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Jack A. Naglieri, PhD, is a Research Professor at the University of Virginia, Senior Research Scientist at the Devereux Center for Resilient Children, and Emeritus Professor of Psychology at George Mason University. With J.P. Das, he is well known for the PASS theory of Intelligence and its application using the Cognitive Assessment System and Cognitive Assessment System—Second Edition.
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My Background

Ø Interest in the concept of intelligence, its measurement and instruction
Traditional IQ and Achievement Tests

- When I worked as a school psychologist I noticed that parts of the WISC was VERY similar to parts of the achievement tests.

- The WISC had VERBAL (with Arithmetic) and Nonverbal Scales.
- The Verbal tests were just like those on the Achievement test.
- HOW DOES THAT MAKE SENSE?
- WHY THIS SIMILARITY?
- WHERE DID THIS COME FROM?

1975 Charles Champagne Elementary, Bethpage, NY
Wechsler (1939)

- Built his IQ test on the Army Alpha and Beta
- His definition of intelligence was “The aggregate or global capacity of the individual to act purposefully, to think rationally, and to deal effectively with his environment (1939)”
- but his test yielded a Verbal IQ and Performance IQ suggesting two types of intelligence
A group of psychologists met at Harvard in April of 1917 to construct an ability test to help the US military evaluate recruits (WWI) for responsible positions.

Their goal was to develop a workable set of tests.
From Alpha & Beta to Wechsler IQ

**Army Alpha**
- Synonym- Antonym
- Disarranged Sentences
- Number Series
- Arithmetic Problems
- Analogies
- Information

**Army Beta**
- Maze
- Cube Imitation
- Cube Construction
- Digit Symbol
- Pictorial Completion
- Geometrical Construction

Verbal IQ

Verbal and Quantitative on CogAT & Otis-Lennon

Originally called “Performance” now “Nonverbal”

Naglieri Nonverbal Ability Tests
General ability

- Wechsler “believed that his Verbal and Performance Scales represented ... general ability... he never believed and nonverbal intelligence as being separate from general ability. Rather he saw the Performance Scale as the most sensible way to measure the general intelligence of people with ... limited proficiency in English. (Kaufman, 2008)

- Yoakum and Yerkes (1920, p. 19) “Men who fail in alpha are sent to beta in order that injustice by reason of relative unfamiliarity with English may be avoided”

- This is a social justice issue of equitable assessment
Take this IQ Test

1. Bull Durham is the name of tobacco
2. The Mackintosh Red is a kind of fruit
3. The Oliver is a typewriter
4. A passenger locomotive type is the Mogul
5. Stone & Webster are well known engineers
6. The Brooklyn Nationals are called Superbas
7. Pongee is a fabric
8. Country Gentleman is a kind of corn
9. The President during the Spanish War was McKinley
10. Fatima is a make of cigarette

From: Psychological Examining the United States Army (Yerkes, 1921, p. 213)
Measure Thinking not Knowledge

- What does the student have to know to complete a task?
  - This is dependent upon educational opportunity

- How does the student have to think to complete a task?
  - This is dependent on the brain

I know this!

I need to figure this out
Measure Thinking Since 1985: History

1985 MAT Short and Expanded Forms

Renamed Naglieri Nonverbal Ability Test in 1997

NNAT -2 published in 2008

NNAT -3 published in 2016
General Ability

- Wechsler recognized that the nonverbal tests were best for uneducated populations and those whose primary language was not English.

- My goal, with the NNAT, NNAT-2 and NNAT-3 was to measure general ability using geometric shapes arranged in a 2 by 2 or 3 by 3 matrix. That is why these tests are called ‘progressive matrices’.

- The first time I made these items was for the K-ABC.
What Does A Nonverbal Test Measure?

General Ability!
These questions require General Ability!

- Which word is different: girl dog chair fish?
- 3 is to 6 as 5 is to _____?
- C⁷ is to F as E⁷ is to _____?

