My email address of CEHL2X captures the evolution of the field of twice-exceptional children education; it harkens back to the days in the mid-1990’s when twice-exceptional children were referred to as “2x” children- and when I was choosing my email address. Now, through general consensus, twice-exceptional students are referred to as “2e” children. The terms have changed over the last 20 years, but who these children are, and what to call them, has been an issue since education began.

Certainly, 2e children have been confounding the educational system since schools became a “system.” Prior to the Industrial Revolution, children with visible or severe disabilities were placed in hospitals, churches, or prisons if their families did not have enough money to care for them at home. Concepts such as autism, learning disabilities, and attention-deficit disorder did not exist in a society where the one-room schoolhouse provided flexible basic education and further education was a luxury. In wealthier families, non-visible exceptionalities were easily accommodated through private tutoring or career paths that did not require education. Children with advanced learning abilities either moved through the basic curriculum faster, or were provided more advanced schooling opportunities, depending on their families’ financial status (Spielhagen, Brown, & Hughes, 2015). Relative and comparable learning abilities were not an issue in a culture where financial status determined educational opportunities, and economic opportunities were only loosely tied to educational status. Stories of children who were capable, but not performing at a expected level abound; stories such as Branwell Bronte, who had similar writing gifts of his sisters but mental health issues, is a tragic tale. There are other examples of successful adults misunderstood as children; Thomas Edison was said to be “too stupid to learn” by his teachers.

After the Industrial Revolution, the need for an educated populace became paramount. The educational system was developed, and began coalescing along age-grade concepts. Driven by Piaget’s concept of “developmentally appropriate” growth, mandatory education laws, the industrial model of education, and the resultant “eggsheet carton” building of schools, children were sorted by age into standard chunks of educational units. At the end of WWI and the resultant waves of immigration, the American public embraced the concept of education for all, and educational reformers began an era of cultural conformity. When this occurred, some children didn’t seem to fit the boxes deemed to be “typical.” At the same time, schools and government were seen as the force for change and progressivism, and the system needed to find a way to provide education for the children who wouldn’t fit. Thus,
Dear Members of The Association for the Gifted (TAG),

Thank you to each of the CEC-TAG members who made presentations at the recent CEC conference in San Diego. Each of the sessions was excellent in presentation and content.

I found it interesting that not only were these sessions well attended, but were also obviously essential for the participants. In the sessions I was able to attend, the participants asked deep and thoughtful questions that illustrated how much they wanted information about their diverse and 2E students. This is encouraging to me in that there appears to be recognition of the unique nature and needs of the diverse and twice exceptional.

Free Book!! If you would like to review one of the CEC-TAG books, contact me. I will send you the information needed to get one of the CEC-TAG books in exchange for posting a review on Amazon.com. All CEC-TAG board members will be reviewing or have already contributed one or more reviews.

Varying thoughts…
In the past month I have been doing a little more domestic land and air travel. One thing that caught my eye and my thoughts was the variety of signs and signals. There were warning signals and “heads-up” signs all around me. They were there to guide me, to help me find my way.

All these signs and signals made me think that if our diverse and twice exceptional students had some flashing lights or marquees on them, we wouldn’t have such angst in determining the best learning route for them. Think how much better for a child from a culture of poverty if there could be a little signal on his/her ear that only teachers could see. We could know how to meet their needs more effectively through more oral assessment or graphic organizers for content. What if the student who has powerful abilities in math and science, but is dyslexic, or one who can read beyond their years, but with a learning disability in math could have some sort of internal glow seen only by teachers that showed ways to facilitate their learning?

Instead, we all educate ourselves to look for their outward signs or hidden signals that help us. When we attend a conference, learn all we can through our CEC-TAG books, or find ways through trial and error grounded in our current knowledge, we are being the professionals who learn to follow the signs and obey the signals.

I look forward to the conference on September 11, 2015, and Board meeting, September 11 and 12, in Conway, AR, at the University of Central Arkansas.

Sincerely,

Cecelia Boswell
President, TAG

---

Dear TAG Members,

In this issue, you will see pictures from the Council for Exceptional Conference held in San Diego, California, in April. Please make plans to attend the next convention in St. Louis, Missouri, from April 13 to 16, 2016.

You will also find abstracts from the articles published in the most recent edition of Journal for the Education of the Gifted (JEG). Remember that your membership entitles you to online access to the journal.

