97 96-94 93-91 90-88 87-85 other

_____(2) achievement test scores (NATIONAL percentiles) CIRCLE THE MINIMUM SCORES FOR QUALIFICATION.

99-97 96-94 93-91 90-88 87-85 other

_____(3) ability test score (Percentile or equivalent) CIRCLE THE MINIMUM SCORES FOR QUALIFICATION.

99-97 96-94 93-91 90-88 87-85 other

_____(4) social/emotional maturity
_____(5) student grades
_____(6) portfolio of student products
_____(7) student's class participation
_____(8) other (please specify)_____

III. FLEXIBLE PACING is defined as a student completing the entire curriculum in less than normal time.

H. CHECK EACH type of flexible pacing used in your district and PLACE THE NUMBER of students who have participated in each type of acceleration IN THE APPROPRIATE SPACES.

_____(1) Clustering of bright students within a classroom to cover curriculum rapidly to accelerate content.
1988-89 ____, 1989-90 ____

_____(2) Summer school/Out-of-School classes for credit enabling the student to cover more content in a shorter time period.
1988-89 ____, 1989-90 ____

_____(3) Compacting of curriculum by individual teachers to allow acceleration of content.
1988-89 ____, 1989-90 _____

_____(4) ConcurrEnt/Dual enrollment in classes of similar content areas (i.e. student enrolled in fourth and fifth grade math simultaneously).
1988-89 ____, 1989-90 _____

I. In the majority of cases of this type of acceleration, who/what initiated the selection of students to be accelerated? RANK BY FREQUENCY WITH #1 BEING THE MOST FREQUENT.

_____(1) parent(s)
_____(2) teacher(s)
_____(3) standardized test scores
_____(4) student him/herself
_____(5) administrator
_____(6) counselor
_____(7) other - please list _____

J. What specific criteria are used in qualifying a student for this type of acceleration? MARK ALL THAT APPLY.

_____(1) achievement test scores (IOWA percentiles). CIRCLE THE MINIMUM SCORES FOR QUALIFICATION.

99-97 96-94 93-91 90-88 87-85 other

_____(2) achievement test scores (NATIONAL percentiles) CIRCLE THE MINIMUM SCORES FOR QUALIFICATION.

99-97 96-94 93-91 90-88 87-85 other

_____(3) ability test score (Percentile or equivalent) CIRCLE THE MINIMUM SCORES FOR QUALIFICATION.

99-97 96-94 93-91 90-88 87-85 other

_____(4) social/emotional maturity
_____(5) student grades
_____(6) portfolio of student products
_____(7) student's class participation
_____(8) other (please specify)_____

IV. CONTENT AREA ACCELERATION is defined as placement of a child at the appropriate level in a specific content area at which he/she excels, vertically higher than age-mates. (Example: Fourth grade student taking fifth grade math rather than fourth grade math with peers.)

K. INDICATE BY NUMBER ENROLLED, how many students have been accelerated during the 1989-90 academic school year in each of the following particular content areas:

_____(1) Math
_____(2) Reading
_____(3) Science
_____(4) Language Arts
_____(5) Social Studies
_____(6) other (specify) _____

L. In the majority of cases of this type of acceleration, who/what initiated the selection of students to be accelerated? RANK BY FREQUENCY WITH #1 BEING THE MOST FREQUENT.

_____(1) parent(s)
_____(2) teacher(s)
_____(3) standardized test scores
_____(4) student him/herself
_____(5) administrator
_____(6) counselor
_____(7) other - please list _____

M. What specific criteria are used in qualifying a student for this type of acceleration? MARK ALL THAT APPLY.

_____(1) achievement test scores (IOWA percentiles). CIRCLE THE MINIMUM SCORES FOR QUALIFICATION.

99-97 96-94 93-91 90-88 87-85 other

_____(2) achievement test scores (NATIONAL percentiles) CIRCLE THE MINIMUM SCORES FOR QUALIFICATION.

99-97 96-94 93-91 90-88 87-85 other

_____(3) ability test score (Percentile or equivalent) CIRCLE THE MINIMUM SCORES FOR QUALIFICATION.

99-97 96-94 93-91 90-88 87-85 other

_____(4) social/emotional maturity
_____(5) student grades
_____(6) portfolio of student products
_____(7) student's class participation
_____(8) other (please specify)_____

(OVER)

V. Additional Information/comments:

N. Number of students enrolled in K - 6 in your district?_____

O. Do any of the acceleration programs you offer take a student to an attendance center other than that which he/she would normally attend?

