

Course Title: Challenging Gifted Students Using the SCGM Model for Teachers II

Instructor: Susan Winebrenner

Length: 15 hours

Credit: 1 semester hour

Course Description:

If left unchallenged, gifted students can often “tune out” in a regular classroom; this second course in the School-Wide Cluster Grouping Model (SCGM) arms teachers with strategies designed to challenge their gifted students. Educators review the roles of teachers, mentors, and specialists before engaging in in-depth consideration of extension menus. Panel discussions—one with administrators and one with gifted program coordinators—help flesh out those roles for teachers, who then study methods for monitoring the progress of the SCGM, placing gifted students in cluster groups, and evaluating student growth. Teachers also learn how to create a database for tracking gifted students and how to handle special populations of gifted students. Additional classroom segments of differentiated instruction techniques round out this course.

Course

Objective/Goals:

1. Knowledge –at the end of this course the student will be able to understand:
 - a. The meaning of extension menus
 - b. How to track growth in gifted cluster classrooms
 - c. More methods for identifying gifted students

2. Skills –after this course a student will be able to:
 - a. Use various methods of implementing the SCGM in the classroom
 - b. Use extension menus
 - c. Monitor progress of gifted students

3. Dispositions – after this course, a student will be able to appreciate:
 - a. The gifted cluster teacher meeting
 - b. The curriculum differentiation training
 - c. The various classroom demonstrations

Units:

1. Creating and Using Effective Extension Menus
2. Gifted Cluster Teacher Meeting
3. Gifted Specialist/Mentor Meeting
4. Evaluating the SCGM
5. Special Populations
6. Additional Demonstrations of Teaching Strategies
7. Research Supporting the SCGM
8. Wrapping Up the SCGM

Instructor Overviews:

Susan Winebrenner is a consultant and author who works with school districts to help them translate current educational research into classroom practice. She is president of Education Consulting Service, Inc., a speakers' bureau for educational topics, which she founded in 1986. Her expertise is in teaching differentiation strategies to teachers and in helping administrators support

teachers' differentiation efforts. Her focus is on empowering students at both ends of the learning continuum; those who are gifted and those with learning problems. For more information, please visit her website at www.susanwinebrenner.com.

Dina Brulles is the Gifted Education Director in the Paradise Valley Unified School District in Arizona, and a faculty associate of the College of Education at Arizona State University where she teaches graduate courses in gifted education. Dina serves as President of the Arizona Association for Gifted and Talented (AAGT), and as a Board Director for the national gifted organization, Supporting Emotional Needs of the Gifted (SENG). Dina consults with school districts in their efforts to create gifted education programs that reflect the needs of the districts' population. She has created and supervised cluster grouping programs and has become a recognized expert in that practice.

Methods of Instruction:

- Video lectures and PowerPoint presentations
- Short answer quizzes
- Graded post assessments
- Final

All steps listed under each topic must be completed to receive credit for the course. No partial credit will be given. Students must earn a minimum of 60% to pass the course.

Percentage of Course Credit

- Graded post assessments and short answer quizzes 40%
- Final Project 60%

KDS Rubric for GA courses (passing requirements: 60 points):

A: 90 - 100 points

B: 80

C: 70 points

D: 60 points

F: Fewer than 60 points

Component	Unsatisfactory (10 points)	Basic (20 points)	Proficient (30 points)	Distinguished (40 points)
Critical thinking post-work	<u>Critical thinking post-work:</u>	<u>Critical thinking post-work:</u>	<u>Critical thinking post-work:</u>	<u>Critical thinking post-work:</u>
And	0-40% correct	60% correct	80% correct	100% correct
Short answer quizzes	<u>Short answer quiz:</u>	<u>Short answer quiz:</u>	<u>Short answer quiz:</u>	<u>Short answer quiz:</u>
	-Participant included no	-Participant included some	-Participant included	-Participant provided rich

	<p>content from the course in his or her responses</p> <p>-Participant did not address the questions posed</p>	<p>content from the course, usually appropriate, in his or her responses</p> <p>-Participant answered the questions directly, not always fully</p>	<p>appropriate content from the course in his or her responses</p> <p>-Participant made thoughtful comments in direct response to the questions</p>	<p>detail from the content of the course in his or her responses</p> <p>-Participant made his or her responses to the questions personally meaningful</p>
Final	<p>Unsatisfactory (30 points)</p> <p><u>Requirements of Assignment:</u></p> <p>-The assignment is substantially incomplete</p> <p><u>Form:</u></p> <p>- Plentiful grammatical mistakes -Confusing content -Missing documentation of sources</p> <p><u>Content:</u></p> <p>-No main idea and/or main idea is irrelevant to the assignment -No apparent paragraph organization -No supporting evidence for supporting ideas -No evidence in</p>	<p>Basic (40 points)</p> <p><u>Requirements of Assignment :</u></p> <p>-Many requirements met, but a few pieces are missing, while others are underdeveloped— e.g., missing reflection or rubric or scant reflection and vague rubric</p> <p><u>Form:</u></p> <p>-Distracting grammatical errors -Confusing content -Inconsistent or missing documentation of sources</p> <p><u>Content:</u></p> <p>-The main idea is not clear in the opening paragraph -Relevance to main idea of supporting paragraphs is not always clear -Supporting ideas are only minimally illustrated by</p>	<p>Proficient (50 points)</p> <p><u>Requirements of Assignment:</u></p> <p>-Participant has fulfilled all the requirements of the assignment.</p> <p><u>Form:</u></p> <p>-Participant has written a solid essay or lesson plan, including appropriate detail and in an interesting style.</p> <p><u>Content:</u></p> <p>-Essay is organized around a thesis or main idea, -Paragraphs are organized around ideas relevant to the main idea -Supporting ideas are evident, and usually include</p>	<p>Distinguished (60 points)</p> <p><u>Requirements of Assignment:</u></p> <p>-All requirements gone beyond the requirements of the Assignment. e.g., inclusion of rubric, reflection, objective(s), etc.— whatever the directions indicate</p> <p><u>Form:</u></p> <p>-No grammatical errors -Eloquent expression -Proper citation of sources</p> <p><u>Content:</u></p> <p>-Essay is organized around a thesis or main idea -Paragraphs are organized around ideas relevant to the main idea -Supporting points are illustrated with examples and/or quotes</p>

	<p>the lesson plan—in objectives, activities, or assessments—that the learner comprehends the course content</p>	<p>examples or quotes -The lesson plan does not show enough evidence that the learner understands the course content. Objectives and/or activities and/or assessments only vaguely apply to the course content</p>	<p>illustrating examples and/or quotes -The lesson plan shows evidence of understanding of the course content in its objectives, activities, and/or assessments</p>	<p>-Lesson plan shows evidence of a deep understanding of course content and participant uses that understanding to create opportunities for students to authentically show what they have learned.</p>
--	--	---	--	---