Dr. Claire Hughes, “Double Lines” columnist, has written an article “Parallel Tracks and Intersections,” about the evolution of the field of twice-exceptional children education.

You will find three regular columns that relate to issues confronting teachers, parents, administrators, and others advocating for and working with gifted students from diverse populations. Dr. Julia Roberts from Western Kentucky University discusses advocacy in a column titled “Speaking Out.” Melanie Lichtenstein from the College of William and Mary provides ideas and advice for teachers in “Gifted Tips and Teacher Tricks.” I address the concerns of principals and central office administrators in my column, “Answers for the Administrator.” We hope that these columns will be useful to you in your role(s) with these special students.

Best regards,

Kimberley L. Chandler
TAG Update Editor
Journal for the Education of the Gifted

The Journal for the Education of the Gifted (JEG), the official journal of CEC-TAG, offers information and research on the educational and psychological needs of gifted and talented children. Devoted to excellence in educational research and scholarship, the journal acts as a forum for diverse ideas and points of view on gifted education, counseling, and parenting. The article abstracts for JEG 38(1) are shared below. Should you be interested in submitting a proposal to the journal, please visit http://jeg.sagepub.com. In addition, Dr. Tracy L. Cross, Editor-in-Chief, is always looking for reviewers. Please e-mail the journal at cfgejeg@wm.edu if you would like to be added to the reviewer list. (See page 12 for instructions on how to access the electronic version of JEG.)

ABSTRACTS FOR JEG 38(1)

JEG Special Issue, Tribute to James J. Gallagher
Guest Editors: Mary Ruth Coleman and Shelagh A. Gallagher

Dr. James Gallagher: Pragmatist, Pioneer, Visionary
Mary Ruth Coleman and Shelagh Gallagher

Psychology, Psychologists, and Gifted Students
James J. Gallagher

Theories of Giftedness: Reflections on James Gallagher’s Work
Joyce VanTassel-Baska

Teacher Variation in Concept Presentation in BSCS Curriculum Program
James J. Gallagher

What Were Willie and Xavier Thinking? A Reflection on James Gallagher’s Research on Student-Teacher Interaction
Shelagh A. Gallagher, Richard D. Courtright, and Linda P. Robinson

Peer Acceptance of Highly Gifted Children in Elementary School
James J. Gallagher

Dr. Gallagher’s Concern for Gifted Learners Beyond Academics
Del Siegle

Education of Gifted Students: A Civil Rights Issue?
James J. Gallagher

Children of Promise: James Gallagher’s Thoughts on Underrepresentation Within Gifted Education
Mary Ruth Coleman and Sneha Shah-Coltrane

Political Issues in Gifted Education
James J. Gallagher

Reflections on Policy in Gifted Education: James J. Gallagher
Elissa F. Brown and Rebecca Garland
In my inaugural column, I mentioned several TAG resources that could be helpful to a building or central office administrator. This time, I am sharing some other important resources, in the form of an annotated bibliography listing readings on the topic of special populations of gifted learners (culturally and linguistically diverse; disadvantaged; twice-exceptional; rural; and urban).

Those books noted with “A CEC-TAG publication” were developed by TAG board members as educational resources for those who interact with gifted students. All books are available from Prufrock Press at prufrockpress.com. Proceeds from the sales of the books go to TAG to support the organization’s work.

Books

*Effective Program Practices for Underserved Gifted Students* provides information about effective program practices for underserved gifted students. In this book, the authors identify and discuss three broad areas of effective practices: differentiation, acceleration, and enrichment. In addition, practical ideas, sample lessons, and two units are provided in an effort to assist busy professionals with implementing effective practices with their students. (A CEC-TAG publication)

This book provides information about effective program models for underserved gifted students. The book highlights eight successful programs that have been designed to use with low-income, high-ability students. (A CEC-TAG publication)

This edited book has three different sections pertaining to culturally and linguistically diverse students: chapters devoted to characteristics and needs of students from diverse backgrounds, chapters focusing on English Language Learners (ELL), and related issues and topics. The book is a good practical resource for helping educators understand the special populations they may encounter in gifted education classes.

