



Episode #188:

**Terry Roberts, PhD, Discusses His Book "The New Smart"
and How Nurturing Creativity Will Help Children Thrive**

December 17, 2019

Debbie: Hello Terry, welcome to the podcast.

Terry: Hi Debbie. It is a pure pleasure to be with you. I have great admiration for your work and great sympathy for your many, many, many listeners, both as a parent and as an educator.

Debbie: Well, thank you so much. I'm looking forward to bringing this conversation and yeah, I think there's so many things that we could touch upon today. So I'm excited to dive in. So could you just take a few minutes to introduce yourself to my listeners, tell us a little bit about your background as an educator and how you came to be doing the work you're doing now, specifically in regards to your new book.

Terry: Sure. Thank you so much. I am a lifelong educator. I grew up in very rural Western North Carolina, and am the product of something like six or seven generations of subsistence farmers going back to 1800, all in the same fairly close area actually, the Southern Appalachian mountains. And as an adult, I've been a high school English teacher. I have worked as a, in something called the principal's executive program as an executive coach to educational administrators. I have, I've taught writing off and on my entire life, my PhD is in American literature. So I'm something of an example of the kind of thing we might talk about today in that I tend, I have with my life, I must say, blended various disciplines. I'm a novelist in, in what I sometimes call another life, a parallel life. I've written three novels and I'm hard at work on a fourth, but I'm also very interested in the educational system, as you said, and how we honor talent, how we recognize and appreciate talent, particularly when it's not traditional talent that identifies itself on test scores, or by being the, you know, voted most likely to succeed in the senior class, that kind of thing.

This new book, I've written a number of nonfiction books about education, a lot to do with dialogue, Socratic dialogue, but this new book is a departure for me. It flowed out of a lunchtime conversation that I had with a man named Howard Gardner. For those of your listeners who know Howard, he is the creator, as it were, of the theory of multiple intelligences; the idea that there is not one intelligence, but many, including types of intelligence that schools don't necessarily traditionally deal with. Everything from interpersonal and intrapersonal intelligence to naturalist intelligence, bodily kinesthetic and spatial intelligence. A lot of the kinds of intelligence that the children of your listeners are quite gifted in, schools don't necessarily know what to do with. And so I'm trying to give you a picture of who Howard is. He's an extraordinarily influential thinker. Probably one of the handful of most influential thinkers, not just in education but also in psychology, in our lifetime, in the 21st century.

So this lunchtime conversation was fun, it was funny, it was engaging and out of it came the idea for this book. And essentially, in a nutshell, this new book, it's titled *The New Smart: How Nurturing Creativity Will Help Children Thrive*, begins by taking a look at the 21st century. Sort of tongue in cheek, it asks the question who will prosper in the year 2050. And of course I picked that at random. But also when you get right down to it, somebody who graduated from high school this past year will be smack in the middle of their long and we hope very productive life in 2050. And so of those, who will be happiest, who will be most successful, who will thrive in the year 2050? And, and what I came up with, inspired by Howard's work and the work of any number of other people, is the notion that creativity is the attribute that is most related to prosperity in this fractured world in which we live. And then go on, of course, to talk about what I mean by creativity and how the education system might nurture that, those attributes. So it's a long and winding tale, but to me it's for, it's unique, maybe not unique, but it's certainly unusual in that it examines not schools as they exist now, but schools as they might and should exist in order to prepare the students for the lives they are going to lead. That's the theory and the thesis of the book.

Debbie: Well that was a great introduction and I love hearing people's stories of how they even got inspired to tackle projects like this and I really loved, you said that there is a disconnect in how we honor talent when it's not traditional because yes, I think that very much speaks to my community and that many of our kids' strengths are not really embraced by the traditional educational model. And I'm just wondering from your many years as an educator, how did you see this play out in terms of, I'm sure you had many differently wired kids come through the door of your classroom and just experienced so many different types of students. So what did you see in how they, their needs were or weren't being met that really inspired you also to kind of move in this direction and to embrace the theory of multiple intelligences?

Terry: Yeah, there's a, there's a sort of catch phrase in the multiple intelligence world, and I did not create this, but it's become so universal. I'll just throw it out there. It's, it could almost be the bumper sticker for your podcast or your audience, I think, and it goes like this, it doesn't matter how smart you are, it matters how you are smart. And to me that's a nice, again, that is in some ways kind of simple minded encapsulation of a very complex topic. But I think the education system in the last, in public education in particular, in the last 20 to 30 years has suffered from a very strong and very intense and very pervasive, particularly in the United States, move towards standardization. You know, when they write the histories of public education in the United States, they may well call this the age of standardization.