Despite the differences in content, each of these questions requires understanding the relationships among parts.
Does the Nonverbal Test Work?
In kindergarten, he scored **141** on the *Naglieri Nonverbal Ability Test*

He was the only African-American at his school to qualify for gifted services

But Devion was NOT getting good grades in school and was not considered GT

He was bored and resistant to do silly work

He appeared in the *Wall Street Journal* article, and was invited to Iles magnet school

He started there January 5\textsuperscript{th}, 2004

**WHAT HAPPENED SINCE THEN?**
Devion Graduated High School and...
Gifted Identification

- This presentation is about children who may not have good grades, or the academic skills or command of English, yet they are very smart – gifted

- These children can become very talented given the opportunity to learn

- How many children like this are in our country?
Number of Students Missed = 848,402

Table 1. Number of Students in US Public Schools Grades K-12 in 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>US Population</th>
<th>Potentially Gifted (8%) of US Population</th>
<th>Actual Numbers of Students in Gifted &amp; Talented Programs</th>
<th>Numbers of students Not Identified</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>26,822,930</td>
<td>2,145,834</td>
<td>2,065,366</td>
<td>80,468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>8,530,756</td>
<td>682,460</td>
<td>366,823</td>
<td>315,637</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>15,888,681</td>
<td>1,271,094</td>
<td>778,545</td>
<td>492,549</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>572,330</td>
<td>45,786</td>
<td>25,183</td>
<td>20,603</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or More Races</td>
<td>1,782,991</td>
<td>142,639</td>
<td>123,026</td>
<td>19,613</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total non-White</td>
<td>26,774,758</td>
<td>2,141,979</td>
<td>1,293,577</td>
<td>848,402</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Does the NNAT work for all groups?

Comparison of White, African American, Hispanic, and Asian Children on the Naglieri Nonverbal Ability Test

Jack A. Naglieri and Margaret E. Ronning
Glasgow University

This study examined differences between 3 matched samples of White (n = 2,306) and African American (n = 2,306), White (n = 1,176) and Hispanic (n = 1,176), and White (n = 466) and Asian (n = 446) children on the Naglieri Nonverbal Ability Test (NNAT; J. A. Naglieri, 1997a). The groups were selected from 22,620 children included in the NNAT standardization sample and matched on geographic region, socioeconomic status, ethnicity, and type of school setting (public or private). There was only a small difference between the NNAT scores for the White and African American samples (d ratio = .25) and minimal differences between the White and Hispanic (d ratio = .17) and between the White and Asian (d ratio = .02) groups. The NNAT was moderately correlated with achievement for the total sample and correlated similarly with achievement for the White and ethnic minority groups. The results concluded that the NNAT was not biased against Asian or Hispanic children. Results suggest that the NNAT scores have little practical significance for assessment of White and minority children.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Diff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>2,306</td>
<td>99.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>2,306</td>
<td>95.1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>1,176</td>
<td>101.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>1,176</td>
<td>98.6</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>466</td>
<td>103.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>446</td>
<td>103.9</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Race Differences by Test (Naglieri 2015)


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Traditional</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB-IV (matched)</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WISC-IV (normative sample)</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WJ-III (normative sample)</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WISC-IV (matched)</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Second generation</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KABC (normative sample)</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KABC (matched)</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KABC-2 (matched)</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAS2 (normative sample)</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAS (demographic controls)</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAS2 (demographic controls)</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Stanford-Binet IV (SB-IV) from Wasserman (2000); Woodcock-Johnson III WJ-III from Edwards and Oakland (2006); Kaufman Assessment Battery for Children (KABC) matched from Naglieri (1986); Kaufman Assessment Battery for Children – 2 from (Lichtenberger et al. 2009); CAS from Naglieri, Rojhahn, Matto, and Aquilino (2005); Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children – IV (WISC-IV) from O’Donnell (2009)
### NNAT’s Small Race & Ethnic Differences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Diff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>2,306</td>
<td>99.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>2,306</td>
<td>95.1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>1,176</td>
<td>101.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>1,176</td>
<td>98.6</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>466</td>
<td>103.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>446</td>
<td>103.0</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Comparison of White, African American, Hispanic, and Asian Children on the Naglieri Nonverbal Ability Test

Jack A. Naglieri and Margaret E. Ronning
Ohio State University

This study examined differences between 3 matched samples of White (n = 2,306) and African American (n = 2,306), White (n = 1,176) and Hispanic (n = 1,176), and White (n = 466) and Asian (n = 466) children on the Naglieri Nonverbal Ability Test (NNAT). The groups were selected from 22,208 children included in the NNAT standardization sample and matched on geographic region, socioeconomic status, ethnicity, and type of school setting (public or private). There was only a small difference between the NNAT scores for the White and African American samples (d ratio = 25) and minimal differences between the White and Hispanic (d ratio = 17) and between the White and Asian (d ratio = 8) groups. The NNAT was moderately correlated with achievement for the total sample and correlated similarly with achievement for the White and ethnic minority groups. The median correlation of NNAT with reading was 52 and NNAT with math was 63 across the samples. Results suggest that the NNAT scores have use for fair assessment of White minority children.