*RtI for Gifted Students* provides a comprehensive overview of Response to Intervention (RtI) frameworks that include gifted students. The book incorporates national, state, and local RtI models and how gifted learners can be included within these frameworks. Specific attention is given to addressing the needs of students who are twice-exceptional and to culturally responsive practices. The book concludes with ways of assessing a school’s RtI model and challenges for using RtI in gifted education. (A CEC-TAG publication)

*Increasing Diversity in Gifted Education* shows teachers, administrators, and other interested parties how to finally meet the educational needs of high-potential students across all racial, ethnic, language, and economic groups as well as some categories of disability. Practitioners will gain the information and knowledge needed to increase the identification of culturally diverse and twice-exceptional students for gifted education programs and services. (A CEC-TAG publication)
Continued from page 4

This publication is based upon work done during a summit focused on issues related to identifying and serving disadvantaged and traditionally underserved populations of gifted students. It includes articles related to the current status of these students and directions for future research.

This publication provides a summary of the research literature related to 50 topics in gifted education. Topics covered include differentiated instruction, identification, mentoring, and other areas relevant to the needs of CLD learners. Included with each summary is a section about practical implications and a list of additional resources.

Schools are increasingly diverse in their student population, presenting new challenges for teachers. In light of these challenges, schools remain important in the talent development process. The book is written for educators who want all children to thrive in school, including those who are twice-exceptional, those from lower income backgrounds, and others who have been underrepresented in gifted programming. (A CEC-TAG publication)

This book is divided into three sections, covering 29 practices in gifted education: at home, in the classroom, and in schools. Many of the practices pertain to culturally and linguistically diverse students, such as mentorships, developing talents in these students, and working with promising students from low-income backgrounds.

Why are some gifted children willing to tackle new challenges whereas others seem insecure or uninterested? Why do some gifted students achieve while others become caught in a cycle of underachievement? Are there strategies teachers and parents can implement that promote an achievement-oriented attitude? This book answers these important questions. This book offers specific strategies to help increase student achievement by improving students’ attitudes in four important areas. (A CEC-TAG publication)

The authors explain the need for a differentiated curriculum for gifted students typically underrepresented in gifted programs, including children of poverty and those who are from culturally and linguistically diverse populations. Features of research-based curriculum found to be effective in enhancing the academic achievement of these populations are highlighted. (A CEC-TAG publication)

Each chapter in this edited book is devoted to a type of gifted education programming outside the regular school day. Many of the topics are relevant to those working with culturally and linguistically diverse gifted students: increasing the retention of students from low-income backgrounds in university programs for the gifted, mentorships, and counseling.

Patterns and Profiles of Promising Learners from Poverty covers a variety of topics pertinent to the education of students from low-income families, including the role of culture in education, curriculum for promising learners, psychosocial stressors that affect these learners, professional development for teachers of low-income students, and state policy implementations that affect these students’ educations.

Special Journal Issues Relevant to Culturally and Linguistically Diverse Gifted Learners

Gifted Child Today, Volume 33, Fall 2010
This special issue includes articles dealing specifically with the needs of urban gifted students. It includes information about programs and curriculum and instructional approaches that have been successful with this population.

Journal of Urban Education, Volume 6, Spring 2009
This special issue is devoted to enrichment for urban students. It includes articles by authorities in gifted education about topics such as the need for scaffolding curriculum and instruction, the underrepresentation of various groups in gifted programs, and issues related to English Language Learners.
Now is definitely the time to speak out for academic excellence. The Excellence Gap describes percentages of students in each gap group who score at the advanced level on the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP). The results are shocking as percentages of children and youth from low-income backgrounds, those who are Black or Hispanic, or those who do not have English as their first language are extremely low. Where is the outrage?

Mind the (Other) Gap (2010) and Talent on the Sidelines (2013) provide full descriptions of the Excellence Gap in states. You may go to http://cepa.uconn.edu/research/mindthegap/ to read the reports and to see how your state ranked in 2010 and 2012 in regard to the gap groups reaching advanced levels.

In March, 2015, the Jack Kent Cooke Foundation issued a report, Equal Talents, Unequal Opportunities: A Report Card on State Support for Academically Talented, Low-income Students, co-authored by Plucker. In this report, each state received letter grades for inputs and outputs. What determines how well each state is doing are inputs or policies that are in place to support children and young people reaching advanced levels. For the outputs, data tell the tale of how each state’s gap groups are doing in relation to the advanced standards. Go to http://www.excellencegap.org/ for current information about how your state is graded in regard to the Excellence Gap.

