Reis, S. M. & Renzulli, J. S. (2010). Opportunity gaps lead to achievement gaps: Encouragement for talent development and schoolwide enrichment in urban schools. *Journal of Education, 190*(1/2), 43–49.

Opportunity Gaps Lead to Achievement Gaps: Encouragement for Talent Development and Schoolwide Enrichment in Urban Schools

Sally M. Reis and Joseph S. Renzulli
University of Connecticut

The premise of this article is straightforward and simple: Students in urban schools are entitled to more enriching and engaging learning opportunities than they have been receiving. This lack of opportunity can often be attributed to the policies enacted under the current federal No Child Left Behind legislation. Enrichment-based learning opportunities are too seldom included in the types of remedial, direct, or test preparation instruction that is the norm in urban classrooms across the country. Additionally, all students who achieve at or above grade level are entitled to learning challenges and opportunities that enable them to make continuous progress in school. Too few advanced students receive differentiated instruction and content, and many are systematically held back in school (Archambault et al., 1993; Reis et al., 2004; Reis & Purcell, 1993; Westberg, Archambault, Dobyns, & Salvin, 1993). Furthermore, research has demonstrated that when urban students are given these types of accelerated, enriched, and differentiated learning opportunities, their general achievement and specific content area achievement improve (Colangelo, Assouline, & Gross, 2004; Gavin et al., 2007; Hébert & Reis, 1999; Little, Feng, VanTassel-Baska, Rogers, & Avery, 2007; Reis et al., 2007; Reis, Eckert, McCoach, Jacobs, & Coyne, 2008; VanTassel-Baska, Zuo, Avery, & Little, 2002). The same types of opportunities can also reduce underachievement in urban and suburban populations (Baum, 1988; Baum, Renzulli, & Hébert, 1995; Reis & Diaz, 1999). Research over the last two decades has also demonstrated that extending the use of enrichment and gifted education pedagogy to more children in urban schools leads to higher achievement for all students (Field, 2009; Gentry & Owen, 1999; Reis et al., 2007; Reis et al., 2008; Reis & Housand, 2009). This article describes the various enrichment approaches used in urban schools and summarizes research documenting higher learning outcomes and engagement for urban students who are exposed to an enriching curriculum.

The Schoolwide Enrichment Model

The Schoolwide Enrichment Model (SEM; Renzulli & Reis, 1985, 1997) has been implemented in school districts worldwide, and extensive evaluations and research studies support the effectiveness of the model that VanTassel-Baska and Brown (2007) described as one of the "mega-models" (p. 344) in the field (Renzulli & Reis, 1994; Reis & Renzulli, 2003; VanTassel-Baska & Brown, 2007). The model draws upon almost three decades of research and field-testing; this history demonstrates the model's effectiveness in schools with widely differing socioeconomic levels and program organization patterns (Olenchak & Renzulli, 1989; Reis & Renzulli, 2003; Renzulli & Reis, 1994). The findings of this research suggest that the model is effective in serving high-ability students enriching content for all students; and integrating enrichment into a variety of educational settings, including urban schools serving culturally

diverse and low socioeconomic populations (Olenchak & Renzulli, 1989; Reis & Renzulli, 2003; Renzulli & Reis, 1994). Prior research reveals that the model is also effective in serving students at all achievement levels in urban and suburban schools that serve diverse ethnic and socioeconomic populations (Reis & Renzulli, 2003; Renzulli & Reis, 1994). Beecher and Sweeny (2008), for example, strategically blended differentiated curriculum with schoolwide enrichment teaching and learning to reduce the achievement gap in an elementary urban school. In this school, the enrichment was integrated into daily instructional and curriculum practices that had previously embraced a remedial paradigm. This enrichment approach resulted in improved student achievement and a reduction in the achievement gap between students from varying socio-economic circumstances and different ethnic groups. Enrichment and differentiation were chosen as the methods to improve the learning environment based on research evidence that suggests that engagement in learning is enhanced: (a) when students' interests and choices are considered and (b) when students are regularly given enriched learning experiences that are responsive to the learning characteristics of a diverse student population (Beecher & Sweeny, 2008).

The SEM provides enriched learning experiences and introduces higher learning standards for all children through three goals: developing talents in all children, providing a broad range of advanced-level enrichment experiences for all students, and providing follow-up advanced learning for children based on their interests. This approach focuses on engagement, and enjoyable and challenging learning experiences constructed around students' preferences with regard to interests, ways of learning, and the creation of products.

