

Gifted Child Quarterly

<http://gcq.sagepub.com>

Investigation of High School Credit and Placement for Summer Coursework Taken Outside of Local Schools

Seon-Young Lee and Paula Olszewski-Kubilius

Gifted Child Quarterly 2005; 49; 37

DOI: 10.1177/001698620504900105

The online version of this article can be found at:
<http://gcq.sagepub.com/cgi/content/abstract/49/1/37>

Published by:



<http://www.sagepublications.com>

On behalf of:



National Association for Gifted Children

Additional services and information for *Gifted Child Quarterly* can be found at:

Email Alerts: <http://gcq.sagepub.com/cgi/alerts>

Subscriptions: <http://gcq.sagepub.com/subscriptions>

Reprints: <http://www.sagepub.com/journalsReprints.nav>

Permissions: <http://www.sagepub.com/journalsPermissions.nav>

Citations <http://gcq.sagepub.com/cgi/content/refs/49/1/37>

Investigation of High School Credit and Placement for Summer Coursework Taken Outside of Local Schools

Seon-Young Lee Paula Olszewski-Kubilius
Center for Talent Development, Northwestern University

ABSTRACT

This study examined how local schools responded to students' outside-of-school summer courses, particularly regarding the awarding of credit and appropriate placement. It involved 262 middle and high school administrators of students who had attended a gifted summer program at a local university. Survey data showed the critical influence of the school's policies on granting credit for outside-of-school coursework and institutional accreditation on the school's responses. For high schools, territory or administrative issues such as the school's own policy on credit, prior notice of a student's participation in the program, sharing outside-of-school course syllabi with school officials in advance, the type of course, and accreditation of the summer program were crucial in decisions regarding the awarding of credit. For middle schools, the school's own evaluation of a student's mastery of the course content, prior notice of the student's participation in the program, and the student's performance in the outside-of-school course were the most significant factors that affected schools' responses regarding appropriate placement. Findings showed that schools' responses were conservative and that parents need to petition more actively for credit or placement for their children.

Practitioners and scholars have proposed that a variety of educational options, including Advanced Placement, distance learning programs, study abroad programs, contests and competitions, mentorships, summer programs, and community-based programs, are essential to developing the academic talents of gifted students. According to Olszewski-Kubilius and Limburg-Weber (1999), these types of programs can meet the varied needs of gifted students, which include academic challenge, continuous

progress in the talent area, opportunities to preview college studies and college life, opportunities to experience meaningful adult-like work, and peer and social support for high achievement. In order to fulfill these needs, many parents and students turn to outside-of-school summer programs.

A considerable number of summer programs for academically talented students in the country are college- or

PUTTING THE RESEARCH TO USE

Since the mid-1990s, the Center for Talent Development (CTD) has been accredited as a "Special Function School" for the gifted by the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools, which permits the Center to grant credit for high school courses completed by students in its programs. Our research suggests that students are more likely to receive credit or appropriate placement for their summer coursework as a result of the accreditation of the Center. Findings imply that more flexible and articulate policies from local schools regarding credit and placement for courses taken outside their own territories are needed, and that cooperative partnerships between schools and outside-of-school gifted institutes are crucial for serving gifted students appropriately. For parents, actively working with schools to give them advanced notice of their children's participation in the summer program and active petitioning for credit and special follow-up afterwards are suggested as ways to encourage schools to respond appropriately to outside-of-school programs. Summer program administrators can facilitate credit and appropriate placement for students by making course syllabi available to local school officials and by sharing information that documents subject mastery and achievement.

university-based (Olszewski-Kubilius, 1989). Researchers and educators have found positive effects of these programs for gifted students academically, personally, socially, and emotionally. Olszewski-Kubilius and Grant (1996) asserted that summer programs that offer challenging courses enhance students' self-confidence, self-esteem, motivation to achieve, and personal responsibility for their learning activities, thereby enabling them to seek and succeed in other advanced and rigorous academic programs in the future, both inside and outside of school. Olszewski-Kubilius (2003) has also proposed that special summer programs can uniquely contribute to the process of talent development for gifted students by providing them with challenging academic coursework in a context of supportive, intellectual peers. Through meeting and interacting with capable peers in an intensive summer program, gifted students can enhance their social skills, increase their social confidence, augment their social networks, and become more self-assured in their capabilities (Olszewski-Kubilius, 1989).

Empirically documented effects of intensive outside-of-school summer programs include experiencing greater academic challenge (Enersen, 1993; Mills, Ablard, & Lynch, 1992), choosing a more rigorous course of study and more advanced courses such as AP and honors classes (Barnett & Durden, 1993), higher educational aspirations (Olszewski-Kubilius & Grant, 1996), greater participation in math-related extracurricular activities (Olszewski-Kubilius & Grant), greater acceleration (Barnett & Durden; Olszewski-Kubilius & Grant), a greater likelihood of getting a National Merit Letter of Commendation (Olszewski-Kubilius & Grant), a greater likelihood of pursuing professional degrees and careers in math (Olszewski-Kubilius & Grant), and selection of more academically selective institutions of higher education (Swiatek & Benbow, 1991). Other documented benefits include enjoyment, a positive self-image, and a feeling of acceptance by peers (Enersen).

Both student participants and their parents perceive substantial benefits of participation in special outside-of-school summer programs. In a follow-up survey involving 100 parents of gifted adolescents who had participated in an academic summer program at a Midwestern university, VanTassel-Baska, Landau, and Olszewski (1984) found that the majority of them perceived that the summer program had improved their children's study skills and academic confidence. Overwhelmingly, parents reported that the summer program allowed their children to form new friendships and interact socially with other intellectually gifted peers. In another study, Olszewski-Kubilius (1989)

followed up with more than 200 parents of students who participated in a summer academic program between 1983 and 1985 and found that they perceived gains in confidence and motivation for seeking out more challenging coursework in their children after participation in the program. The parents also perceived meeting new friends and forming friendships as the most important benefits of their children's participation in the program.

Enersen (1993) interviewed parents of 12 secondary school students aged 13 to 18 who had participated in a highly challenging residential summer program on a university campus in the Midwest. The study showed that participants' parents perceived that their children enjoyed and appreciated the challenging academic experience and hard work involved. The parents also felt that the summer program motivated their child not only to succeed academically in the program, but also to develop long-term goals for future careers.

