I'll just say this is Bill Leslie, and I'm with Dr. Linda Brody this morning at the Center for Talented Youth, but also you head up the Study for Exceptional Talent. We're going to talk today a bit about Julian Stanley, the early years of CTY, and a bit about your own work. And we may come back to that later. So I guess the place to begin, when and why did you come to Hopkins?

I was a high school teacher in Washington, DC and I enrolled in the Master of Liberal Arts program at Johns Hopkins kind of for fun. When I finished that program around 1974, I started looking around for something more relevant to what I was doing professionally, and I actually was looking for a counseling program.

So I was already at Hopkins when Lynn Fox had just finished her degree with Julian Stanley and announced a new masters in gifted education, and it intrigued me. And she had some scholarships. So I applied for one and I got it, I enrolled in my first class with her and I got totally hooked. She was in what is now the School of Education, it was then the Evening College. Julian was in Psychology, but there were close connections, because she had been his student.

So her degree was actually with him—

Yes, with him in psychology, and then Lynn went over to the Evening College as a professor and started this new degree program. She started a whole initiative in gifted education focused

---

1 Note: The interviewee reviewed this transcript and made substantial edits to enhance the clarity and add additional information. The audio of the interview will differ in places from this edited transcript.
on teacher training and working with the schools in Maryland. She had a whole agenda of things she wanted to do, and it was brand new, and it was exciting. In that era, there was very little going on in this field.

Meanwhile, Julian Stanley was still running SMPY and the talent searches. One of my first experiences was helping to administer the SAT in one of those big science lecture rooms on campus, because at that point we were doing it right on the Homewood campus. The kids weren't going to the regular administration of the SAT.

BL: So you were doing that for Stanley.

LB: Yes, there was a lot of collaboration between Lynn’s group and his at SMPY. I was with a cohort of really dynamic other graduate students. The work was very innovative. One of the things Julian did in 1975 was to hold a symposium on campus. I don't know if you're familiar with the Terman Study.

BL: Very much.

LB: The symposium was in honor of the 50th anniversary of the Terman study, and Stanley invited any of the Terman subjects who were still alive to attend. He also included many of the big names in the field of gifted education as speakers. I was very young, and it was a whole new world for me. There was something new happening every day.

So, basically I never left Hopkins or the field of gifted education. I worked for Lynn as her research assistant and I finished my masters, and by the time I finished that, she had started a doctoral program and I completed that under her direction as well. And then when Lynn left the university, she moved out of state, they did not replace her with a full-time person and actually by then I had my degree so I went to work for Julian directly in the Psychology Department and worked for him for six or seven years. Then I brought the Study of Exceptional Talent to CTY because we just felt it belonged where the kids were. Julian eventually followed me to work at CTY as an emeritus professor.

BL: Now it's always confused me a little. Stanley originally came to join the Psychology Department? Or did he come to join the School of Education?
Well this predates me but he came to the old School of Education but when they closed it down, the various faculty went in a number of directions. He went to Psychology, some went to Sociology, which is why that became such a dynamite department in education.

[0:05:00]

One went to history. I know that. Timothy Smith, who's a historian— did others go with him to Psychology and was he recruited?

I don't know if anyone went with him. I'm pretty sure he was recruited and they were pleased to get him. However, once Julian got involved with the SMPY work, I don't think he thought that the Psychology department appreciated that work. But he was established and just did what he wanted to do at that point. And he had the grants and pretty much funded his own work. So nobody got in his way.

I was going to ask you a little bit about that later. I can't resist asking when they asked the Terman members of that study back, did Fred Terman happen to come?

I don't know.

It's a personal question because I wrote a whole book that was in a large part from his papers. It must have been interesting to have your own son as member of this cohort—

This was 50 years after the study. Well, the Terman subjects were school age in 1925, and then add 50 years to it. But they were very engaged in having been a part of this study. Many of them made pretty long trips to come to this symposium. It was very exciting.

Tell me your impressions of Stanley. Because unfortunately, I would have made an effort to meet him if I known he was still here, but I didn't know it—

It's very hard to sum him up in any way. On one level, he was very much a southern gentleman. Very polite. Tiny bit of an accent left. Not much. He’d been gone a long time. But we did think of him as a southern gentleman. Very gracious. Very sharp intellect. Incredible memory. He could remember the test scores of a kid from 40 years ago, you know, just an incredible memory. And very
well read, very cultured, he appreciated theater, he appreciated art, he loved to travel, kind of a Renaissance man in many ways.

I could talk a little about his early history if you want. He grew up outside of Atlanta in a school system that did not challenge him. He graduated young, after 11th grade, then went to the equivalent of maybe a community college or a junior college, and then he transferred to a university to get a four-year degree. But he credits the military for giving him the motivation to excel in life.

He was in World War II. He actually ended up, and I don't know the whole story, but I believe he ended up in Morocco, or somewhere— wherever he was, he was very bored. And he credits his boredom with wanting to come back and really do something with his life. And he had the GI Bill, so he went to Harvard graduate school with the GI Bill.

BL: There aren't many people that tell you that World War II was boring.

