High ability students with coexisting disabilities: Implications for school psychological practice
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Abstract
School psychologists are well-positioned to change the educational landscape for twice-exceptional students, or those who possess high ability in one or more talent domains along with one or more disabilities. Better understanding of the nuanced cognitive and psychosocial assessment patterns within this population may increase well-needed participation in gifted education opportunities and the likelihood of receiving accommodations, as well as decrease missed diagnoses. Based on our review of the empirical literature within domains of twice-exceptionality (e.g., attention deficit hyperactivity disorder, autism spectrum disorder, and specific learning disability), we provide recommendations for how school psychologists can interpret formative and summative assessments taken by twice-exceptional students and subsequently help design educational plans that will meet their unique needs.
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1 | INTRODUCTION

The general description of school psychology (American Psychological Association, n.d., paragraph 1) defines the school psychologist as a professional “... concerned with the science and practice of psychology with children, youth, families, learners of all ages, and the school process,” which would suggest gifted education is not precluded from the skill set of a school psychologist. Yet, “giftedness,” or high ability, is not included in the descriptions of the parameters of practice, populations served, or list of problems and procedures. However, the professional practice of school psychology extensively recognizes the concepts of disability, disorder, and problems associated with disabilities, concepts that are predominant in the general description.
These observations are neither an indictment or criticism of school psychologists, rather a recognition that there is a significant divide between the broad fields of gifted education and special education that does not serve the full range of individuals who would benefit from the knowledge and skills of a school psychologist. Our purpose is to address disability within the context of giftedness and demonstrate that giftedness and disability are not mutually exclusive; rather, they are related concepts that characterize a special population known as twice-exceptional.

2 | OVERVIEW

2.1 | Giftedness and disability

Both giftedness and disability are social constructs. Although there is no microscope or biological assay that can detect giftedness or disability, there has been great interest in the brain, intelligence, disability, and genius well before the common era (BCE; Sattler, 2018). Furthermore, the lack of biological markers did not deter early psychologists (e.g., Alfred Binet, Lewis Terman, or Leta Hollingworth) from developing and using mental measures to assess behaviors associated with these social constructs.

As societies evolved to recognize the value of education, they necessarily found that various principles of measurement, for example, standardizing and norming, were essential to understanding how some individuals scored at exceptional levels, relative to what was considered average, or age expected. In a seminal article, Robinson et al. (2000) argued both giftedness and disability represent exceptionalities and professionals in both fields could learn from each other, especially with respect to better understanding cognitive ability, developmental differences, and best practice for assessment and intervention. Building upon Robinson et al. (2000) work, Assouline and Whiteman (2011) advocated that one way to bridge the divide between the two seemingly disparate terms was to (a) use the term twice-exceptional when describing an individual with giftedness or high ability and a diagnosed disorder or disability and (b) always use a hyphen; twice-exceptional then becomes a compound word, thus grammatically demonstrating the concepts are linked and complex.

To better understand the awareness, knowledge, and experience among professionals in the educational and psychological communities, Foley-Nicpon, Assouline, & Colangelo, (2013) distributed a survey among professionals who were predominately associated with the gifted education community; participants from 40 states responded. The four groups of professionals in the Foley-Nicpon et al. sample (regular teacher, gifted specialist, special educator, or psychologist) varied in their familiarity with the concept of twice-exceptionality. Specifically, gifted educators had more familiarity than psychologists. This was not surprising considering the Robertson et al. (2011) findings from their survey of a sample of the National Association of School Psychologists. Robertson et al. (2011) found 37% of the psychologists reported receiving no training regarding gifted, including individuals who are “twice-exceptional,” and 66.2% reported never or rarely conducting gifted student evaluations. While the scope of school psychology practice appears to include high ability youth, the practice of school psychology does not.

2.2 | Giftedness and the school psychologist

Despite the fact interest in high ability entered the public lexicon in the early to mid-20th century, there is no federal law that recognizes giftedness, nor that promotes maximization of education as a goal. Indeed, the underlying (mis)assumption is that individuals with high cognitive ability will succeed no matter what is offered through the academic environment. A federal report, commissioned by the U.S. Congress (Marland, 1972), put forth a definition of giftedness that is still broadly used, albeit inconsistently implemented, across the United States. The
report suggests high ability children should be identified by a qualified professional but does not specify what type of professional possesses the qualifications. Yet, the findings from Robertson et al. (2011) would suggest school psychologists do not typically include assessment of giftedness within their toolkit of skills. In part, this may be related to the fact that the gifted education community still wrestles with theoretical issues (Dai & Chen, 2013), including such fundamental aspects as definition and identification (Lo & Porath, 2017), which directly impact service.