School Policies on Awarding Credit for Outside-of-School Programs

Despite the positive outcomes for summer programs perceived by both students and their parents, school personnel are still reluctant to award credit for courses taken outside of schools or regard these courses as an integral part of a child's talent development program (Lynch, 1990; Mills, Ablard, & Lynch, 1992; Olszewski-Kubilius, Laubscher, Wohl, & Grant, 1996). This is also true for colleges and universities whose policies on granting credit and advanced placement for students who take college-level courses while in high school vary widely (Brody, 1998).

Previous research has found that reasons for not granting credit for outside-of-school courses center mainly around concerns about student mastery of content given the typically shorter format for a summer course and the fewer number of instructional hours involved in most programs (Brody, 1998; Lynch, 1990; Mills, Ablard, & Lynch, 1992; Olszewski-Kubilius et al., 1996). McCarthy (1998) asserted that content mastery is often determined by irrelevant criteria such as a student's age or grade at the time of the course or hours spent in class, a result of misunderstanding gifted students' intellectual capabilities and underestimating their independent learning abilities (Olszewski-Kubilius, Laubscher, Wohl, & Grant). Similarly, Brody (1998) asserted that, although most colleges award some credit or placement

for college-level courses taken in high school, the reasons for colleges' inconsistent policies are mainly because of their concerns about the variation in quality and rigor of the courses. Selective colleges are more likely to award credit for courses based on standardized assessment measures, such as Advanced Placement tests or the College Level Examination Program (CLEP), or the reputation of a well-known, rigorous academic program such as the International Baccalaureate (IB) program. Also, colleges regard the level of the college institution (e.g., community colleges vs. selective universities) as an important criterion to consider when awarding credit.

Previous Related Research

Research on granting credit for outside-of-school courses taken by gifted students is rare, but what exists is primarily about credit for courses taken by students in university summer programs. VanTassel-Baska, Landau, and Olszewski's (1984) study of 1983 summer program participants at the Center for Talent Development (CTD) at Northwestern University showed that an overwhelming percentage (over 80%) of schools responded that they offered students some type of academic or counseling services subsequent to their participation in the summer program. The types of educational actions reported by the local schools included appropriate placement in the content area (52.4%), placement in a special advanced or honors program (39.0%), provision of independent study opportunities in the content area (24.4%), provision of special counseling (19.5%), and high school credit for the course (7.3%). However, the study revealed a substantial amount of discrepancy between the actions that parents thought schools had taken and what schools had actually done. For example, nearly half of the parents responded that no special services had been given to their children subsequent to the summer program, while much smaller percentage of the schools (8.5%) reported "no follow-up actions."

Olszewski-Kubilius (1989) found that local schools tended to respond to students' and parents' requests for high school credit for summer coursework more often by placing students into a special program or the next course in sequence, but rarely opted to give them actual high school credit. Of about 250 gifted adolescents who participated in a summer program over a 3-year period, only half of them who did extremely well in the summer courses were placed in the next course in sequence in their home schools or received credit from their schools.

Additionally, the possibility of getting high school credit varied according to the subject area. Students who took summer math and science classes were more likely to get credit or appropriate placement in their schools than those who took summer courses related to verbal talent. Olszewski-Kubilius noted that this could be a result of less variation in the content of math and science classes across high schools compared to classes focusing on verbal talent. Data also revealed that more than half of the parents of summer program participants contacted local school personnel to follow up on their children's academic placement after the summer program, although schools tended to provide a minimum level of response.

Lynch (1990) studied 570 students who took science and mathematics courses at the Johns Hopkins University Center for Talented Youth (CTY) summer program. A considerable percentage of students (69%) requested credit or placement from their schools, and 80% of them received it, although placement was the usual response and credit was atypical. Lynch noted that placement was often given over credit because of the schools' concerns about students' mastery of the subject area given the fast-paced coursework and 3-week duration of the program, which is similar to that observed by Olszewski-Kubilius et al. (1996). The study also revealed that some schools asked students to take another test before awarding credit and that students typically had the course recorded as "extra classes taken" on their high school transcripts in lieu of receiving credit for a required high school course.

Further research (see Olszewski-Kubilius et al., 1996) on the credit issue was conducted at the Center for Talent Development (CTD) of Northwestern University to ascertain how accreditation of the Center as a "Special Function School" for the gifted by the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools (NCA), which meant that students get high school credit for successfully completed courses, affected schools' responses to summer coursework. The study involved students who had participated in the CTD summer program in 1992 (preaccreditation) and 1994 (postaccreditation) and showed that, overall, accreditation increased schools' tendency to award credit and appropriate placement to students. Credit earned by students after accreditation were more likely to be regarded by schools as "required" versus "elective" credit. Also, after accreditation, summer program students received more credit (two semesters vs. one semester) for their summer courses and were more likely to be placed in a special program by their home schools. Students were more likely to receive action,

either credit or placement, if their local schools had dual-enrollment programs or had AP or mentorship programs, presumably because these schools were used to dealing with students who took outside courses. Schools were reluctant to grant credit for the summer courses if they offered similar courses; not granting credit often had to do with a kind of "territory" issue. Schools typically viewed summer courses as something families do for their children's own personal enrichment, an attitude that contributed to their reluctance to consider summer coursework as part of a regular school program. However, there was also evidence that schools tended to grant high school credit for the CTD course if parents actively and officially requested and pushed for credit.

In summary, it is important to recognize and acknowledge the various needs of gifted students and provide multiple options for their talent development in and outside of school. Previous research substantiates that students benefit when local schools have policies on granting credit for outside-of-school courses (Lynch, 1990; McCarthy, 1998; Olszewski-Kubilius & Limburg-Weber, 1999), but most schools do not (Olszewski-Kubilius et al., 1996). Research regarding coursework taken outside of local schools assists schools and parents in designing and providing comprehensive educational services for academically talented students, and the growing demand on the part of parents for outside-of-school programs is inevitable as the process of talent development necessarily requires multiple programs and experiences beyond what schools may be able to offer gifted students (Olszewski-Kubilius, 1989, 2003). Therefore, issues regarding credit are likely to remain prominent in the future.

Research Questions

The present study is a follow-up on previous research on awarding credit by local schools for outside-of-school summer classes for gifted students. Research questions examined in this study are:

1. How do local schools recognize and respond to students' summer work?
2. What factors affect the ways in which local schools respond to outside-of-school courses?
3. Does accreditation of the summer program alter responses of local schools to summer courses?
4. Are there differences between middle and high school administrators in response to gifted students' summer coursework?
5. Have schools' responses to summer coursework changed over time?

