

A Dynamic Scaffolding Model of Teacher Development: The Gifted Education Consultant as Catalyst for Change

Dona J. Matthews

Hunter College Center for Gifted Studies and Education
Hunter College, City University of New York

Joanne F. Foster

Tikun Chaim/Special Education, UJA Federation Toronto Board of Jewish Education

Matthews, D. J., & Foster, J. (2005). A dynamic scaffolding model of teacher development: The gifted education consultant as catalyst for change. *Gifted Child Quarterly*, 49, 3, 222-230.

Abstract

The Dynamic Scaffolding Model (DSM) of teacher development is proposed as a good way to meet gifted learners' exceptional learning needs while remaining consistent with current educational realities and research. Using an implementation experience as an illustration, we examine how a gifted education consultant can support teachers in addressing the diverse educational needs of high-ability learners in their classrooms, as well as encouraging high-level outcomes in learners not identified as gifted, leading to classrooms that are more engaging for both students and teachers. In this model, teachers are given opportunities for scaffolded learning and interaction in the form of (a) a series of optional professional development workshops on giftedness, (b) ongoing and targeted individual consultation opportunities, and (c) diverse professional liaisons. We compare the DSM with other resource consultation models, and we discuss characteristics identified by participating teachers as important in their work with gifted learners and others.

Putting the Research to Use

Many educational decision-makers in North America are finding themselves in a position of tightened financial resources, given the political context of increased accountability for meeting all students' educational needs. In many jurisdictions, this means undermining gifted education programs that are already in place and ignoring the special educational needs of gifted learners. While we are not happy with this state of affairs, it is a current political reality and must be addressed by those who understand the importance of adapting curricula to exceptional learning needs. Grounded in our own work in the field and our understanding of current findings regarding teaching and learning, we describe how a school board, with a relatively inexpensive investment in a part-time position of gifted education consultant, can work to help teachers address the diverse educational needs of the high-ability learners in their classrooms. Added benefits of this approach include encouraging high-level outcomes in learners not identified as gifted and creating classroom climates that both students and teachers find more engaging.

We describe ways that resource consultants can share expertise, instructional materials, and other resources, thereby building on teachers' professionalism and providing them with

scaffolded opportunities to acquire expertise in gifted development while, at the same time, creating networks of ongoing support. In the Dynamic Scaffolding Model (DSM), the gifted education consultant does not interact directly with students, or with all teachers, but rather works with interested teachers only, engaging them in collaborative efforts and helping them develop and stylize differentiated programming initiatives. This takes the form of a series of workshops, on-going availability and support, and various liaison activities as required. The classroom teacher is respected as a competent professional who is the gatekeeper for student learning and the person who is engaged in an active learning relationship with the student, whereas the consultant is an advisor who is readily available to provide collaborative and scaffolded support to ensure that the individual needs of teachers and students are met. We have discovered that this kind of approach can generate increased know-how and establish a momentum that acts as a springboard for ongoing professional improvement and collegial networking that targets and addresses the diverse needs of high-ability children and others.

A Dynamic Scaffolding Model of Teacher Development:

The Gifted Education Consultant as Catalyst for Change

The Dynamic Scaffolding Model (DSM) described here reflects a number of principles and processes that have been discussed in the literature as appropriate responses to current realities in gifted education (Kirschenbaum, Armstrong, & Landrum, 1999), and that we have recently had the opportunity to develop and refine in the process of implementation. Schools affiliated with the UJA Federation Board of Jewish Education in Toronto had been providing a very challenging education to all of their students for many years, without a formal means of identifying gifted learners or providing them with programming. Under the auspices of Tikun Chaim, the Board's Special Education Department, a system was developed to enable teachers to be more targeted in meeting exceptionally capable students' learning needs in the approximately 70 affiliated schools from primary through secondary school levels. A gifted education consultant with the necessary expertise was entrusted with the responsibilities of helping interested teachers to become more knowledgeable about giftedness and guiding them in finding optimal ways to program for their gifted students.

The Challenge: Meeting Gifted Learners' Educational Needs

The research literature demonstrates that gifted children are highly diverse (Matthews & Keating, 1995; Shaywitz et al., 2001). They vary in the ways in which they are gifted and in their cognitive, emotional, social, and academic needs (Moon, Swift, & Shallenberger, 2002). Taking this into account, it has been theoretically argued and empirically demonstrated that in order to encourage children's optimal engagement in learning, teachers should work to ensure that each student's education is matched to his or her abilities (Keating, 1991). Teachers need both training and support in order to do this well.

