

Y4
.Ed 8/1
C 43/6

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES

91144
Ed 8/1
C 43/6

GIFTED AND TALENTED CHILDREN EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE ACT

GOVERNMENT
Storage

HEARING BEFORE THE GENERAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION OF THE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES NINETY-FIRST CONGRESS FIRST SESSION

KSU LIBRARIES

✓



A11900 984074

H.R. 4807 and H.R. 12814

BILLS TO PROVIDE FOR EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE FOR
GIFTED AND TALENTED CHILDREN

HEARING HELD IN WASHINGTON, D.C., JULY 15, 1969

Printed for the use of the Committee on Education and Labor
CARL D. PERKINS, *Chairman*



U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON : 1969

32-868

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

CARL D. PERKINS, Kentucky, *Chairman*

EDITH GREEN, Oregon
FRANK THOMPSON, Jr., New Jersey
JOHN H. DENT, Pennsylvania
ROMAN C. PUCINSKI, Illinois
DOMINICK V. DANIELS, New Jersey
JOHN BRADEMAs, Indiana
JAMES G. O'HARA, Michigan
HUGH L. CAREY, New York
AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS, California
WILLIAM D. FORD, Michigan
WILLIAM D. HATHAWAY, Maine
PATSY T. MINK, Hawaii
JAMES H. SCHEUER, New York
LLOYD MEEDS, Washington
PHILIP BURTON, California
JOSEPH M. GAYDOS, Pennsylvania
LOUIS STOKES, Ohio
WILLIAM (BILL) CLAY, Missouri
ADAM C. POWELL, New York

WILLIAM H. AYRES, Ohio
ALBERT H. QUIE, Minnesota
JOHN M. ASHBROOK, Ohio
ALPHONZO BELL, California
OGDEN R. REID, New York
JOHN N. ERLNBORN, Illinois
WILLIAM J. SCHERLE, Iowa
JOHN R. DELLENBACK, Oregon
MARVIN L. ESCH, Michigan
EDWIN D. ESHLEMAN, Pennsylvania
WILLIAM A. STEIGER, Wisconsin
JAMES M. COLLINS, Texas
EARL F. LANDGREBE, Indiana
ORVAL HANSEN, Idaho
EARL B. RUTH, North Carolina

GENERAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION

ROMAN C. PUCINSKI, Illinois, *Chairman*

HUGH L. CAREY, New York
WILLIAM D. FORD, Michigan
LLOYD MEEDS, Washington
JAMES G. O'HARA, Michigan
AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS, California
WILLIAM D. HATHAWAY, Maine
PATSY T. MINK, Hawaii

ALPHONZO BELL, California
JOHN M. ASHBROOK, Ohio
ALBERT H. QUIE, Minnesota
JOHN R. DELLENBACK, Oregon
EDWIN D. ESHLEMAN, Pennsylvania
EARL B. RUTH, North Carolina

CONTENTS

	Page
Text of bills:	
H.R. 4807.....	2
H.R. 12814.....	1
Summary of H.R. 4807, H.R. 12814 and related bills.....	2
Statement of—	
Erlenborn, Hon. John N., a Representative in Congress from the State of Illinois.....	3
Gallagher, Dr. James, Associate Commissioner, Bureau of Education of the Handicapped—HEW, accompanied by Dr. Leonard Lucito, Dr. Edwin Martin, and Dr. Albert L. Alford.....	14
Geer, William C., Executive Secretary and Frederick J. Weintraub, assistant executive secretary, Council for Exceptional Children; accompanied by William G. Vassar, consultant, gifted and talented, Connecticut Department of Education; Dr. Joseph French, professor of special education and educational psychology, Penn State University; Dr. Marvin Gold, legislative chairman of the Association of the Gifted; and Dr. Walter T. Olson, assistant director of the Lewis Research Center, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Cleveland, Ohio.....	24
Stokes, Hon. Louis, a Representative in Congress from the State of Ohio.....	13
Prepared statements:	
French, Dr. Joseph L., immediate past president, the Association for the Gifted, statement of.....	35
Gallagher, Dr. James J., associate commissioner, Bureau of Education for the Handicapped, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, prepared statement by.....	22
Geer, William C., executive secretary, the Council for Exceptional Children, statement of.....	26
Gold, Dr. Marvin J., legislative chairman, the Association for the Gifted, statement of.....	39
Olson, Dr. Walter T., assistant director the Lewis Research Center, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Cleveland, Ohio, testimony of.....	40
Rogge, Dr. William M., president, the Association for the Gifted, statement of.....	29
Vassar, William G., president-elect, the Association for the Gifted: CEC analytic study of State legislation for handicapped children.....	51
Statement of.....	32

GIFTED AND TALENTED CHILDREN EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE ACT

TUESDAY, JULY 15, 1969

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
GENERAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION
OF THE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR,
Washington, D.C.

The subcommittee met at 10:35 a.m., pursuant to recess, in room 2257, Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. Roman C. Pucinski (chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

Present: Representatives Pucinski, Hathaway, Bell, Ashbrook, Quie, and Ruth.

Staff members present: John F. Jennings, subcommittee counsel; Alexandra Kisla, clerk; and Martin L. LaVor, minority research assistant.

(Text of H.R. 12814 and summary follow:)

[H.R. 12814, 91st Cong., first sess.]

A BILL To provide for educational assistance for gifted and talented children

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Gifted and Talented Children Educational Assistance Act".

SEC. 2. (a) Section 303(a) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (relating to the use of Federal funds for supplementary educational centers and services) is amended by—

- (1) striking out "and" at the end of paragraph (H) thereof;
- (2) redesignating paragraph "(I)" as paragraph "(J)"; and
- (3) inserting immediately after paragraph (H) the following new paragraph:

"(I) providing programs for gifted and talented children; and".

(b) Section 503(11) of such Act (relating to grants to strengthen State departments of education) is amended by inserting after "handicapped" a comma and the following: "and gifted and talented children."

(c) Section 801 of such Act (relating to definitions) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(1) The term 'gifted and talented children' means, in accordance with objective criteria prescribed by the Commissioner, children who have outstanding intellectual ability or creative talent the development of which requires special activities or services not ordinarily provided by local educational agencies."

SEC. 3. (a) Section 521 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (relating to fellowships for teachers) is amended by inserting in the last sentence thereof after the words "handicapped children" a comma and the following: "and for gifted and talented children".

(b) Section 1201 of such Act (relating to definitions) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(j) The term 'gifted and talented children' means, in accordance with objective criteria prescribed by the Commissioner, children who have outstanding intellectual ability or creative talent the development of which requires special activities or services not ordinarily provided by local educational agencies."

SEC. 4. (a) The Commissioner of Education is authorized to make a study and investigation in order to evaluate the manner in which existing Federal educational assistance programs can be effectively utilized to meet the needs of gifted and talented children and the extent to which new programs are necessary to meet the needs of such children.

(b) The Commissioner shall report the results of such study, together with his recommendations, to the Congress not later than six months after the enactment of this Act.

SUMMARY OF H.R. 4807, H.R. 12814, AND RELATED BILLS, THE GIFTED AND TALENTED EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE ACT

Section 2 amends Title III of ESEA to permit funding of programs for gifted and talented children.

Section 2 also amends Title V ESEA to permit State departments of education to provide local educational agencies with technical assistance and services for the education of gifted and talented children.

"Gifted and talented children" are defined as children with outstanding intellectual ability or creative talent, the development of which requires special assistance or services not ordinarily provided by local educational agencies.

Section 3 amends the Education Professions Development Act to permit the granting of fellowships for teachers of gifted and talented children.

Section 4 authorizes the Commissioner of Education to make a study of the manner in which existing Federal programs may be used for the education of the gifted and to survey the need for new programs. This report would be due 6 months after enactment of this bill.

Mr. PUCINSKI. The committee will come to order.

Our subcommittee meets this morning to consider H.R. 4807, H.R. 12814, and related bills to provide educational assistance for gifted and talented children.

Last week we held 3 days of hearings dealing with the special needs of children with learning disabilities.

It is a common error to presume that only our handicapped children are in particular need of—or deserve—Federal assistance for education.

We are justly concerned with providing the teachers, techniques, and the learning tools for all our children. In this connection, we consider today the special needs of the exceptionally talented child.

We are very pleased to have with us this morning our colleague, John Erlenborn, who has sponsored H.R. 4807, together with a number of our colleagues on both sides of the aisle, in order to do something about this.

(Text of H.R. 4807 follows:)

[H.R. 4807, 91st Cong., first sess.]

A BILL To provide for educational assistance for gifted and talented children

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Gifted and Talented Children Educational Assistance Act".

SEC. 2. (a) Section 303 (a) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (relating to the use of Federal funds for supplementary educational centers and services) is amended by—

- (1) striking out "and" at the end of paragraph (H) thereof;
- (2) redesignating paragraph "(I)" as paragraph "(J)"; and
- (3) inserting immediately after paragraph (H) the following new paragraph:

"(I) providing programs for gifted and talented children; and".

(b) Section 503(11) of such Act (relating to grants to strengthen State departments of education) is amended by inserting after "handicapped" a comma and the following: "and gifted and talented children."

(c) Section 801 of such Act (relating to definitions) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(1) The term 'gifted and talented children' means, in accordance with objective criteria prescribed by the Commissioner, children who have outstanding intellectual ability or creative talent the development of which requires special activities or services not ordinarily provided by local educational agencies."

SEC. 3. (a) Section 521 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (relating to fellowships for teachers) is amended by inserting in the last sentence thereof after the words "handicapped children" a comma and the following: "and for gifted and talented children".

(b) Section 1201 of such Act (relating to definitions) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(j) The term 'gifted and talented children' means, in accordance with objective criteria prescribed by the Commissioner, children who have outstanding intellectual ability or creative talent the development of which requires special activities or services not ordinarily provided by local educational agencies."

SEC. 4. (a) The Commissioner of Education is authorized to make a study and investigation in order to evaluate the manner in which existing Federal educational assistance programs can be effectively utilized to meet the needs of gifted and talented children and the extent to which new programs are necessary to meet the needs of such children.

(b) The Commissioner shall report the results of such study, together with his recommendations, to the Congress not later than six months after the enactment of this Act.

Mr. ERLNBORN. Without any further delay I am going to welcome our colleague to this committee. We are delighted to have him here. He is a member of the full committee and I think we can all agree that he is one of the hardest working members of Congress.

So, Mr. Erlenborn, we would like you to proceed with your testimony. We are running a little behind time so I thought we would go into the subject matter. We are very grateful for you to take time from your schedule to come before the committee and share with us your views.

STATEMENT OF HON. JOHN N. ERLNBORN, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF ILLINOIS

Mr. ERLNBORN. Thank you.

Mr. Chairman and members of the General Subcommittee on Education, I am pleased that you have before you today for your consideration H.R. 4807, the Gifted and Talented Children Educational Assistance Act of 1969, sponsored by me and Messrs. Ayres, Quie, Reid of New York, Scherle, Esch, and Eshleman.

I am grateful to the chairman, Mr. Pucinski, for making time possible in the busy schedule of this subcommittee to hold hearings on this most important matter.

In 1958, the people of the United States responded to the contemplation of Russian intellectual superiority in the Sputnik period by passing the National Defense Education Act.

The major thrust of this act was to bring American resources to bear on identifying gifted children from all socioeconomic levels and to upgrade educational programs to develop these and other children as well to the limit of their capabilities.

Some of the fruits of this effort will be demonstrated tomorrow when the United States launches the vehicle to place the first man on the moon.

I am afraid, however, that we often forget our lessons. While in 1958 there was great interest on the part of the Federal Government in improving the educational opportunities for gifted and talented children, today there is not one person employed in the Office of Education with specific legislation providing programs for gifted and talented children.

Interestingly enough, according to an October 1968 issue of the Wall Street Journal, the Soviet Union in the past 2 years had created 1,500 new secondary schools for their gifted students.

The question has been asked: Why do we need to concern ourselves about these children? Doesn't he or she make it successfully in the world anyway?

Former Commissioner of Education, Francis Keppel, in his book "The Necessary Revolution in American Education," pointed out that:

The public hears about 6 out of 10 high school graduates who go on to some form of post high school education . . . very few among the public realize that the upper three-fourths of the graduates of certain high schools are better prepared for college than the upper 10 percent in many schools. Studies in 1962 by Project Talent, financed by the Office of Education, show that almost one-fourth (23 percent) of high school seniors in the 80-90 academic percentile of their class, and about one-third (34 percent) of those in the 70-80 percentile, failed to enter college.

Data from Project Talent showed that about 15 percent of the most capable high school graduates with IQ's of 120 or about do not continue their education.

Studies by Dr. Joseph French, Pennsylvania State University, who, I am pleased to note, will be testifying before this subcommittee, reveal that approximately 10 percent of the high school dropouts in the State of Pennsylvania could be classified in the gifted category.

I do not wish to imply that the problem of the gifted is only among high school dropouts or disadvantaged children. We all know that talent knows no economic or cultural level, that gifted and talented children exist in all sectors of our society, regardless of race, color, nationality, or religion.

In some communities, because of the nature of their home and school environment, the abilities of the gifted may clearly rise to the surface and be evident to all those with whom they come in contact.

For other children, poor environmental conditions make it impossible for such abilities to surface, and thus the horizons of these children are severely limited.

This bill, H.R. 4807, addresses itself to all gifted and talented children.

H.R. 4807 is an attempt to place greater discretion in the hands of State and local school administrators and higher education personnel.

Consistent with our recent legislative trends to give these frontline people greater decisionmaking in regard to the use of Federal funds, this bill does not create new authorizations or require additional funds.

Rather, it says to the States that the plight of the gifted and talented child is a legitimate concern under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. This bill has two purposes.

First, it places the Congress on record as being concerned about this problem. Additionally it authorizes the Commissioner of Education to initiate a study to determine how we may more comprehensively develop the potential of our gifted and talented children.

More specifically, H.R. 4807 will do the following:

First. It defines gifted and talented children as those having outstanding intellectual ability or creative talent, the development of which requires programs or services beyond the level of those ordinarily provided in regular school programs.

Second. It amends title III, "Supplementary Educational Centers and Services," of the ESEA to include special programs for the gifted and talented.

Because of their unique learning nature, these children require many services and opportunities beyond the confines of the classroom or school.

Title III has demonstrated itself to be an effective tool for helping school districts to provide such services and opportunities on a multi-school or regional basis.

It is the intent of this bill to permit some of the efforts of title III to meet the program needs of gifted and talented children. The use of demonstration programs in Illinois, California, and several other States has had a significant effect on stimulating local communities to develop programs for gifted and talented youth. Title III has provided some assistance in this regard.

Third, it amends title V, "Grants To Strengthen State Departments of Education," of the ESEA to assist State education agencies in developing appropriate plans for providing for their gifted and talented children and to acquire necessary personnel to implement such plans.

Only 13 of the 50 State departments of education currently assign one or more full-time staff members to programs for the gifted and talented, while 21 States have no one responsible on a full- or part-time basis for such programs.

It is noteworthy that nine-tenths of the gifted and talented children now receiving services come from States employing full-time personnel.

Fourth. It amends the Education Professions Development Act, title V of the Higher Education Act.

There are now only 26 colleges and universities in the Nation offering programs to prepare teachers and other personnel to work with gifted and talented children.

If programs for these children are to be increased to any substantial degree, there will need to be a substantial increase in the number of personnel training programs as well as the number of personnel prepared.

This amendment will make the preparation of such personnel one of the priorities to which the Education Professions Development Act should focus its attention.

Once again allow me to stress that these measures are in line with our interest in giving State and local authorities a greater decision-making base. The bill does not require that they serve the gifted and talented, but only increases their ability to do so, if they desire.

While I realize that H.R. 4807 as introduced has only Republican sponsorship, I would like to emphasize that it was not my intent, or I am sure the intent of the other sponsors, to make this a partisan bill.

Representative Bingham of New York has introduced a companion bill, H.R. 11307, and I hope we may gain bipartisan support for this most worthwhile measure.

I understand yesterday H.R. 12814 was introduced by the chairman of this subcommittee.

Mr. Chairman, may I again express my thanks to you for holding this hearing on this very important bill.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Thank you very much, Congressman Erlenborn. We are grateful to you for this testimony.

I wonder if we could have a clarification of one point.

On page 3 of your bill, beginning on line 3—

Mr. ERLBORN. I am afraid I don't have a copy of the bill before me. I left my folder downstairs.

Page 3, yes, sir.

Mr. PUCINSKI. On page 3, in line 3, in the definition, you say: "The term 'gifted and talented children' means, in accordance with objective criteria prescribed by the Commissioner, children who have outstanding intellectual ability or creative talent the development of which requires special activities or services not ordinarily provided by local educational agencies."

I wonder if you would want to discuss for this record what we have in mind when we say "in accordance with objective criteria prescribed by the Commissioner"?

Mr. ERLBORN. Well, I don't know just what the Commissioner might prescribe as this criteria. I presume that part of this obviously would be IQ tests and other manifestations of the individual child's particularly pronounced creative ability or intellectual ability, maybe some things that are not tested merely by the IQ tests.

Not being an educator, I don't think I would be qualified to spell these out, but I think the Commissioner could establish objective criteria, including IQ tests and other criteria that would identify the particularly gifted and talented child.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Would you have any strong objection if we gave sincere consideration to perhaps deleting that language in your definition? Your definition would then read, "The term 'gifted and talented children' means children who have outstanding intellectual ability and creative talent."

I am concerned about injecting into the definition broad open-ended language.

Perhaps in some other part of the bill we might provide that the Commissioner shall prescribe appropriate means for identifying the gifted child but I am wondering if you really want this broad language.

Mr. ERLBORN. Well, Mr. Chairman, in answer to your question, I don't know that I would have any particular objection to that since the major thrust of this bill is to allow the greatest flexibility at the local level, the State and school district level, though I think that we should have some means of identifying these children.

Maybe it should be made more flexible than to have it established by the Commissioner.

Mr. PUCINSKI. That is why I thought we might give some thought to putting in the bill some additional language as to how these youngsters will be identified.

But I do have some reservations. I am not sure I am quite making myself clear. But it does seem this broad language in the definition of gifted child does set up machinery for relying on the Commissioner's judgment to too great an extent.

I know that is not what you intended in your bill.

Mr. Bell.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Chairman, I have no questions.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Hathaway.

Mr. HATHAWAY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Thank you very much for your testimony and I appreciate the objectives that you are trying to gain here.

Following up Mr. Pucinski's question, what I am a little leary of in the broad definition is that the Commissioner might put it on the basis of IQ tests and we know that a lot of ghetto kids in particular don't score too well on IQ tests and, nevertheless, they may be very talented people.

Maybe we should put in a laundry list to give the Commissioner a little guidance as to what we mean.

Mr. ERLBORN. Your concern is probably understandable, although I don't think the Commissioner would, by whim or caprice, establish these—

Mr. HATHAWAY. No, I am sure he wouldn't.

Mr. ERLBORN. Establish these criteria. Neither would I expect that the Commissioner would limit it to an IQ test, because I think we are all aware of the fact that those who have had the greatest hardships and lack of educational opportunity are not able to communicate as well; and not being able to communicate are not able to score well in the IQ tests.

I am sure there must be something more than the IQ test to establish the criteria.

Mr. HATHAWAY. You amend title III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. Actually it isn't necessary to do that.

Mr. ERLBORN. As a matter of fact it is being done in some States. In my own State of Illinois, title III funds are not limited to it economically or—

Mr. HATHAWAY. The reason is to highlight that.

Mr. ERLBORN. Exactly.

Mr. HATHAWAY. My only concern on that and the other sections that are amended is that without a separate authorization aren't we going to run the risk of dissipating the funds that would be used for the handicapped?

Mr. ERLBORN. No more so than we are today, since, as you point out, they are not limited today to using it for the handicapped.

Mr. HATHAWAY. Not in title III. But when you get into title V where it specifically mentions handicapped, the section pertaining to grants by State Departments of Education, presumably they are going to have to take some of the money they are using for financing the State Departments of Education with respect to handicapped and use that for talented children.

Mr. ERLBORN. My understanding of title V is again, as in title III, it is not limited to the handicapped. I think it is a general thrust to strengthening State Departments of Education.

Mr. HATHAWAY. How about 521 of the Higher Education Act?

Mr. ERLBORN. Again, I do not believe the Education Professions Development Act is limited to providing teacher training or providing teachers for the disadvantaged.

That is one of the thrusts of that title, but I don't think it is the sole thrust.

Mr. HATHAWAY. You mean they can do it now?

Mr. ERLNBORN. I think they could do it now. Most everything that is called for in this bill could be done now but the intent here is to identify very clearly that this is one of the purposes.

I think it has been lost sight of over the years. That is the point I make, that we started out with this in the NDEA as one of the major thrusts of the Federal involvement in education, and over the years we have lost sight of that. Even though it is in the law, it can be done, we are not doing it to any great extent.

The major thrust has now gone to providing greater opportunities for the educationally and culturally disadvantaged, and we are forgetting this other group of gifted and talented. I think what we are really going to do, if we continue down this road, is move toward mediocrity. We will be raising those from the lower level and bypassing those on the upper level and come out with mediocrity. I don't think this should be our goal.

I think we should have a goal of giving the greatest opportunity to all. Let us raise those who have the greatest disadvantage and the greatest learning disabilities but let us also reach the greatest potential for the gifted and talented at the same time.

Mr. HATHAWAY. In section 4, what do you contemplate by that, that the Commissioner is going to make a thorough investigation of all education laws to determine how they shall be amended to help the talented child?

Should that precede any action taken under the preceding sections of the bill?

Mr. ERLNBORN. I think this is an admission of the fact that this bill is not perfect. We have identified some places where the gifted and talented should be considered in the educational programs; but there may be a great deal more that we can do and I think it would be well to ask the Commissioner to turn part of his attention to this problem.

Again, it is something that could be done. There is nothing limiting the Commissioner today from doing this if he wanted to. I think this is an expression of congressional intent that he devote some of the time and talents of his office to this problem.

Mr. HATHAWAY. Thank you.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Ashbrook.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Yes.