Method

Participants

Participants included 262 school administrators (high school: $n = 180$, middle school: $n = 82$) representing the local schools of students who attended CTD's summer program in 2002 and took a science (32.3%), verbal (30.7%), social science (18.7%), or math (18.3%) course. Most of the school personnel came from the Midwestern United States (94.2%); others were based in the West (1.9%), New England (1.6%), the South (1.6%), and the Mid-Atlantic region (0.8%). The majority were from public schools (78.2%), while 16.0% and 5.7% respectively were from private or parochial schools. The communities in which the schools were located were described by 2.3% of the administrators as rural or farming community, by 32.2% as a small city (10,000–50,000), by 28.3% as a medium city or town (50,000–100,000), by 12.4% as a large city (100,000–500,000), by 12.8% as a very large city (over 500,000), and by 4.7% as other. The size of the school's current annual per-pupil expenditure was described by 1.4% of the administrators as less than \$3,000, by 25.6% as \$3,000–\$5,999, by 39.7% as \$6,000–\$8,999, by 14.2% as \$9,000–\$11,999, by 10.5% as \$12,000–\$14,999, and by 8.7% as over \$15,000. With respect to school size, 22.3% of the respondents reported to have between 100 and 500 students in their schools; 26.2% said they had between 500 and 1,000 students; 35% had between 1,000 and 2,000; 9.6% had between 2,000 and 3,000; 3.1% had between 3,000 and 4,000; and 3.5% had over 4,000. The accrediting body of the participants' local schools was the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools (76.8%); the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (1.7%); and other, including ISACS, NAIS, and ISBE (21.5%). Thus, most of the summer program students attended schools that were accredited by the same institution as CTD. More detailed information about participants (high school vs. middle school personnel) and their schools is presented in Table 1.

Summer Accelerative Program

The summer program at the Center is designed to serve students who are identified as gifted according to various indices. Most students qualify on the basis of SAT or ACT scores. For 4th- through 6th-grade students, the 95th percentile or above on a math or verbal composite or subtest of a nationally normed, standardized achievement test is required. Seventh- and 8th-grade students, as well

as 9th through 12th graders, must meet minimum ACT or SAT requirements, which vary according to subject areas (9th–12th graders have to obtain these scores when they participate in the talent search as 7th and 8th graders). A minimum score for verbal courses ranges from 470 to 510 on the SAT-V or from 21 to 24 on the ACT-Reading. A minimum score of 520 to 540 on SAT-M or 19 to 21 on ACT-Math is required for math (and some science) classes, and a minimum score of 21 to 22 on ACT-Science Reasoning is required for science classes. Students who do not have test scores or whose scores are lower than the minimum can submit an alternate admission portfolio including letters of recommendation from teachers, a copy of the latest grade report, a teacher-graded copy of an essay or piece of creative writing, and an expanded admission essay.

Students participate in a 3-week academic program and take one class, 5 1/2 hours per day. Classes are either enrichment or accelerative in nature, and examples are Algebra I Honors, Mathematical Modeling in Algebra II Honors, AP European History, AP English: Language and Composition, Advanced Creative Writing Honors, Topics in Biology Honors, and Research Methods Honors.

Since CTD is accredited by the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools (NCA) as a “Special Function School,” the Center grants high school credit, which varies by course, for high-school-level courses successfully completed by students in the program. All 7th- through 12th-grade students in the program receive final course grades and a written narrative evaluation of their work. Evaluations include a course description, the student’s grade, credit earned, remarks on students’ performance and proficiency, and recommendations for future study. Each student’s school also receives a transcript showing the course taken, the final grade, and the amount of credit earned.

Instrumentation

A survey was developed for high school and middle school administrators to learn what happened to students who took courses in CTD’s summer program after they returned to their home schools. For high school personnel, questions were primarily about awarding credit for their students’ outside-of-school courses, while for middle school personnel, questions focused on the issue of placement. A total of 12 questions common to both high school personnel and middle school personnel included background information on the school (e.g., geographic

Table 1
Participants Characteristics (%)

	Total (N = 262)	High School (n = 180)	Middle School (n = 82)
<i>Geographic region of school</i>			
Mid-West	94.2%	93.8%	95.1%
West	1.9%	2.8%	–
New England	1.6%	1.7%	1.2%
South	1.6%	1.1%	2.5%
Middle Atlantic	.8%	.6%	1.2%
<i>Type of school district</i>			
K–8	9.7%	.6%	29.9%
K–12	49.0%	49.0%	85.7%
9–12	28.0%	39.1%	2.6%
Other	13.2%	14.0%	11.7%
<i>Type of school</i>			
Public	78.2%	72.2%	91.4%
Private	16.0%	20.6%	6.2%
Parochial	5.7%	7.2%	2.5%
<i>Community surrounding school</i>			
Small town	7.4%	6.7%	8.9%
Small city	32.2%	27.5%	41.8%
Medium City/Town	28.3%	29.2%	–
Large city	12.4%	12.9%	11.4%
Very large city	12.8%	16.9%	3.8%
Rural/Farming community	2.3%	2.2%	2.5%
Other	4.7%	4.5%	5.1%
<i>Annual per pupil expenditure</i>			
Less than \$3,000	1.4%	.7%	2.9%
\$3,000–\$5,999	25.6%	24.3%	28.6%
\$6,000–\$8,999	39.7%	35.8%	47.1%
\$9,000 – \$11,999	14.2%	14.2%	14.3%
\$12,000 – \$14,999	10.5%	10.5%	5.7%
Over \$15,000	8.7%	12.2%	1.4%
<i>Approximate no. of students in class</i>			
100–499	22.3%	19.1%	29.6%
500–999	26.2%	13.5%	53.1%
1,000–1,999	35.4%	45.5%	13.6%
2,000–2,999	9.6%	14.0%	–
3,000–3,999	3.1%	3.9%	1.2%
4,000 or more	3.5%	3.5%	2.5%
<i>Accrediting body of school</i>			
NCA	76.8%	78.8%	71.6%
SA	1.7%	1.2%	3.0%
Others*	21.5%	20.0%	25.4%

Note. NCA = North Central Association of Colleges and Schools; SA = Southern Association of Colleges and Schools

* Includes Independent Schools Association of Central States (ISACS), National Association of Independent Schools (NAIS), and Illinois State Board of Education (ISBE).

region of school, type of school district, current annual per pupil expenditure, etc.); factors influencing the school's decisions regarding credit/placement for the CTD summer course (e.g., student shared a course syllabus with school officials prior to enrolling in the course, the grade the student received in the course, the summer instructor's narrative comments about the student's performance, etc.); factors influencing the school's decisions regarding credit/placement for classes taken outside of school in general (e.g., types of course taken, the school's own evaluation of student's mastery of content material, performance of the student on the standardized tests or other objective measures, qualifications of the course instructor, etc.); reasons for not granting credit/placement after the CTD course; whether contacted by the student or parents for credit/placement; type of accrediting body for the school; and suggestions as to what would be required for the school to award high school credit for students who had participated in CTD courses.