LB: He was fortunate not to be in a dangerous situation. He had a background in chemistry and I think he was in some chemical unit or something. But they didn't see much action, which again was a blessing, but he talked about the boredom.

BL: Did he ever talk about what Harvard— he was in the School of Education.

LB: He was in the School of Education at Harvard. He left there with a very strong measurement background, which was the initial emphasis of his career, but he also studied guidance counseling and was interested in testing. And he had been a teacher for a short time before he went into the military. All of this kind of came together with the creation of SMPY, if you want to jump to that part of the story.

BL: I'll get to that in a minute.

LB: Okay. Because people knew he had that background in tests and measurement and counseling, even though his research up until then had been more quantitative psychology-based.

[0:10:05]

BL: I want to ask you a little bit about that because I took a look at his citations and it was interesting that the *Experimental and Quasi-
Experimental Designs for Research book, which he wrote with Donald Campbell, is still the most single cited piece of work.

LB: Absolutely. And it would have made him wealthy, but he and Campbell donated the royalties to the American Educational Research Association (AERA). They never took a penny from it.

BL: You'll have to give me a little bit of a primer, because I took a crack at it and it was tough sledding. So if you could give me a primer in experimental design and explain what made it so influential as a book, why it's still being cited?

LB: I don't know if I'm the right person to do that. I haven't looked at it in so long.

BL: I'm not so worried about the book, but the idea—

[Crosstalk]

LB: Well, the idea is that when you do research on real people, we still struggle in our field with how you know that your findings are important and significant when you can't have the kind of control groups that you might have in a science lab. So Campbell and Stanley structured, basically, the best possible way to accommodate those needs. So it's experimental, but there's also quasi-experimental and it kind of set up the guidelines for acceptable designs in the fields of psychology and education. And I don't think anybody's done a better job describing standards for experimental social science research since then. We have many ways of doing statistical analyses today, but that basic structure is still in place.

BL: That's quite remarkable for a book written in the '60s or the '50s. I have to look it up to get the right date.

LB: And before we had computers which have changed the field a lot, yet it's still a text used in measurement classes all over the country.

BL: That's something. I did want, since I was thinking about the Psychology Department, I was trying to figure out who Stanley might have interacted with there, or whether there were colleagues—the one that came to mind was Bert Green, who came here from Carnegie Mellon just a couple of years after Stanley did, and who was a psychometrician among other things. I wondered if he ever talked about or worked with, with Bert Green.
LB: I know they were collegial and friendly. By the time I got to know Julian, he was involved with SMPY, and there really wasn't anyone else in that department who was particularly interested in that project. But Julian certainly had colleagues in the department that he respected, and I would put Bert probably on the top of the list. Howard Egeth might be another one.

BL: Well, he's still here. I know him pretty well.

LB: But there were others who looked down on this work—

BL: In the psychology world.

LB: In the Hopkins psychology department. At that point, we didn't have any clinical or counseling orientation in that department. It was a very experimental and quantitative department and that's why they welcomed him when they did from the School of Education, because that's what he was doing at that point. That's kind of what they recruited him for, and then he went in this other direction and kind of never looked back.

BL: That's what tenure's for.

LB: He also pretty much had his own funding the entire time he did the SMPY work.

BL: Maybe that's a good segue to get into the—

LB: The Spencer Foundation?

BL: Yes, and the Study of Mathematically Precocious Youth. The Spencer Foundation is famous for being sort of the launching point of something. So whatever you can tell me about that would be great.

LB: So again, I wasn't directly involved the first couple of years of SMPY, but from what I've read and what I heard from Julian, SMPY started with Joe Bates, and Joe certainly can talk with you about his experiences. Doris Liddke, who was teaching some kind of summer class at Hopkins, and Joe was a student in it, had knowledge of Julian's background related to guidance counseling tests and measurements. And reportedly she went to him and said, "You've got to see this kid. He's in this very advanced class and he's holding his own. He's amazing." Joe was in middle school at the time.
Supposedly time passed; Julian didn't jump at this immediately as he was very busy doing other things. But eventually, I guess somebody—whether Doris kept pressing or the parents, I don't know—but eventually Julian decided to meet the family and something sparked in him. He gives credit to other researchers who have used above-level tests, Leta Hollingworth being one, for the idea of giving this boy an SAT. But it was a really very radical idea at the time to give an SAT to someone in middle school, but Joe did really well on the test. Then Julian gave him a whole battery of other tests as well. Joe had not started high school yet, and Julian and Joe’s parents apparently talked to a number of public and private high schools about accommodating this advanced student, but none of them wanted to hear it. So Julian decided to approach Hopkins about enrolling Joe as a full-time student and they agreed to give him a chance. Julian carefully guided him the first semester toward classes he was good at, more of the math/science orientation and he excelled. Joe graduated at age 17 from Johns Hopkins with a master’s degree, having met all the graduation requirements, and went on to earn a PhD at another university.

Then somewhere in there, a second student came along, and then a third student who had heard about Joe wanted to do what he had done. So Julian started thinking there might be others out there, other very advanced students not challenged in school, and decided to hold a talent search to find them. He invited middle school students to come and take the SAT on the Hopkins campus, and a lot of kids showed up and a lot of them did really well.