The SEM combines the previously developed Enrichment Triad Model (Renzulli, 1977) with a flexible approach to identifying high-potential students; offering specific services and levels of enrichment to these students; and providing general enrichment to all other students (Renzulli & Reis, 1985). In schools that use the SEM, students receive several kinds of services, delivered either traditionally or through the use of technology. First, interest and learning preference assessments are conducted with students in the talent pool using either printed questionnaires or the Renzulli Learning program (Renzulli & Reis, 2007). Each student creates an on-line profile that identifies unique strengths and talents, and teachers can identify the patterns of the student's interests, products, and learning preferences across the three categories. These methods are used to both identify students' interests and to encourage students to develop and pursue these interests in various ways. Learning mode preferences include projects, independent study, teaching games, simulations, peer teaching, programmed instruction, lecture, drill and recitation, and discussion. Product preferences include the kinds of projects students like to complete, such as those that are written, oral, hands-on, or artistic, as well as dramatizations, displays, multimedia presentations, and service.

Enrichment Clusters

Another component of the Schoolwide Enrichment Model, called enrichment clusters, has been extensively used in urban schools. Clusters enable non-graded groups of students who share common interests to be grouped together during specially designated time blocks to work with an adult who shares their interest and who has some degree of advanced knowledge and expertise in the area. Research conducted on enrichment clusters in urban schools found that the use of enrichment clusters resulted in higher use of advanced content, thinking skills, and research

skills for all students, and that after classroom teachers had offered these advanced opportunities in their clusters, the majority also began using them in their regular classrooms (Reis, Gentry, & Maxfield, 1998).

Early in the school year, teachers and other school professionals are recruited to form enrichment clusters based on the students' interests, such as drama, history, creative writing, drawing, music, and archaeology. Training is given to the facilitators who agree to offer the clusters, and a brochure is developed and sent to all parents and students with descriptions of the enrichment clusters. Students select their top three choices and are placed in their first, or in some cases, second choice. Like extracurricular activities and programs such as 4-H and Junior Achievement, the main rationale for participation in one or more clusters is that *students and teachers want to be there.* All teachers and staff, including specialists in music, art, and physical education are involved in facilitating the clusters; their involvement in any particular cluster is based on the same type of interest assessment that is used for students when they select their clusters.

The Enrichment Triad Model

The curricular foundation for all SEM learning activities is the Enrichment Triad Model (Renzulli, 1977). The Triad Model was initially implemented in school districts as a gifted and talented program before it became integrated into whole school programming. Research on the use of the Enrichment Triad Model, and its integration into the SEM, has consistently shown the positive outcomes of the use of this approach with urban students, finding that the enriched and accelerated content can reverse underachievement and increase achievement (Baum, 1988; Delcourt, 1993; Hébert, 1993; Reis et al., 2007; Reis et al., 2008). The Triad Model is designed to encourage creative productivity on the part of students by exposing them to various topics, areas of interest, and fields of study. It is also designed to further train them to *apply* advanced content, process-training skills, and methodology training to self-selected areas of interest. Accordingly, three types of enrichment are included in the Enrichment Triad Model: General Exploratory Experiences, Group Training Activities, and Individual and Group Investigations.

In order for enrichment learning and teaching to be applied systematically to the learning process of all students, it must be organized in a way that makes sense to teachers and students; the Enrichment Triad Model can be used for this purpose. The Enrichment Triad Model is based on the ways in which people learn in a natural environment rather than the artificially structured environment that characterizes many classrooms. External stimulation, internal curiosity, necessity, or combinations of these three starting points cause people to develop an interest in a topic, problem, or area of study. Children are, by nature, curious and they enjoy problem solving, but in order for them to act upon a problem or interest with some degree of commitment and enthusiasm, the interest must be sincere and they must feel a personal reason for taking action. The Enrichment Triad Model enables the *interaction* between and among the following three types of enrichment, a process that is as important as any individual type or the collective sum of all three types.

Type I Enrichment: General Exploratory Experiences

Type I enrichment is designed to expose students to a wide variety of disciplines, topics, occupations, hobbies, persons, places, and events that would not ordinarily be covered in the regular curriculum. In schools using the SEM, an enrichment team of parents, teachers, and students often organizes and plans Type I experiences by contacting speakers, arranging mini-courses, demonstrations, or performances, or by ordering and distributing films, DVDs, videotapes, or other print or non-print media. Type I experiences can motivate students to such an extent that they will act on their interests in creative and productive ways. The major purpose of Type I enrichment is to include in the overall school program selected experiences that are purposefully developed to be both enjoyable and motivational, and that expose students to a wide variety of disciplines, topics, ideas, and concepts. Typical Type I methods of delivery include inviting a guest speaker, creating an interest center, showing videos, directing students to web sites, or hosting a debate.