Although there are some notable exceptions (typically, those programs that involve multiple years of training), basic principles of special education, including giftedness, are omitted from many initial teacher training programs. Too few teachers are provided with good opportunities to gain expertise in working with gifted learners either in their preservice training or in readily available professional development (Moon & Rosselli, 2000).

Some important interconnected principles established by current evidence-based understandings of teaching and learning include student engagement in learning, matching

learning opportunities to the individual student's level of knowledge and understanding, and relevance (Bransford, Brown, & Cocking, 2000). These principles are often problematic for gifted learners. Generally speaking, the more exceptional a particular student is, the more challenging it is for teachers to stimulate that student's engagement in the school-based learning process and to provide relevant learning opportunities that match specific ability levels. This is partly because of teachers' lack of experience working with such individuals and partly because of a lack of resources in place to support the teacher in developing the necessary expertise.

Matching students' intellectual and personal needs, on the one hand, and learning opportunities, on the other, requires flexibility, know-how, and ingenuity, and often involves combining and changing options with changing circumstances. It presents a challenge and responsibility that demands time, commitment, and, quite often, support (Matthews & Foster, 2005).

Current Practice: Diverse Methods in Place

Just as there are many ways to be gifted, there is also an enormous variety of approaches that can be used to nurture giftedness (Heller, Monks, Sternberg, & Subotnik, 2000). The number of organizational principles, curriculum adaptation approaches, formal and informal settings, regional and national opportunities, and curriculum packages on the market, collectively illustrate that many people have attempted to develop appropriate programming for gifted learners. Most of these methods have been identified as problematic in one way or another, at least partly because, in most cases, teachers have little familiarity with the available range of gifted programming options or with effecting the best match between the student and the learning environment (Borland, 1997).

In some school boards or districts, there are special education consultants who circulate among schools, offering support and addressing programming needs across the full spectrum of special education, from the very low functioning students through those with behavioral, sensory, and learning problems, to those who are gifted. These general specialists are often spread thinly and their focus on gifted children is limited by constraints of time, available resources, and expertise. Some school boards offer congregated gifted classes which function autonomously, require little by way of teacher preparation for working with gifted learners, and provide neither expertise nor resources to support the teacher's ongoing work with diversely exceptional students. In such systems, not only are there problems with the education provided in the segregated gifted class, but it is also often the case that no attention at all is paid to those high-ability children who, for whatever reason, do not participate in such programs.

When a school or board of education has a designated gifted program coordinator, that person typically handles administrative details, responds to parents' queries, and checks curricular issues, but rarely has the time or mandate to offer professional development in giftedness or ongoing consultation or assistance to regular classroom teachers. There are schools that provide special accommodations of one type or another to those children who have been formally identified as gifted, but which pay little or no heed to those who have not acquired the prerequisite label. Yet other schools have neither special programs nor consultants in the area of gifted education, and have few, if any, learning options designed to encourage gifted-level development in children or support for the teachers.

It should also be noted that some schools and boards of education provide their gifted students with excellent learning opportunities that are well targeted to their special educational needs. This occurs most frequently in situations modeled on adaptive instruction approaches, where there is an explicit and attentive commitment to respecting and attending to individual

differences generally (Johnsen, Haenley, Ryser, & Ford, 2002). It also occurs in some special schools and programs that are designed for high-ability learners and that provide their teachers with the support necessary for matching their students' individual learning needs. In order to provide this kind of appropriate programming, it is particularly important to target the attitudes of teachers and administrators regarding the needs of gifted students. In-service provisions, such as those provided by gifted resource consultants, are documented as an effective way of doing this (Gross, 1997).

Although consultation models vary, there is a general consensus on the value of certain factors: These include teachers' voluntary involvement in the intervention, whereby teachers choose processes they deem viable; a collaborative reciprocity between the consultant and the consultee(s); and shared responsibilities. In general, the term "resource consultation model" implies cooperation and coordinated efforts in planning, implementing, and evaluating programs for children with special needs. The role of the consultant is usually multifaceted and might include modeling processes and strategies, planning programs, nurturing and supporting change initiatives, working in classrooms, acting as a resource provider, and building awareness of alternative learning opportunities for students. Collaboration is frequently identified as an important key to effective service delivery. And, ideally, working relationships are predicated on mutual respect, professionalism, authentic communication, and a shared commitment to enhanced educational experiences and outcomes.