Dai and Chen (2013) present three paradigms within the gifted education world, the gifted child paradigm, the talent development paradigm, and the differentiation paradigm. Enhancing the awareness of school psychologists about all three paradigms would effectively provide more awareness about gifted education and the nuances that relate to issues in which school psychologists could contribute. For example, the concept of differentiation, which is familiar to school psychologists who work with educators to adjust the curriculum for students who have learning differences, can be applied when working with educators who need to differentiate the curriculum to ensure students with high ability are appropriately challenged. The topic of talent development is steeped in the literature related to precocity, above-level testing, and acceleration (Assouline & Lupkowski-Shoplik, 2012; Assouline, Colangelo, Van Tassel-Baska, & Lupkowski-Shoplik, 2015). All three areas have counterparts in the special education world. However, these counterparts are not the same as mirror images.

2.3 | Disability and the school psychologist

Individuals with disabilities are protected by federal legislation and school psychologists play an enormous role in student assessment, identification, and generation of evidence-based recommendations to address the disability. Assouline and Whiteman (2011) briefly describe how legislation prohibiting discrimination against individuals based on race, color, or national origin contributed to legislation protecting individuals with disabilities from discrimination. Disability legislation as applied to the academic setting shifted from a focus on prohibiting discrimination to promoting the rights of individuals with a disability to a Free and Appropriate Public Education and the Least Restrictive Environment. With that original legislation and through several reauthorizations, 13 categories of disability were established along with the responsibly of professionals to define (and refine) eligibility for special education services.

Assouline and Whiteman (2011) also addressed the importance of differential diagnosis when referring to a disability. The field of special education fully recognizes the differences among diagnostic categories, especially with respect to differential diagnosis. Data related to the 13 disability categories in the Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act (IDEA) are collected so that compliance with IDEA can be monitored. Relevant data from the most recent Condition of Education Report (McFarland et al., 2019) appear in Table 1. As presented, the highest percentage of students eligible for services are under the category of specific learning disability (SLD) and when combined with speech or language impairment, the two categories account for more than 50% of students aged 3–21 served. Professionally, school psychologists are more involved with the first, SLD. Other health impairment, which includes several conditions including attention deficit hyperactivity disorder (ADHD), is also an area served by school psychologists. Autism, the prevalence of which has increased significantly in the general population, includes 10% of the students who are eligible under IDEA. A separate report (Cortiella & Horowitz, 2014) from the National Center for Learning Disabilities offers fascinating details about identification and accommodations for individuals with SLD. One recommendation in the report is that more information is needed on “how and to what extent students who are both gifted and who have LD are being identified and served through RTI” (p. 35). These and related issues call on school psychologists to include within their purview knowledge, awareness, and skills regarding assessment and intervention with twice-exceptional students.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disability category/percentage</th>
<th>Total (male/female)</th>
<th>White (% served)</th>
<th>Black (% served)</th>
<th>Hispanic (% served)</th>
<th>Asian (% served)</th>
<th>Pacific Islander (% served)</th>
<th>American Indian/Alaska native (% served)</th>
<th>Two or more races (% served)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All categories</td>
<td>14 (17/9)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLD</td>
<td>34 (34/44)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech and language impairment</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other health impairment</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autism</td>
<td>10 (13/5)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual disability</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional disturbance</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple disabilities</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearing impairment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orthopedic impairment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Total is for the students’ ages 3–21; male and female are reported for the students’ ages 6–21, when only one number appears in the column, it means that the male/female comparisons were not available.

Abbreviations: IDEA, Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act; NA, not available or reported; SLD, specific learning disability.