_____(1) yes _____(2) no

P. Are there provisions for counseling the social and emotional needs of accelerated students in your district?

_____(1) yes _____(2) no

Q. Does the acceleration program provide for continuous progress through the K-12 curriculum?

_____(1) yes _____(2) no

R. If your school has a provision or program for acceleration not listed in any of the above sections, please describe it briefly.

_____

_____

_____

_____

S. Which of the following statements best describes your present position title? (CHECK THE APPROPRIATE NUMBER.)

_____1. Superintendent
_____2. Elementary principal
_____3. Curriculum director
_____4. TAG Coordinator
_____5. TAG Coordinator/Teacher
_____6. TAG Teacher
_____7. Other: _____

Thank You!

THIS COMPLETES THE SURVEY. Information gathered for this study will enable you to compare your accelerated program provisions with other districts in AEA 3, AEA 4, AEA 5, and AEA 12 in Iowa. If you wish to receive a copy of thE results of this survey, indicate this by placing a check in this box: ☐

Appendix C

Contact Schools in Area Education Agencies 3, 4, 5, and 12

Akron Westfield Community
Kerr Drive
Akron, IA 51001

Albert City-Truesdale School
Box 98
Albert City, IA 50510

Algona Community
Box 717 200 North Phillip
Algona, IA 50511

Alta Community
101 West Fifth
Alta, IA 51002

Anthon-Oto Community
110 West Division
Anthon, IA 51004

Ar-We-Va Community
Box 108 108 Clinton Street
Westside, IA 51467

Armstrong-Ringstead
Armstrong
IA 50514

Aurelia Community
Third and Ash Streets
Aurelia, IA 51005

Battle Creek Community
600 Chestnut
Battle Creek, IA 51006

Boyden-Hull Community
801 First Street
Hull, IA 51239

Burt Community School
406 Bush
Burt, IA 50522

Cedar Valley Community
R. R. 1
Farnhamville, IA 50538

Central Lyon Community
1105 South Story
Rock Rapids, IA 51246

Central Webster Community
Burnside
IA 50521

Charter Oak-Ute Community
329 Main Street
Ute, IA 51060

Cherokee Community School
207 North Second Street
Cherokee, IA 51012

Clarion Community School
Third Avenue N. E.
Clarion, IA 50523

Clay Central Community
Box 155 401 Church Street
Royal, IA 51357

Crestland Community School
Early
IA 50535

Dayton Community School
Box 26
Dayton, IA 50530

Denison Community School
North 16th Street
Denison, IA 51442

Dow City-Arion Community
Dow City
IA 51528

Dows Community School
Dows, IA 50071

Eagle Grove Community School
Eagle Grove, IA 50533

East Greene Community
Box 377
Grand Junction, IA 50107

East Monona Community School
Moorhead
IA 51558

Eastwood Community School
Correctionville
IA 51056

Emmetsburg Community School
16th and Grand Streets
Emmetsburg, IA 50536

Estherville Community
301 North Sixth
Estherville, IA 51334

Everly Community School
Box 218 306 East Second St.
Everly, IA 51338

Floyd Valley Community
Box 229 Highway 10 East
Orange City, IA 51238

Fonda Community School
Fonda
IA 50540

Fort Dodge Community
330 First Avenue North
Fort Dodge, IA 50501

Galva-Holstein Community
207 Lubeck Street
Holstein, IA 51025

George Community School
500 East Indiana Avenue
George, IA 51237

Gilmore City-Bradgate
402 Southeast East Avenue
Gilmore City, IA 50541

Goldfield Community School
Box 158 300 School Street
Goldfield, IA 50542

Graettinger Community School
Graettinger
IA 51342

Harris-Lake Park Community
Lake Park
IA 51347

Hartley-Melvin Community
600 Third Street N. W.
Hartley, IA 51346

Hinton Community School
Hinton
IA 51024

Humboldt Community School
900 Sumner Avenue
Humboldt, IA 50548

Ida Grove Community School
900 Montgomery Drive
Ida Grove, IA 51445

Jefferson Community School
Madison Avenue and Elm
Jefferson, IA 50129

Lake City Community School
709 West Main Street
Lake City, IA 51449

Lake View-Auburn Community
Box 1027 801 Jackson
Lake View, IA 51450