**BL:** So when you say they showed up—

**LB:** It was announced to schools that students could come and take this test on campus.

**BL:** Just in the Baltimore region?

**LB:** Initially it was the Baltimore region, but the geography expanded with each SMPY Talent Search. But from the first one, the SMPY staff was kind of blown away with the results, how many came and how well the students did, so they knew it needed to become a program. They approached the Spencer Foundation for funding. I think the Spencer Foundation was new at that time, and the story is that Marion Faldet, who I think was the secretary to the
president— I hope you validate all this stuff, because this is fuzzy— had been somebody Julian had once dated.

BL: Oh, the president of the Spencer Foundation. Yes. I think that's right.

LB: So that got him in the door, because he knew her.

BL: Or flirted with her, I think is what he said.

LB: The Spencer Foundation was also just getting off the ground. They were interested in education and Julian gave them a proposal and the timing was right and they funded it. And he was funded by them for quite a number of years. There were renewals.

BL: Funded to do talent searches?

LB: Yes, to do talent searches and study the students. It was announced as the Study of Mathematically Precocious Youth. The rationale was that there were these amazing kids, but we don't know much about them. So we needed to learn about them, and figure out ways to serve them. We didn't know how to serve them, at that time. SMPY’s work throughout the 1970s was a period of experimentation.

LB: They talked about the three Ds: discovery, description and development, that was the model. We’ve got to discover them, we’ve got to find them—we do that through the testing. We develop their abilities over time through a variety of intervention strategies. Description is the research piece where we learn more about them. And then the fourth D came along pretty quickly, which was dissemination—to share what we know with the public. And with the hope that schools will respond to these kids if they become aware of their needs, and also that others will develop programs like what SMPY was doing because they couldn’t serve all students directly who might benefit from the strategies.

[0:20:04]

So basically, that period of the '70s was a period where these things were put in place and there were a lot of experiments going on. For example, how fast can these kids learn math? Once they invited students to see how much math they could learn in a day. Remember, Julian was a scientist, a researcher. So he tried a lot of different intervention strategies to see what would work. They tried a lot of different cutoff scores for their programs. They were concerned girls weren't participating and tried to address that.
BL: I noticed that, that it was 12 to 1 or something. Some really—

LB: Right, these statistics were reported in an article in *Science* that got a lot of publicity. It was co-authored by Julian and Camilla Benbow. Since then the ratio has improved greatly over time. There is a question of whether the ratio was ever that big even though it was published, because that was a report on the first three years of the talent search. There was a lot of publicity at that time around what Julian was doing. Possibly it disproportionately attracted boys to the whole initiative because it dropped so precipitously pretty quickly after that and the ratio has now leveled off at more like 4 to 1, maybe even 3 to 1 at this point. There still is a gender difference at the upper end on our talent search population in math, but it’s not 12 to 1.

BL: I noticed in that collection of essays that he invited somebody who was an expert on sex differences—

LB: I’m not sure who you are thinking of, but Lynn Fox did some research on that. Her dissertation was involved in studying the girls who had been Talent Search participants because they were aware very quickly of the gender difference being an issue in the early talent searches.

BL: How was Hopkins itself involved? Because they weren't enrolling all the people in the study at Johns Hopkins, like Joe Bates.

LB: Though Julian’s early radical accelerates did well at Hopkins as early entrants, I like to say we've spent the last 40 years trying to have alternatives to what Joe did, which was go to college full-time at 13 because that’s not the optimal path for most gifted kids. So Julian identified numerous other ways to serve advanced students, and he also ran summer classes on campus and these morphed into what became CTY.

BL: You must have been involved in some of them.

LB: Some of them. I was working for Lynn in the School of Education when she and Julian obtained a grant to offer classes one summer. They offered algebra and geometry for talent search kids, as well as a career class for girls, and a teacher training component. There was also additional testing beyond the Talent Search test for high scoring students, and Camilla has access to the data from those days: there are achievement tests, spatial tests, and others.
Camilla's done research with David Lubinski around the spatial ability of some of those students using those results.

By the late 1970s, however, a couple of things were happening. Julian's wife was very ill. The talent searches were growing so that people were coming from West Virginia and staying in Baltimore so their kids could be tested as the testing was still administered in Baltimore.

BL: And you were still giving and grading the tests.

LB: Yes. And the summer programs were commuter-based on the Johns Hopkins campus, which limited which students could participate. Parents were calling SMPY to say: "My child really wants to come, but there's no place to stay." So Julian saw a need for a residential program so students could live on the campus where they were taking the classes and for an organization that could work with the College Board so kids could test wherever they lived. He also was less interested in doing the administrative work that the growing initiative was requiring. So Julian met with the president of the university and reportedly in about ten minutes they set up what's now CTY. Initially it was the Office of Talent Identification and Development—OTID. There was also an SVGY (Study of Verbally Gifted Youth) and Lynn's group was the IGCSG (Intellectually Gifted Child Study Group), so that's in the literature, too, in a few places. There are a lot of these acronyms from the early work at Hopkins on behalf of gifted students.

BL: Now one of the things that really caught my eye when I was reading the chapters in that book, which I guess had been a symposium initially—

LB: Probably.

BL: The Blumberg Symposium or something like that.