So why might people be upset, even enraged about the Excellence Gap? Perhaps the chief reason is that we need to develop the talent among all groups, including those who are in the gap groups, in order to have a bright, promising future for our country. It is an economic development strategy to develop the potential of young people. The one-size-fits-all approach to developing talent does not work: It leaves too many casualties in its wake. No doubt, talent is to be found among all ethnic, racial, and socio-economic groups. Failing to find talent and develop it is a tragedy. Harold Levy, the Jack Kent Cooke Foundation’s executive director, stated, “The potential that is lost year after year due to benign neglect of our brightest students damages our nation’s global competitiveness. America must do better.”

References

REMEMBER – IF NOT YOU, THEN WHO?
Retaining and Engaging the Gifted Culturally Diverse Students

Now that I have gone through the process of finding and identifying the culturally diverse gifted students at my school, how to I make sure they stay?

In my last column, I addressed how I identified the underrepresented culturally diverse gifted students through a team-based effort of locally identification. Scholars have pointed out that identification alone is not enough to support culturally diverse gifted children; retention is equally as important (Ford, 2013; Ford, Grantham, & Whiting, 2008). Retention through appropriate curriculum, culturally competent instruction, and proper social and emotional support are just a few of the strategies that have been suggested to ensure successful participation of culturally diverse students in gifted education (Stambaugh & Chandler, 2012).

Although I was provided with the recommended curriculum to use in my gifted classes, I felt that the material did not address the needs and interests of my culturally diverse (CD) gifted students. I started writing units and lessons that addressed the goals set forth by the state mandate for gifted courses, while at the same time being culturally responsive and engaging. Fortunately, I had extensive experience as a curriculum writer for another state’s Department of Education. In addition, I was in the unique situation of having autonomy over my classroom (a gifted resource class that met during the related arts periods for each grade level). Writing my own curriculum could have been disastrous had I not had the proper training in multicultural education, student-centered inquiry based learning, or gifted education.

Writing my own curriculum could have been disastrous had I not had the proper training in multicultural education, student-centered inquiry based learning, or gifted education.

To ensure the curriculum was not only engaging and relevant, I also made sure that state standards were being addressed or supported throughout the curriculum. The result was a rich, three-year scaffolded program grounded in multicultural education (Banks & Banks, 2013; Nieto & Bode, 2012), social justice (Bigelow 1994; Christensen, 2000; Gorski, 2014), and cultural competence (Ford, 2013) while adhering to the expectations of the state regarding content and rigor for gifted students (Ford, 2011; VanTassel-Baska, 2004).

The Model. This model followed a three-year progression where each year the students studied thematic based units. The intent was to guide the students through exploring their own identities and eventually positioning their own cultural-selves in the global community to pursue social action. I have provided a brief thematic description, a process example, and an explanation of how the units were culturally responsive and gifted appropriate.

The 6th grade theme: The Study of Self (Cultural)

• The Study of Self guides students through the process of understanding who they are and how factors such as family, culture, and identity impact their development.
  • Process Example: “Where I’m From” encourages students to explore their identity through examining “where they came from” through creative writing, research, and interviewing.
  • Culturally Responsive GT strategies and outcomes: Student-centered environment that affirms students’ identities as cultural beings. Characteristics of diversity are examined and celebrated. Strategies include: Interviews, research, discussion, and writing; racial and cultural identity valued and validated throughout unit; variety of products; increase in self-efficacy; multi-disciplinary and real-world application.

The 7th grade theme: The Study of Societies (National)

• The Study of Societies explores cultures and societies around the world. These interdisciplinary literature-based units provide a setting for the students to study and explore different nations, current events, and global issues.

continued on page 8
Gifted Tips and Teacher Tricks continued from page 7

- **Process example:** “Immigration and the Mexican-American Experience.” *Using Esperanza Rising* by Pam Muñoz Ryan as a launching point, students explore the Mexican-American experience throughout history. Students research other immigrant groups (voluntary and involuntary), exploring the events, obstacles, contributions to society, and current status of group. Students produce various creative writing pieces that have real-world applications.

- **Culturally Responsive GT strategies and outcomes:**
  - Content is multicultural based and is especially relevant to school and community context.
  - Literacy resources vary from music, visual art, fiction, and film.
  - Strategies include: creative writing, research, and expression; independent and group work; cross cultural connections; multi-disciplined; variety of products; real-world application; and social action elements.

The 8th grade theme: The Study of Social Action (Global)

- **The Study of Social Action** is the third year of the model. Students use their knowledge of identity and their experiences exploring societies to examine global social justice issues and design and implement action plans.

