Culturally Responsive Pedagogy for Advanced Learners Project

# Aim

# Bias against non-dominant groups is prevalent in American society and in American schools. This project will help you examine practices in your own school that you will want to change in order to foil the prevalent bias. Table 1 ties the outcomes of this project to Ohio’s Operating Standards for Identifying and Serving Students Who are Gifted.

# Standards and Project Outcomes

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Standard | Outcome One | Outcome Two |
| ***Assurance of inclusion in screening and assessment procedures for minority and disadvantaged students, students with disabilities, and English learners.******The ability [for general education teachers] to recognize and respond to characteristics and needs of students from traditionally underrepresented populations who are gifted and create safe and culturally responsive learning environments.*** | Identify the extent of underrepresentation in gifted identification of students from non-dominant groups in your school or district. | Based on data and needs, determine interventions to improve the identification of students from non-dominant groups as gifted. |
| ***All district students who meet the written criteria for a gifted service shall be provided an equal opportunity to receive that service.*** ***The ability [for general education teachers] to recognize and respond to characteristics and needs of students from traditionally underrepresented populations who are gifted and create safe and culturally responsive learning environments.*** | Assess the extent of underrepresentation of non-dominant groups in access to acceleration, advanced curriculum, and gifted services.  | Understand provisions to improve representation of non-dominant groups in acceleration, advanced curriculum, and gifted services.  |

## Background Information

Before completing the project, read the foundational concept, *Culturally Responsive Pedagogy for Advanced Learners.*

## Estimated Time Completion

Five hours

# Procedures:

Teachers completing this project will watch two videos. The videos are interviews with: (1) Dr. Dorinda Carter Andrews, professor of education at Michigan State University and (2) Dr. Donna Ford, professor of gifted education at Vanderbilt’s Peabody College of Education. The interviews will help you engage culturally responsive pedagogy in your own school.

***Step 1.*** Watch the first interview. To prepare for watching the interview, ask yourself two questions and jot down your responses:

* Is there an American Indian student in my school? How would I find out?
* Have I ever read a novel by an African or African American author? Why or why not?

Now view the video with Dr. Andrews (15 minutes). https://youtu.be/iOrgf3wTUbo

To debrief, ask yourself the following questions and jot down your answers:

* How, most likely, would Dr. Andrews answer the first two questions? Why?

***Step 2.*** Watch the second interview—the one with Donna Ford (26 minutes). https://youtu.be/adMFCNdbIsA

***Step 3.*** Think of a specific subgroup in your school that is typically underrepresented in terms of access to identification, advanced curriculum, acceleration, or gifted services. With this subgroup in mind, decide which three interventions mentioned in the table titled Interventions to Support Advanced Learners from Non-Dominant Groups located in the related Foundational Concept you think could help in your school or district. Think about why these interventions would help.

For each one selected, justify your choice (that is, explain the reasons for your choice and describe the situation in your school that the intervention would address). Then describe how you might intervene personally: Describe what you will do personally, the students and the other colleagues who will be involved, and what you predict will happen as a result.

The description of each intervention should be one page in length for a total of three pages. This is the structure for each of the three responses:

1. Intervention name (consult the Foundational Concept)
2. Justification (explain reasons and describe the situation)
3. Personal action (what, who, how)

***Step 4. Submit your report to the educator whom your district has selected to facilitate the Gifted Education professional development course.***

# Rubric:

Participants in the Gifted Education PD might review the “distinguished” column of the rubric below as a guide to what a complete and well-executed project would look like. The person who is supervising the Gifted Education PD can use the rubric to evaluate participants’ projects. Total rubric scores of **12 or higher** are sufficient for receiving credit for the project.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Criterion | Distinguished (Four points for each criterion at this level) | Accomplished (Three points for each criterion at this level) | Competent (Two points for each criterion at this level) | Emerging (One point for each criterion at this level) |
| Reasoning and explanation used to justify selected intervention 1. | The justification is complete, logical, and compelling. | The justification is very logical, and very well explained. | The justification is logical and explained well. | Reasons and explanations are present, but both could be more complete. |
| The reasoning and explanation used to justify selected intervention 2. | The justification is complete, logical, and compelling. | The justification is very logical, and very well explained. | The justification is logical and explained well. | Reasons and explanations are present, but both could be more complete. |
| The reasoning and explanation used to justify selected intervention 3. | The justification is complete, logical, and compelling. | The justification is very logical, and very well explained. | The justification is logical and explained well. | Reasons and explanations are present, but both could be more complete. |
| Specification and defense of personal action plan for intervention 1. | The personal action plan is complete, coherent, and presented compellingly. | The personal action plan is complete and explained in detail. | The personal action plan is explained. | The personal action plan is not yet complete or the explanation of parts is rudimentary. |
| Specification and defense of personal action plan for intervention 2. | The personal action plan is complete, coherent, and presented compellingly. | The personal action plan is complete and explained in detail. | The personal action plan is explained. | The personal action plan is not yet complete or the explanation of parts is rudimentary. |
| Specification and defense of personal action plan for intervention 3. | The personal action plan is complete, coherent, and presented compellingly. | The personal action plan is complete and explained in detail. | The personal action plan is explained. | The personal action plan is not yet complete or the explanation of parts is rudimentary. |