Mr. ERLNBORN, one of the reasons I had a little reluctance in the beginning to cosponsor this bill was it looked like it might be a little bit of an exercise in futility and I note in your testimony you indicate you feel it would be good to emphasize this area, but when it comes right down to it, it is pretty much left to the Office of Education how much they want to stress this particular phase of the educational program.

You say on page 4, "Rather, it says to the States that the plight of the gifted and talented child is a legitimate concern under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act."

I think that probably highlights the bill. That is basically all we are saying.

On page 5 you indicate that 21 States have no one responsible on a full- or part-time basis for such programs and as a result of this bill, if it passes, I am just wondering what you honestly contemplate as the effect as far as these States are concerned.

Mr. ERLNBORN. Well—

Mr. ASHBROOK. Vying for funds that might be in title III. I notice title V is getting letters in already that guidance counselors are cut out of title V.

In my State there is not going to be money available and if there is the money squeeze they claim, I can't see very much coming to pass as a result of this.

Mr. ERLNBORN. I would disagree, firstly, with your assessment that the success of the implementation of this by the Commissioner would be limited. I think that this gives a good deal of authority to the States and to the local school districts.

It will not be dependent only on the Commissioner's desire to implement it. I don't feel that this will water down our present efforts.

I think that these things can be done presently. I think if we turn the attention of the States to getting some part- or full-time personnel devoting their attention to the gifted and talented programs under Title V, ESEA, it will lead more States toward this sort of involvement.

But I don't feel that it will be harmful to the total overall ESEA program.

Mr. ASHBROOK. I am not talking about being harmful. Where there is not money involved, we both know as a practical matter, that there is not going to be a whole lot done.

I am reminded of the statement of Vice President Barkley after we passed the Full Employment Act of 1956 and he was asked by a reporter what it did and he said it gave everybody wanting a job the right to go out and look for one.

And I am wondering after we pass this, if we are not going to put in money, are we really going to accomplish much?

Mr. ERLNBORN. The problem we face here, if you want to put money in and earmark it for this program, is that then we are going to begin to fragment our efforts. If we are going to set aside this money for this program and divorce it from the ESEA, then the question will be: Will you fund this through the Appropriations Committee or will you fund other programs under ESEA?

Additionally, if we earmark this, we are going to have the priorities set, not at the State and local level, which we would like to do in this bill, but by the Appropriation Subcommittee on HEW.

Mr. ASHBROOK. That is the dilemma we want to avoid and he indicates it has already been accomplished. I am convinced that it is needed and it will probably help but I must admit I have reservations because of this general type of atmosphere in which we operate and the indications that there isn't enough money now to do all the things that we would either like to do or feel required to do.

Mr. ERLNBORN. Maybe there are some States and some school districts that would like to do some things in this area that only need this to point to to say it is part of the Congressional intent.

It was, I think part of the philosophy of ESEA; but this bill will make it quite definite that it is the intent of Congress' intent that ESEA would be the proper vehicle to approach the problems of the gifted and talented. With this bill, those States that may want to move in this direction and have been hesitant to do so only have to look at the passage of this bill to say Congress has said this is a legitimate area for ESEA efforts.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I believe there is one aspect of this bill that addresses itself to the point raised by the gentleman from Ohio and that is your section IV which authorizes the Commissioner to make a study and then directs the Commissioner.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Don't bring that up. That is one of the reasons why I almost didn't support it.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I think it is important because this bill directs the Commissioner to tell us what new programs are necessary to meet the needs of gifted children. In my judgment this is the first overt effort to identify the extent of the problems that we may encounter in meeting the special needs of gifted youngsters. It also requires the Commissioner to make his recommendations in 6 months.

Up to now we have never had such a directive.

I think the gentleman is correct, everybody was alarmed when Sputnik was launched. We passed the NDEA shortly thereafter. But now that we are sending men to the moon tomorrow it appears that people believe we can relax when actually the great technological struggle has just begun.

It would seem therefore that you may find some of the answers to your concern in that section IV, wouldn't you think so?

Mr. ASHBROOK. I would have to say as a personal matter I have never been overly impressed with the idea of having us empower nine to study and investigate and report back. Maybe it will be more fruitful in this particular area.

I think it is a bill that is needed and we certainly ought to focus our attention on it. But I would have to say I have a full reservation as to the ultimate success of this sort of increased money.

We are already finding out that most titles—and I know particularly in title V, there doesn't appear to be enough money to accomplish what they already set out.

Mr. PUCINSKI. With a new resident in the White House, the gentleman might have a different attitude.

Mr. ASHBROOK. It was the new resident of the White House that suggested some of the cuts in title V.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Quie.

Mr. QUIE. First, John, on title V, I think most of your letters are in support of putting money back in for guidance and counseling. I hadn't been receiving letters on title V of ESEA.

There seems to be at least substantial authorization there. When our colleague, John Erlenborn states that this bill does not create new authorization, that is true.

But, John, you also say, "or require additional funds."

It seems to me it will require additional funds. The \$116 million that is being recommended by this administration for title III is just enough to continue projects that they have already contracted for.

So, if we are going to get into it it will take additional funds.

Mr. ERLBORN. Maybe it would be more accurate to say "no separate authorization or appropriation." Maybe additional funds would be desirable in this area, or necessary, as you point out; but I don't think that we should identify this as a separate authorization of appropriation. I think it should come within the present authorization.

Mr. QUIE. This is a problem we had with the bill for specific learning disabilities. The administration recommended that we add specific

learning disabilities to the definition of handicapped children to make certain that they were included in some of the expenditure of the money. The learning disabled children will fare much better, according to the administration's point of view and witnesses' point of view if they are included in the definition.

Many of the witnesses wanted special authorization as well as that. You are not asking for that here.

Mr. ERLNBORN. You might call it a modest effort.

Mr. QUIE. According to section IV in the bill, John, study and investigation will evaluate the programs that are in existence and how they are utilized to meet the needs of gifted and talented children and the extent to which new programs are necessary.

Mr. ERLNBORN. That is right.

It might lead to a recommendation by the Commissioner for new legislation or it might lead to a recommendation by the Commissioner that existing authorizations be utilized.

Mr. QUIE. So we either can be suggesting to some of the people that are in the office that here are some programs you ought to be pushing or it might be some encouragement on State and local governments.

Mr. ERLNBORN. Once he starts this, maybe he will continue to have someone in the office devoting time to oversight in this field.

Mr. QUIE. I would thank you for your excellent testimony this morning.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Bell.

Mr. BELL. John, I want to congratulate you on your excellent testimony. I am sorry I wasn't here to hear all of it. But I had some other committee meetings to attend to, as you know.

I was curious about the matter you mentioned on page 4 about no need for funding. Then you go on to say that the States should be encouraged to provide funds for this type of work or at least to encourage talent search and development of talented and gifted children in high school.

How are you going to encourage this. How would you encourage this without providing any funds?

Mr. ERLNBORN. Well, through programs under title III of ESEA, for one thing; through personnel at the State Department level who are charged with the responsibility of having an interest in this area.

I would hope that maybe local funds, more local funds would be devoted.

Mr. BELL. You are not advocating any increased amount in title III or title IV?

Mr. ERLNBORN. I think we will have to face that question in the appropriation bill. I don't think we need any new authorization. I want to emphasize that. I particularly would not want a separate authorization for this to fragment our effort and set priorities here.

Here at the Federal level I think it should be just part of the general authorization.

Mr. BELL. That is all.

Mr. PUCINSKI. You won't have any objection, I hope, if we add language that all rules and regulations will follow the prescribed procedures in the APA rather than guidelines? As you know, my strong feeling is that all of this legislation ought to go through the Federal Register.

We ought to see in advance whatever rules and regulations the administrators want to propose for implementing this legislation and enforcing it. Every interested party ought to have the statutory 30 days to comment on the proposed rules and regulations, rather than having the guidelines set out without an opportunity to review them.

Would you have any objection to including a caveat that the rules and regulations shall be published as prescribed in the Administrative Procedures Act?

Mr. ERLNBORN. If, in the collective wisdom of your subcommittee, that is the thing to do. I do share your concern with guidelines, however. As one example, I think the Green amendment in the poverty bill, even though I opposed it, was completely subverted by the OEO in the issuance of their guidelines for its implementation.

I don't like to see legislation by guidelines. I like to see Congress legislate and the executive branch only implement our intention.

Mr. PUCINSKI. That is the point where we encounter difficulty. When we put in a bill the provision that the administrator shall promulgate the rules and regulations of implementation we give him vast powers. No legislative body could cross every "T" and dot every "I" and anticipate every contingency in the implementation of a bill.

We contend that we spell out the broad philosophy of the act. Yet Congress understood the powers granted the Administrator and consequently, we passed the Administrative Procedures Act which spells out how the Administrator shall use those powers.

One of the provisions of that act is that before the administrator's proposed rules and regulations become enforceable they must be published in the Federal Register and all interested parties, including Members of Congress, have an opportunity to review these proposed rules and regulations to see if indeed they do serve the purpose of the legislation that Congress intended.

As long as agencies follow the APA we have no problems. We have encountered problems with programs like the poverty program simply because in the last 15 years or so, the agencies have bypassed the APA and have developed a new gimmick of government by guidelines, where no one has an opportunity to see what the administrators do with the bills that we pass until the guidelines are published. By that time it is too late, the vote has gone.

As one Member of Congress I want to see what they plan to do with our legislation and if I don't like what they plan to do or if I think it is incorrect I want to have an opportunity as a legislator to say that the proposed rules and regulations are not consistent with what the Congress intended.

Every bill that goes through the floor of the House ought to have that provision in it.

We want to thank you. You have opened up a new and exciting avenue of legislation which I think we need.

Thank you very much.

Mr. ERLNBORN. Thank you.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Before we proceed with Dr. Gallagher, I wonder if I may call upon our colleague, Congressman Stokes. While a new mem-

ber of our committee, he has rapidly won recognition as a hard working, well-instructed member.

Congressman Stokes has a witness whom he would like to introduce at this time, although the witness will testify later along with a panel of other experts in this field.

So we welcome before our committee our very distinguished colleague, Congressman Stokes from Ohio.

STATEMENT OF HON. LOUIS STOKES, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF OHIO

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman and members, thank you very much for recognizing me at this time.

I do have the distinction, honor, and privilege of presenting to this committee a distinguished Clevelander in the person of Dr. Walter Olson.

Interestingly enough, Dr. Olson does not come before your committee in his professional capacity. Dr. Olson is a Director of the Lewis Research Center of NASA in Cleveland, Ohio, and holds a doctorate of philosophy in chemistry from the Case Institute of Technology in Cleveland.

He has been with the U.S. Government since 1942 as a scientist, and has a long and distinguished career in that capacity.

He is now a much sought after consultant, author, and lecturer as a scientist. However, he appears before your committee today in the capacity of being an interested and concerned parent.

Accompanying him here this morning are his wife, Mrs. Olson, and his son. He has long been active, he and his wife, in the gifted and talented child program in Cleveland, Ohio.

Many of the constituents of my district are fortunate to participate in this particular program.

Dr. Olson's son happens to be a gifted child and participates in the program there in Cleveland. He appears here in that capacity today as a sincerely interested and dedicated parent who is concerned with this bill. He has, therefore, asked for the opportunity to appear here and testify in favor of this bill.

It is my pleasure and my privilege to ask that you receive this distinguished gentlemen and that you afford him this opportunity to testify before your committee.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Thank you very much, Mr. Stokes.

We will call on Dr. Olson, together with the rest of the panel, as soon as we hear the testimony of Dr. Gallagher who is from the Bureau of Education of the Handicapped, HEW.

We are grateful you could take time from your busy schedule to come here and tell us about the attributes and interests of Dr. Olson. We congratulate you for having such capable and talented people in your district.

Mr. STOKES. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Dr. Gallagher, would you identify your associates for the record. We are familiar with Dr. Alford. Perhaps you would like to mention the others.

STATEMENT OF DR. JAMES GALLAGHER, ASSOCIATE COMMISSIONER, BUREAU OF EDUCATION OF THE HANDICAPPED, DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE, ACCOMPANIED BY DR. LEONARD LUCITO, DR. EDWIN MARTIN, AND DR. ALBERT L. ALFORD

Dr. GALLAGHER. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

On my right is Dr. Leonard Lucito, who is Director of the Division of Training Programs. Before joining us in the Office of Education, he directed the training programs for educators to work with gifted students at the George Peabody College in Nashville, Tenn., and the University of South Florida in Tampa.

On my far right is Dr. Edwin Martin, whom you are familiar with, the Deputy Associate Commissioner.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to just read some portions of the testimony. If the testimony can be put in the record, I will just read the relevant parts of it and make some comments.

My name is Dr. James J. Gallagher. I am currently the Associate Commissioner in charge of the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped in the Office of Education. I am most pleased to have the opportunity to comment upon H.R. 4807, a bill to provide educational assistance for gifted and talented children.

H.R. 4807 would add to title III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act—supplementary educational centers and services—language specifying that programs for gifted and talented children are among the supplementary educational services and activities which may be supported.

A similar amendment would be made with respect to title V of ESEA—grants to strengthen State departments of education. The bill would also amend section 521 of the Higher Education Act—the Education Professions Development Act—dealing with teacher fellowships, to specify that education for the gifted and talented is a field of education for which fellowships can be granted. A definition of “gifted and talented” is provided for each act amended.

The bill would also authorize the Commissioner to make a study in order to evaluate the manner in which existing Federal educational assistance effectively can be utilized to meet the needs of gifted and talented children and the extent to which new programs are necessary.

I have a personal interest in this area because, prior to coming into the Office of Education I was involved in the Illinois program for the gifted.

The State of Illinois passed a small appropriation for special study projects and a status study of where the State stood in programs for the gifted. After two legislative sessions supporting pilot studies they went on to more extensive legislation. I was pleased to be a member of the State advisory commission on the gifted for 4 years and chairman of that commission for 2 years. In addition, I had the opportunity to work with some of the innovative Governor schools in the States of North Carolina and Georgia.

One of the interesting characteristics of the gifted is that they really aren't a crisis population. They don't require immediate attention. The school system is not going to become unhinged if their needs are not taken care of.

These are long-term needs in terms of what you do or what you don't do for talented youngsters. They extend far into the future.

We have had one major study in this area as done by Dr. Terman in California who followed for 40 years youngsters who were identified as talented and gifted in the California schools. He followed about 1,500 students all the way through their lifespan so that now these subjects that were first seen in the 1920's now are in their full maturity of 50 and 60 years of age.

What he found out was they really were a part of the leadership cadre in business, in the professions, and in politics. In all of the major dimensions of the society, these youngsters grew up to be citizens which had great impact upon the entire citizenry.

That impact extended far beyond their family or their individual circumstances but had a great deal to do with the effectiveness of the community where they lived.

So while they do not cause great immediate concern, or create a crisis, the way that a delinquent youngster or a youngster who is emotionally disturbed causes to the school system, we can say that particular attention paid to them has long-term benefits, not only for the individual, but also for the society.

In Illinois, which is one of the 17 States in which gifted children are specifically noted in the educational code, this program has flourished under both the administration of a Republican Governor and a Democratic Governor.

During the period of time I was there, a Democratic State superintendent of public instruction and a Republican State superintendent of public instruction gave enthusiastic support.

The program itself consisted of a general reimbursement program to provide stimulation for each school district to do what they felt was desirable for their own local needs in this area.

There was a network of demonstration centers that was established. I believe one of those is in the chairman's district as a matter of fact. These were designed to speed the diffusion of new ideas.

The idea was that if you established a practical demonstration of best practices to help gifted students, and you invite other school administrators and teachers to come and view them, this is much more impressive and much more effective in diffusing practices than writing articles in professional journals and/or talking about them in professional conferences or conventions.

There was a training program to help strengthen teachers' abilities to work with talented and gifted youngsters, a small amount of money for research of a practical nature to improve programs, and a small amount of money for State staff.

This program has been going on for about 6 years.

One of the unexpected consequences was the further dispersion of some of the ill-founded fears about what would happen if you really had a program for talented or gifted students. One hears often that they would become labeled as "eggheads" and be rejected by the other students or that the gifted students themselves would become snobbish and contemptuous of other students and their lesser intellectual abilities.

As a matter of fact, some of my own research in this area suggests the opposite happens. Whenever the gifted student comes in contact with other gifted students he becomes much more modest about his

own abilities because, for the first time, he may run into some students that can do better than he can. This is sometimes quite a revelation to the gifted student himself.

In terms of the particular bill, it appears that programs for the gifted and the talented can be conducted under the general authorities to be amended by H.R. 4807. However, such authorities already mention specific target populations or interest areas as examples.

The explicit reference to gifted and talented, while not necessary for program purposes, may enhance the relative priorities which such students receive, thus implementing congressional policy to increase the scope and quality of services to this group.

The committee is, of course, aware that under H.R. 514 and S. 2451 title III of ESEA would, along with title II of ESEA and titles III-A and V-A of the National Defense Education Act, be consolidated into a single title of ESEA. The resulting authority would encompass all programs that presently can be supported under existing law, including programs for the gifted and talented.

In line with the administration's desire to effect a broader and more flexible authority including the title III area, it seems inappropriate to amend title III.

However, we would have no objections to the proposed amendments to title V of ESEA and title V of HEA, if the Congress feels this desirable. We would be prepared to conduct the study suggested in section 4, if authorized.

In closing, Mr. Chairman, this group of gifted and talented children do not cause immediate crises or emergencies in the schools. They do not usually drop out or fail, but their potential attainment may be substantially reduced, essentially unnoticed. Since their ultimate success or lack of success in our educational programs influence our whole society, we welcome the committee's interest in this area.

Thank you.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Thank you very much, Dr. Gallagher.

We will want to incorporate your thinking into the evaluation of this legislation. Would you comment on the question that was raised a little while ago, that, while this does not require any additional expenditures, it will by the very nature of the amendment call for diverting some existing funds into this category?

This seems to be the same question that was raised by the learning disabilities legislation.

What is your thinking about that?

Dr. GALLAGHER. I think by inserting these as examples, what you do is give a signal to the States of congressional interest in this area. This may help the State to make a decision that they would like to spend some of the resources in these titles in this area. It is up to the State to make that decision.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Would the opposite of that also be true now? You mentioned the program in Illinois. In 1969, the State of Illinois spent \$4.5 million for their gifted and talented children programs. Of this money, \$1,200,000, or 26 percent, was spent in the Chicago area.

Illinois recognized the problem and moved. If we create this category in the Federal legislation but don't provide any additional money, as was asked by Mr. Ashbrook a little while ago, is there a possibility that the States will refuse to do anything at the local

level or at the State level because the Federal Government has now incorporated this category in their program?

Can this have an adverse effect on the States trying to solve this problem within their own resources?

Dr. GALLAGHER. Well, in my own judgment, although I have been away from Illinois for 3 years, I think the enthusiasm for the program is well established.

The history of these kinds of interests, I think, would be that it would increase the interests of the local and State educators.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I wasn't thinking of Illinois. I think you are absolutely right. It would be very hard for the State legislature or State superintendent to try to cut back on this very successful program. But I am now thinking about the States that do not have any such program and might be planning a program for gifted and talented children.

If there is Federal legislation, will it discourage the States from taking their own initiative in this area?

Mr. GALLAGHER. I think the histories of these kinds of program, Mr. Chairman, goes the other way. That by showing some stimulation and interest here, you can stimulate the local and State effort.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Perhaps you are right.

Mr. Bell.

Mr. BELL. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Dr. Gallagher, I note that you are involved in work with the handicapped and also I understand that you are concerned about the disadvantaged; and you are also concerned about the problems of the gifted children.

You hear today so much talk about priorities.

How would you place those priorities, the money to be spent. I may sound like a devil's advocate. I am in favor of this bill so don't misunderstand my questioning. But I am curious about these priorities because this is always a constant problem that faces us here in the Congress, particularly during this year when we are having enough problems meeting the budget.

Dr. GALLAGHER. Yes. This is not a practical issue regarding this bill since there is no authorization of funds.

Mr. BELL. That is right. I understand that.

But this could be involved indirectly.

Dr. GALLAGHER. Yes. There is a competition between the immediate needs and the crisis problems of youngsters who are in deep trouble and need help right now, and the needs of youngsters who in the long run will provide some of the major intellectual resources for our society. They might be the very people who can devise solutions to the problems for these other handicapped youngsters.

I think an increased interest in the area of talented youngsters, in terms of what they can do to solve our long-range problems, is a very appropriate one for the States and local educational agencies to consider.

Under the pressure of their immediate circumstances, with all of the problems that bear in on them, they often forget 10 years from now or 5 years from now in favor of saying we have to get through next week.

There is a tendency to put the priorities on those problems which are of immediate impact. It is a worthwhile thing, I think, to re-emphasize the fact that these youngsters need special help, too.

Mr. BELL. Universities and colleges today are actually dropping their requirements in some cases for youngsters entering college because they are trying to admit children from disadvantaged families, whether they are adequately trained or academically capable or not.

Now, we are spending great amounts of money and great effort in the direction of trying to bring our society up, bring our educationally deprived people up.

Dr. GALLAGHER. Yes, sir.

Mr. BELL. We come to a question of how important that is and how important some of these other things are. We just can't do everything.

Dr. GALLAGHER. Yes.

Mr. BELL. I didn't quite get your answer except you said all are important and that this is also important. So you didn't really delineate any particular priority.

Dr. GALLAGHER. Do you want an additional statement?

Mr. BELL. No. [Laughter.]

When you talk about the problems of the gifted child, I assume you mean a gifted child can go into a class where there are no special provisions and lose interest.

And I assume it is even possible he could be a troublemaker and so forth. Is this your feeling from your experience?

Dr. GALLAGHER. Yes; that is right.

In regard to the culturally disadvantaged, the youngster who comes from disadvantaged circumstances, Illinois took special cognizance of this by seeking out those youngsters who were at the very top of their socioeconomic group. So, they didn't just use an IQ score as a single cutoff point for identifying these youngsters.

Most of your programs are taking this into account by assuming there is some major intellectual potential that may be hidden or suppressed by unfortunate circumstances, both in the educational system and in their society. We need to develop that talent every bit as much as the talent which is manifest because of the high opportunities that many talented youngsters have had.

