

Grade 2 Global Screening in Spring 2006

Carlos Martínez, Jr.

Background

Montgomery County Public Schools (MCPS) Policy IOA, *Gifted and Talented Education*, does not require students to be designated “gifted and talented” to receive accelerated and enriched instruction. However, the Code of Maryland Regulations (COMAR) requires students with “*outstanding abilities*” to be “*identified by professionally qualified individuals*” as “*gifted and talented.*” MCPS conducts a screening of all Grade 2 students to meet the state requirement and to serve as a critical review point so that all students are provided appropriate instruction. MCPS refers to this process as “global screening.”

Screening Process

All Grade 2 students participated in the global screening process during March, April, and May. During this period, a variety of data were collected from parent surveys, MCPS teacher and staff surveys, and students’ reading and mathematics instruction levels and scores on the Raven Test of Standard Progressive Matrices and the CTB/McGraw-Hill InView.

After data on each student have been collected, the school’s accelerated and enriched instruction committee chaired by an administrator, analyzes each student’s data. The committee uses multiple criteria to identify students, and no single criterion may be used to exclude a student. Students are either identified as gifted and talented, not identified, or recommended for rescreening. At the end of the process, parents receive a report and explanation of their child’s test scores (MCPS, 2005).

The spring 2006 procedures were revised based on data from the September 2005 MCPS report, *An Examination of the Grade 2 Global Screening for Identification of Gifted and Talented Students* (Stevenson, 2005), and parent, staff, and community input. Specific changes included giving primary consideration to students’ daily performance and secondary consideration to the results of cognitive

assessments. The 2006 teacher, parent, and staff advocacy surveys were revised from the 2005 version to capture characteristics of all populations. Surveys were sent home to parents of all second graders and copies were available at each school. Where appropriate, translations of the surveys were made available. Only two subtests on the InView were included this year. The analogies and quantitative reasoning subtests reflected the best assessment of student strengths in all subgroups.

Monitoring of the global screening process by the Office of School Performance (OSP) and the Division of Accelerated and Enriched Instruction (AEI) included review of committee membership for balanced and diverse representation and timely and thorough completion of the process.

Methodology

Student demographic data as well as identification and recommendations for rescreening were reviewed. Data for reporting purposes were available since spring 2004.

Results

Students Screened and Identified

A total of 3,866 Grade 2 students (39.5%) were identified as gifted and talented in 2005–2006, compared with 3,333 (33.8%) in 2004–2005 and 4,503 (44.5%) identified in 2003–2004 (Appendix Table 1). Analysis of the data disaggregated by student race and ethnicity shows that in 2005–2006 African American and Hispanic students continue to be underrepresented.

While African American students represent 22.6% of all students screened, they account for 13.1% of students identified in 2005–2006, an increase from 12.3% in 2004–2005. While Hispanic students represent 20.6% of all students screened, they represent 11.4% of students identified, an increase from 10.6% in 2004–2005. Grade 2 students who received Free and Reduced-price Meals System

(FARMS), special education, and Limited English Proficiency (LEP) services also are underrepresented, but identified students receiving FARMS and LEP services increased since 2004–2005.

There are some dissimilar identification patterns among students who attend high poverty, red zone versus students attending green zone schools. The proportion of African American and Hispanic students identified is higher in red zone schools than in green zone schools (Appendix Table 2). While African American students represent 32.8% of the students screened in red zone schools, they represent 23.9% of those identified. In green zone schools, African American students represent 13.5% of screened students and 5.6% of identified students. Hispanic students represent 32.7% of the students in red zone schools; they are 20.7% of those identified. In green zone schools, Hispanic students represent 9.7% of screened students, and 4.9% of identified students. African American and Hispanic students enrolled in green zone schools represented less than half of the percentage of their screened representation while the differences within the red zone schools were less.