#### Table 1.6 Standard Score Mean Differences by Race on Traditional and Nontraditional Intelligence Tests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Traditional IQ Tests</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB-IV (matched samples)</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WISC-IV (normative sample)</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WJ-III (normative sample)</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WISC-IV (matched samples)</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nontraditional Tests</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K-ABC (normative sample)</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K-ABC (matched samples)</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KABC-II (matched samples)</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAS2 (normative sample)</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAS (demographic controls of normative sample)</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAS2 (demographic controls of normative sample)</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NNAT Identified Equal Percentages

Very Similar percentages of Black, White and Hispanic students earned a standard score of 125 (95\textsuperscript{th} percentile) or above
BRIEF REPORTS

Comparison of Hispanic Children With and Without Limited English Proficiency on the Naglieri Nonverbal Ability Test

Jack A. Naglieri
George Mason University

Ashley L. Booth
University of Virginia

Adam Winstel
George Mason University

Hispanic children with (n = 148) and without (n = 148) limited English proficiency were given the Naglieri Nonverbal Ability Test (NNAT, J. A. Naglieri, 1997a) and the Stanford Achievement Test—9th edition (SAT-9, 1995). The groups were selected from the NNAT standardization sample (N = 22,820) and matched on geographic region, gender, socioeconomic status, ethnicity, and ethnicity. There was a very small difference (d = 0.1) between the NNAT scaled scores for the children with limited English proficiency (M = 98.8) and those without limited English proficiency (M = 96.7). The NNAT correlated moderately and similarly with achievement for the 2 groups. The sample of children with limited English proficiency earned considerably lower scores on SAT-9 Reading and Verbal subscores. These differences suggest that the NNAT may be useful for the assessment of Hispanic children with and without limited English proficiency.

Assessment of intelligence for persons with limited English language skills has been an important issue since the familiar verbal-nonverbal organization of tests was initially made popular in the Army Alpha and Beta tests (Yung and Yerkes, 1920). The value of a nonverbal test for evaluation of diverse populations was noted by Yung and Yerkes more than 80 years ago: “Men who fail in alpha [the verbal test] are sent to beta [the nonverbal test] in order that it may be due to reason of relative unfamiliarity with English may be avoided” (p. 19). The Beta tests and other similar nonverbal tests have, therefore, served an important role in effective assessment of diverse populations because they content is

Recent research on the nonverbal approach to measuring general ability has shown that the Naglieri Nonverbal Ability Test (NNAT, Naglieri, 1997a) can be an effective way to assess general ability, yields small race and ethnic group differences, and shows good prediction of achievement. Naglieri and R.'_00oa provided a detailed study of mean score differences between matched samples of White (n = 2,306) and Black (n = 2,306), White (n = 1,176) and Hispanic (n = 1,176), and White (n = 406) and Asian (n = 406) children on the NNAT. Only small differences were found between the NNAT scores for the White and Black samples (Cohen’s d
Does the NNAT work for males & females?

Developmental gender differences on the Naglieri Nonverbal Ability Test in a nationally normed sample of 5–17 year olds

Johannes Rojahn *, Jack A. Naglieri

George Mason University, United States
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Abstract

Lynn (Lynn, R. (2002). Sex differences on the progressive matrices among 15–16 year olds: some data from South Africa. Personality and Individual Differences 33, 669–673) proposed that biologically based developmental sex differences produce different IQ trajectories across childhood and adolescence. To test this theory we analyzed the Naglieri Nonverbal Ability Test (NNA; Naglieri, J. A. (1997). Naglieri Nonverbal Ability Test-MultiLevel Form. San Antonio: Harcourt Assessment Company;) standardization sample of 79,780 children and adolescents in grades K-12, which was representative of the US census on several critical demographic variables. NNAT data were consistent with Lynn’s developmental theory of gender differences insofar as (a) there were no gender differences between 6 and 9 years; (b) females scored slightly higher between 10 and 13 years; and (c) males were ahead of females between the ages of 15 and 16. However, the discrepancies between the genders were smaller than predicted by Lynn. In fact they were so small that they have little or no practical importance. In other words, the NNAT did not reveal meaningful gender differences at any stage between the ages of 6 and 17 years.