Mr. BELL. Then you are saying in effect that you can't judge the situation by an IQ test or something of this kind?

Dr. GALLAGHER. Not by itself. It is one tool in a list of tools that should be available to help the educator make these measurements.

Mr. BELL. I don't know that anybody else mentioned another tool. What are some of the other tools?

Dr. GALLAGHER. There has been some research in the area of trying to measure creativity, trying to measure the ability of the youngsters to be innovative, to come up with new ideas, which is different from being a kind of absorber or sponge of information. It is very easy for a lot of these youngsters who are highly talented to take on a pattern of collecting information. They take information in, they remember it better, and they become walking encyclopedias.

What some of these other tools try to get at is not their ability to memorize but, faced with a new problem situation that they had no previous knowledge of, their ability to be imaginative in their attack on the problem.

There has been within the last 5 or 10 years an effort to develop measures of this sort so you could get a dimension of intellectual flexibility and problem-solving ability that goes beyond the usual IQ test.

Some of the States have used these measures in combination with the IQ test in terms of identification in these youngsters.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Hathaway.

Mr. HATHAWAY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Dr. Gallagher, could you give me some examples of what they do in Illinois or any other State with which you are familiar that has a talented childrens program?

Mr. PUCINSKI. If the doctor would yield to me, I would be very happy to read to my colleague the full list of what we do in Illinois.

We have a \$4.5 million program, we have seven high schools and 20 elementary schools in my own district which are active participants in the program.

The high schools and the grade schools have advanced placement programs which include biology, chemistry, physics, English, American history, calculus, European history, and so forth.

A great books reading program is run in grades 3 through 12. This program places a teacher in the role of one who asks questions and leads discussion but who does not supply information. It aids the children in more closely examining what they are reading.

All schools in the district participate in the all school music program. Children are selected by competition from each school to take part in the two yearly concerts given by the all school orchestra.

Five demonstration centers are located in Chicago. These centers are for children grades four through eight. They are selected from throughout the Chicago Public School System. The children are brought to the centers two or three times a week for enrichment activities in all areas.

Three schools in my own district are participating in the creativity project. A 6-year research project is presently in a demonstration phase.

Would you like to add to that?

Dr. GALLAGHER. Yes; I think that you mentioned a number of the programs. I might mention the Governor's school concept which identifies the most talented or gifted secondary school students and brings them together for a period of 6 or 8 weeks in the summertime. One such school is in Winston-Salem, N.C. They take from each county in the State of North Carolina the most outstanding and talented students, as recommended by the school officials, and they bring them together. They employ an outstanding faculty, physicists, chemists, social scientists, people in the arts; they give these students an 8-week program of marked enrichment.

Most of the people who have seen this program have been tremendously impressed by the enrichment and growth that these youngsters can show under the special faculty that have been assembled, and the stimulation of interchanging with one another. Sometimes you find a youngster who knows more about science than his teachers in some school systems and to have him rub his mind up against the other students of similar ability and an outstanding faculty can produce tremendously positive results.

We have also had in Illinois, in addition to the things that Mr. Pucinski gave, some programs for identifying the disadvantaged talented, of trying to go into neighborhoods where you don't ordinarily expect high IQ scores to take those youngsters who have shown the very best talent and give them special instruction and special stimulation in this area.

Mr. HATHAWAY. At what age?

Dr. GALLAGHER. What age?

Mr. HATHAWAY. Yes.

Dr. GALLAGHER. This would range all the way from preschool to secondary school. One of the programs in Illinois is an early admittance program in which youngsters who showed intellectual and social maturity to go into the first grade, but were younger than the first grade entrance requirements, are allowed to come into the schools. So it starts all the way from the age of about 5 all the way through the school program.

Mr. HATHAWAY. And is there a reevaluation that some children might develop later?

Dr. GALLAGHER. Yes.

Mr. HATHAWAY. Would you say that the budget for the program in Illinois is adequate?

Dr. GALLAGHER. When I was in Illinois I never said that, Congressman.

Mr. HATHAWAY. What I am trying to get at is what would it cost to do this?

Dr. GALLAGHER. I don't know. I think one of the things that you are suggesting in the bill here is a good first step. Let us have a study and review of where we stand in this area. On the basis of this study, then let us come forward with some estimated costs.

It is possible that some of the things that work in Illinois don't work in some other areas and you are going to have to modify it to the local circumstances.

So I don't know whether you would want to have a nationwide program the same way that you have it in Illinois or other States.

Mr. HATHAWAY. Thank you.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Ruth.

Mr. RUTH. If you had a youngster and he were capable, would you want him in the gifted program?

Dr. GALLAGHER. Yes, sir.

Mr. RUTH. That is all.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Dr. Gallagher, you have had a great deal of experience in this field. If this legislation is enacted and a study is ordered, while I know you can't speak for the Commissioner, and I wouldn't expect you to, would it be your guess that you would be doing the study?

Dr. GALLAGHER. I would certainly hope to be connected with the study, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. PUCINSKI. And you would have no objection, I take it, to having this bill include the language that would require rules and regulations to go the route of the Administrative Procedures Act?

Dr. GALLAGHER. No.

Mr. PUCINSKI. One final question.

I am not quite sure I understand the definition of "gifted and talented children," in accordance with objective criteria prescribed by the Commissioner, children who have "outstanding intellectual ability," and so on.

Would you have any great objection if we took that language "in accordance with objective criteria prescribed by the Commissioner" out and perhaps in some other part of the bill authorized the Commissioner to set up the appropriate methods for determining a gifted child?

Dr. GALLAGHER. I understand.

I see that on the witness list there are some of the people from the Council for Exceptional Children. Mr. Weintraub, in particular has done a legislative study in this area. I think one of the reasons for the broad language might well be the fact that different States have different ways of defining and identifying these students. It might be giving the State that kind of leeway to say, "use your own definition."

However, if this happened I am sure that one first step would be that the Commissioner would call together some of the more outstanding and knowledgeable people in this area and ask them how this kind of definition can be made more definitive for the guidance of the people using this bill.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I really see no great problem with a definition which states, "The term gifted and talented children means, children who have outstanding intellectual ability or creative talent, the development of which requires special activities or services not ordinarily provided by local educational agencies."

I think that defines it pretty well and I am troubled with the additional phrase "in accordance with objective criteria prescribed by the Commissioner."

I am troubled with that language in a definition. I have no objection to stating in some other part of the bill the Commissioner shall develop appropriate means for determining or ascertaining gifted children.

Dr. GALLAGHER. I see. What you are really asking about then is the term objective criteria?

Mr. PUCINSKI. That is correct.

Because I am quite sure I know what your standards might be, based on the knowledge that we have of your work in this field and the background that you have and the testimony that you have given.

But I don't know what someone in your place 10 years from now is going to use as objective criteria.

Dr. GALLAGHER. I see.

Well, I would think, regardless of whether the phrase is in there or not, the list of characteristics which would give guidance would include some objective criteria. It would also include, I am sure, a broader concept, the kind of concept that you are talking about, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Thank you very much, Dr. Gallagher.

We are very grateful to you for coming down and spending your time with us. It is always a pleasure to have you here. It is very constructive and educational for all of us.

Dr. GALLAGHER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Dr. Alford, we are also very happy to have you here before the committee.

Mr. ALFORD. Thank you.

(Dr. Gallagher's prepared statement follows:)

STATEMENT BY DR. JAMES J. GALLAGHER, ASSOCIATE COMMISSIONER, BUREAU OF EDUCATION FOR THE HANDICAPPED, DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Subcommittee, my name is Dr. James J. Gallagher. I am currently the Associate Commissioner in charge of the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped in the Office of Education. I am most pleased to have the opportunity to comment upon H.R. 4807, a bill to provide educational assistance for gifted and talented children.

H.R. 4807 would add to Title III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (Supplementary Educational Centers and Services) language specifying that programs for gifted and talented children are among the supplementary educational services and activities which may be supported. A similar amendment would be made with respect to Title V of ESEA (grants to strengthen State Departments of Education). The bill would also amend § 521 of the Higher Education Act (the Education Professions Development Act), dealing with teacher fellowships, to specify that education for the gifted and talented is a field of education for which fellowships can be granted. A definition of "gifted and talented" is provided for each act amended.

The bill would also authorize the Commissioner to make a study in order to evaluate the manner in which existing Federal educational assistance effectively can be utilized to meet the needs of gifted and talented children and the extent to which new programs are necessary.

Although my present responsibilities encompass programs to bring educational opportunity to handicapped children and do not include programs affected by this bill, I spent a number of years involved in the Illinois State program for gifted children and was a member and chairman of the Governor's State Advisory Committee for 4 years. In addition, I was a consultant to the Governor's Schools for Gifted Students for the States of North Carolina and Georgia. It is on the basis of this experience I would like to speak today.

Programs for gifted children have received their support in a way very different from handicapped children. However, the problem of being markedly different from the average creates similar problems for the gifted as for the retarded child. Educational programs have not been designed specifically for them, teachers have not been given very much experience or training in how to deal with their special problems and, consequently, they must adjust to the Procrustean bed of the average or slightly above average student. For the mentally retarded child, this results in failure and calls for immediate adjustment of the program requested by both parents and educators. The gifted child, however, is able to adjust to the much lower level performance of the class with ease so the impetus created by immediate trouble is lacking.

In many respects, the conservation of our intellectual resources has had an interesting parallel with conservation of the physical resources of the Nation. As a great Nation with almost unparalleled wealth of natural resources, the United States paid little attention initially to conservation on the grounds that so much was available that a little waste would not be terribly harmful.

The same casual approach has been applied to our educational and intellectual resources. It is a mark of greater maturity in our society that we recognize the need for more systematic measures to allow for the fullest development of intellectual resources.

It was the dramatic impetus of Sputnik, 12 or 13 years ago, that helped the country realize that the maximum possible education for the gifted individual is essential to the society's welfare.

In an egalitarian society it is not often popular to point out that some citizens have a much greater impact on their society than others and that many of these persons would be those called "gifted" in our schools. What we do or do not do for them casts a long shadow influencing many persons besides these youths themselves. The sonata never composed, the medical discovery never made, a political breakthrough not accomplished, do not impress the pennywise and pound-foolish.

How can one measure the value of an Oppenheimer, a Copeland, or a Lewis Terman, except to say that their value lies in their irreplaceability? No collection of less trained or less gifted individuals can do what they have done. At another level, one can ask a similar question. What is the value of a physician in a town where there is only one physician? How many other citizens could equate for that one physician—if he should leave?—none. If we believe our educational system makes any impact on talented students, then our failure to provide the maximum challenge and stimulation should fill us with a sense of immeasurable loss:

"Of all sad words of tongue and pen the saddest are these—it might have been."

Illinois is 1 of 17 States that have gifted children specifically noted in the educational code and its program is widely regarded as one of the more extensive and well planned. Using the impetus of Sputnik and a genuinely bipartisan support in the legislature, the program has flourished under both a Republican and Democratic Governor, and a Republican and Democratic State Superintendent of Public Instruction. Support was generated first for an extensive study of the situation that prevailed in Illinois schools at that time and for the development of some pilot projects. Following this came the design of a five-part program consisting of a general reimbursement program; the development of demonstration centers to speed the diffusion of innovation and new techniques for talented students; a small amount of money for experimental projects to work directly on curriculum adjustments for gifted students; a training program to provide summer workshops, inservice training programs and year-round fellowships to develop competent professional personnel to staff the other elements of the program; and a small amount of money for State staff that will provide administrative leadership for the program. (See the attached table.)

This program has been in existence and ongoing for a 6-year period and has received substantial acclaim throughout the country. Many of the fears voiced about programs for the gifted have been shown to be ill founded. One heard at the beginning that the gifted student would be discriminated against, that they would be labeled as "egg heads" and rejected, or that the gifted students themselves would become snobbish and contemptuous of other students, etc. The enthusiastic support of school systems for this effort is, perhaps, the best rebuttal for these fears.

It appears that programs for the gifted and the talented can be conducted under the general authorities to be amended by H.R. 4807. However, such authorities already mention specific target populations or interest areas as examples. The explicit reference to gifted and talented, while not necessary for program purposes, may enhance the relative priorities which such students receive, thus implementing Congressional policy to increase the scope and quality of services to this group.

The Committee is, of course, aware that under H.R. 514 and S. 2451 Title III of ESEA would, along with Title II of ESEA and Titles III-A and V-A of the National Defense Education Act, be consolidated into a single title of ESEA. The resulting authority would encompass all programs that presently can be supported under existing law, including programs for the gifted and talented.

In line with the Administration's desire to effect a broader and more flexible authority including the Title III area, it seems inappropriate to amend Title III.

However, we would have no objections to the proposed amendments to Title V of ESEA and Title V of HEA, if the Congress feels this desirable. We would be prepared to conduct the study suggested in Section 4 if authorized.

In closing, Mr. Chairman, this group of gifted and talented children do not cause immediate crises or emergencies in the schools. They do not usually drop-out or fail, but their potential attainment may be substantially reduced, essentially unnoticed. Since their ultimate success or lack of success in our educational programs influence our whole society, we welcome the Committee's interest in this area.

TABLE XVIII.—ILLINOIS STATE PROGRAM FOR GIFTED, 1965-67¹

Section	Biennial appropriation	Rationale for section
I. Reimbursement.....	\$4,900,000	Provides support through formula or personnel method for a wide variety of special services for gifted students, the particular nature of which is determined by local needs.
II. Demonstration centers.....	1,200,000	Provide centers that would demonstrate excellent educational programming for gifted students so that visitors would become aware of new developments, could decide whether such innovation fits their school, and could receive help for developing talent in their own system.
III. Experimental projects.....	550,000	Research support given to program development efforts such as curriculum innovation and to efforts to evaluate or investigate the impact of the various programs for gifted students.
IV. Training.....	750,000	Provides support for summer workshops, in-service training programs, year-round fellowships and scholarships to provide competent professional personnel to staff other elements of the program.
V. State staff.....	350,000	Provide administrative leadership for program, coordinate the various elements of the program, and provide consultant help for school systems on program development for the gifted.

¹ See October 1965 Illinois Journal of Education for fuller description.

Mr. PUCINSKI. We would like to have Mr. Geer and Mr. Weintraub. Mr. Geer is executive secretary of the Council for Exceptional Children and Mr. Weintraub is the assistant executive secretary.

If you gentlemen would come forth and perhaps we ought to at this time invite the whole panel to join you. Mr. Vassar and Dr. Joseph French, Mr. Marvin Gold, Dr. William Rogge, Dr. Olson.

Doctor, if you would like to join us here at the panel perhaps we could move along and make better progress.

STATEMENT OF WILLIAM C. GEER, EXECUTIVE SECRETARY AND FREDERICK J. WEINTRAUB, ASSISTANT EXECUTIVE SECRETARY, COUNCIL FOR EXCEPTIONAL CHILDREN, ACCOMPANIED BY WILLIAM G. VASSAR, CONSULTANT, GIFTED AND TALENTED, CONNECTICUT DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION; DR. JOSEPH FRENCH, PROFESSOR OF SPECIAL EDUCATION AND EDUCATIONAL PSYCHOLOGY, PENN STATE UNIVERSITY; DR. MARVIN GOLD, LEGISLATIVE CHAIRMAN OF THE ASSOCIATION OF THE GIFTED; AND DR. WALTER T. OLSON, ASSISTANT DIRECTOR OF THE LEWIS RESEARCH CENTER, NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION, CLEVELAND, OHIO

Mr. GEER. We are pleased to be here this morning.

We are aware that the passing of time has a toll on everyone so I am going to dispense with reading my statement if it can be entered in the record. I am suggesting that my colleagues, at least from the Council of Exceptional Children, also will be brief and will give to you such time as you require in the form of questions and answers.

I would like to briefly comment on two or three things that have been brought out this morning, the first to emphasize the interest of the Council for Exceptional Children in both the handicapped and gifted and to point out that this is not new with us, this has been going on since 1922 when our organization was established.

We have had among the distinguished members of the Council for Exceptional Children as our presidents, for example, Mrs. Dorothy

Norris who for years headed one of the programs in Cleveland which has been alluded to this morning.

Also, Dr. Gallagher who just testified is a past president of the Council for Exceptional Children and certainly a scholar both for the handicapped and the gifted.

This trend has been continued through the years and in many instances you will find people with both interests in the mainstream.

We have noted particularly some successes attached to these various titles and the various educational bills that are now included in this bill that is before you, H.R. 4807, and the more recently sponsored bills by a bipartisan Congress.

I would particularly point out that we have a witness today from one State which has made effective use of those titles, Dr. Vassar from Connecticut.

He heads a program in the State Department of Education which is using title V funds for the very purpose of providing some of the support to him.

Also, in the universities there and in the public schools, title III, EPDA and other programs are at work. We hope that this bill will have the effect of stimulating the Office of Education and the State and local school systems to effectively include the talented and gifted as they further develop their State and local programs so that in every State in this Union, not just in the now 17 or 18 which have such programs, we will be educating talent to the very best of advantage.

We hope that in effect that what is happening will reverse this trend which we have noted in the NDEA and also in the staff of the Office of Education which was alluded to earlier by Mr. Erlenborn.

As to criteria for the gifted, I think if there is some revision needed in this matter of objective criteria, perhaps some subjective measures should be brought in as well and evidence throughout the life span of a child to bear upon his placement in school.

This would include a number of things such as unusual perception and reasoning which is sometimes noted early in life with children as young as 3 or 4 years of age.

Studies that take place and observations that are made in kindergarten programs and Headstart programs and elsewhere are significant. Observations of various kinds in the community in which the child lives are pertinent. The exhibition of talent which sometimes occurs early, particularly in music, art and other fields of that kind, and performance in school is some indication of the ability of a child.

All of these added to the objective tests and we certainly would not discard those. We think they are one measure and a very important measure in time.

I also would like to say a few words about the type of study we think is needed in the Office of Education bringing together the thinking of the country in an effective way toward the education of gifted.

First, we think there should be brought together the existing information about the needs of gifted and educational intervention for them, some of which have been mentioned this morning and all of which can be brought into one location by skilled personnel.

We think there needs to be a thorough analysis of need for increased research and dissemination of information, such as has been done in many other areas through the cooperating research program and

through our own research program in the Bureau of the Handicapped and through other resources. Not nearly enough yet has been done in studying the needs and the ways of educating the gifted.

Furthermore, we think that this study should include the applicability and the appropriate uses of existing programs some of which are specified in this bill but more specifically I would mention title I which does get at the needs of the disadvantaged and from the disadvantaged there should be developed leadership for the disadvantaged. I think this is very important.

In title II, the materials, library materials, and so on, which have been used so much in the past for all children, certainly specific projects here, title III, title IV, title V; another area that I would strongly emphasize is in vocational education.

Bear in mind as we go forward with a stronger technological program than we have had in the past, and this is bound to arise from the technology that has taken us to the moon and is taking us many places, it is going to take more highly gifted persons in the engineering and science fields and their education might well be started in a strong vocational emphasis early in life.

These are the things that I particularly want to say.

I would now like to introduce or let the other members of the group proceed as the committee may see fit.

Dr. Rogge is not with us this morning. He was unavoidably detained. I would like to request that his statement which we have supplied to the council might be placed in the record and that the other witnesses will entertain any questions you have.

(The statements of Mr. Geer and Dr. Rogge follow:)

STATEMENT OF WILLIAM C. GEER, EXECUTIVE SECRETARY, THE COUNCIL FOR EXCEPTIONAL CHILDREN

THE GIFTED AND TALENTED CHILDREN EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1969

Mr. Chairman, The Council for Exceptional Children has, through previous testimonies before this Subcommittee, supported all efforts regarding educational equality of opportunity for all children. We now suggest to the Subcommittee that there is still a population in need of your assistance—the gifted and talented population. Many children, comprising three to five percent of the school population, live in city and suburban slums or desolate rural wastes where their giftedness is stunted and warped, if it develops at all. Others, even though they reside under kinder physical conditions, in middle and upper economic level families, are limited by schools, teachers and other community facilities designed for the average child. A national danger grows from the accelerating impact of the neglect of intellect, a danger to the individual, to the American economy and society. It is on this premise that The Council for Exceptional Children and The Association for the Gifted support federal legislation which would protect and enrich giftedness. All human resources need protection and enrichment.

A small segment of education has been interested in the education of gifted and talented children for a long time but, unfortunately, that interest has not permeated the educational community to a great enough extent to insure adequate planning for the education of the gifted. During the 1965-66 school year, Miss Margaret Bynum, State Director of Programs for the Gifted in Georgia, and Mr. Paul Ackerman, Assistant Executive Secretary of The Council for Exceptional Children, conducted a survey to assess that provisions were being offered gifted children in the fifty states. These studies pointed out that only about $\frac{1}{3}$ of the states have established efforts to assess and improve the education of the gifted. Study commissions have been formed, research and demonstration projects have been conducted, wide publicity and solid theoretical foundations have been established. However, despite these developments, very few of our gifted children are now receiving the special education programming they need.

Mr. Chairman, it is not the lack of programs that directly concerns The Council. It is the effects that such an educational void might have upon gifted children and the resultant effects of this lack to our society. Our government is dedicated through, and exists for, the individual. Every person has the right to pursue a life which will allow him to develop a sense of self-fulfillment, personal satisfaction, and happiness; but to achieve such self realization, modern society demands an education, one which will most effectively develop his potentials. In addition to society's obligations to provide each individual with an access to self-fulfillment, our society has a very real obligation to itself, namely assuring its own healthy survival through the continuing development of manpower and leadership. Dr. James Conant, commenting on the need for more persons to enter into the professions, notes that, "In some states, the most pressing need, in terms of recruiting academically talented students for the professions, is to ensure that more of this group finish high school, and at least enter college." Frances Keppel, former U.S. Commissioner of Education, in his book, *The Necessary Revolution in American Education*, further pointed out that:

"The public hears about 6 out of 10 high school graduates who go on to some form of post high school education . . . very few among the public realize that the upper three-fourths of the graduates of certain high schools are better prepared for college than the upper 10% in many schools. Studies in 1962 by Project Talent, financed by the Office of Education, show that almost one-fourth (23%) of high school seniors in the 80-90 academic percentile of their class, and about one-third (34%) of those in the 70-80 percentile, failed to enter college. Data from Project Talent showed that about 15% of the most capable high school graduates with IQs of 120 or about do not continue their education."