Identification for programming and eligibility for services are nuanced terms that impact the practice of school psychologists when it comes to understanding the dual exceptionalities of giftedness and disability within one person. Assouline et al. (2006) advocated for terms, for example, strengths or talents rather than giftedness, or vulnerabilities rather than disability, which would recognize that the twice-exceptional individual is not easily categorized. School psychologists are the ideal professionals to understand the unique profiles of strengths and areas for growth present in assessments of twice-exceptional learners so that recommendations for talent development, and disability accommodations, can be made. To ground the discussion and relevance for school psychologists, we briefly review the empirical literature in the domains most commonly addressed in the twice-exceptional literature: high ability with SLD, autism spectrum disorder (ASD), and ADHD.

3.1 High ability students with SLD

A key issue relevant to school psychologists is the identification of high ability students with SLD. These students demonstrate talent in one or more domains and a coexisting SLD in one or more academic areas. Debates around about how to identify these students abound (e.g., Assouline, Foley Nicpon, & Whiteman, 2010; Lovett, 2011; Maddocks, 2018, 2020) and no standardized manner exists, which may contribute to late identification and/or no identification at all (Reis, Baum, & Burke, 2014). Further, the student’s learning difficulty in and of itself can negatively impact performance on standardized tests (Bell, Taylor, McCallum, Coles, & Hayes, 2015), which may make identification for gifted programs challenging.

Recent research highlights the importance of considering the duality of cognitive and academic performance in identifying gifted students with SLDs. Maddocks (2018) examined the Woodcock-Johnson III Test of Cognitive Abilities and Tests of Achievement among the test’s normative sample of 4,783 students. By examining rates of identified gifted SLD, gifted, and SLD profiles based on various specified identification criteria, she found that solely using a discrepancy model (1.5 SDs) would overidentify gifted SLD, a finding supported by the psychometric holes present in the discrepancy model because of measurement error and regression to the mean (Fletcher, Lyon, Fuchs, & Barnes, 2007). Yet, Maddocks (2018) further noted the importance of discrepancy models in identifying gifted students with learning disabilities (Gilman et al., 2013) because it is the best way to recognize individual areas of talent and disability. For example, a student with a Verbal Comprehension Index score of 135 whose reading scores vary from 95 to 100 may be reading within an “average” level but is certainly not performing academically as one might expect with verbal skills greater than two standard deviations above the mean. In a similar study, Maddocks (2020) examined rates of identified gifted, gifted SLD, and SLD profiles among 3,865 students from the normative sample of the fourth version of the test (Woodcock-Johnson IV tests of Cognitive Abilities and Achievement). Results were very similar with the high ability students with SLD exhibiting greater score variability than the SLD and gifted only groups.

To correct possible overidentification of gifted students with SLD, Maddocks (2018) suggested using a combination of the discrepancy model, absolute performance criteria (i.e., at or below age/grade-level expectations), and core deficits, such as processing, as a multifaceted process that both identifies low achievement and high ability in the same person. The core deficit component of a combination model is crucial because processing speed and working memory skills are frequently discrepant from verbal and nonverbal skills in twice-exceptional students (Assouline et al., 2010). This method is similar to those of others who emphasize cross battery approaches as opposed to ability–achievement discrepancies or Response to Intervention (RtI) only methods of identification (Flanagan, Fiorello, & Ortiz, 2010). Additionally, Maddocks’s method provides further support for considering test score patterns of strengths and areas for growth when identifying gifted students with SLD, rather
than a reliance on an overall composite score. Maddox's second study (2020) validated her original model through replication with a similar sample. She concluded “...the results suggest that the identification criteria in this study achieved reasonable validity and, if anything, may have been more stringent than some criteria used in the past 2e-LD research by requiring a cognitive weakness” (p. 15).

Duality in profiles of gifted students with SLD may extend to psychosocial factors. Beckmann and Minnaert (2018) conducted a systematic review of studies examining noncognitive or psychosocial characteristics among high ability students with SLD. Authors summarized 23 studies with various methodologies to find common characteristics among participants. Trends noted included students’ negative opinion of school, negative attitudes and emotions, negative self-perceptions, and being socially withdrawn. Yet Beckman and Minnaert also found students were motivated, resilient, self-aware, and persevering. Across studies, participants reported frustration with the difference between their potential and their school performance. This is a common anecdotal statement made by parents of twice-exceptional students, as well as the students themselves, that was supported with empirical data.

