

PART II: ADMINISTRATION OF THE HOPE SCALE

- Renzulli, J. S., & Reis, S. M. (2004). *Identification of students for gifted and talented programs*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- VanTassel-Baska, J., & Stambaugh, T. (2007). *Overlooked gems: A national perspective on low-income promising learners*. Washington, DC: National Association for Gifted Children.
- Weber, C. L., Boswell, C., & Behrens, W. A. (2013). *Exploring critical issues in gifted education: A case studies approach*. Waco, TX: Prufrock Press.
- Wyner, J. S., Bridgeland, J. M., & Dilulio, Jr., J. J. (2009). *Achievement trap: How America is failing millions of high-achieving students from lower-income families*. Lansdowne, VA: Jack Kent Cooke Foundation and Civic Enterprises. Retrieved from <http://www.jkcf.org/news-knowledge/research-reports/>

Professional organizations:

- *National Association for Gifted Children* (NAGC; <http://www.nagc.org>)
- *American Educational Research Association—Research on Giftedness, Creativity, and Talent Special Interest Group* (<http://goo.gl/7Ebkkd>)
- *The Association for the Gifted* (CEC-TAG; <http://cectag.com/>)
- *Supporting the Emotional Needs of the Gifted* (SENG; <http://www.sengifted.org>)

Administration

We recommend that teachers complete the HOPE Scale on each of their students, one class at a time. As we have described, the HOPE Scale is designed to measure two very broad components of giftedness and talent: Social and Academic. It is a tool that will help focus a classroom teacher's nomination and perceptions of his or her students onto behaviors that are often observable by that teacher. When used with other measures and pathways into a program such as aptitude and achievement test scores, the HOPE Scale can help locate gifted and talented students from the general population as well as from traditionally underrepresented populations.

Directions for Raters Using the HOPE Scale

As a rater, it is important that you rate each of your students as *compared to other children similar in age, background, experience, culture, and/or environment*. This is very important, as individual students may demonstrate certain behaviors relative to their prior experiences, and considering those behaviors in context allows for more accurate ratings.

HOPE TEACHER RATING SCALE MANUAL

As you respond to each item, ask yourself, "To what degree does this student exhibit the behavior as compared to other children of similar age, background, experience, culture, and/or environment?" Rate each student using the 6-point scale from "always" (6) demonstrating that particular behavior to "never" (1) demonstrating that behavior. For example, when rating your students, try to compare those from low-income families to other children from low-income families, children from specific cultural groups to other children from the same cultural group, girls to girls, etc. Please indicate any and all areas in which the student demonstrates talent (Item 12) and complete demographic information for each of your students.

The following two scales are measured by their respective items.

Academic Scale	Social Scale
1. Performs or <i>shows potential</i> for performing at remarkably high levels.	2. Is sensitive to larger or deeper issues of human concern.
6. Is eager to explore new concepts.	3. Is self-aware.
7. Exhibits intellectual intensity.	4. Shows compassion for others.
9. Uses alternative processes.	5. Is a leader within his/her group of peers.
10. Thinks "outside the box."	8. Effectively interacts with adults or older students.
11. Has intense interests.	

Hand-Scoring Instructions

You will need to hand-score your instruments in order to use the data they yield. Once you have completed HOPE Scales on all of your students, all of the information (including demographic variables) should be entered into a single database in order to allow for group-specific comparisons when making placement decisions.

Once you have rated all of your students on each of the items, total the scores for each subscale (Academic and Social) separately by adding together the scores you gave the student. For the Academic scale, total items 1, 6, 7, 9, 10, and 11 and for the Social scale, total items 2, 3, 4, 5, and 8. Subscale scores should not be totaled to form one overall score. A student's subscale scores should then be referenced against local norms (see Appendix B), with lower income students being compared to their lower income peers, for example.

Although norms were computed based on the sample used in the development of the HOPE Scale, these as well as national norms should not be used for gifted, talented, or high-ability program placement due to the fact that they are unlikely

to represent local education demographics and needs. Put simply, what is average or gifted for one school is likely to be different from what is average or gifted for your school. Further, the scores that indicate that students need services are likely to vary from district to district or even building to building. For this reason, you should base the programming decisions on a local set of norms for individual schools. You need to establish a set of local norms for your own use from your own data. Please do so following the procedures described in Appendix B.