The Subcommittee and the Congress of the United States have expended great efforts in the past decade to improve the status of education for children in our urban centers. However, The Council must concur with the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders that the task is still great and the needs of ghetto children immense. Realizing that within our urban centers is located one-third or more of our school population, and that giftedness is not the exclusive domain of middle-class America greater efforts must be made to develop the hidden talent in our cities, for as Goodwin Watson, in his foreword to Frank Reisman's book, *The Culturally Deprived Child*, pointed out:

"The great reservoir of undiscovered and undeveloped intellectual talent in America is not in upper class or middle class neighborhoods. While the proportion of high IQs may be lower in underprivileged areas, the actual numbers of intellectually very bright in poor homes are far in excess of those to be found in the relatively few homes of business and professional leaders."

The Council for Exceptional Children supported enthusiastically, in 1958, the National Defense Education Act and its subsequent amendments. This act provided the conceptual foundation for federal involvement in stimulating and improving programs that would benefit gifted children. In the same vein, we supported wholeheartedly in 1965 the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, which we hoped would stimulate unique approaches to meeting the needs of the gifted educationally disadvantaged child. However, over a decade has passed since NDEA, and we are not optimistic about the growth in special education for the gifted that has occurred. Experience with other types of exceptional children, particularly the handicapped child, has shown that without specific legislative authority and clear administrative visibility, programs that serve minority children tend to be pushed aside in the schools' effort to serve the majority. It is our belief that specific legislation for the gifted is needed before adequate programs will develop. It is for this reason that we support the provisions in H.R. 4807. While the bill does not earmark existing funds nor require new legislation it does, most importantly, express the concern of the Congress about the status of present efforts for the gifted and talented child and directs existing federal resources toward improving the conditions. The bill would open avenues to attacking the following needs:

1. *The need for trained personnel to meet the unique problems of educating the gifted child.*—For the education of the gifted, as well as the education of all children, special emphasis must be placed on the preparation of teachers having the necessary competencies to work effectively with such children. Except for being told during training that there are gifted children, the typical teacher is generally unprepared to instruct them. The number of colleges and universities offering programs preparing teachers to work with gifted children last year numbered 26. This is an increase over the number a decade ago; however, if we are going to expand programs for the gifted child to any great extent, there will need to be

an increase in personnel trained at a rate greater than the present growth rate of training programs. The Education Professions Development Act under the most capable direction of Dr. Donald Davies, Associate Commissioner of the Bureau of Educational Professional Development, provides an excellent vehicle for exploring and developing new personnel training processes to meet the serious education manpower shortage and to increase the competencies of present personnel. Under Part of EPDA Section 531(b) (6) the Congress allowed for grants or contracts to institutions of higher education, state and local education agencies to carry out "programs or projects to prepare teachers and other education personnel to meet the special needs of exceptionally gifted students." At present three projects have been funded under this provision. While provision was made under Part D of EPDA to authorize assistance for personnel development in the area of the gifted, no such provision was made under Part C, the teacher fellowship program. Although these two programs are often administered jointly, it is our belief that the proposed amendment to extend authority under Part C to the gifted and talented will stimulate greater administration attention to the needs of the gifted and talented children.

2. *The need for increased research, dissemination of information, and demonstration projects, to foster development of adequate services for gifted children.*—The Council for Exceptional Children believes very strongly in the principle of building programs upon a solid research foundation. We believe it to be the responsibility of research studies in the area of the gifted, to assess and validate their practices. While there have been a number of research studies in the area of the gifted, little has been done to systemize this research and explore many of the areas pertinent to program operation. Research, however, has very little value unless there is some way to disseminate such information to the field. All too often research sponsored by federal agencies never goes further than the research agency itself or the library bookshelf. Experience with the Instructional Materials Centers, funded by the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped, has shown that intensive efforts at dissemination can result in upgrading programs in the classroom.

The value of demonstration programs in the area of the gifted has been illustrated most clearly in the State of Illinois. Beginning in 1959, the Illinois State Legislature appropriated money for the establishment of educational pilot projects to be developed for gifted children throughout the state. The purpose of the demonstration centers was to provide models of program excellence with a variety of provisions for the gifted in ordinary school settings. Twenty-two such centers were established. Most of these centers have had large numbers of visitors who are invited to observe these programs and to discuss them with their local staff and students. Reports from Illinois indicate that the centers have significantly stimulated new programs and helped to upgrade existing programs. We believe that the amendment to Title III, ESEA, has demonstrated itself to be an appropriate vehicle for achieving these ends. The proposed amendment to Title III of ESEA contained in HR 4807 will convey to the administrators of these programs the intent that gifted and talented children are entitled to services under the provision of this act.

3. *The need for the establishment at the federal, state and local level of clear administrative responsibility for the administration of programs for gifted children.*—In a recent bulletin of the Connecticut State Department of Education written by Joseph Renzulli, Assistant Professor, University of Connecticut, and William Vassar, State Consultant for the Gifted and Talented, Connecticut State Department of Education, it was stated that:

"A clear designation of administrative responsibility is an essential condition for the most efficient operation of any school program. Although the size and resources of a school system will determine the amount of administrative time that can be allocated to the gifted child program, it is necessary that the person in charge of even the smallest program be given sufficient time and resources to carry out his administrative duties in this area. Already overburdened administrators, supervisors, or teachers—who are given the responsibility of a special program as an "extra" assignment without a corresponding reduction of duties—are likely to approach the task with less than optimal enthusiasm."

The experiences of The Council and this Subcommittee with programs for the handicapped have given clear indication that programs for minority group children which do not have clear administrative visibility in the Office of Education tend to "get lost" in the maze of Office of Education programs. At present the Office of Education, while supporting a small number of programs for the gifted under Title III of ESEA and other federal support programs, does not, to

the best of our knowledge, employ a full-time staff specialist in the area of the gifted. It is interesting to note that the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped has on its staff two leading authorities in the nation on the education of the gifted, Dr. James Gallagher, Associate Commissioner for the Education of the Handicapped, and Dr. Leonard Lucito, Director of the Division of Training for the Education of the Handicapped. In many states programs for the gifted are administered through a state agency within the State Department of Education which has responsibility for all exceptional children, including the handicapped as well as the gifted.

Title V of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act has proven to be a most successful program in improving the quality of leadership in the state departments of education. As noted earlier in our statement very few state departments of education assign one or more fulltime staff members for programs for the gifted and talented. Nine out of ten of the gifted and talented children now receiving services come from these states. It is our belief that effective state leadership is imperative to the development of adequate local programs for gifted and talented children. In this regard, we recommend the amendment to Title V of ESEA contained in H.R. 4807 which would enable state education agencies to develop appropriate plans for providing for gifted and talented children within their states and for providing the necessary personnel to implement such plans.

4. Perhaps the most important provision contained in H.R. 4807 is that provision requiring the Commissioner of Education to conduct a study as to how existing education programs can best be utilized to meet the needs of the gifted and talented and what new programs might be necessary and further require him to report such findings back to the Congress. It is The Council for Exceptional Children and The Association for the Gifted's sincere hope that the total education community and the existing resources of the federal government can be directed toward meeting the unique needs of the gifted and talented child. It is for this reason that we are not recommending to the Committee at this time the creation of "new" programs for these children. We believe that under Congressional request the Office of Education should review its present programs and offer recommendations for future study. We hope that the Office of Education has learned from past experience with the handicapped that it cannot avoid in its operations the need of minority group children. We believe that the provision contained in H.R. 4807 requiring such a study expresses the intent of the Congress that something should be done for the gifted and talented by allowing the administrative agency to propose a direction to be taken. We believe this is a reasonable approach and we look forward to working with the Office of Education or any other delegated agency in this endeavor.

Mr. Chairman, I do not need to tell you or your colleagues that the Congress and the Administration today are searching for ways to defend democracy and the right of the people of the world to an adequate self-determination of their destiny. As important as defense programs, economic aid programs and others may be, it has been clearly demonstrated through the Peace Corps, through our international exchanges in education and through other means of similar nature, that the most valuable resources we can offer in the interest of world peace and development is the intellect and talent which we have so freely tried to foster through our vast educational system. We consider it paramount, therefore, that the Congress and the Country further delineate our education efforts to the end that the strongest possible intellectual, scientific, artistic, and cultural leaders will be developed. This, we believe, can be done most expeditiously by an organized educational effort through the programs specified in HR 4807.

STATEMENT OF WILLIAM M. ROGGE, PRESIDENT, THE ASSOCIATION FOR THE GIFTED

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Subcommittee, I am William M. Rogge, President of The Association for the Gifted and Research Professor, Department of Special Education, University of Illinois.

Title III, ESEA, was designed to support program development rather than to underwrite existing programs. The goal is laudable for at least two reasons. First, local districts simply cannot underwrite the costs of large scale development and evaluation. They have a constant struggle just to meet the costs of inflation, expanding enrollments, and higher standards imposed by state departments of education. Second, the Act gives recognition to the importance of invention already so well established in business and industry.

The Education Professions Development Act, broadly conceived legislation to give specific support to highly selected training programs, recognizes that invention is also required by training institutions. While the Act provides money to support invention, the more important contribution is to establish new priorities in training.

Despite the intent and implementation of the two Acts, relatively little has been accomplished to develop new types of programs for children with special talents. Existing programs for "gifted" children suffer from several shortcomings that new types of programs would help remedy. These shortcomings are:

1. Though schools show lopsided academic interests, the academically gifted are seldom broken out of the lockstep system. Despite overwhelming evidence that academically gifted are capable of much higher level intellectual effort, typically they are expected to master the regular curriculum, not to assume direct responsibility for intellectual discussions that they are so qualified to do, and not to explore in depth the implications of their talents in their own lives and for their fellowman.

2. The work that is done for "gifted" children is often throttled by narrowly conceived academic criteria. Effective programs for the gifted call for a *greatly expanded base of identification procedures and diversified programs* that recognize the true complexity of talent. A partial list of the talents that need as much recognition and action as academic talent follows:

- a. *Leadership*.—At a time when complaints are being translated into punitive legislation and punishment against "irresponsible" youth, we desperately need positive approaches to develop responsible leadership among youth. Responsible leadership does not mean conforming behavior; it does mean a person who sees himself accountable for the lives he affects and who has a sensitivity for unrecognized wants both in his peers and in-group members as well as in other groups.

- b. *Creativity*.—Though much talk exists in education, little is done about the creative act other than in the expressive arts. The creative act must have an environment in which meaningful problems will exist and can be attacked with solutions that the adult may not like but will accept because the originator and implementor of the solution must follow through and be accountable for the consequences. Some of the highest awards in our society are given to the creator, whether for a new computer design, a new organizational pattern, a new sales approach, or a new book. Unfortunately, little effort is made in schools to recognize and nurture creative talent and to reward it as our culture does.

- c. *Ethical*.—Some might call this talent a religious sensitivity, others, a drive to rebuild value systems by example. Whatever the name, the need is obvious.

Unfortunately, very few programs presently supported by the two acts in any way expand the concept of giftedness, demonstrate unique and in-depth approaches, or train people to do the development and demonstration.

However, if both acts had an added requirement to differentiate their support into several modes of talent development, then there would be more focused attention by educators and others who share in creating new approaches. It is not that most educators are against more intense talent development but that they are already engaged in other tasks demanding attention. They tend to lose a proper sense of priorities because of deep involvement in existing programs. Congress can provide the sense of direction fortunately, by being removed enough to obtain a more proper perspective. Not even those educators who are against specialized programs that isolate academically talented students will reject broader conceptions of talent. They want to place the child first, and the talent second. They even more strongly call for new approaches to develop the talent.

Another powerful argument for development of new programs for diversified talents is that many of the approaches will eventually prove suitable for larger segments of the student population. For example, independent study has been used often for academically gifted children. The experience showed that other children could also profit from independent studies. New mathematics was first designed for the college bound student, but both the approaches and the content have been worked into the general arithmetic curriculum. Art and music, originally conceived for the highly expressive student, is now made available to students of only average talents because he profits too.

More specifically, placing higher priorities on talent development within the two acts should lead to these kinds of consequences:

Identification.—New tests and different identification procedures would be more widely used in the schools. The concentration on traditional I.Q. tests would be broadened.

Development.—Programs would reflect more of the research on creativity, leadership, kinesthetic talent, ethical talent, and other talents, as well as reflect some of the insights little used about academically gifted children. EPDA especially could support the training of professionals to do this developmental work.

Demonstrations.—Title III, ESEA, is essentially a demonstration approach. Such programs for the gifted would make it possible for visitors to see more distinctive and unique demonstrations. The visitor could decide how he might adapt the program in his school. The experience in the Illinois Gifted Program, which has made extensive use of demonstrations, showed that educators knew little about how to make demonstrations effective. An intensive training program was carried on for the directors of the demonstration centers, preparing them to play a role unknown to them and others. EPDA could support similar training efforts.

Reorganization.—Special classes for gifted and talented children should not be the sole organization pattern. More sophisticated approaches will lead to new pupil-teacher administrator relationships that do not isolate the child in a special class, that give a student more self-direction and responsibility, and that encourages more individual treatment.

Student Evaluation.—Nothing places a tighter stranglehold on education than the present system of evaluating students. The system is highly inbred, and serves to reward academic achievement only. Breaking the stranglehold is difficult. Placing higher priority on diversified talents will help shift attention away from narrow testing that, ironically, doesn't do very well even with the academically gifted. Higher level thought processes are only poorly recognized.

Program Evaluation.—In contrast to student evaluation, done with such compulsive rigor, program evaluation is poorly understood and seldom done well. Shifting priorities won't directly help but, hopefully, more specific focus on talents might make evaluation somewhat easier to design and carry out. Now educators are overwhelmed by the difficulties and complexities of evaluation. Consequently, they fall back on those procedures already designed for student evaluation that are so heavily academic. Shifting focus to evaluate a leadership or creative performance could then help in program assessment.

In conclusion, Congress would perform a helpful and highly significant function for the education community by calling for specific efforts to recognize and to develop many of the little developed talents of our people.

Mr. GEER. With us in addition to Dr. Olson, whom Mr. Stokes earlier introduced, are Mr. William Vassar, from Connecticut; Dr. Joseph French, Pennsylvania; Dr. Marvin Gold, transitional from Florida to Connecticut to Kentucky, the Lincoln school in Kentucky; and Mr. Weintraub who has been mentioned earlier as having studied the State legislation in this field.

We will now proceed as you see fit.

Mr. PUTINSKI. Thank you very much.

I have asked Dr. Olson to join the panel here but actually I am looking forward to Dr. Olson's testimony as kind of a wrap-up witness, particularly since he has had vast experience in NASA and when we consider as Mr. Erlenborn has said when we started the hearings, everybody got all worked up about this and related problems some 10 years ago when sputnik was launched.

I would like to see Dr. Olson kind of bring this whole subject back into focus in relation to his own experience in this very important field. But I am glad to see the doctor joined this panel and I hope all of you feel free to make whatever observations you wish as we go along.

Now, you gentlemen all have presented statements, I presume, which will go into the record at this point.

(The statements referred to follow :)

STATEMENT OF WILLIAM G. VASSAR, PRESIDENT-ELECT, THE ASSOCIATION
FOR THE GIFTED

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Subcommittee, I am William G. Vassar, Immediate Past President of the National Association for Gifted Children, President-Elect of The Association for the Gifted and Consultant for the Gifted and Talented, Connecticut State Department of Education.

HR 4807, The Gifted and Talented Children Educational Assistance Act of 1969, is designed to focus existing Federal legislation and financial resources on the improvement of programming and educational opportunities for the nation's gifted and talented children and youth.

The gifted and talented represent a minority group within the total educational spectrum, and, as such, suffer the same disadvantages as other areas of exceptionality when they are faced with general programs in education. Because they are a relatively small interest group, they are many times excluded from taking part in the general policy making, legislative programs or the implementation of existing legislation.

Much the same kinds of things happen to the area of the gifted as has happened to the mentally retarded pupils who, in theory, are included under general education provisions, but in practice are frozen out, not through deliberate intent, but merely through the mechanisms which are developed to make the system work. A specific example of this lies in the similarity between the area of the gifted and the area of the mentally retarded in regard to curriculum differentiation. Originally education of the mentally retarded consisted of attempts to adopt or slightly modify the regular curriculum, without changing it to meet the specific needs of children.

This same problem exists with the gifted and talented in the opposite direction. Numerous moves have been made to allow the gifted and talented to "speed up" their curriculum or extend it through "enrichment" but without full recognition of their abilities to pursue learning well beyond and outside of the curriculum geared to the normality of children and youth.

If the Congress would pass and implement this bill designed to focus Federal resources on the gifted and talented in the areas of teacher training, leadership personnel and innovative and exemplary programs, it would be possible for such "earmarked" areas to be handled by identifiable units concerned with the education of the gifted in the States and the universities.

With the assistance of government stimulation through earmarked areas educational publics could be stimulated to intensify their efforts to provide appropriate education for the gifted and talented. On the basis of past experiences, I feel that education of the gifted and talented can be more adequately encouraged and served through setting aside specific areas in present legislation for this purpose.

At this point, I would like to submit how the amending of Title V of P.L. 89-10 (E.S.E.A.) would enable state education agencies to develop appropriate plans and to acquire the necessary personnel to provide for the educational needs of the gifted and talented within the state.

An unpublished study was conducted by William G. Vassar, Consultant for Gifted and Talented Programs, Connecticut State Department of Education and Joseph S. Renzulli, Associate Professor, University of Connecticut during early 1968 to determine the nature and extent of commitments to differential educational provisions for gifted and talented on the part of the fifty State Departments of Education.

Some of the major findings relevant to the Title V of P. L. 89-10 are as follows:

1. That only a small percentage of the Nation's gifted and talented youth are being served through special programs.

2. That in the vast majority of States (75%), little or no systematic attention is being paid to the problem by State Departments of Education.

(a) Only 15 States reported the assignment of one or more full-time staff member or equivalent to the State's efforts to educate the gifted.

(b) Thirteen states give token attention.

(c) Twenty-two (22) states have *no one* at State level responsible for such children and programs.

(d) The absence of State leadership may mean that the gifted in these states have no one to serve as a spokesman for educational improvement in this area.

3. The data, generally, indicated a positive relationship between State services for the gifted and talented and the percent of students being served. For example, states with full-time consultative services indicated that these services reach about three percent of the total school population.

(a) With less services at the State level, the proportion of gifted students served declined to .06 percent in the 22 States which did not offer any staff services at the State level.

4. States assigning full-time staff members to program for the gifted had only 41.6% of the Nation's public school population but served 75% of the gifted reported in the study. On the other hand, States having no staff members so assigned had 30% of the Nation's children and served but one percent of the gifted reported.

5. Only two States utilized Title V of P.L. 89-10 to strengthen their departments by adding full-time staff to provide stimulation and leadership in the States for the gifted and talented (Connecticut and Colorado). A third State (California) used Title V funds to develop curriculum in this area, since they already had two full-time consultants for the gifted on staff.

I am sure that you as members of this committee know what effect this amendment could have in the States for gifted and talented pupils. However, to further strengthen your perception, permit me to relate to you how a Title V grant to Connecticut for this specific purpose has functioned for the past four years.

As the Consultant for Gifted and Talented Programs in the Connecticut State Department of Education my salary and supportive services have been funded under a Title V grant to the State Department of Education since 1966. The basic objective of the grant was to provide leadership and consultative services to local school districts throughout Connecticut in order to develop quality programs for all gifted and talented pupils.

The following should serve as indicators of what types of growth have materialized with the assistance of Title V monies:

(a) Full-time consultative services to local districts for gifted and talented programs.

(b) State legislation for the gifted and talented has been enacted to provide excess cost reimbursement ($\frac{2}{3}$) to school districts for special programs for such pupils.

(c) Programs for the gifted and talented in local school districts have more than tripled in the past three years and programs in existence are now providing for more than twice as many students.

(d) Teacher-training in the colleges and universities has moved from a single course offering in 1966 (for the entire state) to three graduate training programs in three of our state institutions of higher learning. More than 700 teachers, counselors and leadership personnel are enrolled in these courses.

(e) More than 1500 teachers and leadership personnel have had the benefit of short time workshops and institutes sponsored by the State, exclusively on the gifted throughout the State.

(f) Two state publications have been published and circulated widely throughout the State and Nation.

(g) Over 130 high schools have over 2500 students doing college level work in Advanced Placement.

(h) Conducted an analysis of all programs in the State by Dr. Virgil Ward. This report furnished (June 1969) the State Department with long ranged objectives for both the State and local district leadership in such programming.

Another section of the study dealt with an analysis of the utilization of Title III (P. L. 89-10) to provide for programming for gifted and talented pupils. The following items should show how Title III was used in the fifty states:

1. Title III is one of the most significant programs for identifying and serving gifted children.

2. Careful analysis indicates that, for fiscal year 1967, \$8,507,530 of Title III funds were invested in programs directly or indirectly relative to the gifted and talented. This was 5.3 percent of total expenditures for Fiscal Year 1967. Of this amount, however, only \$4,230,236 was identified as direct classroom support to the gifted, the rest being for total programs in which some gifted pupils could be identified as participants. This represents only 2.9 percent of the total expenditure for Title III in Fiscal Year 1967.

3. For Fiscal Year 1968, only \$906,567 was identified as financial support for gifted projects. This represented 0.5 percent of the total estimated expenditure. Information was not available at the time of the study to determine the precise

reason for this decline in investment for education of the gifted, but there was speculation that it resulted from pressures which compete for available funds.

4. There was little question, from the results of the study, that Title III supplementary centers could have a great impact on education of the gifted through such devices as the establishment of "Talent Centers" in elementary and secondary schools. As the States assume more responsibility under the new funding provisions, it remains to be seen just how such centers will be encouraged and supported by State administration.