The experiences can be based on the topics in the regular curriculum or innovative outgrowths of these topics, but in order to qualify as a bona fide Type I experience, any and all planned activities must stimulate new or present interests that may lead to more intensive follow-up on the parts of individual students or small groups of students. In Type I experiences, students are aware that the activity is an invitation to various kinds and levels of follow-up, and that many opportunities, resources, and encouragement exist for diverse kinds of follow-up.

The Type I dimension of the Enrichment Triad Model can be an extremely exciting aspect of urban education because it creates a legitimate place and time for integrating into students' learning experiences the broader world of knowledge and ideas that are above and beyond the regular curriculum. It is also an excellent vehicle for teams of teachers, students, and parents to plan and work together on a relatively easy-to-implement component of the SEM to expose students to new learning opportunities that they may want to pursue in greater depth.

Type II Enrichment: Group Training Activities

Most educators agree on the need to blend into the curriculum more training in the development of higher order thinking skills. Type II enrichment includes materials and methods designed to promote the development of cognitive thinking and affective processes. Some Type II enrichment is general, is carried out both in classrooms and in enrichment programs, and includes the development of the following: (a) creative thinking and problem solving, critical thinking, and affective processes; (b) affective and character development skills; (c) a wide variety of specific learning how-to-learn skills, such as classifying and analyzing data; (d) skills that are required for the appropriate use of advanced-level reference materials; and (e) written, oral, and visual communication skills. Other Type II enrichment is student specific; it cannot be planned beforehand and usually involves advanced instruction in an interest area selected by the student. For example, students who become interested in older buildings in their city after a Type I activity could pursue advanced learning in this area by reading about local history and architecture.

Type II training provides students with various learning opportunities designed to improve their independent learning skills as well as the quality of their personal assignments,

projects, and research. This type of enrichment also includes a broad range of affective training activities designed to improve interpersonal and intrapersonal skills and to promote greater degrees of cooperation and mutual respect among students. By placing this instruction within the framework of the regular curriculum or in enrichment clusters, teachers can offer these activities without the risk of having the training viewed as an end in and of itself. Types I and II enrichment are designed to be engaging learning opportunities for all children and to provide an integrated approach to learning for urban students, exposing them to new places, ideas, content areas, as well as problem-solving and thinking skills.

Type III Enrichment: Individual and Small Group Investigations

Type III enrichment includes investigative activities and the development of creative products in which students assume roles as investigators, writers, artists, or other types of practicing professionals. Although students pursue these kinds of involvement at a more junior level than adult professionals, the overriding purpose of Type III enrichment is to create situations that enable students to think, feel, and act the way practicing professionals do when they develop products and provide services. Type III enrichment experiences should be viewed as vehicles for using their interests, knowledge, thinking skills, creative ideas, and task commitment in self-selected problems or areas of study. In Type III enrichment, students acquire advanced-level understanding of the knowledge and methodology used within a particular discipline; develop authentic products or provide services directed toward bringing about a desired impact on one or more audiences; and gain self-directed learning skills in planning, problem finding and focusing, organizing, utilizing resources, and managing time. Type III projects develop task commitment, self-confidence, feelings of creative accomplishment, and the ability to interact effectively with other students and adults who share common goals and interests.

Type III enrichment is the vehicle through which everything from basic skills to advanced content and processes is blended in student-developed products and services. In much the same way that all of the separate but interrelated parts of an automobile come together at an assembly plant, this form of enrichment serves as the assembly plant of the mind. This kind of learning represents a synthesis and an application of content, process, and personal involvement. The student's role is transformed from one of lesson learner to firsthand inquirer, and the role of the teacher changes from instructor and disseminator of knowledge to a combination of coach, resource procurer, mentor, and, sometimes, partner or colleague. Students who pursue Type Ill products write short stories and poetry; they design science studies and build telescopes; they research local history and act as junior historians; and they pursue their interests in the arts, mathematics, leadership, and community action. In many ways, the opportunity to conduct a Type III study enables students to use their talents to pursue good work and to make a positive difference in their communities, as these independent or small group studies also create opportunities to solve local problems. For example, students have created campaigns about toy safety, assembled community food banks, and started small businesses to raise money for those in their urban neighborhoods who need assistance.