That's both good and bad. Let me be clear. I mean it's, it's good in the sense that standardized testing, which compares one student to another, one teacher to another, one school, one school district to another, did us this service, it brought to light a number of schools, and indeed school systems, a number of perhaps teachers, even though I am a teacher and this is dangerous ground, it brought to light a number of schools that really just were not that very successful. They weren't teaching kids to read, they weren't teaching, you know, fundamental

math skills. They weren't teaching language in all its' many attributions including math and science and music and color and movement and et cetera. So there's a sense in which the original notion of standardized testing and standardization, I think, provided us with invaluable information about where we were accomplishing what we set out to accomplish and where we weren't.

The problem, however, is that it, over the years, say the past three decades, it has narrowed the focus of most public school systems, most public schools, simply to those things which can be measured on a standardized test. And of course, I'm not alone in thinking this. There are any number of thinkers, Diane Ravitch, George Wood, people around the country who have become advocates for destandardizing public education. And I'm one of those. The thing that I think where we, where we suffer, where perhaps we as parents suffer, where our children sometimes suffer is that we have our own gifts, our own talents, our own interests, our own fascinations, our own obsessions, which don't have to do with schooling. They don't have to do with that narrow range of skills that standardized tests measure.

As a result, and again, it pains me to say this Debbie, because I'm a public school educator and I'm a defender of public education, but, but I'm going to go ahead and be candid in the interest of myself as a parent, you as a parent, your listeners as parents, I think what we need to know is that public schooling is designed to do a fairly narrow range of things and that that range has become increasingly narrow over the last three decades. And as a result, we can run the risk, and have, alienated certain kinds of students who are more interested in the natural world than they are in the biology classroom. Who are more interested in paintings than they are in mathematics. Who are more interested in dance or the internet or in coding than they are in those things which are traditionally taught and measured. And I'll go ahead and tell you that in one sense that's, that's a narrow and unlovely way of proceeding but in another sense, what happens of course is in alienating those students and their families, we lose them as, in the talent pool, the seed corn of the next generation to use a very old fashioned phrase.

So not only do we suffer in a sense individually, but we also run the risks socially, culturally. We are not developing the next generation of painters and musicians and artists and scientists and mathematicians and writers and poets because we aren't paying attention to those things. And so we lose individually and we lose, in a sense, socially and culturally. There's a big piece of this book which examines where education fits in this much, much, much larger lens of social and cultural history. So that you, you get the very specific point, which is your son, my two sons and my daughter and the sons and daughters of your listeners, but you all, who have names and ages and feelings and thoughts. The book approaches that oral, but it also deals with where do they fit in the larger history of our times.

And I think that's significant too, right? I mean, as an educator, people used to say, well, isn't the job of the school to educate your child? And I said, no. Yes, but the job of the school is to educate all children, not just mine. And while mine is one of, you know, professionally, I have to say, it's the job to educate all children. So, and that's the children that are very different from my own. Does that make

sense? In other words, I dare say if we put my three and I believe you have a son, you know your son and perhaps more in the same room we discover they're quite different, right? So how, how do we create a public school system which honors all of them?

Debbie: Yes. So much to unpack there. So, you know, even just as you were getting started with that answer, you know, the thing that jumped out at me is that we have just forgotten what we're even doing here. You know, like it seems like the schools don't have, you know, like any company or business, you have to know what your end goal is. And it seems like the only end goal of the current model is, is getting these kids out of school and meeting standardized, agreed upon measurements. And, and not really, we're not thinking about what we're actually preparing these kids for. And it is a huge problem. I love that you talk about what we lose of the talent pool. That is something that I believe so deeply and many of my listeners, I believe especially, you know, these unconventional thinkers, you know, the kids in my community have learning disabilities or they may have ADHD or they may be profoundly gifted or they may have a lot of things going on at once, but they are the kids who are, I believe, have the potential to contribute in such incredible ways to the future of problem solving and creative thinking. And so it's really hard to think about, you know, as Dr. Ross Greene says, the kids that we lose along the way because of being in a system where those gifts can be squashed or their self esteem can plummet as a result of the environment that they're in.