Lakota Consolidated School
Lakota, IA 50451

Laurens-Marathon Community
Laurens, IA 50554

Lawton-Bronson Community
Box 128
Lawton, IA 51030

Le Mars Community School
921 Third Avenue S. W.
Le Mars, IA 51031

Little Rock Community
Box 247
Little Rock, IA 51243

Lohrville Community School
Box 276
Lohrville, IA 51453

Lu Verne Community School
Lu Verne, IA 50560

Lytton Community School
Lytton, IA 50561

Mallard Community School
414 Macawber Box 326
Mallard, IA 50562

Manilla Community School
Manilla
IA 51454

Manson Community School
227 Sixteenth Street
Manson, IA 51563

Maple Valley Community
410 South Sixth
Mapleton, IA 51034

Marcus Community School
Box 667 East Fenton Street
Marcus, IA 51035

Maurice-Orange City Community
Box 229 Highway 10 East
Orange City, IA 51041

Meriden-Cleghorn Community
Box 97
Cleghorn, IA 51014

Newell-Providence Community
205 Clark Street
Newell, IA 51568

North Kossuth Community
Swea City, IA 50590

Northeast Hamilton Community
Blairsburg, IA 50034

Northwest Webster Community
303 Pierce Street
Barnum, IA 50518

Odebolt-Arthur Community
600 Maple
Odebolt, IA 51458

Okoboji Community School
Box 147
Milford, IA 51351

Palmer Consolidated School
Henrietta Avenue
Palmer, IA 50571

Paton-Churdan Community
Box 157 606 Adrian Street
Churdan, IA 50050

Paullina Community School
Box 638 216 Rutledge
Paullina, IA 51046

Pocahontas Area Community
201 First Avenue S. W.
Pocahontas, IA 50574

Pomeroy Community School
202 East Harrison Street
Pomeroy, IA 50575

Prairie Community School
1005 Riddle Street
Gowrie, IA 50543

Primghar Community School
Primghar
IA 51245

Remson-Union Community
511 Roosevelt
Remsen, IA 51050

Rock Valley Community School
712 Twentieth Avenue
Rock Valley, IA 51247

Rolfe Community School
605 Oak Street
Rohlfe, IA 50581

Ruthven-Ayeshire Community
Ruthven
IA 51358

Sanborn Community School
Sanborn
IA 512248

Schaller Community School
300 South Berwick
Schaller, IA 51055

Schleswig Community School
P. O. Box 250
Schleswig, IA 51461

Scranton Community School
900 Madison
Scranton, IA 51462

Sentral Community School
Fenton
IA 50539

Seargeant Bluff-Luton Comm.
Box 97 Port Neal Road
Sergeant Bluff, IA 51054

Sheldon Community School
1700 Fourth Street
Sheldon, IA 51201

Sibley-Ocheydan Community
120 Eleventh Avenue N. E.
Sibley, IA 51249

Sioux Center Community
550 Ninth Street N. E.
Sioux Center, IA 51250

Sioux City Community School
1221 Pierce Street
Sioux City, IA 51105

Sioux Rapids-Rembrandt School
505 Elm Street
Sioux Rapids, IA 50585

Sioux Valley Community School
Peterson
IA 51047

South Clay Community School
Gillett Grove
IA 51341

South Hamilton Community
Box 100 315 Division Street
Jewell, IA 50130

Spencer Community School
800 East Third Street
Spencer, IA 51301

Spirit Lake Community School
2000 Hill Avenue
Spirit Lake, IA 51360

Storm Lake Commuity School
419 Lake Avenue
Storm Lake, IA 50588

Stratford Community School
1000 Shakespeare
Stratford, IA 50249

Sutherland Community School
Sutherland, IA 51058

Terril Community School
Terril, IA 51364

Titonka Consolidated School
Box 187
Titonka, IA 50480

Twin Rivers Community School
P. O. Box 153
Bode, IA 50519

Wall Lake Community School
206 Boyer Street
Wall Lake, IA 51466

Webster City Community School
304 Prospect Street
Webster City, IA 50595

West Bend Community School
Box247 300 Third Ave. S.W.
West Bend, IA 50597

West Monona Community School
1314 Fifteenth Street
Onawa, IA 51040

Westwood Community School
Box AD 1000 First Street
Sloan, IA 51055

Willow Community School
P. O. Box 151
Washta, IA 51061

West Lyon Community School
Highway 182 North
Inwood, IA 51240

West Sioux Community School
1300-1400 Avenue P.
Hawarden, IA 51023

Whiting Community School
Whiting
IA 51063

Woodbury Central Community
Moville
IA 51039