Renzulli Learning

In many SEM schools, enrichment is also provided using Renzulli Learning, an innovative online enrichment program based on the Enrichment Triad Model designed for students in both

urban and suburban schools. Independent research has demonstrated that this technology-based component of the SEM can increase student achievement. Field (2009) conducted a 16-week experimental study of students who participated in the SEM enrichment program and used Renzulli Learning for 2 to 3 hours each week. The experimental group demonstrated significantly higher growth in reading comprehension than control group students who did not participate in the program. The students who participated in the program also demonstrated significantly higher growth in oral reading fluency and social studies achievement than the students in the control group (Field, 2009).

Renzulli Learning enables access to enrichment during the day as well as after school and at home if computers and the Internet are available. The first step is a computer-based diagnostic profile of each student's academic strengths, interests, learning preferences, and preferred modes of expression. The on-line assessment, which takes about thirty minutes, results in a personalized profile that highlights individual student strengths and sets the stage for step two of Renzulli Learning. The profile serves as a compass for this second step, which is a differentiation search engine that examines thousands of resources that relate specifically to each student's profile. Student profiles can also be used to form groups who share common interests. A project management tool guides students and teachers to use specifically selected resources for assigned curricular activities, independent or small group investigative projects, and a wide variety of challenging enrichment experiences. Another management tool enables teachers to form instructional groups and enrichment clusters based on interests and learning preferences. Teachers have instant access to student profiles, all the sites visited on the Web, and the amount of time spent in each activity. Parents may also access their own child's profile and Web activities. In order to promote parent involvement, parents are encouraged to work with their children on some of their favorite activities.

Once a student's profile is selected, the differentiation search engine matches student strengths and interests to an enrichment database of more than 40,000 activities, materials, resources, and opportunities for further study that are grouped into the following categories: virtual field trips, real field trips, creativity training, critical thinking, projects and independent study, contests and competitions, websites, fiction and nonfiction books, summer programs, online activities, research skills, and high interest videos and DVDs. These resources are intended not merely to inform students about new information or occupy time surfing the Web. Rather, they are used as vehicles to help students find and focus on a problem or engage in a creative exploration of personal interest to pursue in greater depth. Many of the resources provide the methods of inquiry, advanced-level thinking and creative problem-solving skills, and investigative approaches. Students are guided toward the *application of knowledge* in the development of original research studies, creative projects, and action-oriented undertakings that put knowledge to work in personally meaningful areas of interest, and provide students with suggestions for outlets and audiences for their creative products. The resources available in step two also provide students with opportunities to pursue advanced-level training in their areas of strength and personal interest.

Another opportunity in Renzulli Learning is a management plan for Type III projects called the Wizard Project Maker. Using this project planner, teachers can help students target their Web-based explorations to undertake original research or investigative projects, and then to engage in a wide variety of creative undertakings. The sophisticated software used in this tool

automatically locates potentially relevant web-based resources that can be used in connection with the student's investigative activity. This management device is designed to enable students to complete Type III Enrichment experiences on-line. Specifically, the Project Maker guides the students in the use of metacognitive skills for defining a project and setting a goal; identifying and evaluating both the resources to which they have access and the resources they need (e.g., time, Internet sites, teacher or mentor assistance); prioritizing and refining goals; balancing the resources needed to meet multiple goals; learning from past actions and projecting future outcomes; and monitoring progress and making necessary adjustments as a project unfolds. The Wizard Project Maker helps students make the best use of web resources, focus their interests as they pursue advanced level work, and establish a creative and viable responsibility for teachers in their role as "the guide on the side." Using the Wizard Project Maker helps students to pursue advanced levels of challenge and engagement and begin to regard their teachers as mentors rather than mere disseminators of knowledge.

Finally, the Renzulli Learning System enables the automatic compilation and storage of all student activity into an ongoing student record called the Total Talent Portfolio. A management tool allows students to evaluate each site visited and resource used by completing a self-assessment of what they derived from the resource. Students can store favorite activities and resources in their portfolio, allowing easy return-access to ongoing work. Through the use of an access code, teachers and parents can review the portfolio at any time and give feedback and guidance to individual students. The portfolio also provides parents with information about students' work and affords them opportunities to be involved. The Total Talent Portfolio can travel with students throughout their years at the school to serve as a reminder of previous activities and creative accomplishments that they may include in college applications. It is an ongoing record that can help students, teachers, guidance counselors, and parents make decisions about future educational and vocational plans.

Resources in Renzulli Learning enable teachers to differentiate assignments and send tiered and compacted assignments to students by placing them in their electronic talent portfolio. Teachers can also use Renzulli Learning to group students based on their interests, and preferences in ways of learning, modes of expression, or creation of products.

