**Post your response by Friday midnight (10-12-12): Briefly, what are some area(s) of gifted education services specifically addressed by RCWs? What are some area(s) that are not addressed specifically by RCWs ? Please speculate why an area may be included or excluded from RCW.**

Funding:

I’ve never looked at the RCWs before, and I was pleased to read that, “access to accelerated learning and enhanced instruction is access to a basic education.” I think that it is critical to realize how important it is for highly capable learners to have an advanced curriculum and rigor. This should be the basic education that meets them where they are currently at. The RCWs also mention using multiple criteria to identify highly capable learners, but fail to identify a specific process/criteria that should be used in Washington to identify these learners. This is probably leading to a wide variety of definitions of “highly capable” due to the various types of measures. A student who is identified as highly capable in one district could be categorized as not highly capable in another district; which is a problem if students move around often.

Programs:

 I thought it was interesting that the RCWs said that school districts MAY establish programs for highly capable students. The word “MAY” makes it sound like districts can choose not to provide any accelerated programs for students, which seems to be in conflict with the idea that “access to accelerated learning and enhanced instruction is access to a basic education.” Does anyone know if this is a choice that the districts get to make, or if it is a requirement? The wording leaves a lot to be interpreted.

 I also noticed that students of military families, who have been identified as highly capable, must be allowed to initially be enrolled in an advanced program if they move. The RCWs don’t address any other group of students, however. If non-military students move into the district and were formerly in a highly capable program, is there any way to ensure they have access to that advanced program? Perhaps it would open up a can of worms. I know in my district, our humanities plus classes are capped at 32 students and the rest go on a waiting list. If students move into the district, they can be placed on the waiting list, but cannot be moved into the program unless a spot becomes available. I didn’t know about the “military” exception.

**By Sunday midnight (10-14) respond to two other class members’ postings about the RCWs.**

**Post your response by Friday midnight (10-12-12): Find three specific changes described in the *proposed* revision to the WACs.  Contrast the old/new language, discuss newly added provisions, or provisions removed.**

WAC 392-170-020

 In this revision, they chose to remove the section that states, “that seeks an allocation of state funds for a program for highly capable students.” The language now appears to read as though each district MUST, no matter if they get funding or not, submit a plan for their district’s highly capable program. This makes me think that there used to be an option for submitting a plan and now it’s mandatory.

WAC 392-170-038

 In this revision, the proposed changes seem to expand on the definition of a “special teacher.” Prior to the revisions, the definition seems to only require some experience and training; but the proposed revisions seem to emphasize more knowledge about the emotional needs of highly capable students and increased knowledge about programming and identification.

WAC 392-170-055

 This revision was the most interesting to me. The proposed changes virtually eliminated the specific requirements for the identification of highly capable students that might help all districts be on the same page, and has changed the language to be much more general. The additions state that, “Districts shall use multiple objective criteria…” but they no longer state what criteria that might include. It’s all up for interpretation.

**By Sunday midnight (10-14-12) respond to two other members' postings about the WACs.**