LB: Julian had funding to hold a series of symposia which were called Blumberg Symposia, including the Terman Symposium that we talked about earlier, and the proceedings of each one are reflected in the books that SMPY published.

[0:25:01]

BL: Here's the part that really caught my eye, because he said that one of Terman's mistakes was that he didn't have grad students working with him. So he didn't have disciples. That was his words
and he was saying “But I'm going to do it differently, and I've recruited two very bright grad students,” and Dan Keating was one and Lynn Fox was the other one.

LB: It was also, frankly, cost effective. It was less expensive than hiring staff. But he did hope that they would stay in the field. He also later, and I'm in this category, had postdocs. He was very proud of the people he trained and who went off in various directions to continue the work in different ways.

BL: How large a group was it at any one time?

LB: Two or three at most. I think three, probably, at one time.

BL: Here's the line I was going to quote from that report. He was talking about the meetings of the American Educational Research Association. He said, "At any annual meeting, there are dozens of papers on education for the disadvantaged, and almost none on education for the gifted, all authored by my associates and me." That was quite frank, but I wondered whether there was a sense that “Gee, we're if not marginalized, we're our own little shop here and the rest of the world is looking at something else and here we are.”

LB: That was definitely true. Now I have to say, though, in the 1970s, about simultaneous to Julian's work, the field of gifted education was growing in other places. The big name I think might be Joe Renzulli from University of Connecticut, but there were others as well. But they mostly took a more enrichment approach toward intervention and they focused much more on school-based learning. Julian assumed there were few students in any one school at the level of the students with whom he was working so he focused more on acceleration and out-of-school opportunities. So there was a period of time when the debate in the field was acceleration versus enrichment. Hopefully the field has now gotten to a point where we accept both as appropriate strategies for children.

BL: So he would have been somewhat, if not at odds, at least moving in a very different direction than Center for Social Organization of Schools say, which Coleman had set that up in the 1970s—early '60s and '70s, right on the same campus. So they would have been right across from each other.

LB: Yes, I don’t know if I would say they were at odds, but they were focusing on different issues.
BL: Oh, okay. I wondered about that.

LB: One of the symposia was focused on the acceleration in enrichment. That was held at AERA—here’s the book that summarized it:

BL: [reading title] Educating the Gifted. And who are his co-authors here? William George and Sanford Cohn.

LB: Sandy was his graduate student who went off eventually to Arizona State University. And Bill George, I don't know when he came along, I believe he had been an undergrad at Hopkins. They hired him be kind of an office manager. He overlapped Lynn and Dan. And then when they set up OTID, Bill was the first director, but that didn't last too long. But you'll see papers and books co-edited by him.

This book is one, I think this is from the Terman Symposium.

BL: The Gifted and the Creative—

LB: Yes, Bill George is a co-editor. He wasn't a scholar but he knew this field from working with Julian. He was very good at getting things done and he helped with these books. Cecilia Solano was a graduate student in psychology. So Julian mentored undergraduates, graduate students, and postdocs. Not to mention his influence on people outside of Johns Hopkins, including, for example, the people who have run the Talent Search programs at Northwestern and Duke, and he was influential in getting those programs off the ground.

BL: Can you give me a sense of him as a teacher? Especially as a graduate advisor.

LB: Well, he wasn't in an instructor role with for me, but I found him to be an awesome mentor. He was patient, but at least with me we could also speak on a very controversial level and disagree with each other and learn from it.

[0:30:08]

I think he was amazing and the wealth of his knowledge just had no bounds.
BL: What sort of discussions would you have, say about your thesis work?

LB: No. Lynn was my thesis advisor. Actually, Julian was on my committee in the end. But he wasn't involved in my planning of it. The mentoring really began after I started to work for him at SMPY. I don't know. It's hard to give an example. In the later years I drove him to Baltimore every day from Columbia. It just seemed like we had the most energetic conversations.

BL: He strikes me, and as I said I never met him. But he occasionally comes across almost as a crusader on behalf of gifted kids.

LB: Definitely yes!

I’m pulling out more books for you: Here’s another one.

BL: [reading title] Oh, Academic Precocity—

LB: These were all from the symposia. Julian really believed in writing everything down, whatever it was. He was very prolific in publishing, but he specifically produced the books and also a number of reports about SMPY—it was almost like a diary because he wanted the world to read it. So this fourth “D” for Dissemination was added to the model early and it was very crucial.

BL: The reason I mentioned crusaders was in one of the things I read he said, "It's time for parents to arise and demand that their schools do feasible, sensible things to prevent this atrophy of intellectual motivation." And that sounded to me like a crusader's kind of—

LB: Yes. He didn't work directly with the schools, he worked with the families and with the kids, and particularly these kids who would come in the summer and they'd finish two years in mathematics and then it was up to the school to respond to that. And many schools eventually did but that took time.

Let me read this quote from Julian, published in High Ability Studies: "Our intent was not to influence school boards directly. There are far too many and their composition changes too often. To coin an oxymoron, we meant to be benignly insidious. That is, to burrow up under school systems to coerce changes there and curricular flexibility and articulation of in school with out of school educational experiences." So it says “burrow under,” in contrast to what was going on at the University of Connecticut,
where they were trying to train teachers to do things differently in schools for gifted students.