Terry: Yeah, I agree. I think you just described Einstein, by the way. I mean, I know you know that, but I'll just throw out a name. You just described DaVinci, you just described Alice Walker you just described. In other words, you, the list goes on and on of creative individuals who for whatever reason, survived, you know, emotionally, psychologically, but who, as children, would have been thought special needs, if you will. You know, and I think the other thing I will say as somebody who spends his, his nine to five, his working life in schools, the world is full of teachers who believe, as you believe and as I believe, that all of their children have unique and varied talents and all of the children they teach deserve the fullest and best education we can possibly give them.

So I think what we're describing is in many, many, many cases a systemic problem, not a, not the product of evil meaning folks, you know, who are out to get our kids. And sometimes it may feel that way, you know, in that interview with that guidance counselor or that teacher or that assistant principal. But the truth is, most of the teachers that I know, I can't say they're enemies of standardization, but they certainly fully appreciate emotionally and intellectually the limits of standardization. And they suffer in the same way. Many, many very fine teachers leave the profession because they've had their creativity taken away as it were. Dancers, writers, mathematicians, scientists who should thrive in the classroom as teachers. We lose them as well. And so part of our discussion is about you and me as well as our children, if that makes sense.

Debbie: Yeah. And I, I love that you shared that. I mean, this is something I'm thinking a lot about right now. I've spent a lot of time this fall at conferences that have been specifically aimed at the twice exceptional community and with bringing in a lot

of educators, I'm recording a podcast with a colleague that's specifically for educators and we recognize that most educators are just as frustrated by the system as we are. And so, you know, let's just go there. You've been in this system for, as you said, 30 years and you have a vision for, you know, what the public education model could ideally look like. You know, what are your thoughts about how we might change that system?

Terry:

Well, it's a shock in the sense that I'm looking at that list, schools that recognize the challenges of the future, you know, well, sort of called out of the concluding chapters of this new book and the very first item is they feature cross curricular and multidisciplinary work more than subject specific work. I think one of the things that we've done over the years, long before we got around to standardized testing in such a severe way, is we divided middle school and, the middle school and high school experience, the former junior high, now middle school experience, up into these silos, you know, called math and science and English or language arts and history or social studies and, and never the twain shall meet. It's very rare in a public high school or even a private high school that you run into a, even something as simple as a English slash history class. Does that make, in other words so that you have this sense that you're writing about something real or that you're studying something humane.

I think the other thing, you know, before we mentioned Howard's work on multiple intelligences, I think schools, what I'll call schools of the future, schools, both because they recognize the future and because I hope that they're on the way, they also address multiple intelligences. They honor the fact that there is more to a well rounded human being than just his or her ability to read, write and cipher, to do math. Well, you know, and again, I'm not demeaning those things. I'm a writer, obviously, and I'm a manic reader but be that as it may, there are many more layers to fully developed human beings and that those layers interact with each other. We write poetry about mathematics and painting is a matter of math and science, you know, etc.

I think one of the things that schools of the future will do is they stress group and individual assessment as opposed to just pitting one student against another. I think sometimes that we stress the fact that this student is a 93rd percentile child and this student is a 38th percentile child and by some metric that really isn't much related to life quite honestly and doesn't honor who they are, in many ways. I, and then I think there's a characteristic that your listeners will be particularly sensitive to. Two things. First thing first is that schools have to be willing, I think, to offer a much wider range of experience and, and domains in which students can be successful. Even the best students academically, the ones who graduate with the highest GPAs and those kinds of things are profoundly bored in school, not because they're smarter than the curriculum.

You know, that's a myth. That, you know, that they're bored because the curriculum itself has, addresses such a small range of what they know, what they're good at, where their talents lie. The other thing that I believe to be profoundly the case, and I deal with this in this book, is that we think we can standardize what we used to mean by intelligence and what most people still mean by intelligence. You can take an IQ test and be assigned a quotient. Well,

that's never been the case with what I'm calling creativity. There are no creativity tests which are valid predictors of what somebody will produce. There, and that being the case, we can't recreate schools based on a new definition of talent and then choose some students as more talented than others. Now, in other words, your son has a 93 percentile on the talent test or the creativity test, and my son has a 42nd percentile.

Well, we better get your son into a special situation and god help your son, my son excuse me. You know, it doesn't hold, it's not valid. We can't, you know, there's, there's no way to really do that in any sense that it holds water, you know, either scientifically, experimentally or intellectually. And so the one, the last characteristic in this list of what I think schools must be, should be, is that they create the kinds of experiences that I described for all students, not for a select few students. We don't give into the temptation to rank sort the kids in our schools and then provide special experiences for some but not for others. I think that's, it's unjustifiable in any real way.