Perceived benefits of these approaches typically include site-based management and a better connection between regular classroom activities and those which are differentiated for gifted learners. Benefits to teachers include shared decision making, enhanced knowledge, and a greater awareness of how to address learning issues. Benefits to students are generally seen to include an enhancement of the pace of learning and the range of learning options (Landrum, 2002).

Gifted education consultation approaches have been evolving with the field. Traditionally, the gifted specialist was called in to work directly with targeted individual gifted children. The idea of combining this kind of direct service delivery with indirect service delivery, by having the consultant work with the teacher who then works with gifted children, refined this approach. One resource consultation model developed in 1988 (Curtis, Curtis, & Graden) and later adapted for use in gifted education in 1994 (Ward & Landrum), promotes ongoing partnership efforts and focuses on serving gifted learners more collaboratively. Consultation occurs at three different levels. At Level 1, there is informal collaboration and exploration among teachers to address the issues. At Level 2, there is individual consultation between a teacher and the gifted education specialist, incorporating joint planning as well as team, demonstration, or complementary teaching (often occurring when Level 1 activities need further resolution). At Level 3, there are combined staff efforts in the design and implementation of differentiated curriculum for gifted learners, calling upon the services of administrators, counselors, psychologists, other support persons, and teachers, all working together. In this model, generally 85% of the gifted resource specialist's time is spent at Level 2 in consultation; 10% is spent in Level 1 activities, providing information or resources upon request; and 5% represents engagement at Level 3 (Kirschenbaum et al., 1999).

Another model differentiates between the consultant as an external force/facilitator with expertise to share on an episodic basis, on the one hand, and the consultant as a process-oriented collaborator serving students and sharing responsibility for them, on the other. Factors that enhance such initiatives include the consultant's enthusiasm, ability to support a teacher through

a change process, and effectiveness in areas of interactive communication and problem solving (Kirschenbaum et al., 1999).

In a third model, the gifted consultant meets with colleagues on a weekly basis and co-teaches, engaging in a steady process of collaborative activity enhanced by periodic professional development or in-service activities (Landrum, 2001). This specialist model is described as working effectively with a maximum of fifteen teachers at one time.

In yet another approach that is described in the literature (Hertzog, 1998), a school district employs 3.5 gifted resource specialists and works toward integrated, long-range curricular planning. The specialists act as change agents offering instructional support, curricular advice, identification and assessment assistance, direct service to students, suggestions for promoting best practice in specific subject areas, professional development opportunities, and networking opportunities for shared learning. This district emphasizes plans that encourage the strengths and talents of *all* children; in this model, services (not children) are labeled as gifted, and there is no compartmentalizing or categorization of individual students.

The Dynamic Scaffolding Model

Our Dynamic Scaffolding Model embraces and builds on these approaches and on the idea of encouraging resource consultants not only to be “teachers on wheels” with lots of instructional materials to share (Landrum, 2001), but also to build on teachers’ professionalism in order to help them extend their abilities and provide them with scaffolded measures for meaningful learning experiences. In our model, the gifted education consultant does not interact directly with students but rather works with interested teachers, engaging them in collaborative efforts and helping them develop and stylize differentiated programming initiatives. This takes the form of a series of workshops, on-going availability and support, and various liaison activities, as required. Thus the role of the consultant evolves yet again. The classroom teacher is respected as a competent professional who is the gatekeeper for student learning and the person who is engaged in an active learning relationship with the student; and the consultant is an advisor who is readily available to provide collaborative and scaffolded support in order to ensure that individual needs of teachers and students are met. We have discovered that this kind of approach can generate increased know-how and establish a momentum that acts as a springboard for ongoing professional improvement that targets and addresses the diverse needs of high-ability children and others.

Based on current research about how learning happens (which applies to teachers as well as to their students; Bransford et al., 2000), the Dynamic Scaffolding Model facilitates teachers' acquisition of the necessary expertise for dealing with all of their diversely gifted learners. For those teachers who choose to participate, the DSM includes the provision of ready access to (a) appropriate professional development in collegial settings, (b) ongoing and targeted individual consultation opportunities, and (c) diverse kinds of liaisons and networking.