- **Process example 1:** “An Election is Coming” facilitates learning and participation in the democratic process. Students demonstrate their cultural, gender, and community identities through their narratives. For example, students created a bi-lingual digital photo story to share with their families and other community members about the election.

- **Process example 2:** “Global Issues,” in which students select and research a global issue that they are interested in or care about, such as: racism, immigration, drugs, disease, genocide, abuse. “Expert role” for selected issue, plan and implement an Action Plan to bring about positive social change or awareness for their issue.

  - Students analyze creative modes of expression (songs, visual art, plays, film, poetry, etc.) that have been created about the various issues. They then create their own pieces using multiple forms of creative expression.

- **Culturally Responsive GT strategies and outcomes:**
  - Activities are higher-level thinking matching the learning and cognitive styles of culturally diverse students.

Learning is shared using cultural identities and is designed to problem solve and address issues.

- Strategies include: creative writing and expression, research, independent and group work, cross cultural connections, multi-disciplined, variety of products, real-world application, and social action.

As the years went on I learned to incorporate mathematics and science. My students’ expression of interest and passion in the subjects prompted the addition of those subjects. It is important as a teacher of culturally diverse gifted students to constantly monitor instruction and adjust when needed to remain student centered and relevant; so often we lose gifted students because they are not supported in their area of eminence.

After WWII, the GIs returned from war with a deep desire for education and economic opportunities. They had seen the horrors of a system in Nazi Germany that sorted people and there was a strong sense of optimism that the United States could make a better world. In 1954, the Supreme Court determined that separate schools could not provide equal opportunities for all children in the landmark case of “Brown v. Board of Education.” Thus, special education began a push for access to both inclusive classrooms and curriculum. With the advent of Sputnik in the 1960’s, gifted education began a push for acceleration and enrichment in public education. Both fields became more organized through the formation of the National Association for Gifted Children in 1954 and the creation of the Handicapped Children Office at the federal level in 1963.

Such organization led quickly to federal action. In 1972’s the Marland Report, gifted children were defined and a Gifted and Talented Children’s Education Act was passed. Additionally, in 1975, the landmark Public Law 94-142 was passed that defined special education and the rights of children with disabilities. Neither act specifically noted that some children could be gifted and have a disability, but in 1976, June Maker first conceptualized the twice-exceptional child in her work “Providing Programs for Gifted Handicapped.”

Educational programs and organizational support soon followed in the 1980s. In Westchester County, New York, a program for the “gifted-handicapped child” was implemented. A “Gifted Underachiever” program was founded in Cupertino, California in 1980. The Twice-Exceptional Child Project was started in the late 1980’s in Albuquerque, New Mexico, using the term “2x.” Connecticut, Maryland and Colorado started programs. NAGC formed their Special Populations Division, while CEC formed The Association for the Gifted (TAG) Division. In 2004, the words “twice-exceptional” appeared in the re-authorization of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). In 2014, the 2e National Community of Practice brought together members of multiple organizations who work with these children to create a unified national definition.

Research and publications have followed along. In 1986, a special edition of Roeper Review provided landmark articles, while in 2013, a special edition of Gifted Child Quarterly provided research updates. Recently, in 2015, a special edition of Gifted Child Today will focus on the multiple viewpoints and history of the field of twice-exceptional children.

Despite its lofty ideals, however, the use of the IQ test quickly became reflective of society. In the 1930s and 40’s, those with limited financial backgrounds dropped out of school or went to work, and the wealthy often elected private schooling, so public schools became the embodiment of the middle class (Spielhagen, Brown & Hughes, 2015). Through the use of the IQ test that measured those skills that lead to success in a Western culture, special education became a dumping ground for those children who came from poor or immigrant backgrounds, while gifted education provided opportunity for those who were wealthier and more culturally successful. Children with disabilities were served through a medical model that sought to identify, treat, and cure disabilities as though they were a disease; they were warehoused, separate from their age peers, in educational settings similar to quarantine.

It was during this time that psychologists and educators became aware of non-visible disabilities. Because of the lack of physical markers but observable specific patterns of behavioral characteristics, new labels were conceptualized. It was noted at the time, particularly by Leo Kanner and Hans Asperger who helped formulate the field of autism, and Cruikshank, who helped originate the field of Learning Disabilities, that children could have high IQs, but still have problematic behavioral and learning issues (Baum, et al, in press).