Differentiation and Curriculum Compacting

Other components of the SEM are curriculum differentiation and compacting. Classroom teachers can learn to differentiate curriculum and instruction in their regular classroom situations and to extend gifted education strategies and pedagogy to all content areas (Colangelo et al., 2004; Field, 2009; Little et al., 2007; Reis, Gentry, et al., 1998; Reis et al., 2007; Reis, Westberg, Kulikowich, & Purcell, 1998; Tieso, 2002). Curriculum compacting has been used to eliminate previously mastered work for high ability/gifted students in both urban and suburban schools. When classroom teachers eliminated from 40 to 50% of the previously mastered regular curriculum for high-ability students, no differences were found between students whose work was compacted and students who did *all* the work in reading, math computation, social studies, and spelling (Reis, Westberg, et al., 1998). All classroom teachers can learn to use compacting, but they need coaching and help to substitute appropriately challenging options. Although teachers are often initially trained to use the compacting process with gifted and high-potential students, they subsequently use this strategy with all students. Differentiation for urban students

should include strategies such as curriculum compacting and using accelerated learning opportunities.

Curriculum compacting streamlines the grade-level curriculum for high potential students in order to make time for more challenging and interesting work. This differentiation strategy was specifically designed to make appropriate curricular adjustments for students in any content area and at any grade level. The procedure involves the following: (a) defining the goals and outcomes of a particular unit or block of instruction; (b) determining the students who have already mastered most or all of a specified set of learning outcomes and documenting the evidence; and (c) providing replacement strategies for learned material through the use of instructional options that enable a more challenging, interesting, and productive use of the student's time, often, the Enrichment Triad approach.

The Schoolwide Enrichment Model in Reading (SEM-R)

During the last several years, in more than two-dozen urban schools across the country, the Schoolwide Enrichment Model in Reading (SEM-R; Reis et al., 2009) has been implemented as an enrichment-based approach to reading that evolved from the SEM (Renzulli, 1977; Renzulli & Reis, 1997). The SEM-R focuses on challenging, self-selected reading materials, accompanied by instruction in higher-order thinking skills and strategies. A second core focus of the SEM-R is differentiation of instruction and reading content, coupled with more challenging reading experiences. and advanced opportunities for metacognitive reading. This differentiation of instruction in reading is critical, as a wide variation exists in the range of reading levels in most elementary and middle school classrooms. In the classrooms where SEM-R is used, the range of reading instructional levels spans eight or more grade levels. For example, it is often the case that some third-grade students read on a first-grade level, while others in the same class read on an eighth-grade level.

The SEM-R has been implemented in urban schools under rigorous research conditions during the last 4 years with positive results in every study (Reis et al., 2007; Reis et al., 2008). Results in the initial years were so promising that an increased allotment of federal funds enabled the researchers to conduct additional studies on the SEM-R in urban schools across the country. In each urban implementation of the SEM-R, students' scores in reading fluency and comprehension increased significantly when compared to a control group (Reis et al., 2007; Reis et al., 2008).

The model has been effective in increasing reading fluency and comprehension scores, as well as improving attitudes toward reading for elementary and middle school students placed at risk of poor reading performance due to poverty, attendance at a low-performing school, or linguistic diversity (Housand & Reis, 2008; Reis, et al., 2007; Reis et al., 2008; Reis & Housand, 2009). In the SEM-R, students' strengths and interests are analyzed, and reading instruction is delivered through the use of gifted education pedagogy, including curricular differentiation, both acceleration and enrichment, as well as instructional differentiation.

Three phases of SEM-R can be implemented during part of a language arts block or during independent reading time, such as silent, sustained independent reading (SSR) or Drop Everything and Read (DEAR). During Phase 1, teachers present short read-alouds from high-

quality, engaging literature to introduce students to a wide variety of titles, genres, authors, and topics. Along with these read-alouds, teachers provide reading strategy instruction through modeling and discussion, demonstrating reading strategies and self-regulation, and using higher-order questions to guide discussion. Early in the study period, these Phase 1 activities last about 20 minutes per day; Phase 1 decreases in length relative to the increase in time spent in Phase 2 over the course of the intervention.