A competent and readily accessible gifted education consultant can act as a catalyst for a large number of schools to provide their teachers with the means to increase their know-how, the tools they need to support their highly capable learners, and the ongoing help and encouragement required to ensure that it all comes together well. We are discovering that one such consultant can work effectively to help educators at all levels provide flexible and challenging learning environments that are well designed to meet individual students’ needs, interests, and domain-specific strengths. Implementing teacher development initiatives and new programming approaches for high-ability students requires some revisiting of beliefs and structures (Moon & Rosselli, 2000), and a gifted education consultant in a position of responsibility within a board can act to oversee, steer, and champion these efforts.

An essential evidence-based principle of this model is its reliance on scaffolding the learning experience for teachers and thereby not only facilitating their learning, but also providing them with a model for doing the same with their students. The emphasis on scaffolded learning emerges out of Vygotsky's (1978) descriptions of the socially mediated learning process that occurs within the individual's Zone of Proximal Development. Scaffolding has been effective with many kinds of learners and situations, as demonstrated in Jerome Bruner's early work with problem-solving (Wood, Bruner, & Ross, 1976), Bereiter and Scardamalia's (1993) work on the development of expertise, and other more recent applications described in a National Research Council publication investigating implications for current research on pedagogy (Bransford et al., 2000).

There are numerous ways to conceptualize scaffolding, but in general, its essential components include: (a) engaging the learner in the task; (b) establishing an individually relevant shared goal; (c) actively diagnosing the learner's needs, including assessing and addressing

misconceptions; (d) providing tailored assistance; (e) encouraging goal-directed motivation; (f) providing ongoing feedback that encourages self-monitoring; (g) creating an environment where one feels free to take learning risks; and (h) assisting internalization, independence, and generalization to other contexts (Hogan & Pressley, 1997). Although scaffolding is a highly effective way of teaching for all kinds of learners, it is often seen as particularly appropriate and useful when adapting instruction for exceptional individual learners' needs (Larkin, 2001). Its implementation value is therefore twofold: Not only do teachers of gifted children benefit from this learning approach, but they are also provided with a modeled experience that encourages them to replicate the process with their own students.

Another important emphasis in the Dynamic Scaffolding Model of teacher development under discussion is its responsive flexibility to both individual differences and to changing circumstances and contexts. This kind of flexibility has often been noted as the most important attribute in facilitating an ongoing match between an individual learner and his or her learning needs (Matthews, 1998). Because of the highly political nature of education in general, and gifted education in particular, such responsive flexibility (the Dynamic part of this scaffolding model's name) is essential for those who are interested in any kind of gifted educational change.

A Series of Workshops

Professional development workshops offered by an individual with proficiency in the area of gifted child development and education can provide opportunities for teachers to learn together about the nature of gifted development and also provide practical methods for enhancing their ability to facilitate high-level learning. The workshops can include interested teachers from within one school or from several schools, depending on local constraints and situations. These sessions work best when delivered in a well-organized series, with opportunities between workshops for ongoing interaction, support, and consultation among participating teachers and with experts. Such interaction opportunities can be virtual or actual, formal or informal. By providing these opportunities to those teachers who are interested in learning about such topics on a self-selection basis, a community of learners is created that enhances both motivation and learning opportunities and tremendously increases the value of the board's investment in the consultant.

Ongoing Availability and Support

Following a teacher's participation in the professional learning program or workshops described above, and consistently from there on, the gifted education consultant should be available to help teachers apply what they have learned with the individual students in their classrooms and stay current with possible learning options that are available in their community and beyond. As with anyone acquiring a skill, teachers learn best when they are supported in applying theory to practice and in discovering available resources and programming adaptations that work for different students in different grades, subject areas, and contexts.

Two key roles of the gifted education consultant in the DSM, then, are to meet with teachers on a requested consultation basis to discuss the needs of individual children or targeted groups of students, and to provide the necessary support as the teachers learn to implement appropriate strategies in their classrooms. Depending on the teacher's experience of working with gifted children and participation in the workshops, such support might be needed on an occasional, ongoing, or short- or long-term basis. Teachers should be encouraged to participate in creating and furthering their own professional development by discussing with the consultant those issues and concerns that are most pertinent to them. The consultant can then help them to prioritize and address the specifics. By continuing to ask teachers what they would like to know

more about, the consultant can incorporate their input into future workshop designs. We know that the most effective learning happens for teachers (as with students) when they feel that they are an integral part of the process and when they feel that their learning experiences are authentic and personally relevant (Matthews & Keating, 1999). An additional benefit is that such engagement provides teachers with an excellent experiential model for facilitating the same kind of dynamic and interactive process with their students.