In 1916, Louis Terman developed the Stanford-Binet IQ test that was, at its time, a great leap forward in egalitarian ideals. Children were to be provided educational opportunities, not based on their families’ wealth, but on the results of an objective test that theoretically measured inherent qualities. His work deeply impacted the emerging fields of special education and gifted education. In 1922, the Council for Exceptional Children (CEC) was founded to advocate for the education of children with disabilities, not just their identification. At the same time, in 1926, Leta Hollingworth became very interested in the education of children with very high IQs. The IQ test quickly became the instrument of sorting, in which children were sorted into one of three options of education: at grade level, below grade level, or above grade level. Children who might have had high IQs, but poor school performance, or have wildly discrepant scores within the IQ test, were simply sorted into one of these three tracks.

Despite its lofty ideals, however, the use of the IQ test quickly became reflective of society. In the 1930s and 40’s, those with limited financial backgrounds dropped out of school or went to work, and the wealthy often elected private schooling, so public schools became the embodiment of the middle class (Spielhagen, Brown & Hughes, 2015). Through the use of the IQ test that measured those skills that lead to success in a Western culture, special education became a dumping ground for those children who came from poor or immigrant backgrounds, while gifted education provided opportunity for those who were wealthier and more culturally successful. Children with disabilities were served through a medical model that sought to identify, treat, and cure disabilities as though they were a disease; they were warehoused, separate from their age peers, in educational settings similar to quarantine.

It was during this time that psychologists and educators became aware of non-visible disabilities. Because of the lack of physical markers but observable specific patterns of behavioral characteristics, new labels were conceptualized. It was noted at the time, particularly by Leo Kanner and Hans Asperger who helped formulate the field of autism, and Cruikshank, who helped originate the field of Learning Disabilities, that children could have high IQs, but still have problematic behavioral and learning issues (Baum, et al, in press).

After WWII, the GIs returned from war with a deep desire for education and economic opportunities. They had seen the horrors of a system in Nazi Germany that sorted people and there was a strong sense of optimism that the United States could make a better world. In 1954, the Supreme Court determined that separate schools could not provide equal opportunities for all children in the landmark case of “Brown v. Board of Education.” Thus, special education began a push for access to both inclusive classrooms and curriculum. With the advent of Sputnik in the 1960’s, gifted education began a push for acceleration and enrichment in public education. Both fields became more organized through the formation of the National Association for Gifted Children in 1954 and the creation of the Handicapped Children Office at the federal level in 1963.

Such organization led quickly to federal action. In 1972’s the Marland Report, gifted children were defined and a Gifted and Talented Children’s Education Act was passed. Additionally, in 1975, the landmark Public Law 94-142 was passed that defined special education and the rights of children with disabilities. Neither act specifically noted that some children could be gifted and have a disability, but in 1976, June Maker first conceptualized the twice-exceptional child in her work “Providing Programs for Gifted Handicapped.”

Educational programs and organizational support soon followed in the 1980s. In Westchester County, New York, a program for the “gifted-handicapped child” was implemented. A “Gifted Underachiever” program was founded in Cupertino, California in 1980. The Twice-Exceptional Child Project was started in the late 1980’s in Albuquerque, New Mexico, using the term “2x.” Connecticut, Maryland and Colorado started programs. NAGC formed their Special Populations Division, while CEC formed The Association for the Gifted (TAG) Division. In 2004, the words “twice-exceptional” appeared in the re-authorization of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). In 2014, the 2e National Community of Practice brought together members of multiple organizations who work with these children to create a unified national definition.

Research and publications have followed along. In 1986, a special edition of Roeper Review provided landmark articles, while in 2013, a special edition of Gifted Child Quarterly provided research updates. Recently, in 2015, a special edition of Gifted Child Today will focus on the multiple viewpoints and history of the field of twice-exceptional children.
This area of twice-exceptional education is one that intersects two fields that developed along parallel, and at times, opposing lines. It incorporates both the push for the access of special education programs and the pull for acceleration in gifted education. Many of the original founders, writers, and teachers are still actively engaged. However, as the field grows in impact, the concepts of dual services and dual needs meld into the understanding of unique services and unique needs.

I don’t want to change my email address because I’ve had it for 20 years, but it does show the era in which I first came into the field, the changes that have happened since, and the future that is being written now.
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