Phase 2 of the SEM-R emphasizes the development of students' ability to engage in supported independent reading (SIR) of self-selected, appropriately challenging books, with differentiated instructional support provided through conferences with the teacher or another adult. During Phase 2, students select books that are at a challenging instructional level, at least 1 to 1.5 grade levels above their current independent reading levels. Teachers monitor and evaluate each book and assist students in the selection of books that are at appropriately challenging instructional levels. Students learn strategies for recognizing appropriately challenging books, and they are coached to select challenging instructional-level books in areas of their interest to promote engagement. Most students initially read for 5 to 15 minutes a day during Phase 2, but over time they extend SIR to 20 to 25 minutes, and finally to 35 to 45 minutes each day. During this in-class reading time, students participate in individualized reading conferences with their teachers; on average, each student participates in one to two conferences per week, and conferences usually last about 5 to 7 minutes. In student conferences and student logs, teachers consistently monitor and document the instructional challenge match of each book read in Phase 2. During the conferences, classroom teachers and instructional aides assess reading fluency and comprehension and provide individualized instruction in strategy use, including predicting, using inferences, and making connections. For more advanced readers, these differentiated conferences focus less on specific reading strategies and more on higher-order questions and critical concepts.

In Phase 3, students change from teacher-directed opportunities to self-selected activities over the course of the intervention. Activities include but are not limited to opportunities to explore new technology; participate in discussion groups, free reading, book chats, or creativity experiences in the language arts; develop interest-based projects; practice advanced questioning and thinking skills; and work in learning centers. The intent of these experiences is to provide time for students to pursue areas of personal interest through the use of interest development centers and the Internet to learn to read critically and to locate other reading materials, especially high-quality, challenging literature.

The SEM-R was designed with attention to key principles of differentiation as well as enrichment, with urban schools as the target population. The three phases reflect different grouping structures; flexibility in instructional delivery; differentiation by student readiness, interest, and learning preferences; and individualized differentiated assessment and instruction targeted to the needs of individual students. The focus on self-regulation supports the management of the framework by giving responsibility for classroom management to students as well as teachers.

Summary

The SEM and related services and programs described in this article focus on the development of both academic and creative talents through enrichment and engaging learning experiences. The research that provides compelling evidence has been summarized in the hope that urban educators will consider implementing this approach. The research supports the use of enrichment and gifted education pedagogy to provide enjoyable learning experiences as well as increased achievement scores for urban students and also presents evidence that this approach may be more effective than the use of other types of programs. Overemphasis on test preparation and mechanistic instruction and the use of remedial materials has made many urban classrooms dreary places to learn. When enrichment pedagogy is extended to urban students, these high-end opportunities can provide more advanced and enriched learning experiences that promote creativity and engagement, as well as enable students to apply thinking skills and use knowledge in an integrated, inductive, and problem-oriented manner. In urban classrooms where students are using Renzulli Learning, both engagement and wonder emerge when they take a virtual field trip to a world-famous museum, research a topic in their area of interest, complete a self-selected independent study, or apply critical and creative thinking skills in areas of choice. The SEM integrates advanced opportunities for talent development in different types and levels of enrichment, and differentiation for students in all learning opportunities, such as enrichment clusters, the SEM-R, Renzulli Learning, and the Enrichment Triad Model.

The many changes taking place in urban schools should enable educators to examine a broad range of techniques for providing equitably for *all* students. The research described in this article and the practical experiences gained through a few decades of field testing and refining the SEM, particularly in urban areas and in schools that serve culturally diverse students, have demonstrated the many positive benefits to students and teachers that result from using an enrichment approach, including higher achievement and lower underachievement (Baum, 1988; Beecher & Sweeny, 2008; Gavin et al., 2007; Little et al., 2007; Reis et al., 2007; Reis et al., 2008). Academically talented students, who may be placed at risk for underachieving in school, are also the beneficiaries of this type of pedagogy. Like any innovation, implementing programs such as those described in this article requires time, energy, acceptance, and support from teachers. Yet urban educators who have effectively implemented the SEM and its related programs indicate that it takes no longer than normal teaching practices (Reis & Renzulli, 2003). More important, they report that the benefits for all students make their efforts worthwhile, suggesting that engagement and enjoyment should be considered an integral part of urban education. One urban teacher's comment about enrichment clusters reflects the attitude of most teachers who have participated in enrichment pedagogy research, *"Suddenly I remembered why I had gone into teaching* in *the first place. I had forgotten, and I didn't even know I had forgotten. Then I remembered what I had always thought teaching would be all about"* (Reis, Gentry, & Park, 1995).