Program Benefits

Not only are gifted students and their parents likely to be much happier when teachers have the necessary training and support to meet gifted students' learning needs, but there are also many additional benefits. Teachers with whom we have worked have expressed a greater sense of confidence when adapting programming and taking the initiative to try new strategies. They have found many of the consultant's recommendations to be useful, have employed them successfully, and have extended them and shared them with their colleagues. Moreover, they have accessed resources and links, reflected on their practices, and say that they are more attuned to high-level outcomes across *all* students.

The teachers we have worked with over the years have consistently told us that learning how to meet the educational needs of their most exceptional students gives them skills and understandings that help them to create a much more interesting and challenging classroom climate for all of their students. At the same time, they find their own engagement in the teaching process is augmented; and because they have a mastery of more learning options, tools, and strategies, they become more enthusiastic supporters of students' optimal development in a number of different directions. Moreover, for those educators who work collaboratively in addressing the nature of high-level learning and appropriately responsive teaching, there is the enrichment that comes from participating in a network of peer support and resource-sharing. As teachers acquire the knowledge and understanding necessary for working effectively with gifted learners, they become able to meet many other kinds of special learning needs, and the classroom culture generally becomes more engaging, inclusive, welcoming of diversity, and facilitative of each child's abilities and possibilities (Matthews & Foster, 2005).

A Board-Wide Implementation in Progress

We will now discuss board-wide implementation of the DSM, outlining the collaborative experience and supports available across the board of education where this initiative took place.

Over the course of one school year, the gifted education consultant conducted three board-wide professional learning programs of five hours duration each. Teachers at all of the approximately 70 schools affiliated with the board were sent invitations to participate, and approximately 80 educators availed themselves of the opportunity, attending one or more of the three sessions. There were teachers from primary through secondary school levels, and a number of principals, vice principals, and resource librarians took part as well.

Sessions were designed to provide a lively mix of presentation material around understanding giftedness and its complexities, programming options, and strategies for supporting the emotional, social, academic, and motivational implications of high-level functioning. Throughout the sessions, many opportunities were provided for interaction among the participants and for thoughtful discourse and inquiry.

A follow-up assessment component (specified by the board and designed by the consultant) required teachers to go back to their classrooms and, within a specific period of time, implement one or more of the learning strategies presented during the workshop. Teachers were

asked to submit a written reflection on their implementation experience. The consultant was available to help them throughout the specified period of time. Later, upon receiving the written work, the consultant provided follow-up consultations with each of the teachers on a one-to-one basis in his or her school. These meetings generally took place over lunch, after school, or at another time that was convenient to the teacher. Sometimes email dialogue or phone discussions helped supplement this process.

The consultant remained available by phone or email when further support was required, and more than half of the teachers took advantage of these ongoing opportunities for online communication and additional input. As the second year of the program begins and the consultant continues to strengthen the collaborative relationship with these colleagues, there are many indications that most of them will again avail themselves of the kinds of service that will help them provide appropriately differentiated programming for some of their new gifted students.

A number of professional development workshops were also offered to staff groupings within schools. These were usually coordinated by school administrative teams during the course of the year and were attended by anywhere from 15 to 50 people, depending on the size of the school or the department. Programs were approximately two hours in length and bridged theory and practical application. Teachers were again afforded the opportunity to work with the consultant on an individual basis and at their convenience any time thereafter. As a result, many one-on-one, cross-grade, and cross-panel collaborative meetings were held with teachers who, because they were familiar with the consultant and the collaborative process, felt comfortable requesting further support.

Material pertaining to and extending workshop content was always distributed. It included hands-on strategies, useful resources, and relevant links. The consultant sent every teacher with whom she collaborated a written summary of her perspective on the process in which they were involved, including issues addressed and recommended strategies and inviting further communication down the road as the teacher desired it.

In total, the board employs approximately 1,700 teachers and serves approximately 17,000 students in its affiliated full-time day schools and part-time supplementary schools. Most schools did not participate in the first year of implementation, although many teachers representing several of the larger schools were actively involved in the DSM. The consultant worked independently as an external facilitator employed on a fee-for-service basis by the board. She operated on a flexible timetable that averaged out to the equivalent of half a fulltime position. Responding to teachers' schedules and requests, most of the work was done in October and November, and then again in January through May.