There were nine questions unique for high school personnel, including the amount of credit awarded, whether a student's CTD grade was factored into their GPA, types of placement after completion of the CTD course, and whether the student was placed in a special program as a result of the CTD course. Middle school personnel were asked to indicate the types of actions (e.g., placement in a high-ability group for instruction in the same subject area, placement in an accelerated program, placement in a distance learning course or in an independent study, etc.) taken by the school after a student's participation in a CTD course. A complete list of questions and the response formats are available in Appendix A.

Data Collection and Analysis

The survey was mailed out to 431 high school administrators and 163 middle school administrators at the end of February 2003. Students in the summer program had requested that these individuals receive their final course evaluation. Data were collected until June of 2003, with surveys from 180 high school administrators and 82 middle school administrators returned (final response rate = 44.1%: high school = 41.8%, middle school = 50.3%). Data were analyzed using the computer software program SPSS (Statistical Packages for Social Sciences) Version 10.0. Descriptive statistics, chi-square tests, a two-way contingency table analysis using crosstabs, and independent *t* tests were conducted.

Results

Awarding Credit in High School

More than half of the students (64.1%) received high school credit after taking CTD summer courses, while a smaller percentage of students (41.9%) had their CTD course factored into their school GPAs. As to the amount of credit awarded for the outside-of-school course, 52.4% received one semester credit, 29.5% two semesters, and 18.1% half a semester. Of those students ($n = 72$) whose grade was factored into their GPAs, almost an equivalent percentage reported that their grade was weighted as an honor course (53.8%) versus not weighted (46.2%).

Data analysis found some relationships between school demographic variables and the awarding of credit. Compared to private schools, public schools were more likely to award credit for students' CTD courses ($\chi^2 = 13.52, p < .01$), factor students' grades in the CTD courses into their school GPAs ($\chi^2 = 13.77, p < .01$), and weight students' CTD course grades as honors courses ($\chi^2 = 14.92, p < .01$). Schools located in a small city (e.g., with a population between 10,000 and 50,000) were more likely than schools located in a larger city to grant credit ($\chi^2 = 22.32, p < .01$) and to factor students' CTD grades into their school GPAs ($\chi^2 = 15.11, p < .05$). Also, the larger the annual per-pupil expenditure, the more likely it was that students would be awarded credit by their schools ($\chi^2 = 26.45, p < .01$). However, subject area of the courses had no bearing on schools' granting of credit ($\chi^2 = .63, p > .05$) or whether the CTD course grade was factored into the high school GPA ($\chi^2 = 3.25, p > .05$).

High school administrators were asked about the type of placement they offered to students subsequent to CTD summer courses. Twenty-six percent placed students in an honors or a more advanced class in the same subject area (e.g., to Chemistry Honors from Topics in Chemistry), 15.0% placed students in an honors class in a related subject (e.g., to Algebra II from Geometry), and 13.3% placed students in an AP class in the subject area (e.g., to AP Chemistry from Chemistry). Six percent of the administrators reenrolled students in the same course at their home schools, while 3.9% placed students in a college- or university-level course or an independent study. Open-ended responses regarding placement included "assigning sequential courses to the students and encouraging them to continue to take AP classes" ($n = 14, 24.1\%$). When asked about whether students' participation in the CTD summer program led to placement

in some type of “special program,” only 12 (7.1%) school administrators responded “Yes,” with five citing placement in a special accelerated program, five placement in advanced courses, and two placement into college, while no students were placed into mentorship or university programs.

Almost half of the school administrators (42.2%) responded that their school had AP classes, while 35.0% had honors classes, 15.6% had a dual-enrollment program with college-level classes, and 13.9% had an accelerated program. However, except for the dual-enrollment programs, the classes or programs the schools had did not significantly affect their decisions about granting credit or factoring the CTD grade into the students’ GPA. Students from schools with dual-enrollment programs were more likely to receive credit for the CTD course than students from schools with no dual-enrollment programs ($\chi^2 = 8.33$, $p < .01$).

With respect to the reasons for not granting credit for the CTD course, 38 high school administrators (21.1%) responded that their school had a policy against credit for any outside-of-school coursework, while 7 administrators (3.9%) gave as a reason that the CTD course material did not match the material covered in their school for that course. Only one administrator cited the student’s poor performance. Other responses included that the students or parents chose not to request credit ($n = 11$, 36.7%); the school would not accept outside-of-school coursework or could not give credit for more than one course ($n = 6$, 20.0%); the student did not get the class preapproved ($n = 5$, 16.7%); and the school was concerned about the limited number of instructional hours in the summer class ($n = 2$, 6.7%). Table 2 contains more information on these open-ended responses.

Data revealed that the majority of the students or students’ parents contacted the school administrators regarding credit or placement after the CTD course; 78.6% contacted school personnel and 53.6% did so prior to enrolling their child in the course.

Placement in Middle School After the CTD Summer Courses

When asked about follow-up actions to students’ participation in the CTD course, 76.5% of the middle school administrators responded that they placed the CTD evaluation in the student’s file, and 54.3% shared the evaluation with the student’s teachers. Other actions taken by the school included placement in a high-ability group for instruction in the subject area (17.3%), place-

Table 2

Reasons Why Schools Did Not Grant Credit to Student for the CTD Course

	<i>n</i>	%
<i>High school (n = 30)</i>		
Student/parent did not request or apply for credit	11	36.7
Students did not get the class preapproved	5	16.7
School does not accept outside credit	6	20.0
Number of class hours in CTD course	2	6.7
Other	6	20.0
<i>Middle school (n = 9)</i>		
Student took for enrichment not credit	4	44.4
No comparable course in our school	2	22.2
Necessary to test out of classes	1	11.1
Credit is never granted	1	11.1
Considered CTD course as an independent study	1	11.1

Note. Responses were based on 39 open-ended comments made by the respondents.

ment in the next course in the sequence in the subject area (14.8%), and placement in an advanced course at a local high school (12.3%). Less than 10.0% of the administrators chose an accelerated program (8.6%) or an independent study (2.5%) as an option for placement, and 7.4% responded “no action taken.” Open-ended responses given by the respondents were student moved on to high school ($n = 3$); student was recommended for advanced classes ($n = 3$); student was awarded high school credit ($n = 2$); and student was offered enrichment classes ($n = 2$). Also, 7 administrators reported that they did not provide the student with further placement because they never received the CTD evaluation ($n = 2$); no further classes were available in the school ($n = 2$); the student moved to another school ($n = 2$); or the student’s parents did not request any further placement for their child ($n = 1$).