References

Archambault, F. X., Jr., Westberg, K. L., Brown, S. W., Hallmark, B. W., Emmons, C. L., & Zhang, W. (1993). *Regular classroom practices with gifted students: Results of a national survey of classroom teachers* (Research Monograph 93102). Storrs: University of Connecticut, The National Research Center on the Gifted and Talented. https://nrcgt.uconn.edu/wp-content/uploads/sites/953/2015/04/rm93102.pdf

Baum, S. M. (1988). An enrichment program for gifted learning disabled students. *Gifted Child Quarterly, 32*(1), 226–230. https://doi.org/10.1177/001698628803200108

Baum, S. M., Renzulli, J. S., & Hébert, T. P. (1995). Reversing underachievement: Creative productivity as a systematic intervention. *Gifted Child Quarterly, 39*(4), 224–235. https://doi.org/10.1177/001698629503900406

Beecher, M., & Sweeny, S. M. (2008). Closing the achievement gap with curriculum enrichment and differentiation: One school's story. *Journal of Advanced Academics, 19*(3), 502–530. https://doi.org/10.4219/jaa-2008-815

Colangelo, N., Assouline, S., & Gross, M. U. M. (Eds.). (2004). *A nation deceived: How schools hold back America's brightest students*. Iowa City, IA: The University of Iowa.

Delcourt, M. A. B. (1993). Creative productivity among secondary school students: Combining energy, interest and imagination. *Gifted Child Quarterly, 37*(1), 23–31. https://doi.org/10.1177/001698629303700104

Field, G. B. (2009). The effects of the use of Renzulli Learning on student achievement in reading comprehension, reading fluency, social studies, and science. *International Journal of Emerging Technology in Learning, 4*(1), 29–39. https://doi.org/10.3991/ijet.v4i1.629

Gavin, M. K., Casa, T. M., Adelson, J. L., Carroll, S. R., & Sheffield, L. J., & Spinelli, A. M. (2007). Project M^3: Mentoring mathematical minds–A research-based curriculum for talented elementary students. *Journal of Advanced Academics, 18*(4), 566–585. https://doi.org/10.4219/jaa-2007-552

Gentry, M., & Owen, S. V. (1999). An investigation of the effects of total school flexible cluster grouping on identification, achievement, and classroom practices. *Gifted Child Quarterly, 43*(4), 224–243. https://doi.org/10.1177/001698629904300402

Hébert, T. P. (1993). Reflections at graduation: The long-term impact of elementary school experiences in creative productivity. *Roeper Review, 16*(1), 22–28. https://doi.org/10.1080/02783199309553529

Hébert, T. P., & Reis, S. M. (1999). Culturally diverse high achieving students in an urban high school. *Urban Education, 34*(4), 428–457. https://doi.org/10.1177/0042085999344002

Housand, A., & Reis, S. M. (2008). Self-regulated learning in reading: Gifted pedagogy and instructional settings. *Journal for Advanced Academics, 20*(1), 108–136. https://doi.org/10.4219/jaa-2008-865

Little, C. A., Feng, A. X., VanTassel-Baska, J., Rogers, K. B., & Avery, L. D. (2007). A study of curriculum effectiveness in social studies. *Gifted Child Quarterly, 51*, 272-284.

Olenchak, F. R., & Renzulli, J. S. (1989). The effectiveness of the Schoolwide Enrichment Model on selected aspects of elementary school change. *Gifted Child Quarterly, 33*(1), 36–46. https://doi.org/10.1177/001698628903300106

Reis, S. M., & Diaz, E. I. (1999, March). Economically disadvantaged urban female students who achieve in school. *The Urban Review, 31*, 31–54. https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1023244315236

Reis, S. M., Eckert, R. D., Fogarty, E. A., Little, C. A., Housand, A. M., Sweeny, S. M., Housand, B. C., & Sullivan, E. E. (2009). *Joyful reading: Differentiation and enrichment for successful literacy learning, grades K-8.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Reis, S. M., Eckert, R. D., McCoach, D. B., Jacobs, J. K., & Coyne, M. (2008). Using enrichment reading practices to increase reading fluency, comprehension, and attitudes. *Journal of Educational Research, 101*(5), 299–314. https://doi.org/10.3200/JOER.101.5.299-315

Reis, S. M., Gentry, M., & Maxfield, L. R. (1998). The application of enrichment clusters to teachers' classroom practices. *Journal for Education of the Gifted, 21*(3), 310–324. https://doi.org/10.1177/016235329802100304

Reis, S. M., Gentry, M., & Park, S. (1995). *Extending the pedagogy of gifted education to all students* (Research Monograph 95118). Storrs: University of Connecticut, The National Research Center on the Gifted and Talented. https://nrcgt.uconn.edu/wp-content/uploads/sites/953/2015/04/rm95118.pdf

Reis, S. M., Gubbins, E. J., Briggs, C., Schreiber, F., Richards, S., Jacobs, J., & Renzulli, J. S. (2004). Reading instruction for talented readers: Case studies documenting few opportunities for continuous progress. *Gifted Child Quarterly, 48*(4), 315–338. https://doi.org/10.1177/001698620404800406

Reis, S. M., & Housand, A. M. (2009). The impact of gifted education pedagogy and enriched reading practices on reading achievement for urban students in bilingual and English-speaking classes. *Journal of Urban Education, 6*(1), 72–86.