5. Despite the opportunity which Title III provides for efforts to aid the gifted and talented, consultant evaluation indicate that this opportunity has been largely overlooked or neglected.

6. Thus, the operational results of this program seem to indicate that permissiveness of support authorization by itself is *not* sufficient to bring about adequate attention to the education of the gifted and talented; what is required is a specific designation that funds from Title III should be available for this purpose.

Furthermore, the most significant reasons why Title III has not been used to a greater extent for development of programs for the gifted seem to be the following according to consultants involved in the study:

1. School districts usually assign a low priority to any effort specific to the gifted. Other needs seem much more important. (In reality, other needs do affect *more* pupils, although they may not be more important needs.)

2. Few school personnel have been educated specifically to understand and plan for the gifted. (On the other hand, thousands of specialists are educated each year to work with the handicapped.)

3. Most gifted students do not exhibit striking symptoms of maladjustment; this contributes to the illusion that their needs are being met in the regular school program. Unfortunately, many talents are completely obscured during school years because potential giftedness is not sought systematically, nor encouraged to produce beyond "the norms".

4. In most cases where gifted students have been identified, the traditional concept of "intelligence by I.Q." has been rigidly employed. The result of course, is that the range of *remarkable leadership* and the creative abilities of children (not measured by I.Q.) are largely neglected.

Notwithstanding the weaknesses of programming and administering the Title III program, it provides a basic concept and vehicle for the kind of effort which can bear fruit in identifying, nurturing and bringing to the fore those gifted and talented individuals which the school district has too often neglected because they are beyond the pace of the regular curriculum design. However, the effective utilization of Title III depends upon our recognition that the extraordinary learning abilities and outstanding talents in the creative arts of our Nation's children and youth are our greatest insurance for maintaining social health and assuring national progress in the years ahead.

Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act provides general assistance to improve the education of children from low-income families.

According to another unpublished study, there is a strong indication that programs for potentially gifted and talented youth from disadvantaged areas are assigned a low priority. In contrast to its analysis of programs supported under provisions of Title III, the survey showed that Title I funding involved very little activity to identify or develop the special talents of disadvantaged children.

School administrators probably tend to feel that until every deprived student obtains an education of minimum quality, there is no time to worry about special efforts for the gifted in that population.

However, the point has to be made that compensatory programs should not rule out special programs for gifted students in ghetto schools. Considering all that we know about the motivational effect that students have on each other, we should realize that encouraging brilliant achievement by a few students in a school population of hundreds, can inspire other deprived pupils to greater effort than even the most understanding teacher can elicit.

Programs for gifted and talented pupils are doomed to failure almost immediately unless specific thrusts are made to train experienced and prospective teachers of the gifted and talented. Teacher training is one of the most important components of the total package for gifted and talented students. Gifted students need the benefit of teachers and leadership professionals who have been properly trained to meet the needs of these pupils. If these youngsters are exceptionally bright pupils who deviate from the norm so markedly that they need *special kinds*

of programs, then the professional personnel delegated this responsibility need special kinds of training in teaching strategies and curriculum materials that will nurture intelligence to its fullest.

Few quality programs for training of teachers of exceptional children exist in the area of higher education without some Federal Assistance from the variety of Federal legislation now being implemented throughout the country. The proposed amendments to Sections 521 and 1201 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 would focus attention on the recruitment and development of personnel necessary to work with gifted and talented children by adding "gifted and talented" as a priority area.

A recent EPDA grant to the University of Connecticut under the direction of Dr. Joseph S. Renzulli, entitled "Teaching the Talented: A Program to Train Personnel for Working with Culturally Disadvantaged Gifted and Talented Students," has been funded for the next academic year (1969-70) for over \$100,000. This grant should assist the State and the Nation in training personnel in a specific area of the gifted and talented. However, only three EPDA proposals relative to the gifted were funded for this time period.

The amendment should allow a priority for such traineeship and fellowships so sorely needed to properly implement total programing for the gifted and talented at the local level.

The Association for the Gifted and the National Association for Gifted Children represent over 2000 professional and lay people throughout the country with profound commitments to the education of gifted and talented children and youth agree that this present bill would give much needed impetus to stimulate education of the gifted in the Nation.

The Council of State Directors of Gifted Programs, a group of fifteen full-time state consultants for the education of the gifted are also in full agreement that this legislation would be a major step forward in education of the gifted throughout the country.

The two state affiliate organizations of The Association for the Gifted—the Ohio Association for the Gifted and the Florida Association for the Gifted—have endorsed this bill for passage by the Congress.

I would like to take this opportunity to thank the members of this committee for giving me the opportunity to present testimony for H.R. 4807. I deem it a sincere pleasure and hope that you will see fit to act favorably on this educational assistance act to benefit the gifted and talented children and youth of our Nation. I know from personal experience, as a full-time state consultant, what the amendments suggested in this bill could provide to better the educational opportunities for this type of exceptional youngster. Please feel free to call upon the people in Connecticut for further help when it is needed.

STATEMENT OF JOSEPH L. FRENCH, IMMEDIATE PAST PRESIDENT, THE
ASSOCIATION FOR THE GIFTED

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Subcommittee, I am Joseph L. French, Immediate Past President of The Association for the Gifted, and Professor of Special Education and Educational Psychology at The Pennsylvania State University.

Providing ideal learning conditions for all school children has been the principal concern of educators for a long time. Every few years someone or some event causes attention to be focused on students with superior potential for learning. During the late fifties and early sixties there was renewed interest in the gifted. However, the interest has reached a plateau or has receded during the last few years.

The terms "gifted" and "talented" usually refer to those with intellectual or academic capabilities that exceed a majority of their age mates. But in a way all children have gifts and talents in addition to those that are academic in nature. We have all seen persons who are quite unusual in their ability to arbitrate or express affection. Others possess unique physical characteristics, exceptional musical qualities, or mechanical ingenuity. Sometimes several or all of these characteristics are found in one individual. If these characteristics are "gifts," they are the product of an individual's inherited capability and interaction with his surroundings. The point we are trying to make today is that this country possesses a large number of individuals who have outstanding potentiality, but whose interactions with their surroundings are not sufficient to produce the kind of effective brain utilization that we desire.

"Gifted" is a hard thing to define. One cannot evaluate Thomas Jefferson by saying he is equal to 20 statesmen of inferior rank. The most frequently used method of identifying gifted children and youth is through the use of tests that require a maximum performance from the individual. In many instances this maximum performance is not forthcoming. Giftedness is much more difficult to identify than dullness because (1) many gifted people do not live in situations which encourage ingenious verbal or academic behavior, (2) gifted people are capable of average performance and often perform at an average level (unless they are motivated to perform at their maximum level), and (3) gifted responses are marked by appropriateness in a particular situation and/or by the fact that the responses are stimulated by small clues which may or may not produce unusual behavior or performance. These responses indicate giftedness because less able people in that situation do not function as effectively. In the research involving gifted subjects, more often than not, investigators have used unique rather than uniform cutoff scores on the measuring instruments used in the identification process of the gifted. Unfortunately, this inconsistency makes generalization from study to study difficult. Perhaps one of the reasons for diversity in identification procedures is that most of the research is done by graduate students in education working independently. Since these students are anxious to finish their degrees, the studies are often of short duration rather than of a longitudinal nature.

However, from the studies that have been conducted we can feel rather sure of some findings. We do know that identification of gifted children is not easy. If the teacher is not aided by tests she tends to miss large numbers of children who are actually gifted and she may recommend others as gifted when in reality they are not. Among minority groups in our culture who live in less than average socio-economic situations and have limited educational opportunities the development of ability and talent is most limited, although gifted children are to be found in every racial and economic group so far examined. Gifted children are as a group more popular with their peers than any other intellectual group. This popularity of gifted individuals probably does not depend on their intellectual characteristics, for in many instances, the gifted hide their intellectual superiority to obtain popularity. Furthermore, their popularity is more evident at the elementary school level than at the secondary level. Most gifted children do well in school by usual standards of performance. They excel in achievement tests which measure factual knowledge. Their ability to be creative or analytical with the information they have obtained is less obvious. However, a sizable minority of gifted children are underachieving. While some of these children seem to have personality and motivation problems which often have their beginning outside of the school, the underachievement of many others can be traced to an inadequate understanding of intellectual superiority by the teachers with whom they come in contact and the program the students must follow.

In recent years many people have assumed that all students of above intellectual ability not only graduate from high school but go on to college. Such an assumption is incorrect. Recent studies indicate that about 10% of high school dropouts have IQ's of 110 or above. In a comprehensive study of Pennsylvania youth in 1964-65, we found more than 1800 high ability dropouts. Nearly 500 had IQ's of 120 and above, and 80 had IQ's of 130 or more. These figures are impressive when it is recognized that Pennsylvania has one of the lowest dropout rates in the country.

Some frequently mentioned reasons for school withdrawal were not substantiated in the findings of this study of dropouts with IQ's of 110 and above. Noticeably absent from the data are indications of frequent school transfer, early part-time employment, unemployment upon leaving school, generally low parental education, and generally low parental employment status. On the other hand, the dropouts differ from the persisters (that is, students of the same sex, age, IQ, and neighborhood who were still in school) in such areas as personality, interests, educational skills, and family orientation towards school processes.

At the conclusion of our study of high school dropouts of high mental ability, we drew a number of conclusions and I would like to mention very briefly a few of them at this point. What most of the dropouts wanted out of school was "practical" courses which would assist them in "living in the real world." There is reason to believe that their perception of the content of many courses and sequences of courses was not altogether unrealistic. We obtained much evidence

from our interviews to suggest that teachers were either unaware of or inattentive to many of the needs of these students. One girl put it this way :

"I feel the two main problems in today's schools are the over-crowded classrooms and the lack of teacher dedication and interest. Classes today are so large that the students have little chance to get individual attention for their special problems. By the time attendance is taken, assignments given out, and things organized, there is little time for study of the subject itself. Children who find it difficult to study or slow learners are left behind or forgotten and soon lose interest. Consequently, the slow learners fail the subject. On the other hand, the quick learners are quickly bored and disgusted. If classes were smaller or divided according to learning ability, the teachers would get to know the students as people with different interests and problems, and in many cases could find out why the children find it difficult to learn a certain subject. If the teachers would take a little more time and interest to show the students that someone cares about them and their progress, the students would try a lot harder to get better grades.

"Some people just don't have the ability, but many more have it and don't use it. What's the use of trying if no one notices or cares about your efforts? I know I never would have left school if my teachers and principal had listened to me and tried to understand why I found a subject difficult. If they had helped me instead of lecturing, I could have been a graduate today. I had only four weeks to go."

This girl gives some of the reasons that many of us have given over the years, but I have come to believe that she is overly generous. I believe that many teachers are not informed about the different learning needs of children and expect all individuals to learn as they learned.

A male dropout was not so kind. He had this to say :

"... Some of the most psychotic human beings I have ever met have been in a school room. These teachers not only undermine the possibility of education in the classroom, but they harass and psychologically upset the children and young adults at an age when they cannot retaliate. Periodic checks, not only written but oral, should be made to see if teachers are fit to be in such a position. Thank you for giving me this opportunity to let you know how I feel."

Dropouts in our study desired more opportunity to arrange for good classes with understanding teachers in all curricular offerings. "If they had helped me instead of lecturing ..." was a theme frequently observed. Diversified learning activities to meet the needs of bright, average, and dull students in every curriculum and, especially, to meet the needs of bright students in vocational-commercial courses were frequently requested by the students in our study.

The commonly held expectation that bright students should attend traditional college programs is possibly an important variable in the dropping-out process. Such a notion leads naturally to the conclusion that bright boys who go into the trades have low standards and are consequently failing to use their talents wisely. Can it be that the services of a dentist are of more value than those of a skilled auto mechanic? Is the public accountant to be more respected than a carpenter? The interdependence of the one upon the other makes comparison meaningless, yet bright students are often expected to go into the academic curriculum as a matter of course. When failure is apparent they are often transferred to another curriculum. But in the other curriculum which is geared to a student of lower intellectual level, the challenge, the interest, the pace, is not appropriate for the intellectually capable student.

It is possible in light of their academic success (or lack of it, particularly in English) that many of the male dropouts of high intellectual ability left school because they lacked the basic language skills. Such difficulties as would result from poor language ability might well have led to vocational training as a logical substitute for professional instruction, which demands a higher level ability of English usage. Early identification of deficits in learning skills is essential for effective remedial assistance. It seems particularly important to be aware of a bright student with learning difficulties and to take necessary steps to overcome these deficiencies as early as possible. Too often bright students with learning difficulties have been excluded from the few programs that are in existence in the country today. Instead of being given special consideration and remediation, in effect, they have been told "stay in the same old rut in which you have experienced failure until you succeed, and then, if you succeed, you can have some of our special programming."

Perhaps I have emphasized the dropouts too much in this presentation. Educators have been fighting the dropout problem vigorously over the past decade, and they have made excellent success in retaining students in school. Each year we retain more and more students through 12 years of schooling. However, one of the important findings in our study of dropouts was not anticipated and therefore unavailable in desirable detail. This surprise finding dealt with the persister and the problems he faces in school. Perhaps his problems are more severe than the dropout's problems; for after the dropout left school, he recognized the importance of school and had some desire to improve his education. Whether the dropouts went back to school or not is probably not as important as the fact they were fighting their problem and working for a better situation. Many of the persisters, on the other hand, sounded on the tapes of their interviews more like we expected the dropouts to sound. They were quite hostile toward school. One of them stated, "I have an agreement with the teachers—they don't bother me, and I don't bother them." Another referred to school as "a place to come in out of the cold." These students, while not contributing to the official dropout statistics, have dropped out of the educational process and are staying on because we are treating the symptom rather than the real causes of undesirable student attitude; namely, inadequate preparation of teachers to meet the educational needs of children and youth who are of above average learning ability.

Although I have not engaged in formal study of campus rebels, from the listening I have done, I think many of the rebels exhibit some of the same symptoms we observed in our sample of "persisters." Many students are in college because their parents force them to be there, because business leaders require college degrees of bright job applicants, and/or because they will be drafted if they drop out of college and do not find a job in an essential industry. Whatever the reason, the large increase in proportion of youth in college results in classes partially filled with youths who do not want to be there and/or who do not see the relevance in the material covered.

Professors are familiar with students who had reasons for going to college much like our reasons and many professors are not ready to meet the changing educational needs of the student body. Just because a student is bright does not mean that he is academically oriented and thirsting for the courses we "canned" 10 years ago. However, just because a student is academically oriented does not mean he is bright. In 1950 we were sending one-third of all high school graduates to college, including "students" with IQ's as low as 65. Today we send nearly one-half of all high school graduates to college. Many colleges have students encompassing a large range of intellectual ability. To treat this range of intellectual ability as if a range does not exist certainly is asking for trouble. Many of the rebelling college students have not had an educational program to meet their intellectual needs. In the old days, as parental influence diminished, students withdrew from school. Now when withdrawal is not so easy, rebellious disorder emerges. Of course, there are many kinds of campus rebels, and my remarks are not meant to be all-encompassing.

When I first became interested in the education of gifted children and youth in the early 1950's, only a few colleges offered any work specifically concerned with educating the gifted. This work was offered only in the summer time. Although in the post-Sputnik era there was renewed attention to the education of the gifted, in a national survey I conducted for the 1964-65 year covering the entire United States, only 64 colleges offered one or more courses pertaining specifically to the gifted. Only 29 of these colleges offered two or more courses. Enrollment in these courses was small; 25 to 30 students being found in most introductory courses. Even fewer students enrolled in the second and/or third courses offered. More often than not these students were in-service teachers who recognized the problems they had in meeting the needs of gifted and talented youth. In a survey this year, Vassar and Renzulli noted a drop in the number of offerings. They found only 54 colleges offering coursework specifically concerned with the education of the gifted and fewer colleges with more than one course. However, one important trend was noted: most of the work is offered during the academic year in addition to the summer session.

If teacher placement offices do not have a call from school administrators for teachers with special training about gifted children and youth, colleges of education neither offer much work in this important area nor encourage students to enroll in such coursework. So far federal legislation has been unable to generate much real attention to gifted and talented youth. To date, many influential educators still believe that the gifted are the responsibility of everyone, but in

fact while the gifted may be the responsibility of everyone, no one does much about them. It is my conclusion that aid for the gifted is essential if we are to improve our development of this important natural resource. Perhaps the most economical course to follow is that of mandating personnel in state departments of education whose primary responsibility will be the initiation of programming for the gifted. Quite obviously they will not be able to do their job without additional funds for the training of professional personnel for employment in the schools and assistance to the schools in initiating and maintaining personnel who can help the gifted directly in classroom activities and indirectly through work with other teachers and educational specialists. Without such aid, resources planned for the gifted are drained off for others with the rationalization that the gifted can take care of themselves. From previous experiences over several decades, we know that only a few of the gifted do achieve their potential; thus, our society loses the benefits it could derive from more effective education of the gifted.

STATEMENT OF DR. MARVIN J. GOLD, LEGISLATIVE CHAIRMAN, THE ASSOCIATION FOR THE GIFTED

I am Marvin J. Gold, Legislative Chairman of The Association for the Gifted. As of this coming September, I will be Director of the Lincoln School in Simpsonville, Kentucky. The Lincoln School, which is administered by the University of Kentucky under mandate of the Legislature, offers a unique program geared to aiding gifted but culturally and economically disadvantaged high school youngsters from throughout the Commonwealth. Young men and women, black and white, urban and rural are invited to participate in the Lincoln School program that not only is aimed at serving them but also through them other youngsters, comparable in both intellectual abilities and cultural and economic limitations. Curriculum development and research concerning the potential, limitations, needs, and learning habits of our students all should have value for students in Kentucky as well as the Nation.

However, even though we at Lincoln School see much value and ultimate benefit for more children than we serve from the things we are doing, we are concerned lest our greatest potential be dissipated by certain factors not within our control.

It is to these factors that I would like to address myself today, and since several of these factors are incorporated in the intent of S. 718, I will also relate my remarks to the bill. Naturally, because of my other relative professional experience, I will not limit my comments to those points that are relevant to only the Lincoln School. Indeed, if an overall statement might be made, one very fine aspect of the proposed legislation is the universality of its intent.

Definition of population to be served.—The openness of the definition of gifted and talented is to be highly commended. All too often we educators build ourselves a straitjacket of a term and its meaning and then force ourselves to be restrained by it. The definition included in this bill is flexible enough to allow for sufficient leeway in interpretation, which is necessary in order to serve groups of youngsters from a variety of backgrounds, experiences, and aspirations. Still, the definition is worded to avoid either ambiguity or too-broad implication.

Personnel.—The most impressive thing I have discovered at the Lincoln School is the staff and their talent to foster effective learning programs for gifted children. This has once again reinforced the old adage that the key to education is the relationship between the teacher and the child and that such relationship depends greatly on the competency of the teacher. Programs for the gifted and talented demand teachers having a mastery of educational methodologies, insights into curricula, and understanding of child development, and the impact of the community on the child's needs. We need teacher education programs which would prepare innovative teachers like those who can actively plan and design programs for children with differing needs.

Innovative and Exemplary Programs.—Title III of ESEA has encouraged the development of activities that formerly had little chance of seeing the light of day. Although innovative programs for the gifted may certainly be included, as the law is presently written, categorical assignment of funds is most necessary at this time to assure the needed impact on the field of educating gifted youngsters.

Too many educators reduce approaches to working with the gifted to three oversimplified categories: acceleration (of the standard program and/or the gifted

youngster, e.g. "skipping"), grouping (which is only one way of implementing a program and is too often accepted to be the program itself), and enrichment (a term so vague yet attractive that it very often permits us to do nothing under the guise of doing something special).

Through an amendment to Title III of ESEA, we will be assured that new approaches and curriculum for the gifted and talented are sought after and implemented and that a wide variety of model programs be given life so that educators from throughout the particular states (as well as, ideally, throughout the Nation) might be able to aid their gifted charges by observing those programs and where appropriate adapting them for local purposes.

I respectfully urge not only the adoption of this amendment but that consideration also be given to other nonprofit agencies, such as universities, to allow them to be considered appropriate applicants. I believe this is especially important for the immediate future for a very basic reason: right now this is where much of the appropriate expertise lies. Although there are some excellent individuals responsible for gifted programming in state education agencies, only about 25% of the agencies have one or more full-time professionals devoted to the task. Until this figure increases drastically, too little progress might be made in too many of our states.

Aid to State Education Agencies.—There is no doubt in my mind that without leadership personnel in each of our state education agencies devoting full-time efforts to programs for the gifted, very little coordinated, meaningful, and effective progress can be made.

As program approaches are developed, as teachers are trained, and as innovative and exemplary programs are identified, administrative coordination and more importantly, educational leadership on a state level, become critically important. For what could be considered a very limited effort, maximum results could be forthcoming.

The aid given to state agencies could be considered the mortar that will bind the building blocks of the rest of the program together.

Future Directions: Mr. Chairman, I would be less than honest with you (and with myself) if I stated that the proposed legislation will meet the needs of America's gifted youth most handsomely. However, by the Congress requesting a study of existing programs and seeking recommendations for future actions, this proposed legislation looks effectively to the future and portends a greater education for the gifted in the future than they have had in the past.

As an educator, I am concerned for all children; as an individual who has devoted some time and effort to working with gifted youngsters (as well as professionals working with gifted youngsters), I am deeply concerned for them. Aside from the talent loss to our Nation, which is considerable, the lack of self-fulfillment and resultant personal problems cannot be ignored.

The first step in expressing Congressional intent that federal efforts be extended to the gifted and talented, is most welcome. I thank you, Mr. Chairman, and the members of this committee for the part you play in developing this legislation.

TESTIMONY OF DR. WALTER T. OLSON, ASSISTANT DIRECTOR OF THE LEWIS RESEARCH CENTER, NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION, CLEVELAND, OHIO

As I understand it, the purpose of the bill, H.R. 4807 is to establish Congressional intent that federal agencies should direct some energies and resources toward assisting communities to develop and provide services for gifted and talented children. In accepting the honor and responsibility of appearing before this Committee, I would state that it is my intention to plead for the enactment of this bill into law.