When no action was taken subsequent to the summer program, the most frequent reason given by administrators was the lack of advanced courses available for placement (42.0%), while fewer than 10.0% of the respondents reported either that their schools had a policy against changing students’ placement subsequent to an outside-of-school course (9.9%) or that a change in placement was not warranted given the student’s per-

formance in the CTD class (7.4%). Additionally, 3 administrators cited that they did not advance the student's placement because the student's parents did not want any action taken. The data also showed that more than half (58.3%) of the students (or their parents) did not contact the school administrator regarding further placement as a result of the CTD course, while 22.2% of them contacted school personnel prior to enrolling in the course and 19.4% following completion of the course.

Comparisons Between High School and Middle School Personnel

Responses from high school and middle school administrators were compared in relation to factors influencing their decisions to give either credit or placement for the CTD summer course. When combined across both groups of administrators and on the basis of a 5-point Likert scale (from 1 = *very unimportant* to 5 = *very important*), the ranking of factors from most important to least was the school's policy on credit/placement for outside-of-school coursework (importance 84.9%, unimportance 4.9%; $M = 4.36$, $SD = .99$); CTD's accreditation (importance 67.2%, unimportance 12.9%; $M = 3.84$, $SD = 1.26$); the schools' review of the CTD course syllabus (importance 63.8%, unimportance 12.9%; $M = 3.72$, $SD = 1.18$); the sharing of the CTD syllabus with school officials prior to the CTD course (importance 55.6%, unimportance 16.7%; $M = 3.60$, $SD = 1.27$); the grade the student received in the course (importance 51.8%, unimportance 19.6%; $M = 3.43$, $SD = 1.23$); CTD's recommendation on credit/placement (importance 50.7%, unimportance 18.8%; $M = 3.43$, $SD = 1.23$); the school's own evaluation of the student's mastery of the content material (importance 49.1%, unimportance 18.9%; $M = 3.41$, $SD = 1.28$); and the summer instructor's narrative comments about the student's performance (importance 42.0%, unimportance 16.0%; $M = 3.44$, $SD = 1.17$).

For high school administrators, their school policy regarding credit for outside-of-school coursework was the most important factor (importance 91.8%). The second and third most important factors were accreditation (importance 72.6%) and the review of the course syllabus (importance 67.8%). The importance ranking of the remaining factors were: the sharing of the CTD syllabus with school officials prior to the CTD course (importance 64.9%); the grade the student received in the course (importance 50.6%); CTD's recommendation on

credit/placement (importance 50.0%), summer instructors' narrative comments about the student's achievement (importance 46.8%); and the school's own evaluation of the student's mastery of the content material (importance 39.1%).

For middle school administrators, the most important factor affecting their decisions was the school's own evaluation of the student's mastery of the summer course material (importance 72.3%), followed by the school's policy regarding the awarding of credit (importance 69.2%) and the summer instructors' narrative comments about the students' performance in the summer class (importance 64.7%). Other factors, in order of importance, were: the schools' review of the course syllabus (importance 55.8%); CTD's accreditation by NCA (importance 55.2%); the grade the student received (importance 55.1%); CTD's recommendation on credit/placement (importance 53.0%); and the sharing of the course syllabus with school officials prior to the CTD course (importance 34.3%). Table 3 presents this information in more detail.

T tests revealed that high school personnel placed more importance than middle school administrators on their school's own policy on awarding credit (high school: $M = 4.52$, $SD = .96$; middle school: $M = 3.97$, $SD = .94$; $t = 3.95$, $p < .01$); students sharing the CTD syllabus with school officials in advance of the summer course (high school: $M = 3.81$, $SD = 1.30$; middle school: $M = 3.12$, $SD = 1.0$; $t = 3.74$, $p < .01$); and CTD's accreditation (high school: $M = 3.96$, $SD = 1.30$; middle school: $M = 3.57$, $SD = 1.12$; $t = 2.11$, $p < .05$). Middle school personnel placed more importance than high school personnel on their school's own evaluation of the student's mastery of the content material (middle school: $M = 3.98$, $SD = 1.13$; high school: $M = 3.17$, $SD = 1.26$; $t = -4.56$, $p < .01$) and the summer instructor's narrative comments about the student's performance (middle school: $M = 3.75$, $SD = .99$; high school: $M = 3.29$, $SD = 1.21$; $t = -2.76$, $p < .01$). A separate chi-square test in the crosstabs analysis also demonstrated the significant differences for these factors between the middle and high school respondents, so these findings appear to be fairly robust (see Tables 3 and 4 for results).

Factors affecting decisions regarding credit or placement for classes taken outside of school "in general," not in relation to the CTD course specifically, were also examined. Combining both groups of administrators, these factors in order of importance were the type of course (importance 74.0%, unimportance 11.7%; $M = 3.95$, $SD = 1.17$); the accreditation of the program

(importance 69.8%, unimportance 11.6%; $M = 3.92$, $SD = 1.21$); schools having prior notice of the student's participation in the program (importance 61.2%, unimportance 15.5%; $M = 3.71$, $SD = 1.23$); the school's own evaluation of the student's mastery of the content material (importance 59.1%, unimportance 16.5%; $M = 3.62$, $SD = 1.24$); student or parent petitions for credit/place-ment (importance 51.5%, unimportance 18.2%; $M = 3.40$, $SD = 1.13$); the student's performance on standardized tests or other measures (importance 49.5%, unimportance 23.9%; $M = 3.32$, $SD = 1.23$); and qualifications of the program instructor (importance 46.7%, unimportance 20.5%; $M = 3.30$, $SD = 1.17$).

For high school administrators, the top three factors affecting their decisions regarding credit or placement were the type of course (importance 79.7%); the accreditation of the summer program by NCA (importance 76.1%); and prior notice of the student's participation in the program (importance 70.7%). Other factors in order of importance were qualifications of the program instructor (importance 50.6%); student or parent petitions for credit/place-ment (importance 50.4%); the school's own evaluation of the student's mastery of the content material (importance 49.6%); and students' performance on standardized tests or other measures (importance 36.9%).