Making it Work: Dynamic Scaffolding Model Essentials

In our workshop discussions and ongoing pre- and post-workshop communications, we have discussed this model with participating teachers. They have indicated to us that a gifted education consultant should be ready and able to provide professional development support in a number of areas including the following:

- making sense of assessment information (e.g., interpreting reports, applying results to classroom practice, understanding how achievement might be affected, and devising alternative evaluation techniques);
- implementing curricular recommendations (e.g., developing programming modifications, tapping into different learning options at school and within the community);

- working within the parameters of official guidelines;
- addressing the practical aspects of working with gifted-level learners (e.g., paying attention to their organizational and study skills and to classroom management techniques);
- understanding the complex nature and implications of giftedness (e.g., the emotional, social, behavioral, and cognitive/developmental aspects, among children of various ages, competencies, and experiential backgrounds); and
- learning how to support giftedness in all students (e.g., finding out more about motivation, creativity, and higher order thinking skills).

Liaison Function

Optimally, the gifted education consultant also works as a multi-tasking liaison. This role might involve addressing the concerns of parents within the system by offering them support and information about gifted development. There are many ways to do this, including providing open-panel discussions or forums where the focus is on specific issues, resources, educational practices, and other concerns of relevant interest. This enables parents to participate by putting forward their own ideas, suggestions, and questions pertaining to giftedness, and helps to augment sensitivity, collaboration, and understanding among those who live and work with gifted children and those who seek to know more about this exceptionality.

The appropriate and potential liaison function depends very much on the particular school situation. Optimally, it involves promoting professional development opportunities that have an outreach component and networking with education leaders and consultants in other schools and districts. A particularly valuable mechanism for ongoing networking and liaison activities is the creation of an interactive website, where participants can discuss matters of interest, provide mutual support in problem solving, and share resources and effective techniques.

The Consultant

The success of an implementation process is directly linked to the competence and commitment of the specialist who is responsible for making it happen (Moon & Rosselli, 2000). In this case, the consultant has been a teacher of gifted students herself, has completed a doctorate in gifted education, and has co-written a book on giftedness, all of which combine to give her a rich background of understanding and expertise in this area. She sees giftedness as exceptional domain-specific ability that requires adapting instruction in order to ensure that the student's education matches his or her level of ability. She enjoys working with teachers and is approachable and encouraging in her attitude, emphasizing that teachers should feel comfortable about the consultation process. She is enthusiastic about helping teachers engage their gifted students in the challenges of learning, about building a strong conceptual foundation for this endeavor, and about building bridges to other stakeholders in the learning process. She volunteers on several educational committees within the community for those very reasons.

There are many possible routes to the kind of competence required to develop and implement a dynamic scaffolded program of teacher development such as that described here. Necessary personal attributes for the consultant include a rich and diverse set of experiences with gifted students and with educators, enthusiasm for the learning process both in students and in teachers, demonstrated leadership and strong communication skills, and an attitude of responsibility to all stakeholders, from parents to policy makers and certainly including students and teachers. The individual should be prepared to be proactive as well as reactive in approach, and focused on encouraging high-level learning outcomes and in making a difference in learning programs for teachers and their gifted and talented students.

Conclusion

The framework that has been described here was established to facilitate growth among teaching professionals and positive outcomes for students. To summarize, the Dynamic Scaffolding Model can be conceptualized as a three-tiered initiative wherein a gifted education consultant: (a) *offers teachers professional development opportunities* that emphasize programming for advanced learners and include other issues and concerns associated with giftedness; (b) *is readily accessible to consult with teachers individually and/or in groups* in order to help them address the diverse learning needs of their particular students and thereby help those children to enjoy learning and develop their abilities in distinct, healthy, and self-affirming ways; and (c) *offers a range of networking opportunities, liaisons, and other services*.

The Dynamic Scaffolding Model of service delivery provides many opportunities for a gifted education consultant to help teachers and students become competent and happily engaged in their work. By taking a proactive leadership role in the area of gifted education consultancy, school boards can enhance their commitment to the learning needs of their students. By opening up a wide range of dynamically responsive and scaffolded support mechanisms to interested teachers and providing opportunities for gifted-level development in as many students as possible, the overall quality of education is improved and many more learners are afforded opportunities to develop optimally.