Students Recommended for Rescreening

A total of 1,167 students were recommended to be rescreened, 11.9% of the screened students (Appendix Table 3). Students recommended for rescreening were proportionate to overall system demographics. For example, 22.4% of those recommended for rescreening were African American, close to the 22.6% proportion they represent of all students screened. Asian American students represent 14.9 % of screened students and 13.0% of those rescreened; Hispanic students represent 20.6% of screened students and 23.9% of those recommended to be rescreened; and Whites were 41.6% of all screened students and 40.1% of those recommended to be rescreened.

For students receiving special services, the proportions of those recommended to be rescreened are similar to their representation of the original screened population.

Discussion

MCPS policy encourages providing access to rigorous instruction for all students. Results from the spring 2006 Grade 2 global screening process indicate that African American and Hispanic students continue to be underrepresented in identification.

However, the results indicate an improvement from the previous year.

Further, the global screening of Grade 2 students in 2006 is the first time rescreening was reported by demographic groups of students. These data show that African American and Hispanic students were represented more proportionally.

These results suggest that work continues to be needed for the global screening process. Continued monitoring is encouraged, and the Department of Shared Accountability will continue to work with OSP and the AEI to examine the issues of access and performance. Schools results are available in Appendix Table 4.

Continuation of current processes without increased support before Grade 2 will likely maintain the trend of disproportionate representation. Efforts to develop a countywide primary talent development model to reveal, nurture, develop, and document student strengths prior to the global screening of Grade 2 students will help reduce disproportional identification and align the screening process with other system efforts to eliminate the achievement gap.

References

- Montgomery County Public Schools. (1995). *Policy IOA, Gifted and Talented Education*. Rockville, MD: Author.
- Montgomery County Public Schools. (2005). *Procedures for Recognition of Elementary Students for Gifted and Talented Service*. Rockville, MD: Author.
- Naglieri, J. and Ford, D. (2005). Increasing minority children's participation in gifted classes using the NNAT: A response to Lohman. *Gifted Child Quarterly*. 49 (1), 27–34.
- Stevenson, J. (2005). *An Examination of the Grade 2 Global Screening for Identification of Gifted and Talented Students*. Rockville, MD: Montgomery County Public Schools. Rockville, MD.

Grade 2 Global Screening in Spring 2006

Appendix

Table 1

Number and Proportional Percentage of Grade 2 Students Screened and Identified
in 2003–2004 through 2005–2006 by Race/Ethnicity and Services Provided

	2003–2004				2004–2005				2005–2006			
	Screened		Identified		Screened		Identified		Screened		Identified	
	<i>N</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>N</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>N</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
All Students	10,118		4,503	44.5	9,875		3,333	33.8	9,782		3,866	39.5
Race/Ethnicity												
African American	2,127	21.0	519	11.5	2,196	22.2	411	12.3	2,213	22.6	506	13.1
Asian American	1,544	15.3	887	19.7	1,568	15.9	710	21.3	1,454	14.9	830	21.5
Hispanic	2,101	20.8	625	13.9	2,079	21.1	354	10.6	2,011	20.6	439	11.4
White	4,320	42.7	2,465	54.7	3,995	40.5	1,840	55.2	4,072	41.6	2,090	54.1
Services Provided												
FARMS	2,863	28.3	711	15.8	2,950	29.9	432	13.0	2,432	24.9	557	14.4
Special Education	965	9.5	244	5.4	1,017	10.3	139	4.2	876	9.0	159	4.1
LEP	952	9.4	211	4.7	1,149	11.6	176	5.3	1,015	10.4	217	5.6

Note: Due to small numbers, Native American data are not reported, so column totals and percentages may not sum.