For middle school administrators, the three most important factors were the school's own evaluation of the student's mastery of the content material (importance 80.6%); students' performance on standardized tests or other measures (importance 76.4%); and the type of course (importance 62.5%). Other factors were in the following order of importance: the accreditation of the summer program by NCA (importance 57.0%); student or parent petitions for credit/place-ment (importance 53.5%); schools having prior notice of the student's participation in the program (importance 40.8%); and qualifications of the program instructor (importance 38.6%).

High school and middle school administrators were significantly different on five of the seven criteria. High school personnel gave more weight to prior notice of the student's participation in the outside-of-school program (high school: $M = 3.86$, $SD = 1.25$; middle school: $M = 3.36$, $SD = 1.12$; $t = 2.92$, $p < .01$); the type of course (high school: $M = 4.06$, $SD = 1.19$; middle school: $M = 3.71$, $SD = 1.07$; $t = 2.14$, $p < .05$); and the accreditation of the program (high school: $M = 4.03$, $SD = 1.24$; middle school: $M = 3.67$, $SD = 1.09$; $t = 2.13$, $p < .05$) than did middle school personnel. Middle school administrators

Table 3

Factors Influencing the Decisions Regarding Credit or Placement After the CTD Course

	<i>n</i>	Imp.	Unimp.	χ^2
Shared CTD syllabus with school before enrolling				
High school	151	64.9%	13.2%	
Middle school	64	34.3%	23.4%	
Total	216	55.6%	16.7%	35.26**
Grade the student received				
High school	154	50.6%	22.7%	
Middle school	69	55.1%	13.0%	
Total	224	51.8%	19.6%	6.22
Summer instructor's narrative of the student's achievement				
High school	156	46.8%	19.9%	
Middle school	68	64.7%	7.4%	
Total	225	42.0%	16.0%	7.82
Review of the course syllabus				
High school	155	67.8%	14.8%	
Middle school	68	55.8%	8.8%	
Total	224	63.8%	12.9%	14.93*
CTD's recommendation on credit/place-ment				
High school	154	50.0%	23.4%	
Middle school	68	53.0%	8.8%	
Total	223	50.7%	18.8%	11.61*
CTD's accreditation by NCA				
High school	157	72.6%	14.0%	
Middle school	67	55.2%	10.4%	
Total	225	67.2%	12.9%	20.69**
School's evaluation of student's mastery of content material				
High school	156	39.1%	23.1%	
Middle school	65	72.3%	9.2%	
Total	222	49.1%	18.9%	23.43**
School's policy on credit/place-ment for outside coursework				
High school	159	91.8%	5.0%	
Middle school	65	69.2%	4.6%	
Total	225	84.9%	4.9%	45.35**

Note. Number of cases varies according to missing cases. Importance (%) = very important + important; unimportance (%) = very unimportant + unimportant. * $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$

Table 4

Comparison Between High School and Middle School Personnel: Factors Influencing the Decisions Regarding Credit or Placement After the CTD Course

	<i>df</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>	Comparison
1. Shared CTD syllabus with school officials before enrolling in the CTD course	214	3.74	.000**	MS < HS
2. Grade the student received	222	-.78	.434	
3. Instructor's narrative comments about the student's performance	223	-2.76	.006**	HS < MS
4. Review of the course syllabus	222	1.09	.278	
5. CTD's recommendation on credit/placement	221	-.89	.372	
6. CTD's accreditation by NCA	223	2.11	.036*	MS < HS
7. School's own evaluation of student's mastery of the content material	220	-4.56	.000**	HS < MS
8. School's policy on credit/placement for outside-of-school coursework	223	3.95	.000**	MS < HS

Note. HS - High school administrators ($n = 180$); MS - Middle school administrators ($n = 82$). Comparison indicates who has a higher mean score. * $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$

gave more weight to their school's own evaluation of the student's mastery of the content material (middle school: $M = 4.21$, $SD = .99$; high school: $M = 3.35$, $SD = 1.26$; $t = -5.13$, $p < .01$) and the student's performance on standardized tests or other achievement indices used to evaluate the summer course compared to high school administrators (middle school: $M = 4.08$, $SD = .78$; high school: $M = 2.97$, $SD = 1.24$; $t = -7.04$, $p < .01$). The chi-square tests in the crosstabs analysis yielded the same significant differences as the t tests indicating these findings are fairly robust (see Tables 5 and 6).

Summary and Discussion

Overall, the data suggest that most schools (over 60%) recognized students' outside-of-school summer coursework by awarding high school credit or appropriate placement, typically by placing students in more advanced classes, such as an honors or AP class in the same or relevant subject area. In comparison to previous research (see Olszewski-Kubilius et al., 1996) conducted with the local schools of student participants in the summer program in the early and mid-1990s, there was a substantial increase in the percentage of students whose schools gave them credit for their CTD summer course (i.e., 28.0% in 1992, 36.0% in 1994, 64.1% in 2002). Also, in the present study, the number of stu-

dents receiving one semester of credit in the school subsequent to the CTD course increased considerably from 1994 levels, and consequently the percentage receiving two semesters declined (i.e., one semester of credit: 34.2% in 1992, 30.0% in 1994, 52.4% in 2002; two semesters of credit: 6.1% in 1992, 50.0% in 1994, 29.5% in 2002).

These data perhaps reflect a greater acceptance on the part of school administrators of courses taken outside of their buildings or districts. However, while getting credit is easier, getting the appropriate amount of credit has become more difficult. We suspect that schools' tendency to reduce the amount of credit is an indication of their lack of full acceptance of outside-of-school courses. A discouraging finding is that less than half of the students had the CTD course grade factored into their school GPA, although it is unclear from our data whether parents advocated for this or not. It has been 9 years since CTD obtained accreditation with the sole purpose of enabling students to get credit for their CTD courses, and it is unclear how much of the positive change observed in this study is due to the accreditation versus changes in general attitudes toward outside-of-school courses.