Reis, S. M., McCoach, D. B., Coyne, M., Schreiber, F. J., Eckert, R. D., & Gubbins, E. J. (2007). Using planned enrichment strategies with direct instruction to improve reading fluency, comprehension, and attitude toward reading: An evidence-based study. *Elementary School Journal, 108*(1), 3–24. https://doi.org/10.1086/522383

Reis, S. M., & Purcell, J. H. (1993). An analysis of content elimination and strategies used by elementary classroom teachers in the curriculum compacting process. *Journal for the Education of the Gifted, 16*(2), 147–170. https://doi.org/10.1177/016235329301600205

Reis, S. M., & Renzulli, J. S. (2003). Research related to the Schoolwide Enrichment Triad Model. *Gifted Education International, 18*(1), 15–39. https://doi.org/10.1177/026142940301800104

Reis, S. M., Westberg, K. L., Kulikowich, J. M., & Purcell, J. H. (1998). Curriculum compacting and achievement test scores: What does the research say? *Gifted Child Quarterly, 42*(2), 123–129. https://doi.org/10.1177/001698629804200206

Renzulli, J. S. (1977). *The enrichment triad model: A Guide for developing defensible programs for the gifted and talented.* Mansfield Center, CT: Creative Learning Press.

Renzulli, J. S., & Reis, S. M. (1985). *The Schoolwide Enrichment Model: A comprehensive plan for educational excellence.* Mansfield Center, CT: Creative Learning Press.

Renzulli, J. S., & Reis, S. M. (1994). Research related to the Schoolwide Enrichment Triad Model. *Gifted Child Quarterly, 38*(1), 7–20. https://doi.org/10.1177/001698629403800102

Renzulli, J. S., & Reis, S. M. (1997). *The Schoolwide Enrichment Model: A guide for developing defensible programs for the gifted and talented.* Mansfield Center, CT: Creative Learning Press.

Renzulli, J. S., & Reis, S. M. (2007). A technology based program that matches enrichment resources with student strengths. *International Journal of Emerging Technologies in Learning, 2*(3), 1–12.

Tieso, C. L. (2002). *The effects of grouping and curricular practices on intermediate students' math achievement* (RM02154). Storrs: University of Connecticut, The National Research Center on the Gifted and Talented. https://nrcgt.uconn.edu/wp-content/uploads/sites/953/2015/04/rm02154.pdf

VanTassel-Baska, J., & Brown, E. F. (2007). Toward best practice: An analysis of the efficacy of curriculum models in gifted education. *Gifted Child Quarterly*, *51*(4), 342–358. https://doi.org/10.1177/0016986207306323

VanTassel-Baska, J., Zuo, L., Avery, L. D., & Little, C. A. (2002). A curriculum study of gifted-student learning in the language arts. *Gifted Child Quarterly*, *46*(1), 30–44. https://doi.org/10.1177/001698620204600104

Westberg, K. L., Archambault, F. X., Jr., Dobyns, S. M., & Salvin, T. J. (1993). *An observational study of instructional and curricular practices used with gifted and talented students in regular classrooms* (Research Monograph 93104). Storrs: University of Connecticut, The National Research Center on the Gifted and Talented. https://nrcgt.uconn.edu/wp-content/uploads/sites/953/2015/04/rm93104.pdf

Sally M. Reis is a Board of Trustees Distinguished Professor and Teaching Fellow at the University of Connecticut. Professor Reis can be reached at the University of Connecticut, 2131 Hillside Road, Unit 3007, Storrs, CT 06269-3007; sally.reis@uconn.edu.

Joseph S. Renzulli is the Director of The National Research Center on the Gifted and Talented, a Board Trustees Distinguished Professor, and the Raymond and Lynn Neag Professor of Gifted Education and Talent Development at the University of Connecticut. Professor Renzulli can be reached at the University of Connecticut, 2131 Hillsdale Road, Unit 3007, Storrs, CT 06269-3007; joseph.renzulli@uconn.edu.