Julian assumed that there wouldn’t be a lot of students in any one school who could, for example, learn algebra in three weeks so he didn’t expect schools to develop programs for these few kids, rather he sought flexibility and acceleration. So the students could come to a summer program like CTY to take algebra, and what he wanted was for schools to then place the student in the next course. So his model was very much let's just accelerate the kids. He didn’t believe we really need to develop a lot of new curricula. But that kids could be served if we just place them appropriately. So it was in a way a very simple model, but boy, did schools fight it in the beginning. There was a lot of resentment toward him on the part of a lot of the schools when SMPY was starting.

BL: I was going to ask who his opponents, or who his critics would have been.

LB: Well, there were the people in the gifted education field who were pushing for enrichment. And there were the schools that just didn't believe kids could learn that quickly or didn't want to do something different than what they had been doing, so there were plenty of critics.

BL: Was it an advantage to Stanley to be at a school or a university that really didn't have a School of Education at that point?

LB: He thought so, and actually the programs at Northwestern and Duke when they were set up were not placed in Schools of Education originally either. Because what he was doing was too atypical and he believed there would be resistance from more traditionally trained people in education.

[0:35:00]

BL: I would also expect that given the times, I remember when The Bell Curve came out and when Stephen J. Gould came to speak on campus about the mismeasurement of man, there was—

LB: He was part of that. He signed that thing that all the scholars signed. Remember that?

BL: For the Wall Street Journal.

LB: Yes.
BL: But I would have assumed that he would have found himself on the defensive in some sense at that time because there was really a pretty big push against educational testing and the kind of work that he did. I just wondered how he responded to the—

LB: He believed in the tests. He would say whatever's causing the inequity, we should be addressing it. He really believed the tests measured something that we needed to know and the results helped to inform educational decisions. He really believed in his model, that using the SAT as an above-level test of specific abilities helped to identify what this child is ready to learn right now. He specifically did not use IQ tests, believing they are too general to garner that information.

Basically, the Talent Searches were identifying precocity, this ability to reason above grade level and curriculum needed to match that level. Stanley avoided the bigger issue of how years of neglect may have affected a child. He also avoided predicting whether a student with great potential might achieve that level in the future. Mostly it was about serving the student with advanced abilities right now. Does that make sense? It's a much narrower focus.

BL: Yes. Did he have opinions on either of those questions or just didn't—

LB: I think he did. He talked a lot about racial inequities in particular. He gave a lot of money to Planned Parenthood. He thought teenage pregnancy was a big issue. Nutrition was a big issue. I think his finger was pointed at those kinds of things for causes. Not genetic, innate differences, but he still took the view that the test score of 12 was the test score of 12. He didn't believe in affirmative action at that point because he didn't feel it did a service for the child. He was identifying kids who were ready to do algebra right now.

That's why I said the focus became narrow and pragmatic. And he didn't believe in these squishy kind of gifted programs that just made kids feel good. He thought they were a complete waste of time, and that's where he got in trouble with the other end of the gifted field that was doing a lot of these pull-out programs where Friday afternoon you had gifted and talented class, and you had good readers in there, you had good math kids in there, you had a hodgepodge. And he thought that was a complete waste. You should be identifying this specific ability and serving that specific ability in a very academic way.
BL: And his bar was pretty high, right?

LB: Because he thought that group was the most neglected, and that's who he was interested in. It didn't mean there shouldn't be other programs for other kids.

BL: Right, but he was looking at what, the top half of one percent or something like that?

LB: Something like that. But of course he had a long career, so there were different strategies. He started with Joe Bates going to college full-time, and he realized very early that wasn't going to work for most of the kids CTY is now serving, so he identified and advocated for numerous other intervention strategies.

For one, he got involved with a couple of universities that started early college programs, where they brought cohorts of young students in, perhaps two years early and provided supportive services for those students. And then there were the kids who were in regular school but maybe need the summer program. So he kind of did stratify different services for different levels of students. And also what they needed was based somewhat on what they lacked at home. Some didn't lack anything. They were fine. So it was very much an individualized approach.

He used the term, you must have come across this, “smorgasbord of opportunities,” and I still quote that because the idea is you think of the buffet and all these possible strategies and programs are on the table. Meanwhile, you assess the student—not just on the SAT, but on other things including interests and motivation and personal characteristics. You get to know the child as well as you can.

[0:39:58]

You consider what they have already in place and then you pick from this buffet additional opportunities to serve their needs. And that's what we do in SET. That's what this program was set up to do, to help these very high ability students find the particular strategies that will help augment what they need so that they can achieve their full potential.

BL: As somebody who never liked taking standardized tests, I was amused by his comment that if you can take test after test after test, kind of Parris Island at the end, you'll probably do okay in college.
He seemed to believe that the test—just being able to take that many tests told you something.

LB: Well, right now we're dealing with our 12-year-olds and the SAT's 4 hours long, and it's quite an endurance test in an era where kids are used to stuff moving quickly. It's kind of interesting. I don't know. We've got the new SAT coming down the pike. We're not sure what that's going to mean.