Two elements—the school policy regarding credit or placement and CTD's accreditation by NCA—had a profound impact on schools' actions subsequent to the CTD course. These elements were more prominent for

Table 5**Factors Influencing Credit or Placement
for Classes Taken Outside of School in General**

	<i>n</i>	Imp.	Unimp.	χ^2
<i>Type of course taken</i>				
High school	158	79.7%	11.4%	
Middle school	72	62.5%	12.5%	
Total	231	74.0%	11.7%	19.37**
<i>School's evaluation of student's mastery of content</i>				
High school	157	49.6%	21.6%	
Middle school	72	80.6%	5.6%	
Total	230	59.1%	16.5%	26.68**
<i>Performance of student on standardized tests</i>				
High school	157	36.9%	34.4%	
Middle school	72	76.4%	1.4%	
Total	230	49.5%	23.9%	42.18**
<i>Qualification of instructor</i>				
High school	158	50.6%	22.8%	
Middle school	70	38.6%	15.7%	
Total	229	46.7%	20.5%	10.63*
<i>Student/Parent petitions for placement</i>				
High school	159	50.4%	23.8%	
Middle school	71	53.5%	5.6%	
Total	231	51.5%	18.2%	13.35*
<i>Prior notice of participation in program</i>				
High school	160	70.7%	15.1%	
Middle school	71	40.8%	16.9%	
Total	232	61.2%	15.5%	26.43**
<i>Accreditation of the summer program by NCA</i>				
High school	159	76.1%	13.2%	
Middle school	72	57.0%	8.3%	
Total	232	69.8%	11.6%	24.79**

Note. Number of cases varies according to missing cases. Importance (%) = very important + important; unimportance (%) = very unimportant + unimportant.
* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$

high school administrators than middle school administrators. The positive effect of the accreditation had also been apparent in a previous study (Olszewski-Kubilius et al., 1996); thus, a continued impact of accreditation on schools' provision of either credit or further placement

for gifted students participating in outside-of-school courses is expected. Prior notice of the student's participation in the program, including a preview of the summer course syllabus, has become increasingly important to high school personnel as a factor influencing their decisions about credit (24.8% in 1992, 35.8% in 1994, and 61.2% in 2002). Also, the type of course taken in the summer program was an increasingly important consideration for credit decisions (48.2% from 1994 to 74.0% from 2002). Students' mastery of the content material, their performance in the summer courses, and the unavailability of an advanced course in their schools were the predominant criteria for changing a student's "placement" subsequent to a summer course. Interestingly, recommendations for placement about the students' performance from the summer program and qualifications of the instructor were least likely to affect the school's response regarding credit or placement compared to other factors. Also, there was some distrust on the part of schools regarding summer program instructors' evaluation of students' mastery of their course material. In particular, middle school administrators wanted to make their own determination of a student's mastery of the subject. This is disconcerting to parents and students, as students are sometimes unfairly evaluated by being given tests that do not match their courses or for which they were not told to prepare. Therefore, it appears that, for high schools, territory or administrative issues such as their policies, students' prior notice of participation in the program, sharing of course syllabi with the school official in advance, or accreditation of the summer program were crucial in making a decision about granting credit, while for middle school administrators, the level of students' mastery or achievement in the summer course, primarily based on the school's own criteria or the summer program's standardized tests or measures, was the decisive factor. This latter finding is consistent with previous research (e.g., Brody, 1998; Lynch, 1990; Mills, Ablard, & Lynch, 1992; Olszewski-Kubilius et al., 1996).

It was thought that schools that offered special advanced or accelerated courses or programs or community-based programs might be more amenable to awarding credit to outside-of-school courses like CTD. However, our results showed that high schools were not more likely to grant credit if they had their own accelerated classes like honors and AP, but were more likely to grant credit and factor the CTD course grade into the GPA if they had a dual-enrollment program. Dual-grade-enrollment programs exist by legis-

Table 6

*Comparison Between High School and Middle School Personnel:
Factors Influencing Decisions Regarding Credit or Placement for Outside-of-School Classes in General*

	<i>df</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>	Comparison
1. The type of course taken at CTD	229	2.14	.033*	MS < HS
2. School's own evaluation of the student's mastery of the content material	228	-5.13	.000**	HS < MS
3. Performance of the student on standardized tests or other objective measures	228	-7.04	.000**	HS < MS
4. Qualifications of the course instructor	227	-.074	.941	
5. Student or parent petitions for credit or further placement	229	-1.80	.072	
6. Prior notice of the student's participation in the summer program	230	2.92	.004**	MS < HS
7. Accredited summer program	230	2.13	.034*	MS < HS

Note. HS = High school administrators ($n = 180$); MS = Middle school administrators ($n = 82$). Comparison indicates who has a higher mean score.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$

lation in states, and the legislation typically specifies that local schools must accept and honor credits earned at colleges and universities through this program. Thus, schools who have students in dual-enrollment programs are used to dealing with "outside" credits. These findings regarding the effects of types of in-school programs or the awarding of credit are both consistent (for dual enrollment) and inconsistent (for honors and AP courses) with previous research (Olszewski-Kubilius et al., 1996).

Students and parents actively petitioned their schools for credit. In particular, a larger number of high school students and their parents contacted their local schools to advocate for credit, and more than half did so prior to enrollment in the CTD summer course, compared to middle school families. This may be because high school students and their parents are concerned with college entrance and possibly accumulating high school credit for early college entrance. Also, parents may be actively seeking contact to ensure that credit is received for summer courses, thereby allowing students to fit other advanced classes into their schedules. Alternatively, the school officials in this study reported that some parents did not request credit or placement, which may also have been fueled by concerns about college, especially the effect of the CTD course grade on GPA. However, parents' reluctance regarding credit or placement subsequent to the CTD course has also been continuously and substantially observed to decrease

since 1992 (i.e., student/parents did not want and/or ask any action taken: 26.2% in 1992, 8.4% in 1994, and 4.6% in 2002). Students' and their parents' advocacy for the recognition of the outside-of-school coursework is imperative to receiving it (Olszewski-Kubilius et al., 1996). Thus, parents should be encouraged to be active and assertive in their requests.

There are some implications of this study for practice. Accreditation of centers such as CTD that offer summer courses for gifted students does facilitate credit and appropriate placement. Other institutions need to consider obtaining accreditation. Also, our data suggest that the sharing of information is critical for getting schools to respond appropriately to students' summer coursework. Schools want information about the content of the course (prior to the summer) and about the students' performance and achievement. Summer programs vary greatly on what kind of information is routinely sent to students' schools, but most do not send anything unless requested by the parent.

In conclusion, schools' recognizing students' outside-of-school summer courses by offering credit or appropriate placement has increased over time with CTD's accreditation by NCA and with the increasing interest and effect of students and parents to pursue it. Of several factors affecting local schools in awarding credit or appropriate placement for accelerated summer courses, the school's policy on credit and placement, its own evaluation of students' mastery level, and the summer pro-

gram instructors' comments about the students' performance were crucial to responding to the summer courses. Thus, more flexible and articulate policies by local schools regarding credit for outside-of-school coursework is needed, as is more cooperative, productive partnerships between outside-of-school program coordinators and local school administrators in order to meet the needs of gifted children.