Table 2

Number and Proportional Percentage of Students Screened and Identified
in MCPS Red and Green Zone Schools in 2005–2006

	Red Zone Schools				Green Zone Schools			
	Screened		Identified		Screened		Identified	
	<i>N</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>N</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
All Students	4594		1576	34.3	5146		2303	44.75
Race/Ethnicity								
African American	1508	32.8	377	23.9	694	13.5	129	5.6
Asian American	522	11.4	270	17.1	927	18.0	559	24.3
Hispanic	1500	32.7	326	20.7	498	9.7	113	4.9
White	1046	22.8	596	37.8	3013	58.6	1494	64.9
Service Provided								
FARMS	2016	43.9	411	26.1	568	11.0	85	3.7
Special Education	544	11.8	81	5.1	529	10.3	100	4.3
LEP	868	18.9	138	8.8	389	7.6	94	4.1

Note. The term “Red Zone” refers to the 60 elementary schools with the highest concentrations of students who are economically disadvantaged, as measured by student participation in FARMS.

Table 3
 Number and Proportional Percentage of Grade 2 Students
 in Spring 2006 Recommended to be Rescreened in 2007
 by Race/Ethnicity and Services Provided

	Screened		Recommended to be Rescreened in 2007	
	<i>N</i>	%	<i>N</i>	%
All Students	9,782	100	1,167	11.9
Race/Ethnicity				
African American	2,213	22.6	261	22.4
Asian American	1,454	14.9	152	13.0
Hispanic	2,011	20.6	279	23.9
White	4,072	41.6	468	40.1
Services Provided				0.0
FARMS	2,432	24.9	356	30.5
Special Education	876	9.0	79	6.8
LEP	1,015	10.4	144	12.3

Note: Due to small numbers, Native American data are not reported, so column totals may not sum.

Table 4

Number and Proportional Percentage of Students
Identified as Gifted and Talented by Cluster

Cluster 1 Elementary Schools	2004–2005			2005–2006		
	Screened	Identified		Screened	Identified	
	<i>N</i>	<i>n</i>	%	<i>N</i>	<i>n</i>	%
Brown Station	55	11	20.0	50	15	30.0
Clopper Mill	86	21	24.4	50	23	46.0
Darnestown	62	26	41.9	64	30	46.9
Diamond	74	30	40.5	67	33	49.3
Fields Road	78	16	20.5	78	30	38.5
Fox Chapel	75	24	32.0	81	20	24.7
Germantown	77	22	28.6	87	20	23.0
Jones Lane	89	47	52.8	80	39	48.7
Lake Seneca	54	7	13.0	61	22	36.1
Matsunaga	169	71	42.0	204	99	48.5
McAuliffe	109	34	31.2	91	16	17.6
McNair	117	24	20.5	126	49	38.9
Monocacy	30	11	36.7	39	12	30.8
Poolesville	67	22	32.8	73	14	19.2
Rachel Carson	115	44	38.3	121	46	38.0
Sally Ride	101	26	25.7	86	27	31.4
Thurgood Marshall	73	30	41.1	69	27	39.1
Waters Landing	108	22	20.4	118	31	26.3
Cluster 2 Elementary Schools						
Barnsley	72	25	34.7	61	24	39.3
Beall	99	27	27.3	103	46	44.7
Bells Mill	67	31	46.3	78	33	42.3
Beverly Farms	100	50	50.0	99	47	47.5
Cold Spring	76	33	43.4	71	39	54.9
College Gardens	56	24	42.9	74	38	51.4
DuFief	66	30	45.5	85	51	60.0
Fallsmead	84	33	39.3	94	57	60.6
Lakewood	92	34	37.0	88	50	56.8
Maryvale	91	25	27.5	97	39	40.2
Meadow Hall	63	14	22.2	59	18	30.5
Potomac	80	44	55.0	89	50	56.2
Ritchie Park	64	31	48.4	68	33	48.5
Rock Creek Valley	58	23	39.7	59	20	33.9
Seven Locks	44	30	68.2	46	31	67.4
Stone Mill	100	60	60.0	104	65	62.5
Travilah	94	33	35.1	76	43	56.6
Twinbrook	77	24	31.2	82	40	48.8