References

- Bereiter, C., & Scardamalia, M. (1993). *Surpassing ourselves: An inquiry into the nature and implications of expertise*. Chicago: Open Court.
- Borland, J. (1997). *Rethinking curriculum, instruction, and assessment in gifted education at the end of the millennium*. Keynote address presented at the Second National Curriculum Network Conference., Williamsburg, VA.
- Bransford, J. D., Brown, A. L., & Cocking, R. R. (Eds.). (2000). *How people learn: Brain, mind, experience, and school*. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.
- Curtis, M. J., Curtis, V. A., & Graden, J. L. (1988). Prevention and early intervention through intervention assistance programs. *School Psychology International, 9*, 257-264.
- Gross, M. (1997). Changing teacher attitudes toward gifted children: An early and essential step. In J. Chan, R. Li, & J. Spinks (Eds.), *Maximizing Potential: Lengthening and Strengthening our Stride. Proceedings of the 11th World Conference on Gifted and Talented Children* (p. 3-22). Hong Kong: University of Hong Kong Social Sciences Center.
- Heller, K., Monks, F. J., Sternberg, R. J., & Subotnik, R. F. (Eds.). (2000). *International handbook of giftedness & talent* (2nd ed.). Oxford, UK: Elsevier Science Ltd.
- Hertzog, N. B. (1998). The changing role of the gifted education specialist. *Teaching Exceptional Children, 30*, 39-43.
- Hogan, K., & Pressley, M. (Eds.). (1997). *Scaffolding student learning: Instructional approaches and issues*. Cambridge, MA: Brookline Books.
- Johnsen, S. K., Haensly, P. A., Ryser, G. R., & Ford, R. F. (2002). Changing general education classroom practices to adapt for gifted students. *Gifted Child Quarterly, 46*, 45-63.
- Keating, D. P. (1991). Curriculum options for the developmentally advanced. *Exceptionality Education Canada, 1*, 53-83.
- Kirschenbaum, R. J., Armstrong, D. C., & Landrum, M. S. (1999). Resource consultation model in gifted education to support talent development in today's inclusive schools. *Gifted Child Quarterly, 43*, 39-47.
- Landrum, M. (2001). Resource consultation and collaboration in gifted education. *Psychology in the Schools, 38* (5), 457-465.
- Landrum, M. (2002). *Consultation in Gifted Education*. Mansfield Center, CT: Creative Learning Press.
- Larkin, M. J. (2001). Providing support for student independence through scaffolded instruction. *TEACHING Exceptional Children, 34* (1), 30-34.
- Matthews, D. J. (1998). Enhancing learning outcomes for diversely gifted adolescents: Education in the social/emotional domain. *The Journal of Secondary Gifted Education, 10*, 157-168.
- Matthews, D. J., & Foster, J. F. (2005). *Being smart about gifted children: A guidebook for parents and educators*. Scottsdale, AZ: Great Potential Press.
- Matthews, D. J., & Keating, D. P. (1995). Domain specificity and habits of mind: An investigation of patterns of high-level development. *Journal of Early Adolescence, 15*, 319-343.
- Matthews, D. J., & Keating, D. P. (1999). What we are learning about how children learn, and what this means for teachers. *Education Canada, 39* (1), 35-37.
- Moon, S. M., & Rosselli, H. C. (2000). Developing gifted programs. In K. Heller, F. J. Monks, R. J. Sternberg, & R. F. Subotnik (Eds.), *International handbook of giftedness & talent* (2nd edition, pp. 499-521). Oxford, UK: Elsevier Science Ltd.

- Moon, S. M., Swift, M., & Shallenberger, A. (2002). Perceptions of a self-contained class for fourth- and fifth-grade students with high to extreme levels of intellectual giftedness. *Gifted Child Quarterly, 46*, 64-79.
- Shaywitz, S. E., Holahan, J. M., Fletcher, J. M., Freudenheim, D. A., Makuch, R. W., & Shaywitz, B. A. (2001). Heterogeneity within the gifted: Higher IQ boys exhibit behaviors resembling boys with learning disabilities. *Gifted Child Quarterly, 45*, 16-23.
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Ward, S. B., & Landrum, M. S. (1994). Resource consultation: An alternative service delivery model for gifted education. *Roeper Review, 16*, 276-279.
- Wood, D., Bruner, J. S., & Ross, G. (1976). The role of tutoring in problem-solving. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry, 17*, 89-100.