Debbie: Yeah, I completely agree. As you were talking, I was thinking of Scott Barry Kaufman's work, who I'm sure you're familiar with and we've had him on the show and he's written a book called *Ungifted: Intelligence Redefined: The Truth About Talent, Practice, Creativity and the Many Paths to Greatness*. And you know, I think this conversation about changing what we value, you know, in society and just question the markers that we've been measuring against I think is so important. And I'm wondering, one of the things that jumped out at me when I was reading your book was this idea of being lifelong learners. And it really just struck me that in many ways I think the traditional school model is, it is fostering a dislike of learning, right? And you know, you mentioned students who are bored and can you talk about why it's so important that, that we raise children to be lifelong learners and how maybe even as how we as parents can pick up where schools are not meeting that need?

Terry: Yeah. Well, I think one of the things, I've tried in the last few days, as you might imagine, to think about how to describe this book as different from others. In other words, the one you just described, for example, or other books about creativity or about education. And I think the thing that I've tried to do, and hopefully successfully, is contextualize this conversation in the future. Right? In other words, it's not just about how we're treating our kids now, although that's vitally important. And when your son or daughter is unhappy at the dinner table, it's not a happy meal, you know. But I mean that we can't avoid that sort of existential piece to this. But, but the real argument in this book is if we stop and take a deep breath and look at the world in which our children will live, that world demands the kind of creativity that we're talking about.

And in fact, for parents, affluent parents living in the suburbs who are very invested in their children having the highest scores and getting into the best colleges and succeeding in all the sort of traditional ways, perhaps in the ways they themselves succeeded, the bad news is that the world that exists really right around the corner, but certainly by 2050, that world doesn't reward those paths. Not only are there multiple paths, I believe we can safely predict that a lot of the traditional paths to success are shutting down. Now what does that mean? One of

the things, one of the reasons they're shutting down is that I think success in the 21st century, there are two graphs in the book. One graph looks like a saw blade, right? The path through one's life goes up, down, up, down, up, down.

Even though the general arc may be up towards more prosperity and wisdom and accomplishment, the traditional arc is, you know, goes straight up. I go from doing well in elementary school to gifted programs in middle school to a special high school, to the best university. You know, et cetera, et cetera. And then 20 years later I've married well, have two beautiful children and I'm living outside Boston, you know. I'm joking, but you, I hope you can tell I'm joking, but you get the general idea. Everything we know about the 21st century says that you're going to have to learn a profession and then learn a new profession. You're going to have to quite likely survive several primary relationships. Not survive. That's the wrong word. Survive and thrive through several primary relationships. You're going to have a family that is about as far from Ozzie and Harriet as we can possibly imagine.

Quite likely you're going to live in at least one foreign country, probably more. Your children may well be, have dual citizenship in one or more foreign countries. You're going move comfortably back and forth across borders. You're going to experience times of economic prosperity, but probably also times of relative economic downturn in your own personal finances. There's a lot of research that suggests that millennials will not make as much money as their parents. And so you know, to the extent that money is a marker for success or prosperity. And so ultimately what we come to is, and I'm going to use an odd word here. I've had colleagues tell me not to use this word, but I think it applies. Our children are going to live in a very volatile world. And by volatile, I don't mean bombs on every street corner, although, you know, if you look at certain parts of the world that seems like a possibility, by volatile, I mean it's going to be changing very, very quickly.

And, and the elements of their personal lives, their private lives as well as their public lives or professional lives are going to change rapidly. And now what that means is that the person who will thrive is the person who likes that kind of world. I'll tell one personal anecdote. My son, my youngest son, Henry, was rified as they say, reduction in force from his job about a year and a half after he graduated from college. And when he called me up to tell me about it, I thought it was going to be one of these, you know, kind of frightening, upset, disappointed, sort of phone calls. And he said, oh no, he said, I've got a month severance pay. I'm spending that time designing the job I want to have as opposed to the job I just lost.