Using HOPE Scale Scores

The HOPE Scale can be used as one procedure to identify students for gifted services. Although identification procedures may vary across school districts, the use of the HOPE Scale is intended to be one of multiple “alternate pathways” (Renzulli et al., 2013) to identify giftedness, none of which would necessarily guarantee entrance into, or exclusion from, a gifted program. Other indicators may be tests of a student’s mental ability (e.g., an aptitude test or an achievement test in a more specific domain), evidence of unique talent (e.g., musical ability), and other indications for giftedness in one or more domains. Consult federal, state, and local definitions of giftedness and consider the program or services for which students are being identified in order to best select identification procedures.



The authors of the HOPE Scale recommend against using a set cut-off score on the subscales, partly because of the multiple pathways of identifying giftedness, and partly because cut-off scores are often arbitrary and all measures have some degree of error; so using a cut-off score may result in excluding someone who might benefit from inclusion. We advocate, instead, using scores for inclusion (rather than exclusion) of students for services. Instead, the HOPE Scale should be used as a single artifact in a portfolio or other documentation of qualifications in order to make an informed decision. Additionally, administrators should be aware that the number of gifted students in a school will vary from school to school and from year to year. Administrators should establish data collection procedures in order to create local norms (i.e., those observed in a particular district or school) to better understand the unique scoring patterns of the students in a district at that moment, and for comparison purposes as new students are rated on the HOPE Scale and as they complete other measures. These norms can then be used in order to better understand and use the HOPE Scale for local identification purposes.

HOPE Scale scores are separate but related to measures of performance or ability (Peters & Gentry, 2012). Peters and Gentry (2012) found that approximately half of the students in their sample would be identified by the HOPE Scale and the MSAT (achievement test), leaving the other half to be identified by either the HOPE Scale or the MSAT. In other words, some students scored high on

HOPE TEACHER RATING SCALE MANUAL

the achievement measure, but did not receive high teacher ratings on the HOPE Scale. Perhaps such students have negative behaviors, and they may be at risk of underachievement and not being placed in a program if the program requires high scores and teacher recommendations. We believe that their high scores on either measure should result in placement. Similarly, some students did not receive high scores but were rated highly by their teachers, meaning the teachers are seeing potential and achievement missed by the test alone. This is why multiple pathways and multiple measures are important in developing a sound identification system. A single test score or recommendation alone should not be the deciding factor for placement in an intervention (NAGC, 2013). There are a variety of procedures and methods for developing sound identification procedures that are beyond the scope of this manual. See Chapter 3 in Peters, Matthews, McBee, and McCoach (2014) for an overview of the identification process. For a discussion on the And, Or, or Mean Combination approaches (McBee, Peters, & Waterman, 2014), see Appendix E.

We also recommend against two-phase approaches to identification in which a screening phase is used, and then students who pass through that first phase are tested further for final program placement. It's important to note that a screening system always harms the accuracy or resulting sensitivity of the identification system because only those who pass through the first phase are tested with the more complex and accurate confirmation assessment. In this sense, screening or nomination phases always make identification systems worse (exacerbate false negatives). For a discussion on screening systems, see Appendix E.

Finally, it is important to remember that identification of children is done for program placement and for the purposes of delivering appropriately rigorous material and providing support so that high-potential students can thrive in school. Therefore, the HOPE Scale and other identification assessments and procedures must yield valid data that reflect the students' need for the program for which they will be provided if successfully identified. The HOPE Scale should be helpful in diversifying the identified population of students to more proportionally reflect the general population. These proportional data should be gathered and analyzed on a regular basis to ensure that the district equitably identifies and serves students from all traditionally underserved populations. Only by making an effort to change perceptions, programming, and practices can the longstanding problem of underidentification and underserved youth be addressed in gifted education. The HOPE Scale is one tool that can help with this important effort.