© 2005 Elsevier Inc. All rights reserved.
Numbers of gifted population depicted by ethnic representation of White and Hispanic gifted student populations between 2000-2006
### ID Rates for NNAT and COGAT

#### 2013-2015 Screening pool

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic Group</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>1492</td>
<td>80.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1851</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic Group</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>1333</td>
<td>89.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1498</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% Increase for Blacks -> 54.0%
% Increase for Hispanics -> 54.0%
Introducing The Naglieri Tests of General Ability
(Naglieri, Brulles & Lansdowne, 2021)

Naglieri Nonverbal (Naglieri)
Naglieri Verbal (Naglieri & Brulles)
Naglieri Quantitative (Naglieri & Lansdowne)
Measuring Ability Equitably

- Dina Brulles, Kim Lansdowne and I have constructed three new tests that will be used for identification of gifted students.
- The focus of these tests is EQUITABLE ASSESSMENT of all students.
- The tests are currently in norming phase.
- The tests measure general ability using three types of content: Verbal, Nonverbal and Quantitative.
  - Naglieri Ability Test- **Nonverbal** (NAT-NV) (Naglieri, 2021)
  - NAT-**Verbal** (Naglieri & Brulles, 2021)
  - NAT-**Quantitative** (Naglieri & Lansdowne, 2021)
Description Of The Nonverbal Measure Of General Ability

Naglieri (2021)
Pictorial Instructions for All Students

- The paper form for all three tests have *pictorial directions*
- Naglieri Nonverbal: General Ability Test (Naglieri, 2021)
- Naglieri Verbal: General Ability Test (Naglieri & Brulles, 2021)
- Naglieri Quantitative: General Ability Test (Naglieri & Lansdowne, 2021)
Animated Directions for All Students

- All three online tests have animated directions
- Naglieri NonVerbal: General Ability Test (Naglieri, 2021)
- Naglieri Verbal: General Ability Test (Naglieri & Brulles, 2021)
- Naglieri Quantitative: General Ability Test (Naglieri & Lansdowne, 2021)
Naglieri Ability Test - Non-verbal

- Online and paper versions
- Group or individual administration
- Several NEW types of items have been developed
- Animated instructional video
- Interactive practice questions
- Minimal verbal directions
- Pre-K, Kindergarten, Grade 1, Grade 2, Grade 3/4, Grade 5/6, Grade 7-9, Grade 10-12
NAT-Nonverbal Pilot Study Results

- **SAMPLE**
  - 3,630 That closely matches the US population on key demographics

- **GENDER**
  - No difference between *males* and *females* for raw score across all forms

- **RACE/ETHNICITY**
  - No differences among *White, Black, & Hispanic* for raw score across all forms

- **PARENTAL EDUCATION LEVEL**
  - No differences among five education levels (*No high school diploma; High School graduate; Some college/Associate’s degree; Bachelor’s degree; Graduate/professional degree*) for raw score across all forms
Description of the Verbal Measure of General Ability

Naglieri & Brulles (in preparation)
Naglieri Ability Test - Verbal

This test was modeled after an approach described by A. R. Luria (1966) to evaluate verbal conceptual thinking.

Luria (1982) stated that language involves, "a complex system of codes (p. 29)" where, "every word designates a thing, an attribute, an action or a relationship (p 34)."

The task, referred to as superfluous fourth, demands that a subject reason and identify which word does not belong with the others, for example, “rose, daisy, stem, tulip.”

Authors: Jack Naglieri & Dina Brulles
NAT-Verbal Pilot Study Results

- **SAMPLE**
  - 2,482 That closely matches the US population on key demographics

- **GENDER**
  - No difference between *males* and *females* for raw score across all forms

- **RACE/ETHNICITY**
  - No differences among *White, Black, & Hispanic* for raw score across all forms

- **PARENTAL EDUCATION LEVEL**
  - No differences among five education levels (*No high school diploma; High School graduate; Some college/Associate’s degree; Bachelor’s degree; Graduate/professional degree*) for raw score across all forms
Description of the Quantitative Measure of General Ability

Naglieri & Lansdowne (in preparation)
Naglieri Ability Test - Quantitative

- These items demand analysis of sequences of numbers or relationships among a group of numbers. For example, 1 is to 2 (a difference of 1) as 3 is to ... 4. Alternatively, the items can be solved by simply recognizing that when analyzed vertically, 1 becomes 3, so 2 should become 4.

- These items test a person’s ability to understand relationships and patterns involving numbers, just as understanding relationships among shapes in the NAT-Nonverbal or verbal categories in the NAT-Verbal.