The recommendation most often made for twice-exceptional students is to provide them with exposure to content in their talent domains, while remediating their weaknesses or areas of growth (Baum, Schader, & Hébert, 2014; Foley Nicpon & Assouline, 2015). This recommendation is grounded in empirical evidence. For example, in an investigation of the differences between math talent and math disability, Abreu-Mendoza et al. (2018) found executive functions related to math talent differed from those related to math disabilities. Those with math talent were better at shifting attention with changing instructions than those with average math skills, and those with math disabilities had poorer visuospatial working memory skills than those with average math skills. In two similar studies (Ottone-Cross et al., 2017, 2018), investigating performance on the Kaufman Tests of Educational Achievement, Third Edition, among three separate groups (gifted, SLD, and gifted students with SLD), researchers found unique patterns of performance in the gifted SLD group. Specifically, academic scores were lowest in the SLD group and highest in the gifted group, with the performance of the gifted SLD group in the middle. More detailed analyses revealed gifted students with SLD performed more like gifted students on higher-order skill assessments, and more similar to students with SLD on lower-order skill assessments. Additionally, the students with SLD demonstrated average academic performance, whereas the gifted with SLD group almost always had peaks and valleys in their academic performance (Ottone-Cross et al., 2017). These findings, along with the others mentioned, indicate that if accommodations are granted only for a disability, gifted students with SLD miss out on talent development opportunities to enrich their areas of strength. Because of the peaks and valleys in cognitive and academic performance, they may not be identified for a gifted program that relies on composite scores for entry.

3.2 High ability students with ASD

ASD is a neurodevelopmental disorder impacting one's social, communication, and behavioral functioning. Prevalence rates of ASD were increasing at startling levels but have recently plateaued at around 2.47% of the U.S. population of children and adolescents (Xu, Strathearn, Liu, & Bao, 2018). ASD occurs across the ability spectrum, including among those with high ability. Some researchers have focused on the high ability with ASD population, and some recent findings are important for school psychologists to consider. For example, many parents of children with ASD have multiple concerns about their child's educational environment, including educators' ability to meet their child's complex needs, communicate and collaborate about their child's strengths and areas of concern, and provide their child social opportunities (Rubenstein, Schelling, Wilczynski, & Hooks, 2015). In their qualitative study of 11 parents of gifted students with ASD, Rubenstein et al. (2015) found parents reported symptoms, such as intense interests, rigidity, and difficulty communicating, were challenging for both parents and educators to manage. When educators did not have proper training regarding gifted students with ASD and their needs, there were additional issues, such as inflexible instructional approaches.
School psychologists with concerns that a child may have ASD may be in a position to administer screening or diagnostic instruments, and emerging evidence suggests twice-exceptional students may perform differently on these measures. For example, well known autism screening instruments such as the Autism Spectrum Screening Questionnaire and the Social Responsiveness Scale did not reliability screen for ASD in a sample of 23 high ability students with ASD who were previously diagnosed using gold standard identification instruments (i.e., the Autism Diagnostic Observation Schedule [ADOS] and the Autism Diagnostic Interview, Revised [ADI-R]; Cederberg, Gann, Foley-Nicpon, & Sussman, 2018). A similar study emphasized the need to use the ADOS and ADI-R in combination to accurately diagnose gifted students with ASD under the DSM-V diagnostic criteria (Foley-Nicpon, Fosenburg, Wurster, & Assouline, 2017). Understanding the context of high ability and how it may influence assessment results is crucial for the school psychologist to consider.

Evidence supporting nonmedical interventions for individuals with ASD vary considerably from insufficient to moderate, with social skills interventions with higher-functioning students in the moderate range (Maglione, Gans, Das, Timbie, & Kasari, 2012). One study specifically examined this intervention with high ability elementary students with social skill deficits (Foley-Nicpon et al., 2017). Findings suggested video self-modeling was beneficial for participants' comfort with asking their friends for help; however, participating in talent development opportunities, in and of themselves, had beneficial effects on friendship companionship and security. More research is needed in this important area, but these initial findings help support the need for school psychologists to advocate for both social skill and talent development opportunities for high ability youth with ASD.