Limitations and Future Research

A limitation of this study is that it relied on individuals who were willing to complete the survey. Though the response rate was good, it is also probable that the school administrators who returned the survey were more likely to have given credit for the CTD course. Because this study did not involve students and parents, but rather depended exclusively on school administrators' reports, it was impossible to assess discrepancies between schools and parents or schools and students regarding the school's responses to outside-of-school courses. It should be noted that significant discrepancies were found in a previous study (see VanTassel-Baska, Landau, & Olszewski, 1984).

Our data also suggest that students and parents were more anxious to pursue credit for the CTD summer course and that CTD's accreditation had a more significant impact on schools' offering credit to the students compared to previous studies. It might be interesting to know whether the CTD accreditation influenced not only schools, but also students and parents to take action for future credit decisions. This study did not attempt to elucidate the mechanism by which accreditation affected schools or families, but this issue is worthy of future research. Other possible themes for future studies include a follow-up of students' performance after the summer coursework in order to learn whether the summer course was instrumental in better preparing them for advanced courses in school (e.g., Mills, Albard, & Lynch, 1992) and colleges' reactions to the awarding of credit or placement for college-level courses taken in high school (e.g., Brody, 1998).

References

Barnett, L. B., & Durden, W. G. (1993). Education patterns of academically talented youth. *Gifted Child Quarterly*, 37, 161-168.

- Brody, L. E. (1998). The talent searches: A catalyst for change in higher education. *Journal of Secondary Gifted Education*, 9, 124-133.
- Enersen, D. L. (1993). Summer residential programs: Academics and beyond. *Gifted Child Quarterly*, 37, 169-176.
- Lynch, S. J. (1990). Credit and placement issues for the academically talented following summer studies in science and mathematics. *Gifted Child Quarterly*, 34, 27-30.
- McCarthy, C. R. (1998). Assimilating the talent search model into the school day. *Journal of Secondary Gifted Education*, 9, 114-123.
- Mills, C. J., Ablard, K. E., & Lynch, S. J. (1992). Academically talented students' preparation for advanced-level coursework after individually-paced precalculus class. *Journal for the Education of the Gifted*, 16, 3-17.
- Olszewski-Kubilius, P. (1989). Development of academic talent: The role of summer programs. In J. VanTassel-Baska & P. Olszewski-Kubilius (Eds.), *Patterns of influence on gifted learners: The home, the self, and the school* (pp. 214-230). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Olszewski-Kubilius, P. (2003). Special summer and Saturday programs for gifted students. In N. Colangelo & G. A. Davis (Eds.), *Handbook of gifted education* (3rd ed., pp. 219-228). Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Olszewski-Kubilius, P., & Grant, B. (1996). Academically talented women and mathematics: The role of special programs and support from others on acceleration, achievement, and aspirations. In K. D. Arnold, K. D. Noble, & R. F. Subotnik (Eds.), *Remarkable women: Perspectives on female talent development* (pp. 281-294). Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press.
- Olszewski-Kubilius, P., Laubscher, L., Wohl, V., & Grant, B. (1996). Issues and factors involved in credit and placement for accelerated summer coursework. *Journal of Secondary Gifted Education*, 13, 5-15.
- Olszewski-Kubilius, P., & Limburg-Weber, L. (1999). Options for middle school and secondary level gifted students. *Journal of Secondary Gifted Education*, 11, 4-10.
- Swiatek, M. A., & Benbow, C. P. (1991). A ten-year longitudinal follow-up of participants in a fast-paced mathematics class. *Journal for Research in Mathematics Education*, 22, 138-159.
- VanTassel-Baska, J., Landau, M., & Olszewski, P. (1984). The benefits of summer programming for gifted adolescents. *Journal for the Education of the Gifted*, 13, 73-82.

Author Note

The review process for this article was conducted by the Association Editor, Joseph Renzulli.

Appendix A

List of Survey Questions

A. Common Items for High School and Middle School Personnel

1. Background information on the school (e.g., geographic region of school; types of school and school district; the community within which the school is situated; current annual per pupil expenditure; number of students in school; the accrediting body of the school)
2. Factors that influenced the school's decision regarding credit/placement for the CTD course* (e.g., the student or student parents shared a course syllabus with school officials prior to enrolling in the CTD course; the grade(s) the students received in the CTD course; the summer instructor's narrative comments about the student's performance; a review of the CTD course syllabus; CTD's recommendation; CTD's accreditation; the school's own evaluation of student's mastery of the content material; the school's own policy on granting credit for courses taken outside the school)
3. Factors that influenced the school's decision regarding credit/placement for classes taken outside of school in general (e.g., types of course taken; the school's own evaluation of student's mastery of content material; performance of the student on the standardized tests or other objective measures used to assess mastery; the qualifications of the course instructor; students' or parents' active petitions; prior notice of the student's participation in the program; accreditation of the program)
4. Reasons for not granting credit/placement to the student for his/her CTD course* (e.g., the school policy against granting credit; the student's performance level; the CTD material; no further course was available; parents of the student did not want credit/placement)
5. Contact time of the student and his/her parents for

credit or placement as a result of the CTD course (1 = prior to enrolling in the course, 2 = following completion of the course, 3 = never)

B. Items Exclusively for High School Personnel

1. Whether high school credit was granted for the CTD course (yes vs. no)
2. Whether the CTD grade was factored into the student's GPA (yes vs. no)
3. Whether the student's participation in the summer program led to placement in a special program in the school (yes vs. no)
4. Types of placement following completion of the CTD course regardless of credit for the CTD course* (e.g., honors level class or more advanced class in the same subject/in a related subject, AP class, college-level or university-level class, independent study, reenrollment in the same course at school)
5. Types of program offered in the school* (e.g., AP class, honors level class, special accelerated program, university program, mentorship program, dual enrollment program)

C. Items Exclusively for Middle School Personnel

1. Types of actions taken by the school in response to the CTD course* (e.g., placed the evaluation in the students' files; shared the evaluation with the student's teachers; placed the student in the next course/in a high school course taken at the local high school/in a high ability group for instruction in that area/in an independent study/in an accelerated program/in a distance learning course)

Note. * indicates items which include a section (e.g., other) for open-ended comments.