A perusal of my biography will reveal that I am neither a professional educator nor an educational administrator. My career has been that of a working scientist and scientist-administrator. My professional activities have, however, kept me in contact with educators and people concerned with education. Also, my brother, John Frederick, was, until his untimely death last month, President of Oklahoma City University. My wife has trained for and taught in the Cleveland Public Schools. Our son has a high I.Q. and demonstrates outstanding talent; he is entering high school after having spent part of his elementary schooling in a system without a program for gifted and talented children and part of it in a system with such a program. And the Ohio Association for Gifted Children

(about 125 members), at their May 3, 1969 meeting, asked Mrs. Olson and me to work on behalf of H.R. 4807—without reimbursement of any kind, of course. So, I come before you as a concerned citizen, a friend of education, a father with minimum (one!) experience, and a spokesman for an informed and dedicated group of parents and teachers in Ohio.

The future well-being of our nation requires that our gifted and talented children be given a near-optimum chance to develop to their maximum potential.

Gifted and talented children are our greatest resource. They become the gifted and talented adults who provide most of the leadership for future generations. And it need hardly be argued that we need leadership in ever increasing quality and quantity in a world filling up with people.

We need leadership to continue our prosperity and progress in a world in which technology plays an ever-greater role. An astute Frenchman, J. J. Servan-Schreiber, looking in at us in "The American Challenge", stresses that the dynamism of Americans comes from our "investment in man" through education and social justice. "The wealth we seek", he writes, "does not lie in the earth or in numbers of men or in machines, but in the human spirit. And particularly in the ability of men to think and to create."¹

We need leadership on our social scene. Our increasing understanding and mastery of nature is providing us wealth and power. Science and technology are providing us a dazzling array of goods and services, and at an increasing rate. In fact, this rate of change in our material environment has now become so great that it is quite marked even during a human lifetime. The impact on cultural habits, patterns, and aspirations already almost threatens to overwhelm us. We could create a Golden Age; yet the age is far from Golden. Both goal and methods are needed.

We need leadership on the world scene. Instant communications, jet-speed transportation, methods of mass production and marketing, preventive medicine, and burgeoning birth rates are shrinking the globe. As the world gets smaller, minds must be bigger. In a world rocking with change, we need a capacity for adjustment to change, a capacity for innovation, and only high ability and appropriate education will equip citizens for continuous seeking of new solutions.

We need leadership for the future, but, on the other hand, lack of quality education is already a major problem in our cities. It is imperative to discover and develop the gifted and talented children of the inner city. As we fail to find and challenge these capable children with appropriate programs, they "shriveled" and are lost to society; or worse, they become dissident and even actively hostile. One educator² has estimated that less than half of all gifted children realize their educational potential—a prodigious waste of ability that this society cannot afford. Also, the problem of dropouts with high I.Q.'s has been documented in the Congressional Record.³ We need the development of high-capability inner city children if democracy is ever to become a socio-economic as well as a political reality.

One might agree, then, that all children should be educated to the level of their capability. But why should this specific legislation be required?

Because of their unusual learning traits, the gifted and talented children in our Nation's schools are as much in need of special programs as are the handicapped at the other end of the "distribution curve" of inherent capability. Exceptional children need exceptional education. Special programs for the handicapped exist almost universally in our public schools; that is a fine and worthy expression of our very human emotions of care and concern. But, I am advised that only 13 of the 50 state departments of education assign one or more full-time staff members to programs for the gifted and talented, while 21 states have no one responsible even on a part-time basis for such programs. With H.R. 4807, amendments to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 would call attention to the desirability of special programs for educating the talented just as it already does for the handicapped.

One observation I have made is that there are some parents, individual teachers, some school systems, and some administrators at local and State levels who see the necessity of providing exceptional educational opportunities for exceptional children, but who do not form an effective management chain from classroom to school system to State to federal government because "gifted and talented children" is nowhere spelled out in legislation, directives, etc. The result: no action. H.R. 4807 would provide the focus for action.

¹ J. J. Servan-Schreiber, "The American Challenge," Atheneum, New York, 1968, page 276.

² Maurice Frechill, *Gifted Children*, Macmillan Company, New York, 1963.

³ Congressional Record, 91st Congress, First Session, Vol. 115, March 24, 1969, pp. S3189-S3192.

The Office of Education has told me that it is possible to fund projects for the gifted under Title I and Title III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. But that Office hastens to point out that State and local education agencies would have to consider such programs to be of high priority. Of course they would, especially since the Act doesn't mention such programs by name! The main advantage of H.R. 4807 is its focusing of attention on the problems of programs for the gifted. It provides some administrative clout for educators in working up programs through local, State and Federal levels.

How programs for talented children are to be conducted is not the concern of this bill; nor is it any area of my expertise. It is sufficient to note that there are enough lively and productive programs in sufficiently varied school districts to assure us that actions encouraged by H.R. 4807 are fully feasible.

If programs for the gifted and talented children are to be increased to any substantial degree, there will need to be substantial increases in the numbers of teachers and administrators trained to be sympathetic to and effective in conducting such programs. A clear route to expanding and increasing the training programs for personnel to administer and provide education for gifted and talented children seems to lie through the existing, very fine Education Professions Development Act. H.R. 4807 will open this route.

Finally, and importantly, the Bill H.R. 4807 does more than just pave the way to States to use already existing programs on behalf of gifted and talented children. The Bill does what any good manager would do; it asks for some positive action and sets a deadline for it. In this case, the action is for the Commissioner of Education to spell out the specific ways that the Federal programs can be used to meet the needs of gifted and talented children. Such action would be a most commendable beginning on a problem of vital import to our Nation.

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH OF WALTER T. OLSON

Dr. Walter T. Olson, Assistant Director of the Lewis Research Center, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Cleveland, Ohio, has been associated with the U.S. Government as an aeronautical and space scientist since 1942.

Born in Royal Oak, Michigan, he resided for a number of years in Baltimore, Maryland.

Dr. Olson graduated from DePauw University, Greencastle, Indiana, in 1939, with a bachelor's degree in chemistry. He earned his master's and Ph.D. degrees in chemistry and chemical engineering from Case Institute of Technology, Cleveland, in 1940 and 1942, respectively.

As an Assistant Director of the Lewis Research Center, Dr. Olson is responsible there for NASA programs relating to the technical and industrial community, universities, the news media and the public, and elementary and secondary schools.

Dr. Olson joined the Lewis staff in 1942, and shared in completing and reporting the Center's first experimental research project. After World War II, he was in charge of Lewis' fuels and combustion program for turbojet, ramjet, and rocket engines. He is an author of numerous publications and lectures in these fields. Research divisions directed by Dr. Olson from 1953 to 1963 led the NASA into such important activities as chemical rockets, high energy fuels, altitude-chamber tests of rockets, high-performance liquid propellants, electric rockets, fuel cells, and solar energy conversion.

Dr. Olson has served as a consultant to the National Academy of Sciences, the National Research Council, and to various activities both here and abroad. He is active in community affairs. He is a Fellow of the American Institute of Aeronautics and Astronautics, a Director of the Combustion Institute, a Fellow and Council Member of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, and a member of the American Chemical Society, Sigma Xi, The Cosmos Club, and the Ohio Association for the Gifted.

Dr. OLSON resides at 18960 Coffinberry Blvd., Fairview Park, Ohio, 44126 with his wife, Ruth Elizabeth, and son, David Paul (14).

Mr. PUCINSKI. And Mr. Geer, why don't we then let you handle the panel in any way you wish, keeping in mind that we would like to have as much time for questioning as we can rather than a formal presentation of statements which will appear in the record anyway.

Mr. GEER. I would like to ask Dr. French to give us a few minutes to amplify what Dr. Gallagher brought up as to the research on the gifted and their needs.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I wonder if you gentlemen would care to address yourselves to the question that has been raised by the definition of gifted children.

As you know, I raised the question about this language in accordance with objective criteria prescribed by the Commissioner. That language worries me. I am not too sure we ought to have it in a definition and I would like to have your views on it.

Dr. FRENCH. I would like to start off with Dr. Gallagher's point about an immediate crisis not being present. I would agree with that but I also feel that there is a silent ferment that is causing a great deal of concern.

We find it very difficult to identify all of the gifted and talented youth with the procedures that we use now. One of the reasons is that it requires the maximum performance on the part of an individual to exhibit outstanding performance and many of the youth in schools are not really ready to produce this outstanding and maximum performance.

I can recall 30 years ago when I was in Illinois in the fifth grade. One of the fellows who had a watch said well let us see how long these tests take and then quit a little early because if we do well they will expect a lot out of us.

And so we were able to find out how long each section of the test would take and we were able to stop sooner than the teacher indicated and the teacher then didn't expect a great deal of us.

I am sure kids today have a lot more effective systems than we had then but we avoided some of the rigors of the classroom in that manner.

We find that many teachers try to teach the way they learned. But as schools are holding more and more people in school for longer and longer periods of time, many people who are pretty gifted do not fit into the mold of their teachers and require different methods of techniques and concerns.

In my study of high school dropouts we found that there were a lot of people who were going through the system very effectively and learning a great deal in the program but the dropouts that we studied withdrew and one of the real pleasing things to me was that although they really had quit they were still seeking out ways to improve themselves so they could have better jobs even though not in the formal educational channel.

One of the real disappointing portions of the study was to look at the persistors, those we matched on the basis of IQ section and residence in the same neighborhood and we found these people to be a rather hostile bunch.

They were saying that the teacher and I have an agreement. I don't bother her and she doesn't bother me. They were referring to the school as a place to come in out of the cold. They are troublemakers within the school. They were detracting from the school programs.

Yet, these were very bright kids. And they had not dropped out technically but they had dropped out of the educational process even though they were staying on in school.

We found with this study there are many kinds of gifted kids and that many of the gifted kids are not living up to their potential.

Sometimes this is because of motivation. Sometimes this is because they feel behind in the educational process and needed a rehabilitation program or a rebuilding program of some kind and sometimes because the curriculum didn't meet their needs.

So, I would like to see some help that would analyze the current educational program so that we could become more attentive to the needs of these different gifted kids.

So far Federal legislation has been pretty ineffective in recollecting them and I hope you will support these bills so as to express your concern and help us find ways through the study that is required in the legislation to meet these needs more effectively.

Mr. PUCINSKI. We recognize the need for identifying these problems but I wonder if we are not proliferating a series of special programs, when perhaps the best kind of educational program is a school that develops its own programs, rather than waiting for either the State or the Federal Government to identify each of these respective problem areas.

Aren't you fearful that we may direct our educational system into compartments rather than having a system where young people have an easy flow in and out?

Don't you feel that we ought to have a freer educational system where the local administrator would have the ability to deal with these problems without waiting for a special compartment dealing with gifted children, a special compartment for learning disabilities, a special compartment for handicapped children, and a special compartment for emotionally disturbed children?

Isn't there some fear that we have become too rigid in our school system instead of having flexibilities?

Dr. FRENCH. Well, I agree very much with the point that we need the flexibility that you describe. The problem though has been that the gifted have been everyone's responsibility and, therefore, no one's responsibility and so they never come in and unless there is some way of requiring that those with problems come in there is always a more immediate crisis and this one that isn't quite so ferocious is bypassed funds that may be identified for them in the title III and other projects with guidance in NDEA money for testing seems to be drained off into other more pressing problems at the time.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I ask the other members of the committee to get into this at will whenever you feel in the mood to ask a question.

Mr. BELL. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. GEER. I will just designate you the chairman and you can assign questions among the panel members.

I again want to reiterate I am in favor of this bill. I do want to ask some questions that might sound antagonistic but they really are not.

What will we accomplish by this small amount of money that is going to be involved, if any? Can we really accomplish anything in this program?

Mr. GEER. It is my opinion that we will accomplish something if no more than to call to the attention of educators that here is a group which thus far have not gotten into this as much as they should have even though the amount requested is small.

I am reminded of a relative of mine, an uncle and aunt who raised a rather large family during the depression. This family had very little money but somehow they managed to find enough money to send all of their children who wanted to go to college and eight out of 10 made it.

I think this is what we are into here. Can't we find enough for the best minds in our country to be developed through even though the resources seem small? That is a what, \$2 or \$3 billion program now, the total?

Mr. BELL. The educational program you are speaking of?

Mr. GEER. Yes, sir. This is what we are shooting at. It is not just the one little bit that is in one of the titles or two titles, but the entire educational expenditure. Programs like this will have a stimulating effect on the States, 17 of them already have legislation that is accomplishing some good.

Maybe the rest will develop it. Perhaps our local people will become more concerned as a result of the nation expressing its concern.

Like Mr. Pucinski, I wish it were possible to say in one sweeping legislative measure, let us educate all the children of all the people to their greatest potential.

But the record simply shows that the educational administrator who has total responsibility does not have the time to think through all the problems nor the knowledge to cope with them.

We must bring to him three specific bills through specific appropriations, the people who will help him plan for the small groups of people, the small groups of children who are not going to be recognized unless we do it.

And I think this is what bills like this accomplish.

Mr. BELL. Well, Doctor, are you saying that we ought to emphasize programs for the talented few or, if you had a choice of which direction to go, would you emphasize trying to bring all of your people up, as you said a moment ago, to the greatest possible potential?

Now conceivably you could get into a serious problem, as I have said earlier, when we talk about priorities. Priorities are important and if this does involve some money eventually, which route would you go, which route should America go.

Mr. GEER. If I had to make a choice, and I hope I will never have to make a choice about what would put our country the furthest ahead and be the best good for all people, it would be to selectively educate the best minds who could help us think our way out of such a morass, I think I would have to make this choice.

Mr. BELL. You would go toward the route of selecting special talented individuals throughout the country, a relative few, rather than trying to bring up the total educational facilities of all of our youngsters so that perhaps we could have a far superior general educational system and all of our people would be further educated than in say, the Soviet Union or any other area.

I note for example that one of the arguments given as to why the Israelis have so quickly overcome the great numbers of Arabs is not only the machinery but the fact that literacy in that country is close to 95 percent. All of their people are educated significantly more than the Arabs.

Now, you can get into an argument as to which route you ought to go with limited funds.

Mr. GEER. Well, of course, the problem here and the question would be where do you stop; if you stop somewhere and don't do the whole job. If I could point out I think that what you have been talking about is precisely what has happened historically in the United States.

If you look back to education in the 1700's and 1800's it was largely for what we would call the elite, the more able. The concept of modern mass education is really a modern concept and only came to fruition in this country in the 1930's and 1940's as States and local school systems expanded educational programs.

Mr. BELL. So you are saying we are moving in this direction?

Mr. GEER. The inevitable has happened. That which mass educational movement we have educated to the central population and for a time we have been neglecting both ends of our scale, the more able and less able, trying to get this entire group of people educated in the entire country.

We now must, if we are going to develop not only our best resources but our total resources, we must continue to put our educational program where it is in reach of all children and where their best capabilities are brought to fruition by effective educational training.

Dr. FRENCH. What portion of your question?

Mr. BELL. My last question related to which route we should go in assigning priorities.

Dr. FRENCH. Well, I think that the one that has been omitted so far has been the area of the gifted and that as we would develop more capably this area there will be greater spinoff for the total group in school.

My position at Penn State is certainly broader than only in the area of educating teachers to work better with the gifted, and so—

Mr. BELL. Your particular interest is in this area?

Dr. FRENCH. Yes, sir.

Mr. BELL. Dr. Olson?

Dr. OLSON. I think you have to do both. No question in my mind you have to do both. Just the struggle to get somewhere with the human race is a tough struggle and you don't do one part or another.

Mr. BELL. In other words, you don't think there are any priorities, you just do the whole thing.

Dr. OLSON. You have to do the whole thing. I recognize that in the course of history itself there is a sort of a pendulum effect. One part of the spectrum of people gets a little more than some other part. I think we have quite properly paid attention to the handicapped. Our sympathies tend to run toward them. The legislation that the Congress has already put into action spells out "the handicapped."

Now, you have an equally difficult problem in educating the exceptional child at the other end of the distribution spectrum of ability.

And that child is the gifted and talented. That child is exceptional in the same sense that a handicapped child is exceptional. That child needs special attention in the kind of education that must be provided for him, and all we say is that the bill, to be as democratic as possible, ought to add simply these phrases, "and the gifted and talented," to the phrase and, "the handicapped," which is already in the NDEA.

Mr. BELL. Would you advocate then that we assign additional money to the gifted?

Dr. OLSON. I think one of these days you will have to. The first thing you have to do is to get the attention of the States called to the

fact that the intent of the Congress is that they do the most effective job of educating every individual child that can be done. That should be the intent of the Education Act.

Mr. BELL. Dr. Olson, the attention of the Nation was drawn many years ago to the need to educate the deprived yet we had to pass several bills and put a lot of money into it before it really started going.

Dr. OLSON. For many parts of our country and increasingly in our major cities I think we have to do that.

Mr. BELL. So you advocate that we must go full steam ahead with additional money for all segments of our educational system?

Dr. OLSON. Yes, sir.

Mr. BELL. Gifted and otherwise?

Dr. OLSON. Yes. That is becoming increasingly evident in the kind of society that we are creating.

Mr. BELL. We heard so much about Sputnik and the educational successes of the Soviets. Would you say that they are ahead of us in graduating, as far as your knowledge is concerned, engineers and scientists?

Do you think they are doing a better job?

Dr. OLSON. I don't think they are better than we are. They are another technical, highly industrialized society that is moving ahead by training people.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Chairman, I see that the bells have rung.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Perhaps Mr. Vassar would like to add something to the colloquy?

Mr. VASSAR. I think what we are talking about are short-range goals and long-range goals. We get this question in the school districts throughout Connecticut.

Well, what the average kid, what about the generality, what about the nongrade? Couldn't this take care of all our problems?

I think we are looking at long-range goals. I would have to agree with the upgrading of maximizing potential throughout the entire population. We live in the trenches and we don't test and an immediate kind of thing is coming off. We see models for nongraded schools and we have changed grade levels to reading levels but in essence I have yet to visit one of these schools and find where all exceptional kids are being taken care of through the nongraded concept.

So I look at this through long-range goal, and a philosophy that this could come about in maximizing all kinds of human potential.

But I think we have immediate goals to talk about and I think we have immediate kinds of things we need in States.

Mr. BELL. When you say immediate goals, which are you talking about?

Mr. VASSAR. I think along with Dr. Olson and Mr. Geer when we talk about specific kind of programs in exceptionality such as the handicapped and gifted. For example in my own State of Connecticut we have special legislation which is a package bill, an omnibus bill for all exceptional children, and the definition, if you are looking for a definition, says any youngster who deviates from the norm so markedly that he or she needs special kinds of programs in services and/or services—and this cuts across all exceptionalities from the trainable retarded through the highly gifted.

Mr. BELL. Would you then say that from the standpoint of Federal money that the emphasis should be not on bringing into college

youngsters who aren't prepared and might lower the universities' academic standing, but to bring up the total standard of our country. Would you prefer that the emphasis be in the direction of bringing in the talented and letting the others slide?

Mr. VASSAR. I am not so sure that I agree with that. I think in Dr. Gallagher's statement and other statements on disadvantaged talent, we are finding some sophistication now in identifying children in both rural and urban ghettos who have certain kinds of potential.

This, by the way, is written into our State legislation so we allow school districts to go out and attempt to identify youngsters who come from low-socioeconomic minority groups kind of thing and we are coming up with criteria to identify these kids, mixed criteria.

You were talking about objective criteria. We are talking about a combination of criteria, for example, utilizing some of the objective criteria and some of the values of the subcultural or minority cultural in trying to bring these together to identify.

Dr. Gold is involved more in this than I am but what I think we are doing, I would still like to see some of these potentially talented kids that are being admitted into college without meeting the specific criteria of the college administrations, I would still like to see this continued but I would like to see as much emphasis placed on the kid who has the demonstrated ability.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Would you like to add something to that?

Dr. GOLD. I think one point that ought to be stressed is that the gifted as an exceptionality is the only one that parenthetically might have the word "potentially" inserted before it.

Because we are dealing with a population of those that not only exhibit gifts but also that have the potential for gifts. Right now.

Mr. PUCINSKI. At that point, if we are talking about potential, we are really talking about the whole school system. I am under the impression that this legislation is directed at bringing help to the gifted and talented child who has outstanding intellectual ability or creative talent, the development of which requires special activities or services not ordinarily provided by local educational agencies.

Isn't there a danger of diluting?

Dr. GOLD. No, I don't—

Mr. PUCINSKI. The activity, if we added to your definition the word "potential."

Dr. GOLD. No, I don't believe one negates the other, sir, in that my next position deals with one of disadvantaged gifted.

If we were to allow ourselves to build some sort of restricted definition, and restrictive criteria for identification, we are liable to eliminate a very important segment of the population and that is why—

Mr. BELL. How are you going to know whether they are gifted when you are talking about the socioeconomically deprived.

How are you going to know whether they are gifted or not until you get them in the school and find out?

You are almost going to have to go en masse and try to bring the whole educational system up for all kids, aren't you?

Dr. GOLD. For the identification—I believe Dr. Gallagher alluded to the—if you think in terms of top percentage of a particular subject population, regardless of what this IQ numeral might be, regardless

of the standing of a child compared to Nation, within his own population he indeed could be the gifted bright member and exhibits potential that requires an appropriated—

Mr. BELL. Would you pick out a gang leader of a bunch of kids in a low socioeconomic area?

Dr. GOLD. I think he is a beautiful example of a potentially talented and potential gifted member and one thing that we can't ignore is that giftedness hasn't got a value to it.

So in a way you have got to say that a dictator of a foreign power—no one doubts Castro's giftedness. You might not like his politics but you don't doubt he is a gifted individual. So we have the potential in a gang leader and it is up to us as educators who work with these youngsters.

Mr. BELL. By making the greater effort to educate more of our children, won't we find a total that we never knew existed?

Dr. GOLD. Let me refer to a brief study made in Florida where I am presently located. I was surveying what was being done for gifted children in our State and I discovered that 1 percent of those who would be eligible for gifted programs, not 1 percent of the student population, 1 percent of the gifted population, were being served in our State.