3.3 | High ability students with ADHD

ADHD is a neurodevelopmental disorder that manifests in individuals across ability levels. Like youth with ADHD, high ability youth with ADHD display persistent symptoms of inattention, distractibility, impulsivity, and hyperactivity (Fugate & Gentry, 2016). However, like ASD, diagnosing twice-exceptional youth with ADHD may be nuanced. For example, Chae et al. (2003) found that high ability students made fewer errors than average ability children with ADHD on a continuous performance test commonly used in ADHD diagnostics. Similarly, Gomez et al. (2019) found symptom presentation varied among groups of students with ADHD (N = 350), high ability (N = 15), and high ability with ADHD (N = 18), as well as those the control group (N = 124). To be expected, the two groups of students with ADHD endorsed more ADHD-related symptoms than the two groups without ADHD, but students with ADHD only had higher inattentive and total ADHD symptom scores than the gifted ADHD group. Together, these findings suggest traditional methods used to identify ADHD in youth may be less sensitive among high ability youth, but more research would be needed before this can be stated definitively.

Psychosocial presentations may also be unique for high ability youth with ADHD. In a relatively small clinical sample of high ability youth with ADHD (Foley-Nicpon, Rickels, Assouline, & Richards, 2012), participants reported lower self-esteem, overall happiness, and poorer self-perceptions of behavior than high ability students without ADHD. Antshel, et al., (2009) found high ability adults with ADHD more closely matched adults with ADHD than high IQ adults across a range of symptoms, such depression and anxiety. However, this same sample of adults had much lower prevalence rates of antisocial behavior, substance use, and cigarette smoking than typical ADHD samples. The gifted/ADHD group also had greater childhood needs for academic tutoring, as well as reading and math skills in the average range. It was not reported whether they received as children any academic supports. In a study examining data from the Longitudinal Study of Adolescent and Adult Health (Park, 2019) authors examined factors impacting educational and career outcomes for adolescents identified as high ability, ADHD, or high ability/ADHD. Results suggested family income was a crucial factor in predicting enrollment in higher education and employment among the high ability/ADHD group only. This finding matters to school psychologists; if students are not identified and provided services in
public schools, parents must rely on personal finances to get their child’s needs met. Too often, this is the case. In a recent study of over 13,000 students with disabilities from the Special Education Elementary Longitudinal Study, only 11.1% of the 9.1% of students who had at least one score from the WJIII Tests of Achievement at or above the 90th percentile participated in any sort of gifted and talented program (Barnard-Brak, Johnsen, Hannig, & Wei, 2015). This is a devastatingly small number, which demonstrates the high number of students whose talent development needs are not being met in our schools. School psychologists can help change these historical trends.

4 | DIVERSITY AND MULTICULTURAL CONSIDERATIONS

Historically, as well as currently, groups of students identifying as African American, Latinx, and Native American are underrepresented in gifted education, while White/European American and Asian American students are well represented (Peters, Gentry, Whiting, & McBee, 2019; Yoon & Gentry, 2009). This disproportionality continues despite an increased attention on equity in the gifted education literature (Plucker & Peters, 2016) and may be even more prominent among students with disabilities. A recent analysis (Peters, Gentry, Whiting, & McBeen, 2019) found students served under IDEA are extremely underrepresented in gifted education. According to the Office of Civil Rights data collected in 2016, the percent of individuals identified as gifted who also have an IEP is 0.21%. Among all underserved groups, these students, regardless of race, ethnicity, or gender, are the most disproportionately underrepresented. Further, students residing in states with a mandate for gifted education were not better off or identified at higher rates (Peters et al., 2019).

Yet, there is limited to no research examining the multiple identities and educational experiences of twice-exceptional youth from underrepresented racial/ethnic groups. The sole study conducted thus far (Park, Foley-Nicpon, Choate, & Bolenbaugh, 2018) was a qualitative investigation of 10 Asian American parents of twice-exceptional children who were interviewed regarding learning about their child’s identities, seeking educational resources, and constructing their parenting methods in relation to their sociocultural identities. Results suggested Asian American parents of twice-exceptional youth reported similar struggles as parents in other studies (e.g., Besnoy et al. 2015; Speirs Neumeister, Yssel, & Burney, 2013), such as disillusionment with the educational system, need for consistent advocacy, and cultivation of student resiliency, with added elements related to their cultural identity. That is, the participants revealed complex cultural and individual identities that impacted parenting their twice-exceptional children, but also universal struggles experienced by parents from various racial and cultural backgrounds. Clearly more research is needed with diverse populations of twice-exceptional students and their families to properly consider context and systems that influence access to educational opportunities.