And he did. You know. And so, not to brag on Henry, but there's a certain, well yeah, to brag on Henry, but, but also there's a certain, there's a certain way in which I'm not sure I could have done that at his, that quickly at his age. Right. I wouldn't have had the confidence, I wouldn't have had the, the belief in my own ability, I wouldn't have had the fundamental comfort with a world that's constantly changing, as it were. And so that's what I mean by volatility. I don't mean dangerous as much as I mean our kids are going to live in a world, you know, that will inspire creativity and reward creativity as opposed to a world

that will reward consistency and stability and that sort of thing. More traditional values, particularly in the workplace if you will.

Debbie: Well, I, you know, in the back of the book or towards the back of the book, you share examples of schools who are doing it right and who are educating our kids for this new future. But as you just mentioned, so many parents are still on that path. And I think that's where a lot of pain within my community comes from as we still are trying to get our kids on this path that we think is the one they need to be on to be successful, whether that's taking AP classes or getting into the right schools and, you know, moving down this. So do you have thoughts for how parents can shift their thinking? Because I also think that, you know, within this paradigm shift that at Tilt Parenting I'm really trying to spread widely is this idea that the way that our kids move through the world needs to be shifted. Parents, especially even parents of neurotypical kids have a lot of power in this paradigm. And a lot at stake in keeping it in place. But what you're sharing is that the goals that they're working towards are not even, are not even going to work for them. So how do we help parents make the shift? Do you have thoughts about that?

Terry: I do. I have several actually. I'm chuckling cause I've imagined over the years all the conversations I've had with parents, you know, as a parent as well as an educator, and I'm old enough, I'm 63 years old and have lived through a lot of, a lot of movements in education and parenting, et cetera. So, so I would approach it this way. The first piece of advice that I would offer parents, you know, if I'm sitting in the downstairs basement of our house and outside of Asheville, and if we could, if 12 of us could sit around the room and take our shoes off and talk honestly about parenting, one of the things I would say is if you yourself are successful, meaning you've, you know, you have a certain level of income, you have a certain amount of affluence, you know, and of course there are all kinds of racial and gender and issues that go along with affluence.

But if you're successful, be careful because the path to success for your children almost by definition, is not the same path you followed. In other words, if you're successful because you were a more, I think you used the phrase neurotypical, which I've never heard and I kind of like it, I'm going to jot it down. If you're a neurotypical person, but, you know, you were successful because you went to the right schools, you kept your nose clean, you don't have an arrest record, god forbid, you went to that first job and showed up 15 minutes early every single day, you know, and you never took a day off and you worked hard, et cetera, et cetera, you know, the traditional American pathway to success. That's all fine and good, but the world that's coming probably won't reward that in your children.

So be careful of projecting onto your children your own pathway. Long ago as an educator, I learned to be very leery of the self-made man or woman because what they tended to assume is that their path was the path rather than a path. And so I think that's tempting for us as parents, right? Do it the way I did it. And, and you know, and that might work, but it, but it could well not work and it may also not honor who your child is. And so that's the first thing. The second thing I think is that education doesn't equal schooling. That's true in two ways. The first way in which it's true is that one becomes educated over the course of one's

lifetime, I believe. It's legitimate to talk about someone who's 50 as being well educated.

It's not legitimate to talk about someone who's 22 as educated. They're schooled. But for better or worse in some ways. And being educated is, is a matter of many more decades I think, I think personally. And so don't, don't put too much pressure on school to be the gateway to success. The other way in which schooling doesn't equal education is, I think schooling, as we've said, at best they're, even the best schools only offer a certain amount of, can logistically offer a certain range of experience and things like travel, things like outdoor experience in the natural world. Things like leadership training, things like a lot of creativity sorts of things involving the traditional arts, but other forms of sort of creative expression. Try as we might, it's almost impossible to fit those things into 180 days and six hours a day.

You know, I've tried. We've tried, my colleagues and I have tried. And so as, and I've been in conversations with parents and they've said they must give my student algebra one by the seventh grade. And you know, one of them ran up and said, no, they mustn't. They can't, it's impossible. You know, as a parent educator, I just know it's not. And I think kids learn so much of what they learn outside of school. And so that's another way in which schooling doesn't equal education. And so I think they learn from spending time with their grandparents. They learn from being in Scouts, they learn from taking art classes. They learn from being by themselves and reading, you know, the list goes on and on and on. But as parents, it's a, we run a risk if we say to the school, if we confront the schoolhouse and say, you arrange, I'm sending you my child, arrange their future for them.