BL: I wanted to ask you about the summer programs, partly because you got involved with them. You wrote your dissertation on them.

LB: Oh, you've really dug, huh?

BL: So tell me something about the CTY summer programs—

LB: Well, Julian really believed in the importance of those programs. I told you that the geography of where students were coming from to attend the SMPY programs was expanding. So he wanted the residential programs to allow students who come from a further distance to be able to participate. But he really believed that these kids, possibly even more than needing the academic enrichment, needed to be with kids more like themselves—kids who share their interests and abilities.

I don't know whether he grew up lonely, where that came from, or whether it was based on some of the first students he met doing this work, but he had this sense that some of these kids who were so above level needed some access to other bright students their age, and that's what he had in mind with the residential summer programs, that it would be a social environment, as well as an academic environment. And to this day, CTY is very proud of providing that. It's a big component of what we're offering.

BL: How do you make the selection? Is it simply based on test scores or do you look for other things that make for a good—

LB: We use test scores, scores on above-grade-level tests. When CTY started, there weren't as many of these programs. There are plenty of others out there now and different programs look for different characteristics. I think some of it for CTY is pragmatic because we have 10,000 students in our summer programs.

BL: Ten thousand? Now this is scattered all over the country—
LB: Yes. Now I will say, even though we don't do it in a systematic way, there is also a certain level of finding kids who want to do academics in the summer, who want to do rigorous academics, so in a way that's a test of motivation and interest. Students qualify in verbal areas and/or in math and science, and they get to choose the class they want in the area in which they are qualified, so we're identifying a specific ability and providing an opportunity for their interest to be a factor.

BL: I confess, I didn't get to read your dissertation.

LB: Don't.

BL: It's only 134 pages. But what were you actually looking at and what were your conclusions?

LB: I was focused on—back then there was a lot of prep going on for SAT. The Princeton Review and others had started prep classes and we really didn’t want the Talent Search students to be heavily prepping, we wanted to use it as an aptitude measure. So I looked at the kids in our summer program, and I studied five groups: students who took math, a language, science, writing, and students who did not take an academic program that summer.

They had all taken the SAT for Talent Search, and I administered the test again after the summer program and controlled for their initial score. Because there were a lot of kids enrolling in Latin thinking it was going to boost their SATs, stuff like that going on, this seemed important to study. Or would the short-term math class make a difference? There was growth in all the kids’ scores, but my control group blew it out of the water. We did not get short-term growth on the SATs for the summer kids compared to the control group. Of course, it was never the goal of the summer classes to raise SAT scores so we were not disappointed with those results.

[0:45:00]

But then, I did a subsequent study with Camilla Benbow where we looked at a group of Talent Search students over about five years, from seventh grade through the end of high school and evaluated their SATs when they applied to college in relation to their high school academic experiences. For these students, we found coursework throughout high school really made a difference. So my conclusion pretty much was that long-term serious academics
do influence these scores, which is what we want. Advanced Placement courses, in particular, made a difference.

Summer programs also, we believe, made a difference. But the quick fix wasn't there, which kind of supported the literature. With the new SAT, we've got Khan Academy getting on board prepping kids. It may help some kids, certainly they should be familiar with test items. But, in general, I believe students are better off reading and studying and being involved in activities, than prepping for a test, even for college admissions.

BL: When I took it, they just said you can't study for this and we just sat down and took it. But my kids, they would—I should have talked to you first. Although they scored stratospherically but I don't know if it was the test prep or not. Dan and Lynn also wrote their dissertations around SMPY—that's why I'm getting a sense of Stanley, as well. If you're going to work with me as a grad student, how about taking a look—we've got this data—

LB: Well, their graduate programs were supported financially by SMPY (actually by the Spencer grant) so it was kind of expected that they would work on that something related to the SMPY study. And they were committed to the project. As a result of their efforts, by the time CTY was launched in 1979, Julian, Dan, Lynn, and the rest of the staff had studied the characteristics and needs of advanced learners, had experimented with programs and had evidence that students could successfully complete work designed for older students in a short period of time, had experimented with cut-off scores for specific programs, and had evidence that schools were responding with flexible placements. As a result, CTY could claim to be a research-based program from the time it was established.

BL: Yes, I think that is right. In thinking about where to put it, I'm coming to the conclusion it's really a kind of field science. Tell me about the origins of the SET.

LB: Okay. After Julian had his ten-minute meeting with the Johns Hopkins University President to start CTY with the goal that CTY would run the Talent Search and summer programs and report directly to the provost's office he wanted to kind of go back to his roots, which was working more individually with the highest scoring math students.

So he announced a national search for students who scored 700 or above on the SAT math. They could come from the CTY talent
search, they could come from the other talent searches, or it could just be a kid who went took the SAT on his own. That's where I wonder if—and this initiative was in newspapers that he was launching it, which is why I thought perhaps it was a little more disproportionately boys responding than girls to this idea. But anyway, so he launched this program in 1980 as an initiative “for youths who reason extremely well mathematically.” He avoided using the word gifted.

Camilla was working with him then, and I joined them in 1985. When Camilla left the university a year later, I was named associate director of SMPY.