5 | IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR EDUCATIONAL POLICY AND PRACTICE

Twice-exceptional students in today’s schools have immediate needs, and so do the professionals who work with them. For the past two decades, researchers have demonstrated the existence of twice-exceptionality and the necessity to apply patterns of cognitive, academic, and psychosocial strengths and areas for growth to academic settings. School psychologists are the perfect advocates for this practice. Academic challenge is just as important (if not more) than remediation of growth areas and should be specified in students’ academic plans (Foley Nicpon & Assouline, 2015; Maddocks, 2018). However, twice-exceptional students need to be properly identified first. We are failing to provide gifted education access to our students with disabilities (Peters, et al., 2019), but school psychologists can be a part of the solution. For example, reliance on pure RtI
models likely will not identify gifted students with SLD because they will not obtain scores low enough on curriculum-based assessments to warrant intervention. Likewise, pure discrepancy models are insufficient given their propensity to identify too many gifted students as having a learning disability (Maddocks, 2018). Instead, comprehensive methods, such as those proposed by Maddocks (2018, 2020) and Flanagan et al. (2010) seem to represent best practice for identification of all students with SLD, including those who are high ability. Further, school psychologists should consider the added influence of high ability on assessment performance when screening for disorders such as ADHD and ASD (Cederberg et al., 2018; Chae et al., 2003). Examining scores independent of this context may perpetuate missing valid diagnoses. Considering multiple assessments from multiple sources, which is best practice (Foley Nicpon & Assouline, 2015), may reduce the risk of misinterpreting data from a single test alone.

School psychologists have tremendous knowledge of the various categories of disability as defined by IDEA. Although their familiarity with giftedness is still less than ideal (Foley Nicpon et al., 2013; Robertson et al., 2011), they have an important skill set with respect to the assessment of disability, high ability, or twice-exceptionality. This skill set, coupled with knowledge about disability and cognitive assessment, makes them uniquely positioned to be an important member of a child-study team designing educational plans for gifted children with a disability. To be an effective team member, we recommend school psychologists:

- Use their assessment expertise to help other educational professionals understand twice-exceptional students. For example, school psychologists administer and interpret cognitive ability/intelligence tests and recognize results represent much more than simply an IQ. They can help explain a twice-exceptional student’s assessment results as markers of the student’s strengths and areas of vulnerability so that wholistic educational planning can take place.
- Know RtI will not necessarily find the twice-exceptional student. That is, a child with average reading scores will inevitably not perform in the lowest 20% of the class; however, if the same child also has a verbal score in the superior range, this may represent a strength, and the vulnerability in reading would not be identified by looking at reading performance alone.
- Know that symptoms corresponding with a twice-exceptional student’s diagnosis may manifest differently than for other students with the same diagnosis.
- Offer, and/or seek, professional development opportunities to better understand twice-exceptionality. Numerous qualitative studies (e.g., Park et al., 2018; Rubenstein et al., 2015) have identified parents’ continuous need to advocate due to educators not understanding twice-exceptionality or focusing solely on their child’s disability. Knowledge of twice-exceptionality, both in and out of gifted education, is important to identify and provide twice-exceptional students requisite educational and occupational opportunities.
- Note variability in psychosocial factors, such as motivation or educational engagement (Beckmann & Minnaert, 2018), may represent an undiagnosed twice-exceptionality. For example, gifted students who also have an SLD may feel frustrated by the gap between their very high potential and their relatively average or below-average academic achievement (Beckmann & Minnaert, 2018), unlike the typically developing student whose academic growth is progressing at a grade-expected rate that is consistent with their ability or potential.
- Recognize and support strengths-based approaches in our schools. There is ample evidence to suggest this is the approach of choice with twice-exceptional children in general (e.g., Baum & Olenchak, 2002), as well as for specific populations of twice-exceptionality (Fugate & Gentry, 2016).
- Collaborate with other educational professionals to serve as agents for change.
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