When I take off my parent hat and put on my educator hat, I say, we'll do as much as we can in collaboration with you in the best of all possible worlds. But there's lots of things we can't do. You know, even if you send them to us 24/7, 365, there's lots of things we can't do, lots of experiences we can't recreate. So again, I'm really saying to parents, think about the time you spend with kids. Think about that with your kids. Think about how you spend that time, you know, have you gone to live abroad? Have you traveled, have you, and again, we're now into dangerous territory because a lot of that has to do with income. You know, I, one of the dangers I see in the, even in the schooling that I propose is I don't want it to become schooling for the affluent.

And a dear friend, George Wood, who writes a blurb on the back of the book, George said, the only problem with what you're talking about is that in many places, this kind of sensitive, thoughtful, wise schooling exists, but only for the most affluent. And, and he, George and I, Terry and you, Debbie, I'm now recruiting you. You know, we're profoundly against that. You know, we're, or at least I, I'll speak for George and myself. We're, we're for that schooling as nearly as we can create it for all students. Because again, the talent pool argument, if nothing else. I mean, there's the humane argument that all schools, you know, the schooling, the schooling for best is the schooling for all, but there's also the talent pool argument. You know, the next great musician lives somewhere in the rural Midwest and is hundreds of miles from a residential school of music.

The next great architect will never find a place to take a drafting class in an urban setting in New England. You know, in other words, the list goes on and on. I can make up a dozen examples, but the point is there's nothing about me that wants us to create enlightened schools for the few. Right. And I, and I have a feeling this is probably true of your listeners. I, you have listeners everywhere, I expect.

Debbie: Yeah, all over the world, I'm sure.

Terry: Yeah. All over the world. And one of the things about this as I began to write this book and sort of situate education in our current social, cultural, social milieu, it's safe to say that the conditions that I describe exist everywhere except China. And I just don't know if they exist in China. But they, you know, they exist all over, Africa, South America, Europe, Asia, and the US. And there are school systems, by the way, in the world that are already moving beyond standardization. We just seem to be stuck there in the US right now. And so I'm a believer that we need to not just be advocates for our own children, our own biological children or adopted children, but for all, you know, and in the case you describe all differently wired children, which is of course what you've done. But, and you know, the sound you hear is applause by the way, but, you know, we need to, we need to rethink how we do education in as wide a possible range as possible.

Debbie: Absolutely. Wow, so much food for thought, I'm really just grateful that you put this work out. I, and I'm happy to be bringing this conversation. I hope that your book sparks lots of conversations, not just among parent communities who are raising kids like mine, but among all communities and educators because it's important that we, yeah, make this kind of shift accessible for all students. 100%. So could you just take a minute and tell us where listeners can learn more about you and where they can find your book?

Terry: Sure. This book is published by Turner publishing in Nashville, Tennessee. I work for something called the National Paideia Center, paideia is the Greek word for the nurturing of children. You can find me in two places. You can, you can follow me on Facebook at Terry Roberts author. You can follow our work as a school transformation organization at the Paideia Center website, which is www.paideia.org. Paideia is spelled paideia.org. So follow us in all of those places. The book will of course will be available through all the standard outlets, through Amazon, through Turner publishing, through your local independent bookstore. It will eventually, if it's not already, be available both electronically and as an audio book. So there are lots of different ways in which you can hear these ideas, absorb these ideas and think about them. And I would also invite you as you begin to dig in if you'd be interested in continuing this conversation, please email me. You can email me at TRoberts@paideia.org. And I would love to hear from you.

Debbie: Fantastic. Well Terry, thank you so much for just sharing all these ideas with us. Again, I really love having these kinds of conversations because it just, there's so much to think about and it's exciting to think about the kind of changes that we could make and just to know that there are so many people out there working to

make these shifts and to question the status quo. So thank you so much for this contribution and for coming by today.

Terry: Debbie, thank you. Thank you for everything you do. And here is a deep bow to you personally for all your work and may it prosper.

Debbie: Thank you so much, Terry.

RESOURCES MENTIONED:

- [Dr. Terry Roberts' website](#)
- Dr. Roberts' email: troberts@paideia.org
- [Dr. Roberts on Facebook](#)
- *The New Smart: How Nurturing Creativity Will Help Children Thrive* by Terry Roberts
- [National Paideia Center](#)
- [Dr. Scott Barry Kaufman on Redefining Giftedness and Intelligence](#) (TiLT Podcast episode)
- *Ungifted: Intelligence Redefined* by Dr. Scott Barry Kaufman
- [Howard Gardner's theory of multiple intelligences](#)