And then Julian brought on a couple of other postdocs. And I actually had postdoc funding. We had a funder who was supporting Julian’s postdocs for a couple of years. We were finding maybe a hundred kids a year nationally or internationally who met this criteria of scoring 700 or above on SAT-M before age 13. We were writing newsletters for them, we were counseling them, and we were studying them.

[0:50:00]

BL: How did SET come about?

LB: Julian was looking for a permanent home for this project with the 700M students. He was always worried about retiring or dying or whatever and the work not continuing. The same foundation that supported our postdocs gave me a grant to move the project to CTY and that became SET or the Study of Exceptional Talent. At CTY, we expanded it to include serving verbal scorers, also started Imagine magazine and other initiatives including CTY’s Diagnostic and Counseling Center, but that core of serving this high ability group is what we're still doing today in SET.

BL: So it has an interesting history in that it begins after CTY was fully established?

LB: Well, we brought it back to CTY because that's where the kids were and also because we believe the Psychology department would not continue this program without Julian being directly involved. Actually, there had been a little bit of a falling out for a few years between Bill Durden, who was director of CTY, and Julian. So Bill wasn't giving Julian access to the kids for a couple of years, which was unbelievable. So it was almost like we had to move the project to CTY to have access to the kids.
BL: To get back to the kids.

LB: To get back to the kids. Initially I went to CTY alone while Julian stayed in Psychology, and I hired staff. After a few years—by then Bill Durden had left and Lea Ybarra was our director—Julian approached her about the possibly of moving his office to CTY as well. I think he was lonely without any staff or graduate students and being based at CTY gave him access to colleagues. I was still directing the project, but he communicated with some of the families, wrote op-eds for newspapers. He occasionally wrote a professional article and he had colleagues to have lunch with and to interact with.

BL: Where was CTY?

LB: We were at 2701 North Charles.

BL: Oh, that modern building where CSOS is now.

LB: Yes. Prior to coming to CTY, Julian had been working out of a suite of offices in Bloomberg. SMPY had had to move several times during its history, but the university was very good to him. They always gave him space, but they kept moving him.

BL: They put him in Physics.

LB: Yes, Julian’s second wife's deceased former husband was physics Professor Donald Kerr. And then through that connection, Julian had given some money to Physics. And then I think when they opened that building they had a lot of empty space, so they had welcomed Julian there. But he was very isolated from the other faculty and by that time had no students—I think his secretary actually, who was part-time, retired. So he was alone. That's why the option of taking an office at CTY was appealing. And Bill who, again, they had a kind of difficult relationship at times, had left and with Lea there was none of that negative history.

She welcomed him. I mean she never put him in a position of influence or authority with regard to running CTY. He really was the back corner historian doing his own work. He wasn't involved in CTY policy on any level, but he felt warmly welcomed, and I think that was really wonderful. We moved into this building in Mt. Washington in the winter of 2005 and then he died in August of that year, so we weren't here very long but he liked it here.
BL: He actually spent a little time over in Mount Washington. That's very interesting. I have only a couple more questions for you today. One is that nowadays CTY is a big operation. It started out small, but it's a big operation. It's got international outreach. I wouldn't call them branches, but programs like—

LB: Sister programs.

BL: Sister programs. Thank you. Why does it need to be at Johns Hopkins? Or does it? Why couldn't it just be its own nonprofit entity?

LB: It could be. Many independent non-profits run summer programs for gifted students. But I think the academic affiliation is influential. I think parents respect it. I know we attract people because it's Hopkins and they respect this huge research base that is behind what we do. So it's history, and I think influence. I can't imagine us leaving Hopkins. And the other programs that I would call our sister programs, the direct-spinoffs, are typically university-based programs as well. I think the university affiliation is a big part of the model that we promote.

[0:55:03]

BL: And has anything changed any because the School of Education has been rebooted, if you like? Since we re-established that as an independent division of the university, has that affected CTY?

LB: Well, it's starting to. We have one staff member, Amy Shelton, who has a joint appointment now and we're bringing on Jonathan Plucker with a joint appointment at CTY and the School of Education. I don't know if you've heard that news.

BL: I do know. Yes. That made me think of it.

LB: So clearly that's a move toward a closer affiliation and a more formal affiliation. I think the relationship between our Executive Director Elaine Hanson, and she'd have to speak to this, and the School of Education Dean David Andrews is pretty warm and good and they want to do more together. So I think we're moving in that direction.

BL: The CSOS is across the street from the School of Education and they were removed from Arts and Sciences into the School of Education. But as long as you're in Mount Washington, it is a pretty big distance—is that a problem?
LB: It is, a little. It can be hard to get faculty or staff to attend events that aren’t on their own turf. We had a reception on Monday, actually, to welcome Jonathan Plucker, and some people from the School of Education did come over for that, but if we'd been around the corner, maybe we would have gotten more. I think the geography is a bit of an issue. But CTY needs a lot of space. When we came here, it was because it was big.

BL: It's not bad space. It's beautiful space, but it's not campus space. I wondered whether eventually CTY would end up being part of the School of Education. I have no reason to think one way or the other.

LB: Well, I hate to be recorded on that one, but I can't believe it won't happen eventually. It may have to be between directors.

BL: I can understand that.