Authors: Jack Naglieri & Kim Lansdowne
Quantitative Pilot Study Results

- **SAMPLE**
  - 2,841 That closely matches the US population on key demographics

- **GENDER**
  - No difference between males and females for raw score across all forms

- **RACE/ETHNICITY**
  - No differences among White, Black, & Hispanic for raw score across all forms

- **PARENTAL EDUCATION LEVEL**
  - No differences among five education levels (No high school diploma; High School graduate; Some college/Associate’s degree; Bachelor’s degree; Graduate/professional degree) for raw score across all forms
Turn & Talk: Do you agree that these tests all measure the same ability?
How Best to Use These Tests
The district with 42% Hispanics identified only 2% as gifted. Did the District discriminate against Hispanic Students?

**CogAt Verbal, Quantitative require English**

**Weighted matrix favored achievement and CogAT**

**Too little reliance on NNAT**

On July 11, 2013, Judge Robert Gettlemen issued a decision holding that District U-46 intentionally discriminated against Hispanic students specific in their gifted programming (placement), and found problems with policies and instruments for students – Hispanic and Black students for SWAS. Judge Gettlemen found discrimination regarding (a) tests for screening and for identification, (b) designated cutoff scores for screening and identification, (c) use of both verbal and math scores at arbitrary designated levels for screening and for identification, (d) use of weighted matrix, as well as content and criteria in weighted matrices that favored achievement and traditional measures, (e) too little reliance on a nonverbal test (Naglieri Nonverbal Ability Test) for admission to SWAS, (f) re-testing Hispanic students for middle school gifted program, (g) timing of testing, (h) use of parental referrals, and (i) use of teacher referrals (see Table 2).
How to Equitably Identify Gifted

- Do **universal screening** with ability tests that do not require knowledge of English.
- Naglieri nonverbal has been shown to be an efficient way to test a large number of students for gifted programs.
- Adding Verbal and Quantitative tests that do not demand knowledge of English will increase participation of under-served populations.
- These tests will also be useful when using a matrix to avoid problems illustrated in the U-46 court case.
Numbers of White and Hispanic gifted student populations between 2000-2006

Dr. Dina Brulles Glendale, AZ
Gifted using NNAT in Years 2000-2006

- White
- Hispanic
Verbal Tests Discriminate

The district with 42% Hispanics only 2% were identified as gifted. Did the District discriminate against Hispanic Students?

CogAt Verbal, Quantitative require English

Weighted matrix favored achievement and CogAT

Too little reliance on NNAT

On July 11, 2013, Judge Robert Gettlemen issued a decision holding that District U-46 intentionally discriminated against Hispanic students specific in their gifted programming (placement), and found problems with policies and instruments for students – Hispanic and Black students for SWAS. Judge Gettlemen found discrimination regarding (a) tests for screening and for identification, (b) designated cutoff scores for screening and identification, (c) use of both verbal and math scores at arbitrary designated levels for screening and for identification, (d) use of weighted matrix, as well as content and criteria in weighted matrices that favored achievement and traditional measures, (e) too little reliance on a nonverbal test (Naglieri Nonverbal Ability Test) for admission to SWAS, (f) re-testing Hispanic students for middle school gifted program, (g) timing of testing, (h) use of parental referrals, and (i) use of teacher referrals (see Table 2).
How to Equitably Identify Gifted

- Do **universal screening** with ability tests that do not require knowledge of English
- Naglieri nonverbal has been shown to be an efficient way to test a large number of students for gifted programs
- Adding Verbal and Quantitative tests that do not demand knowledge of English will increase participation of under-served populations
- These tests will also be useful when using a matrix to avoid problems illustrated in the U-46 court case
WE CAN DO BETTER
Participate in Standardization of New Tests

- MHS is looking for standardization sites to finalize the development of these three tests.
- Raw score data (like normed standard scores) could be used as part of the process to identify students for gifted and talented educational programs.
- Contact: Sydney Scanlan, Data Collection Coordinator at MHS: sydney.scanlan@mhs.com
  800-456-3003 ext. 447
Final thoughts and questions please
Gifted Identification is a Social Justice Issue

MAKE A CAREER OF HUMANITY. COMMIT YOURSELF TO THE NOBLE STRUGGLE FOR EQUAL RIGHTS. YOU WILL MAKE A GREATER PERSON OF YOURSELF, A GREATER NATION OF YOUR COUNTRY, AND A FINER WORLD TO LIVE IN.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, 1959