If I may digress for a second, I think this is why the title V support is extremely important. If we had supported the State level, the State Department, this kind of inactivity certainly wouldn't take place to the degree it has in the past.

Mr. HATHAWAY. Of the 17 States that you say have programs for gifted children, how many of them use title III funds to partially fund their program?

Mr. VASSAR. That is under title V, sir.

Mr. HATHAWAY. How about funds under title III.

Mr. VASSAR. I know of no State utilizing title III for State Department consultation.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Are any States using title I money—the very question Mr. Bell raised?

Mr. VASSAR. Yes, we had a study last year, a nonpublished Federal study, and we did check out titles I, III and IV of ESEA. We found that in the perception of the people answering the questionnaire in the various States there were approximately three or four States utilizing title I to identify and program for disadvantaged talent.

One was the State of California and another one was the State of Maine.

This was through Ruth Pennell in our State Department. She was our contact person in our State Department but we found very little being done.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Off the record.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. PUCINSKI. We will recess for 10 minutes then.

(A brief recess was taken from 12:30 to 1 p.m.)

Mr. PUCINSKI. We will resume.

The other members will be coming along as quickly as they can.

I believe Mr. Hathaway was asking you, Mr. Vassar, about some of the studies that you have made on title I, III, and V.

Would you like to continue telling us about some of your studies?
Mr. VASSAR. Yes.

This was conducted last year and still is yet unpublished although the State study of the State agencies has been published under my name and Dr. Renzulli from the University of Connecticut.

We would like to submit this as evidence to your committee for your use through Mr. Weintraub of the CEC. I brought these down with us yesterday.

We found that very few States are using title I to identify disadvantaged talent. We found probably, as I say, three or four States.

Three was being used probably—I want to state this correctly—for a number of programs for the gifted were identified within the total program. Yet on site visits we found it was probably more paper than anything else. Although we had financed a number of title III projects throughout the country which were per se gifted ones including one which Dr. Gold was involved with in Hillsboro County, Fla., and two in Massachusetts I was involved with prior to coming to Connecticut.

One is a summer school for the gifted which still exists at Bridge-water State College. As a matter of fact, we have 300 youngsters in this facility right now for the summer and Talcot Mountain in Connecticut which was an old Nike site we turned into a science center on top of a mountain which has the components for gifted youngsters interested in research for meteorology and astronomy, et cetera.

People in the field have said this is probably one of the better title III projects in meeting the needs directly of youngsters. Title V is used by three States, Connecticut, Colorado, for full-time consultants in the area and California utilizes about \$69,000—I am talking fiscal year 1968—\$69,000 in title V money for the advanced placement kind of program.

However, last year they asked for a change. Some of this money was moved into developing a differential kind of curriculum for the gifted and talented. This is now in the process of being completed in California so to our knowledge in this State we only had three States utilizing title V moneys.

I would like to at this point in time refer directly to pages 3, 4, and 5 as to what can be done in a State utilizing a very small amount of money.

For example, I point to Connecticut with a \$27,000 budget under title V. This pays for my salary and supportive services. And through this we were involved in a study that brought about the omnibus bill for all exceptional children.

So our program, as the testimony shows, has tripled in 2 years of State legislation, and we have doubled the number of identifiable gifted youngsters in the State.

We had one course being taught on the gifted in all of our State colleges and universities, as of September 1969. We will have three full-time graduate programs to train teachers of the gifted and talented.

One of these is at the State University, University of Connecticut has just been funded with an EPDA grant under Dr. Renzulli for approximately \$115,000. There are three EPDA grants we are familiar with that zero in on the gifted in the disadvantaged areas.

One is in South Florida, the University of South Florida, under Dr. Sisk, and the other, as I mentioned, was Dr. Renzulli, and the third was Dr. Rogge who was to appear here for testimony today.

So we heartily endorse on behalf of the National Association for Gifted Children, the association for the gifted and three affiliates, the Ohio Association for the Gifted and the Florida Association for Gifted, and the Council of State Directors, we heartily endorse your committee to seek favorable action on this particular bill.

(The study referred to follows:)

C.E.C. ANALYTIC STUDY OF STATE LEGISLATION FOR HANDICAPPED CHILDREN

ANALYSIS OF STATE LAWS FOR GIFTED CHILDREN

The following information is derived from an analysis of the education statutes of the fifty states. We have found that at present seventeen states have within their education code a term which can be construed to apply to the clinical entity known as the gifted child. Of these seventeen states only ten provide any legal guidelines or definitions for determining the type of child to be served. Sixteen states describe within their laws some criteria for the service programs to be provided for such children. The need for advisory committees and study groups to establish criteria and oversee the development of programs is articulated in the legislation of five states. Three states have included in their laws criteria prescribing how gifted children are to be diagnosed. Finally, the structure and procedures for state financial assistance for such programs is outlined in the laws of fifteen states.

The analysis has been limited to those laws specifically mentioning gifted children within and without the special education umbrella. It can be assumed that some states not included could provide for such children under their general special education authority.

The reader should take caution in relating law to program. The fact that a law exists does not imply a program and vice-versa.

The following is a state-by-state analysis of the state laws for gifted children:

DEFINITIONS

California (Educ. 6421): "*Mentally gifted minor*."—"A minor enrolled in a public primary or secondary school of this state who demonstrates such general intellectual capacity as to place him within the top 2% of all students having achieved his school grade throughout the state." (1961)

Connecticut (10-76): "*Extraordinary learning ability*", "*outstanding talent in the creative arts*".—To be defined by regulation, "after consideration of the opinions of appropriate specialists and of the normal range of ability and rate of progress of children in the Connecticut public schools." (1967)

Delaware (3101): "*Gifted children*".—"Children who have the native capacity for high potential intellectual attainment and scholastic achievement." (1957)

"*Talented children*".—"Children who have demonstrated outstanding leadership qualities and abilities or whose performance is consistently remarkable in mechanics, manipulative skills, the art of expression of ideas, orally or written, music, art, human relations or any other worthwhile line of human achievement."

Florida (230.23[6e]): "*Unusual ability*".—Not defined. (1939)

Georgia (32-626, 32-651): "*Gifted pupils*"., "*student honors program*".—"Children who have manifested exceptional abilities, unique potentials or who have made exceptional academic achievements." (1964)

Idaho (33-2002): "*Academically talented*".—Not defined. (1965)

Illinois (Article 14a-2): "*Gifted children*".—"Children whose mental development is accelerated beyond the average to the extent that they need and can profit from specially planned educational services." (1965)

Kansas (72-5334): "*Intellectual superiority*".—Not defined. (1949)

Louisiana (17:1943): "*Gifted*".—Not defined. (1964)

Massachusetts (1:15:6c) (Inoperative 6-30-67): "*Academically talented children*".—Not defined.

Minnesota (Extra session 1959, Ch. 82, Sec. 1:2/3/) (Inoperative 1961): "*Gifted children*".—Not defined.

Nebraska (1266) : "*Gifted children*".—"Children who excel markedly in ability to think, reason, judge, invent or create and who need special facilities for educational services or both such facilities and services in order to assist them to achieve more clearly their potentials, for their own sakes as individuals and for the increased contributions they may make to the community, state and nation." (1967)

North Carolina (115-307) : "*Exceptionally talented children*".—A pupil in the public school system of North Carolina who possesses the following qualifications :

- a. A group of intelligence quotient of 120 or higher.
- b. A majority of marks of A and B.
- c. Emotional adjustment that is average or better.
- d. Achievements of at least two grades above the state norm or in the upper 10% of the local norms of the administrative unit.
- e. Recommended by the pupil's teacher or principal.

Ohio (3323.02) : "*Academically gifted children*".—Not defined. (1959)

Oregon (343.395) : "*Educationally able and gifted children*".—"Those children who individually meet the criteria for such children as determined by the State Board of Education according to generally accepted standards." (1965)

Rhode Island (16-42-5) : "*Gifted and talented children*".—Requires that the commissioner of education and the state board of education create regulations to establish "(a) criteria for determining who is to be included in the category of the gifted or talented child." (1958)

Washington (28.16.010) : "*Students of superior capacity*".—" . . . Those who consistently show remarkable performance in academic pursuits or demonstrate exceptional ability." (1961)

PROGRAMS

California (6423-6424) : Section 6423 cites that "any school district may provide programs for mentally gifted minors living in the district or enrolled in kindergarten and grades 1 through 12 in the schools of the districts . . ." Section 6423.1 goes further to define the nature of the program to be provided for mentally gifted minors. It allows districts to "conduct programs of seven hours of classes for mentally gifted minors within or without the boundaries of the school district." To "transport or arrange transportation of pupils, instructors, supervisors, or other personnel to or from such places where such programs and classes are being conducted" (limited to transportation within the state and a radius of 110 miles). Section 6423 and Section 6424 provide the authority for districts to contract with other school districts to furnish programs for such minors or allow the district to enter into agreements with a county superintendent of schools for the provision of the needed services. (1961)

Connecticut (10-76) : Section 4c of the act provides that each town or regional school district may provide special education for gifted children. Section 2 of the same act authorizes the State Department of Education to "regulate curriculum, conditions of instruction, physical facilities and equipment, class composition and size, admission of students, and requirements respecting necessary special services of instruction to be provided by town and regional boards of education." Section 7 of the act defines special education transportation as including (1) transportation to and from a facility for the purpose of determining the need for special education and to and from the agency providing special education. (1967)

Delaware (3103) : This section states that "the state board of education and local school boards shall provide and maintain, under appropriate regulations, special classes and facilities whenever possible to meet the needs of all . . . gifted and talented children . . ." (1957)

Florida (232-6E) : County boards of education are to provide insofar as "practicable" special facilities for classes for children with unusual ability. (1939)

Georgia (Act. No. 523, Sections 26 and 51) : Section 26 establishes the authority for the operation of summer school programs by local school districts. Within the provisions of this act are included "enrichment school programs beyond prescribed school programs and accelerated school programs." Section 51 goes further and establishes a specific student honors program, noting that such program "may be conducted during summer months between normal school year terms at institutions of higher learning or other appropriate centers within the state with the facilities adequate to providing challenging opportunities for advance study and accomplishments by such students."

Idaho (33-2002a) : Idaho, under the special education umbrella, specifies the types of special services to be provided for exceptional children. Services are

described in regard to the provision of various types of personnel. Section 33-2002 of the act does authorize the State Board of Education to establish programs, set standards, etc., to educate and train exceptional children. It also establishes a research program to evaluate ongoing programs, assess the number and types of exceptional children. (1965)

Illinois (Article 14a and 14a-6) : The first of these sections establishes procedures which allow local school districts to submit to a State Advisory Council plans for local special programs. Upon approval of the programs by the Council and the Superintendent of Public Instruction, the district will be entitled to state reimbursement for the services and materials required by the proposed program. The second section authorizes the Superintendent of Public Instruction with the advice and consent of the Advisory Council to "enter into contracts with school districts, colleges and universities for the conduct of demonstration centers, experimental projects and institutes in the field of education of gifted children." (1965)

Iowa (282.26) : Allows high school students to enroll in and obtain credits from courses in higher academic institutions. Credits may be earned in any course and may be applied toward high school graduation. Courses may be taken within or without the state, if an out-of-state facility is closer to the home of the student, than the nearest state junior college or university. No public funds are permitted to be expended for the payment of tuition. (1965)

Kansas (72-5336) : The State Division of Special Education is authorized to aid school districts in establishing and maintaining day classes, schools, home instruction, and other methods of special education for exceptional children under the general special education laws. In addition to this, the Division is to "encourage school districts through consultation and guidance to make provision for gifted children by adapting school work to their needs, and to waive restrictions which interfere with the development of such children." (1945)

Louisiana (17:1944) : This section requires local school boards to provide special education and/or training facilities and classes for exceptional children when certain conditions are met. The law is quite general and no specific provisions for gifted children are described, although such children are mentioned among those who are to receive services. (1964)

Massachusetts (Chapter 651, Sections 1 to 6) (Inoperative 6-30-67). The focus of the Massachusetts legislation is on identification, prescription, and research. It encourages local school districts to establish plans for identifying and selecting children who are academically talented and to develop under the plan a means of prescribing special programs for such children. Section 4 of the chapter authorizes the State Department of Education "to engage in research or experimentation consistent with the purposes of the act." (1964)

North Carolina (115-306 to 115-315) : The article establishes at the state level an administrative unit called the Division for the Education of Exceptionally Talented Children. In addition, at the local level it establishes 8 district supervisors, in each of the 8 educational districts of the state. Their purpose is to oversee the development of programs for gifted children in the district, as well as providing consultation to local administrative units planning programs and developing curricula. The act further empowers the Division for the Education of Exceptionally Talented Children to conduct research studies which will "develop techniques, curricula and materials, especially applicable to exceptionally talented children," and to recommend special books, materials, and other supplies to be purchased by the state for the implementation of the article. The article also requires local districts to submit to the Division a plan for programs for such children. In addition, the law provides for the establishment of five pilot centers for the purpose of demonstrating programs for the education of exceptionally talented children, the cost of such programs to be totally assumed by the state. These pilot centers are on an experimental basis and are subject to reexamination by the state board of education. (1961)

Oregon (343.395, 343.397, 343.401) : Allows school districts to submit to the Superintendent of Public Instruction "a written plan for the improvement of instruction or curriculum for the improvement of instruction or curriculum for educationally able and gifted children enrolled in its schools or residing in the district." In approving the plans for the Superintendent shall consider :

"(a) The adequacy and type of program proposed.

"(b) The number of children who will benefit by the proposed program.

"(c) The availability of personnel and facilities in the school district or districts.

- “(d) The need for such a program in the district or districts.
- “(e) Whether the plan meets the requirements of the statutes.
- “(f) Any other factors which will help accomplish the purposes of the statutes.”

Permits the Superintendent to spend up to \$25,000 per fiscal year “to provide supervisory and consultant services to school districts with approved plans.” (1965)

Rhode Island (16-42-4, 16-42-5, 16-42-7, 16-42-11) : Program for gifted and talented children basically determined by local school district in consultation with area advisory committee and Commissioner of Education. (1958)

Washington (28.16.010, 28.16.020, 28.16.030) : The law establishes in the Office of the State Superintendent of Public Instruction a Division of Special Education for Students of Superior Capacity. The title further authorizes the State Superintendent to “administer a program to improve the education of students of superior capacity”, and to also conduct, coordinate and aid in research (including pilot programs), disseminate information to local school districts and allocate supplementary funds for excess costs when appropriated for this purpose by the legislature. Local school districts are permitted either separately or jointly to “(1) establish and operate special, seminar or augment programs of education for superior students; and (2) establish and operate in conjunction with any instruction of higher learning, joint programs of education for superior students.” (1961)

ADVISORY COMMITTEES AND STUDY GROUPS

Delaware (3108) : “The governor shall appoint an advisory committee on the needs of exceptional children to serve in an advisory capacity to the State Board of Education . . .” (1957)

Illinois (Article 14a-4) : This article creates a seven-member Advisory Council on the Education of Gifted Children, appointed by the State Superintendent of Public Instruction, whose members hold office for seven years. Members are to be selected on the basis of their knowledge of or experience in problems of the education gifted children. The purpose of the council is to serve as an advisory unit to the Superintendent of Public Instruction regarding all rules and regulations promulgated by the Department of Public Instruction and related to gifted children, as well as program plans in local school districts. The council is to also approve plans by the Superintendent of Public Instruction for the conduct of demonstration centers, experimental projects and institutes in the field of education of gifted children. Members of the council shall serve without compensation, but are entitled to “reasonable amounts for expenses necessarily incurred in the performance of their duties.” The Superintendent of Public Instruction is to designate an employee of his office to act as executive secretary of the council and to furnish all clerical assistance necessary. (1965)

Massachusetts (Ch. 651, Sec. 5; [15:6c]) (Inoperative 6-30-67) : This section authorizes the creation of an Advisory Commission on Academically Talented Pupils for the purpose of conducting a comprehensive study of programs for such children in Massachusetts and plans for the development of such programs. The Commission is then to report to the legislature the results of its study and its recommendations together with drafts of legislation necessary to carry out the recommendations. Section 5 further stipulates that the Commission be provided with quarters by the Department of Education and that they may travel within and without the Commonwealth, hold hearings and expend funds for expert, clerical and other services. The Commission was to present their report to the legislature before June 30th, 1967. (1964)

Minnesota (Extra Session 1959, Ch. 82, Sec. 1:2 [3]) (Inoperative 1961) : This 1959 law creates an Interim Commission on the Problems of Mentally Retarded, Handicapped and Gifted Children. The purpose of the Commission is to consider the problems related to gifted children including, but not limited to, the “(1) improvement of consultation and field services to aid local communities in developing more adequate programs and facilities for gifted children; (2) extension and improvement of services and facilities for gifted children in rural areas; (3) improvement and coordination of testing, screening, reporting, identification and census programs in the schools for school children, and by public health and other agencies for the pre-school child; (4) improvement of diagnostic facilities (medical, psychological and educational) as a basis for improved child understanding and better education; (5) improvement of programs for the training of teachers and other professional workers; (6) research as a basis for evaluation and improvement of the existing program and for long-range planning; (7) development

of resources for the educational training of gifted youth; (8) improvement of parent consultations and services relating to family planning." The Commission is given further authority to appoint advisory committees. Members of the Commission are to serve without compensation. (1959)

Rhode Island (16-42-1.16-42-2, 16-42-3, 16-42-10). The Commissioner of Education is to create a Rhode Island area advisory committee, "consisting of one (1) superintendent of schools from each of the areas of the state determined by the Commissioner of Education; three (3) representatives-at-large from the Superintendents and Assistant Superintendents of the state; and the President of the Rhode Island Superintendents' Association."

The members of the committee are to serve without compensation but may be reimbursed for necessary travel expenses. The Commissioner is to provide all technical, clerical, and other assistance needed by the committee.

"It shall be the duty of the area advisory committee to recommend to the Commissioner of Education: (a) programs within a school for gifted and talented children; (b) area programs for gifted and talented children; and (c) outside school programs for gifted and talented children, provided, however, that no city or town shall participate or be required to participate in such programs without the affirmative vote of the respective school committees.

"The area advisory committee shall annually make a report of its activities for the preceding fiscal year to the governor, the board of education and the Commissioner of Education." (1958)

DIAGNOSTIC PROCEDURES

California (Educ. 6422): "The general intellectual ability of a minor shall be evidenced by one or more of the following factors: (a) Achievement in school work. (b) Scores on tests measuring intellectual ability and aptitude. (c) The judgments of teachers and school administrators and supervisors who are familiar with the demonstrated ability of the minor." (1961)

Kansas (72-5340): "In order to render proper instruction to each exceptional child, the school district shall certify exceptional children in accordance with the requirements set up by the state division of special education and shall provide examinations for children preliminary to making certification. The examinations necessary for the certification of exceptional children shall be conducted by persons certified by the state division of special education. The result of such examination shall be furnished to the teacher who is responsible for the training of such a child." (1949)

North Carolina (115-307, 115-310): In North Carolina an "exceptionally talented child" must meet the following criteria: (1) a group intelligence quotient of 120 or higher, (2) a majority of marks of A and B, (3) average or better emotional adjustment, (4) achievement at least two grades above the state norm, or in the upper ten percent of local norms of the administrative unit, and (5) referral by school teachers and administrators. Section 115-310 states that "the director shall recommend and the State Superintendent appoint, with the approval of the State Board, a supervisor for testing and pupil classification who shall, in cooperation with existing testing and pupil classification services of the Department of Public Instruction, be charged with the responsibility of testing and evaluating all children in the public school system for the purpose of identifying the exceptionally talented children. Said supervisor shall be a person well trained and professionally qualified to carry out this responsibility. In addition, the director shall recommend and the state superintendent appoint with the approval of the state board, such specialists as may be necessary for adequate counseling and identification of such exceptionally talented school children throughout the state; and the state shall provide necessary funds for office expenses and travel for the conduct of their work." (1961)

FINANCIAL SUPPORT

California (6425 to 6431 as amended by AB 272 [1967]): In addition to general state aid, the school districts may receive up to a maximum of \$40.00 per pupil for identification expenses, and \$60.00 per pupil program expenses. Funding for programs for the gifted in California is limited to 2% of the school population. (1961)

Connecticut (10-76): This law provides that districts providing special education in accordance with state regulations shall be reimbursed in an amount equal to 66⅔% of the excess cost of the program. In computing excess cost, school

districts may include costs of personnel, equipment and materials, transportation, special consultant services and rent. (1967)

Delaware (1703) : The State of Delaware reimburses local special education programs on a unit basis. A normal unit in the State is 25 pupils; however, for exceptional children under various categories, the number of children per unit has been reduced. However, there is no mention in the law of the unit structure for gifted children. (1965)

Georgia (32-651) : This section provides that the Student Honors Program, (a summer program for gifted children) may be financed by the State Board of Education to meet all operating and pupil costs and expenses. (1964)

Idaho (33-2005) : This section provides that the State Board of Education add 80% of the total cost of the special education program for exceptional children to the education foundation program of the district. (1965)

Illinois (Article 14A-5) : Illinois law provides two alternatives for state reimbursement. The first provides for the payment of one-half of the average per capita costs of pupils in programs for the gifted throughout the state, multiplied by the number of pupils and average daily attendance in the district's program, multiplied by one of the following factors: "The factors for school districts having different assessed valuations per pupil in average daily attendance shall be: 1.0 in districts with \$20,000 or more; 1.2 in districts with \$16,000 but less than \$20,000; 1.3 in districts with \$12,000 but less than \$16,000; 1.4 in districts with \$9,000 but less than \$12,000; 1.5 in districts with less than \$9,000." "In no case shall the claim for reimbursement of any district exceed the per capita cost of such program to the district multiplied by the number of pupils in average daily attendance." This formula also limits the number of pupils in attendance to no more than 5% of the average daily attendance in the district.