LB: A merger also wouldn’t necessarily mean we would move to campus.

For so long we dwarfed the School of Education in size. That's changed with them taking on CSOS and expanding in many ways in recent years, but for the longest time we were bigger than they were. That's really changed and I think may have opened the door to including CTY in their structure.

BL: Well for a long time they weren't very visible, but now because so much of the ranking depends on research dollars, they moved up—and my daughter went through a very good education program and she's appalled. "They're not the number one education program." But if US News & World Report says so, it matters.

LB: Yes, it brings prestige.

BL: It does. So my final question for today really is, looking back both on your work and Julian Stanley's, what would you consider CTY and SET's signature accomplishments? If you were going to make a little bullet point list of ways in which they really made a difference for the field and for Hopkins.

LB: Perhaps the most important result of this work is that we found the kids. We validated that there are students languishing (a word Julian would have used) in age-in-grade classes who are cognitively ready to work at a much higher level and faster pace,
but, if left alone, are at risk for boredom and loss of academic motivation. These students—who have the potential to solve some of society’s greatest problems—need to be served appropriately if they are to achieve their full potential.

We validated the use of above-level testing to find these students, and proved the effectiveness of a variety of intervention strategies, especially accelerative ones, to meet their needs. We’ve also focused on the social needs of advanced students and shown the value of providing ways—especially through the summer programs, competitions, and other extra-curricular activities—for them to connect with intellectual peers who share their interests and abilities.

Today, work like CTY is being carried out at other universities, in some cases by mentees of Julian, and an increasing number of students have access to the academic programs and opportunities they need. The model has also been replicated outside of the United States.

[1:00:06]

BL: I can't resist commenting on Coleman, whose early work was on adolescent high schoolers and socialization, and one of his findings in the Chicago high schools. He was very much a mathematically oriented guy, too, [and his finding] was “Well, the problem is that the reward system isn't structured around academics.”

LB: Yes, it was sports and—

BL: It was everything except academics. I think Coleman felt that as he was an athlete, et cetera, but also a very bright guy. But it's interesting that they kind of converge on this sense of how do you get these students engaged—

LB: By encouraging students to seek advanced work and supplemental activities, we have also spurred their creation. So when I look at the number of summer programs available today, the expansion in the AP curriculum, the number of competition-type options for kids, there really are a lot of opportunities for bright and motivated kids. Our Imagine magazine spotlights those kinds of things for the kids.

Acknowledging the individual differences of students, even gifted students, I think, is a big piece, too. Their abilities can differ.
Content knowledge differs. Their motivation differs. And the one size fits all gifted program on Friday afternoon is not the solution.

BL: To the extent you can speak for him, because you knew Stanley very well, what would he have said would be his most important legacy, intellectual legacy?

LB: Well, you know, you brought up his training of the postdocs and the graduate students. He did say that multiple times, that he was very proud that almost everything he was involved in starting was still continuing, and that's still pretty much true. There are also the individual kids he empowered, who are now making major discoveries in science, math, and other domains.

He was very concerned that the types of programs he started are there for future generations. Having it continue is what he really wanted. And I think he's kind of put systems in place so that it would. Having CTY report to the provost, and you brought up maybe we'll move to School of Education, but I think he felt that that the Provost’s office was a good place for CTY, to have the upper echelon of the university on board.

BL: Did you know, by the way—I saw a very interesting thing in one of the files. It was a memo to the president, it must have been Muller, about [how] this is a great recruitment tool for Hopkins and you really should think about programs [where] you want to bring in students. They took it seriously. You could see that there was a lot of correspondence back and forth. They never did it, of course, but they didn't make a big push to bring in 14-year-old students. But he certainly thought that the university could do that.

LB: Yes, I think so. He did talk to a number of university officials at various times about establishing an early entrance program but it didn’t happen. I think the bigger issue is that I think there was concern that these kids wouldn't want to be isolated. Dorm space at Hopkins was always a problem and we had 14- and 15-year-olds in there, but they didn't want to be segregated and there wasn't room to have a larger group. So it came up a lot. But we never had a formal program.

[1:04:57]

Actually, there's a funny story about that because after he started SMPY and worked with the early radical accelerates who enrolled at Hopkins, Hal and Nancy Robinson started an early entrance program at the University of Washington, claiming it was modeled
after the one at Johns Hopkins. But Hopkins never had a formal program.

BL: But is an early entrance program something you might have wanted to do?

LB: Oh, yeah. Julian was a fan of the organized early entrance programs. I don't know why it never happened. But he definitely moved away from his focus on early college, wanting to serve more kids and he thought radical acceleration was not the solution. He preferred to go the routes of creating summer programs and other types of opportunities and not have students move quite so quickly through high school. Julian valued, and this is often not acknowledged enough, a broad liberal arts education. So even though he was moving students rapidly through mathematics, he wanted them to read literature and study music and become cultured adults and members of society who were prepared to vote. So he didn’t really want the radical acceleration in grade placement.

BL: Excellent.

LB: Even though it's ironic, because they said that they modeled that program after SMPY, but it didn't exist. They only found that out later.

BL: They modeled it on what you might have done.

LB: Yes.

[End of Audio]