

**Subject: gifted education proposal****Date:** Tuesday, April 26, 2005 3:35 PM**From:** Plucker, Jonathan Alan <jplucker@indiana.edu>**To:** "Delandshere, Ginette" <gdelands@indiana.edu>**Cc:** "Kloosterman, Peter W." <klooster@indiana.edu>

Hi Ginette,

I have some problems with this proposal. I can't be at the PC meeting tomorrow to voice concerns, so I want to share them with you. I would have preferred to share my concerns earlier in the process, but this is the first I've heard of this proposal.

I was disappointed to see this proposal for a few reasons. First, the proposal uses the CEC program standards and not the new CEC/NAGC standards for graduate programs. The new standards, which are attached, are moving through the NCATE adoption process and are tentatively scheduled to be in effect by summer 2006. Minor wordsmithing is expected, otherwise this draft is very close to what the eventual standards will look like. As you can see, the new standards are very different from the old standards.

Second, the proposal does not address the competitive nature of graduate-level gifted education in Indiana. Both Purdue and Ball State have well-known programs that directly compete with our course offerings, and the existence of these programs is why I was told a few years back to forget about doing anything with these gifted ed courses (i.e., because the market was just too competitive). The class sizes, according to the proposal, have been adequate over the past few years, but will that continue now that Purdue is expanding their gifted education offerings? This may not be an issue, but I am surprised it wasn't addressed in the proposal.

Third, the program doesn't involve any full-time, tenure-track faculty. This licensure program will have one adjunct and two emeriti professors, and the adjunct teaching the ed psych of the gifted course isn't an ed psychologist, to my knowledge. We have several colleagues with at least a passing interest in this topic who could be involved in at least a cursory way.

When we create/revise programs, perhaps those of us with specializations in the relevant areas should be consulted. Regardless, I can live with my second and third concerns (I fully realize that no one else may be bothered in the least by those two issues), but any graduate coursework in gifted education should be aligned with the new standards.

JP