The second formula provides an annual rate of \$5,000 for each professional worker who meets the established standards for the position. (1965)

Kansas (72-5362) : Reimbursement for services to exceptional children in Kansas is based upon a per teacher unit system with additional reimbursement for transportation, travel and instructional materials. Cooperative programs between districts are further reimbursed. (1961)

Louisiana (17:1946) : Louisiana provides financial support for special education on a unit basis. That is, it assists in the financial support of a teacher per so many pupils. This section outlines the per pupil ratio in all areas of exceptionality except that of the gifted, which is left to be determined by regulations of the State Board of Education. (1964)

Massachusetts (Chapter 651, Section 1, [15:6c]) (Inoperative 6-30-67) : This section authorizes the State Department of Education to reimburse on a matching basis cities and towns and regional school districts for the cost of special programs. (1964)

Nebraska (L448) : 1967 general school finance law—provides that districts having programs for gifted children be reimbursed an additional .25 A.D.A. for every gifted child. (1967)

North Carolina (115-306 to 115-315) : The full program outlined in this article for "exceptionally talented children" is financed by the State. In regard to locally administered programs, "the Superintendent of any school administrative unit may submit to the director a proposal, including any program already in operation, for a local program for the education of the exceptionally talented children in that administrative unit. If such proposal is approved by the director, in accordance with the rules and regulations to be prescribed by the state board, the qualification of local programs under this article, there shall be allocated by the State Board out of the Nine Months School Fund, to the school administrative unit, such funds as may be necessary to carry out the program." (1961)

Ohio (Section 3323.02) : "The State Board of Education may provide financial assistance out of any funds appropriated for this purpose to Boards of Education for developing and conducting experimental programs of education for academically gifted children." (1959)

Oregon (343.397, 343.399) : School districts must submit at the end of the fiscal year the amount expended pursuant to the plan during that fiscal year. Reimbursement "shall be based on the number of children in average daily membership . . . in the schools of that district for the fiscal year ending June 30 prior to the school year for which the plan was approved and in effect. The amount of reimbursement shall be:

(a) \$1.50 per child for the first year the program operates.

(b) \$1.00 per child for the second year the program operates.

(c) \$0.50 per child for the third year the program operates."

Requires districts to expend out of district funds an amount equal to the grant by the state. (1965)

Rhode Island (16-42-6, 16-42-7, 16-42-8, 16-42-9) : "The state shall reimburse each city and town in an amount not to exceed one-half ($1\frac{1}{2}$) of the sum of the instructional salaries, textbooks and supplies expended for each approved program."

The general assembly is to appropriate the funds it deems necessary to carry out the program. Eligibility for reimbursement is to be determined by the Commissioner upon recommendation of the area advisory committee.

NOTE.—1960, general state aid law removed all categories for state funding. Thus the above statutes, while remaining on the books, receive no earmarked funds. (1958)

Washington (28.16.020) : This law gives the State Superintendent of Public Instruction the authority to allocate supplementary funds for excess costs of programs for students of superior capacity. (1961)

Mr. PUCINSKI. What about Mr. Bell's question that you can have so many of these programs going that you don't do anything well, you disburse your funds too thinly.

You said that some of the programs that you looked at were really paper projects, they look good on paper. But when you get down to the basic issue and see how many people are being reached, and how effectively, you suddenly realize that we have a great deal of tokenism in these projects.

This is one of the problems that I now have in evaluating ESEA and it seems like we are moving in the direction of spreading the limited dollar ever thinner in the various educational programs.

I don't want to get into a discussion here of title I but I think that a thorough study of title I would show the many areas where it is not doing an effective job.

The same situation applies with this. The same situation applies with educational laboratories. Mr. Bell raised a question. Does this bill further dilute the educational dollar?

Dr. French, you talked about the fact that this bill would at least provide a national stimulus to recognize the problem of dealing with gifted children.

How do we assure that we are not spreading the limited educational dollar further and negating the possibility of actual work being done?

Dr. GOLD. I would like to reply to that, sir.

Again using Florida as an example, I started mentioning some very dismal figures relative to this study that was done a couple of years back; I believe with very limited dollars at the State Department level.

And I am talking in terms of perhaps \$25,000 to \$50,000 a year within our one State, with appropriate leadership in that position who could oversee the State and give guidance and the help, the proper placement of funds wouldn't dissipate the effect of a large package of dollars yet have the impact of doing something or seeing that something is done.

This past year the State of Florida has introduced some legislation to enable some more action to be taken with gifted programming.

However, unfortunately, we still didn't have anyone at the State level who would work with the legislative and guide them in getting the legislative package through and it died simply because of apathy, there was no resistance.

I think Federal dollars well placed could assure that State dollars would be used most appropriately.

Mr. PUCINSKI. The gentleman from Illinois, Mr. Erlenborn, made a strong point of the fact that this bill does not carry any additional funds. But even if we were to take \$50,000 a State as seed money, we need \$2,750,000.

Dr. GOLD. Let me back it up if I may, sir.

There are parent organizations and professional organizations located around the country. I think if we had the Federal legislation that we could point to we could serve as a force to encourage the States to use the money that has already been appropriated for title V.

Mr. PUCINSKI. You don't think you can do that without the Federal legislation?

Dr. FRENCH. I think we have not.

Mr. WEINTRAUB. I think if I could comment because I think we are getting back to a question similar to the kind of question we were facing on the specific learning disabilities legislation.

Mr. PUCINSKI. That is right.

If I may interrupt you, we have a lot of bills pending. Another subcommittee is considering legislation right now to authorize money to set up training programs and educational programs on narcotics addiction.

But we have to inquire, as Mr. Bell did, whether just passing these bills to meet individual needs is not diluting the basic responsibility of good education for all youngsters.

We have before this committee a bill that we are going to hold some hearings on very shortly, a very simple resolution setting up a national policy that it is the obligation of the Government to provide every child with an education consistent with his needs. Very simple.

To give you an example, in the State of Illinois we passed a bill that went into effect July 1. The State now must provide an education for every child in that State. It must by law. If they can't provide that education they have to provide the parents of that child the money it will take for the parents to provide that education through sources other than public education.

Now, what has been the net effect of a bill like that? For decades we have treated the subeducable youngster as a lost citizen.

We said it was the family's problem and if we happened to have some facilities, fine, and if we didn't *c'est le guerre*.

Now we pass a bill and we say the State, the local school authority must provide an education for every child. In the last 2 weeks there has been a crash program going on in Chicago and many other communities of Illinois to set up facilities for the subeducable youngster.

I think that is what Mr. Bell had in mind when he said shouldn't we try and set up a national goal and then let the respective educators fill in the slots as they become needed rather than the present approach which is to try to legislate a single answer to every educational problem and yet without additional money.

The HEW department won't recommend any more money.

Aren't we kidding ourselves, kidding the educational community, and kidding the people of the country when we legislate in this manner?

Dr. FRENCH. Mr. Bell did say he was for the gifted child because everybody should be for the gifted child. And I think that is what we have found. And one of the values I see in this legislation is the required study that will see how well we will do and see what the degree

of success is that we have been able to accomplish so far and then perhaps as that study is available we will have some other direction to go.

Mr. PUCINSKI. This is the one redeeming feature of this bill. I am attracted to this legislation primarily because in section 4 it directs the Commissioner of Education to tell us the nature of the problem and what needs to be done to deal with it.

I would say that this bill is worth supporting if for no other reason than it does instruct the Commissioner to address himself to the problem of the gifted child and come to Congress 6 months hence and make his recommendations.

Mr. VASSAR. Might I get back to that for just a moment. We proceed a little differently in the State Department level. For example, States stimulate States. Your State stimulated Connecticut. We wrote an article in the Illinois Journal of Education last October thanking the Galaghers and Rogges and the Bakers out there for stimulating us to utilize title V money.

I am not so sure if Connecticut would have utilized this money. I would have to go back in history to find out. I recall going to a meeting at Allenton House at the University of Illinois where your State utilized section 503 to bring a group of us from around the country. I was at that time holding the same position in Massachusetts. And it was the getting together of all of the part-time and full-time people in the State Departments to see if we could find some kind of vehicle with which to spread the wealth around the country in terms of programming for the gifted.

Ironically enough it was there I was contacted to come to Connecticut but Connecticut did take this money, Colorado had the same thing. In that study which is not part of this particular testimony I just looked at the observations we had about this kind of thing.

We had States represented by the positive and it was a direct dichotomy as we had this study. There were the haves and have nots. Very few middle of the road. Either you had people you were committed or you weren't.

I have also worked with a few other States on a part-time basis as a consultant on legislation for gifted. And I find State school offices, the deputy commissioner saying but we did like to do it but we have other priorities at this point in time.

However, if the Congress saw fit to pass V this way and give some visibility under the guidelines of V, they would see an opportunity to provide this full-time consultant not forever and ever but strictly as a stimulant or for 3 or 4 years, for example, like Connecticut and then the line item be picked up in the State budget for a commitment to the full-time consultant.

I can only look back to what has gone on in our State and its part of the testimony and it has just been as my own commissioner says, he was amazed he never believed this could have gone on with one stimulant.

And I am sure now for example I had a letter on my desk yesterday from Idaho and another letter last week from Michigan. They are studying the need for the gifted. They are going to be asking for a specific kind of thing.

The strongest thing that came out in the study of the 50 States was the need for full-time consultants in each and every one of the 50 States.

I found that any positive experience in school administration was probably the strongest strength that I brought to the State Department, the ability to get down and stimulate local district superintendents to at least attempt to try something.

This was even prior to our State legislation, to try a pilot program or try to differentiate kinds of experiences and activities for bright kids and I am a very strong advocate, I couldn't be stronger on the stimulation factor of title V at State department level.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Gold, did you want to add something there?

Dr. GOLD. No, sir.

Mr. GEER. I think what we are really talking about is the evolutionary process of developing education. We have been going through this at different stages and here and there parts have been developed as they were needed. Certainly, in the total spectrum, although there are different pieces of legislation, these finally come together as a whole.

I am reminded of the State often where I worked beginning of 1949 for about 9 years. When I went into this State we had only about 30 teachers of handicapped children. They were very carefully earmarked out of this total educational budget. There was much resistance to raising this number of positions. Finally one year they decided to make this part of the foundation educational program. Since then it has grown and there is no longer a question whether it is part of the total program or not.

It started somewhat like the specific bills we are talking about, learning disabilities and gifted, a period of time of visibility, then acceptance and no longer any question about it.

It becomes a part of the total process, so I think it is evolutionary in nature.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Dr. French.

Dr. FRENCH. No.

Mr. WEINTRAUB. I think there is an important point and that is again it goes to the point we were trying to raise in regard to the learning disabilities and I think Mr. Geer has touched on this in looking at both State and Federal law, is the importance of visibility of the manner in which the passage of a simple law such as is proposed to this committee gives to the forces in the field that are concerned about these children, I can imagine what the passage of this bill will mean to parents like Dr. Olson, throughout the country, who can then begin to solidify, unify, to begin to say there are people who are concerned.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Weintraub, the problem that we have is that we have been proliferating educational bills around here at such a pace that the Appropriations Committee to a great extent is losing confidence and is just not funding them.

And that is a problem. This bill doesn't ask for any appropriation. Although as Mr. Quie had pointed out there is an implied authorization. Sooner or later we must face up to the fact that this is meaningless unless there is some money to go with it.

What you need from the Congress is authorization to do the work that you want to do and you have been wanting to do for a long time.

That is the problem and that is the problem that we have in the legislative process. We at the authorizing level are very happy to authorize these bills because we think there is a need for them, a definite need.

We talk about title I and the great promise that it holds out and then we see it funded only to the extent of 49 percent of authorization.

We talk about the Vocational Education Act and last year we got all the voc-ed people all over the country inspired. It appeared we had reached a point in education where we stopped building birdhouses and sewing hems in dresses and that we were really going to do something meaningful.

Eight hundred fifty million dollars worth of hopes. That was the authorization for fiscal 1970. And now the big struggle is going on before the Appropriations Committee to get at least a few more dollars over the 1969 appropriation.

I think there is a tendency to arouse false hopes in people by passing a very fine authorization bill and then not being able to back it up with the money to carry it out.

Dr. OLSON. Mr. Chairman, if I may intrude on the testimony of the Council for Exceptional Children.

As to this matter of whether we are raising false hopes or not when we put the words "gifted and exceptional children" into the existing act, I would observe that much of the money, most of the money, for education comes at the local level. There exist in the local schools, in the local school boards, in the States, people on payrolls, money available for equipments, which admittedly might be taken from something else but which could be organized in a different way with some sense of direction and some sense of confidence on the part of the chain of command from teacher to principal to school superintendent to State.

The visibility given to programs for gifted and talented children by this legislation would not necessarily just raise false hopes at all. It will in the opinion of many people do positive good.

It will do it even without Federal money being appropriated for that specific purpose at this time.

Now admittedly there is always a struggle in any human effort to get a share of the limited resources of the society. And this struggle goes on whether or not you pass this particular bill.

The passage of this bill will be an effective instrument to our teachers or principals or school superintendents or others like them who already are there and who are already trying to do the educational job.

Mr. PUCINSKI. You may be absolutely right.

In other words, all of you feel that the fact that this bill does not provide any funds as such, at this point in time, should not defer enactment of this bill?

Mr. GEER. I feel certain that that is true. I think the appropriations dilemma that we are now in will never be completely resolved but I think there are signs on the horizon there may be more resources in the future than there are now and and I think the educational communities—

Mr. PUCINSKI. You have a better crystal ball than I have.

Mr. GEER. The educational community has become sufficiently disturbed about this that it is seriously working at the entire problem at every level and particularly at the Federal level.

We are determined that the education of children will not be the reason for the failure of this country to discharge its responsibilities.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I wish that I could be as helpful as you are.

I wish that I could say that the end of the Vietnam war is going to open the floodgates for urgently needed money to take care of domestic problems.

I think that money will be coming from the growth of the economy, hopefully, if we can keep the economy rolling and curb inflation.

Nevertheless I think we have heard your message. You feel very strongly that to those who would argue as they will on the floor, that this legislation is meaningless, you feel very strongly it is not that it has a purpose, and even though there is no specific earmarking of funds it will give visibility to a problem that now has been somewhat subordinate to other problems in education.

Is that the main thrust of your reasoning.

Mr. GEER. Yes, sir.

Mr. PUCINSKI. We want to thank you gentlemen and I hope Mr. Vassar that we can get your report put in the record at this point, and whatever other information you want to give us. I would like to thank you gentlemen for being with us this morning and apologize to you for keeping you so late.

If I asked you a lot of questions it was merely to have a record to refer to from experts in this field.

We will ask Dr. Olson to wrap up this set of hearings now. You were going to give us some of your views on this legislation.

Dr. OLSON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I would like to comment on the enactment of this bill. I have presented a statement and I have sent in my biography. It is hard to know exactly what to say after having heard the well-informed, expert, and eloquent testimony of the people who are in this business.

As you learned from your colleague, Mr. Stokes, I am not a professional educator. I am not an educational administrator. I am an Assistant Director of the Lewis Research Center of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration in Cleveland.

And in that capacity I have been a working scientist and science administrator, but my profession has kept me in close contact with educators.

My recently deceased brother was president of Oklahoma City University. My dear wife has trained for and taught in the Cleveland school system. I have a son who has had part of his education in a school system that did not provide a program for gifted and exceptional children and part of it in a school system that did provide one.

I would like to add that he is moving into high school, and so my personal interest could not possibly be served by any action one way or the other on the legislation that we are discussing.

I have been asked by the Ohio Association for Gifted Children to work on behalf of H.R. 4807. And so I am just here as an interested citizen, a friend of education, and a spokesman for this very dedicated and interested group of parents and teachers.

I just want to summarize some of the points that I tried to make in the written testimony.

I really believe that the future of our country requires that we give our gifted and talented children an optimum chance to develop to their maximum potential, and mainly because we need leadership so badly.

In our business we need leadership. Tomorrow we are going to be launching three men to the moon. In NASA I would say that the scientists and engineers at work right now are working on subject matters, half of which had not existed 10 years ago.

And I am pretty sure that 10 years from now people in technical efforts like NASA and in the technical productive efforts of our country will be working on subject matters, half of them perhaps that do not exist today.

So, we need leadership to continue prosperity and progress in this technical world we are creating.

Furthermore, this technical world now is producing change in our society so rapidly that change occurs within the lifetime of a person. That is a new phenomenon in the human story, and this change threatens to overwhelm us. It is behind what is happening in our cities and our country.

In many respects we need leadership to manage the rapidly changing society and I am sure we all agree we need it on the world scene.

We see a world filling up with people. We see communications and transportation helping to shrink the world. We see the aspirations of the people in other countries, emerging parts of the world, yellow and black countries growing very rapidly and we will need leadership to sit at the counsel tables of the world and deal with the problems of this "spaceship" that is getting overcrowded.

So we need leadership.

On the other hand, we already have a problem in our big cities in particular in missing the chance to give education to these exceptional talented and gifted children. And when we miss them they either shrivel up or they may become dissident and even hostile.

They become the gang leader that Mr. Bell referred to.

We have lots of evidence in the literature, and we have evidence in the Congressional Record and presented here today that more than half of the gifted and talented children are not given their full educational potential.

Dr. Charles Jordan of the Cleveland system has indicated to me that something like 80 percent of the Negro children in innercities that are gifted and talented do not get a chance to go on to finish high school and college. They are lost.

Now we can't afford that kind of loss.

Further, we really need the development of these inner city children if we are ever to have a socioeconomic democracy as well as a political democracy. So we can all agree that children ought to be educated to the level of their capacity.

What about this bill?

Well, there is ample evidence in the literature and I think we have had ample testimony here that the gifted and talented children need special programs. I think in a nutshell we have said exceptional children, whichever end of the distribution scale of talent that they may be on, need exceptional education. And yet we have also had testimony that says that only 13 of the 50 State Departments have one or more full-time people working on gifted and talented children programs, and there are something like 21 States that have no one responsible.

An examination of where gifted and talented children are receiving attention indicates nine-tenths of them get attention in States where

there are people assigned to the job of seeing to it that there are programs.

And so H.R. 4807 calls attention to the States of the desirability of special programs for educating the talent.

They certainly "hop to" on the handicapped which you have already spelled out in Congress.

I observed myself around Cleveland and other places that there are parents, teachers, school systems, and administrative people at State and local levels who see the necessity of providing the educational needs for gifted and talented, but the management chain may become broken somewhere simply because you hadn't spelled out anywhere in legislation or in directives and so on the words "gifted and talented children." Thus they don't feel they have anything to rally around.

And just the words in the act would give these people something to rally around.

I was interested enough in that point to write the Office of Education, and they told me that it is possible to fund projects for the gifted under title I and title III of the Elementary and Secondary Act. And I believe I heard here today that there are programs so funded.

But in the same letter that I got back from that Office they hasten to remind me that such programs would have to be very high priority indeed. Of course, they would and particularly so since the act doesn't mention these programs by name.

So, having the words spelled out in the act will give some administrative clout to the educators at the State and local levels.

Now, we don't need to worry about how these programs are to be conducted. The act doesn't concern itself with "how." But there is plenty of evidence again that programs can be arranged and conducted—all sorts of programs. We have the program in Cleveland. It is one of the oldest in the country, something like 35 years now. Illinois, of course, is also a fine example. So there is good evidence that it is fully feasible to have such programs.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Would you pardon the interruption; Dr. French, I don't know whether you want to be excused or not. I see you have your family here. Perhaps the youngsters wanted to see some of the Capital.

Dr. OLSON. I am going to finish in just a moment.

If you are going to expand these programs, you have to increase the number of teachers and administrators that are trained to run programs like this. You have an Education Professional Development Act, and H.R. 4807 simply opens the route to use that act to help train teachers and administrators in the programs for the gifted.

And finally, you do just more than pave the way for the States to use the already existing programs that Congress has established. What the bill does is what any good manager would do; ask for positive action.

You ask the Office of Education to tell your legislature what could be done. This business of spelling out a specific way that you could use Federal programs in behalf of the needs of gifted and talented children is a very commendable beginning on this vital problem, this problem that is so important to the Nation. And I came down here mainly to urge you to act positively and act definitely to try to get this legislation into law, not just to be for it, but to really work on it.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Dr. French, maybe you would like to comment or any of you gentlemen. Do we have facilities in the country for training teachers to deal with gifted youngsters?

Dr. FRENCH. Yes. I conducted surveys over the past 10 years to determine the extent to which courses are offered in the various institutions and we did see the big spurt right after Sputnik.

It has been declining since then. The courses usually are on the books. There are very few people who enroll in them. I am sure we could mount a number of programs in a lot of institutions throughout the United States.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Dr. Olson, has at least some effort been made toward implementing the NDEA and various other programs, have they been of any significant help in the NASA program?

Mr. OLSON. In an indirect way, in that many of the key people in NASA have had their education provided in very fine fashion back in elementary school so that they have kept a thirst for learning. Some of our people have had their thirst for high academic adventure and scientific and engineering achievement created by special programs that maybe were put on a Saturday or something of that sort. So, in a very indirect way, absolutely, yes.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I want to thank all of you gentlemen for taking time out to be with us. Dr. French, I want to congratulate you for your fine family back there. I watched your youngsters sit through this hearing and while it may be of great interest to those of you who are very closely related to it, I am not so sure it is a profound interest to those young people and I would venture the opinion that any man who can raise a family with such good manners belongs in the field that you are in.

Dr. FRENCH. Thank you.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I congratulate you for a very fine family and I want to congratulate all of you for the work that you have done for this testimony.

This is an important subject.

I think when we listen to witnesses like you we discover that there are specific problems that have to be dealt with in a very specific way. Maybe that has been the trouble up to now; maybe there has been too much tendency to lump everything together and hope for the best.

Maybe that has been the mistake. Maybe we ought to have more emphasis on the specific individual needs of education, identify them and try to bring some help.

Perhaps that is the wave of the future in education. Your testimony has certainly I think given us a great deal to think about.

I am sure the committee will want to view this legislation with a great deal more seriousness in the light of the problem that you pointed out here today. I want to thank all of you for coming down and taking the time to be with us.

Thank you very much.

Mr. GEER. Mr. Chairman, we appreciate the opportunity and hope you will call on us whenever we can be of help.

Mr. PUCINSKI. We certainly will and this committee will stand adjourned until we start marking up the bills.

(Whereupon, at 1:45 p.m. the committee adjourned.)