continued

Table 4 *continued*

Cluster 3 Elementary Schools	2004–2005			2005–2006		
	Screened <i>N</i>	Identified <i>n</i>	%	Screened <i>N</i>	Identified <i>n</i>	%
Belmont	65	27	41.5	66	24	36.4
Broad Acres	83	23	27.7	64	14	21.9
Brooke Grove	75	21	28.0	55	17	30.9
Burnt Mills	89	27	30.3	76	18	23.7
Burtonsville	113	28	24.8	98	25	25.5
Cannon Road	57	26	45.6	61	18	29.5
Charles Drew	55	7	12.7	66	20	30.3
Cloverly	81	21	25.9	85	26	30.6
Cresthaven	92	21	22.8	98	29	29.6
Fairland	81	23	28.4	91	26	28.6
Galway	112	38	33.9	103	30	29.1
Greencastle	99	16	16.2	90	32	35.6
Greenwood	105	37	35.2	99	59	59.6
Jackson Road	63	14	22.2	91	48	52.7
Olney	94	31	33.0	106	41	38.7
Sherwood	80	22	27.5	89	33	37.1
Stonegate	67	34	50.7	64	24	37.5
Westover	41	17	41.5	40	27	67.5
William Tyler Page	66	16	24.2	64	16	25.0
Cluster 4 Elementary Schools						
Ashburton	92	42	45.7	87	32	36.8
Bannockburn	61	34	55.7	49	34	69.4
Bethesda	72	42	58.3	67	41	61.2
Bradley Hills	58	36	62.1	66	41	62.1
Brookhaven	65	15	23.1	51	19	37.3
Burning Tree*	86	0	0.0	94	0	0.0*
Carderock Springs	42	24	57.1	64	37	57.8
Farmland	97	45	46.4	97	60	61.9
Garrett Park	80	36	45.0	75	41	54.7
Harmony Hills	76	18	23.7	81	28	34.6
Kensington Parkwood	86	42	48.8	72	38	52.8
Luxmanor	53	28	52.8	58	36	62.1
Rock Creek Forest	83	35	42.2	84	40	47.6
Rosemary Hills	164	104	63.4	163	97	59.5
Somerset	69	37	53.6	58	44	75.9
Viers Mill	118	35	29.7	95	23	24.2
Weller Road	93	17	18.3	85	12	14.1
Westbrook	48	40	83.3	51	41	80.4
Wheaton Woods	106	30	28.3	109	53	48.6
Wood Acres	100	47	47.0	97	38	39.2
Wyngate	76	37	48.7	86	40	46.5

* Burning Tree and Georgian Forest participated in screening, but did not identify students *continued*

Table 4 *continued*

Cluster 5 Elementary Schools	2004–2005			2005–2006		
	Screened	Identified		Screened	Identified	
	<i>N</i>	<i>n</i>	%	<i>N</i>	<i>n</i>	%
Candlewood	63	21	33.3	50	16	32.0
Cashell	65	29	44.6	44	22	50.0
Cedar Grove	94	25	26.6	92	35	38.0
Clarksburg	87	22	25.3	117	49	41.9
Clearspring	86	27	31.4	69	24	34.8
Daly	90	19	21.1	74	19	25.7
Damascus	60	14	23.3	47	20	42.6
Flower Hill	83	17	20.5	88	26	29.5
Gaithersburg	107	16	15.0	60	18	30.0
Goshen	115	21	18.3	122	32	26.2
Laytonsville	85	29	34.1	74	28	37.8
Mill Creek Towne	57	17	29.8	77	27	35.1
Resnik	104	21	20.2	92	18	19.6
Rockwell	80	26	32.5	73	22	30.1
Rosemont	62	13	21.0	88	20	22.7
Sequoyah	81	19	23.5	82	28	34.1
South Lake	81	18	22.2	81	19	23.5
Stedwick	103	28	27.2	75	25	33.3
Strawberry Knoll	75	19	25.3	72	19	26.4
Summit Hall	89	17	19.1	66	12	18.2
Washington Grove	63	20	31.7	67	21	31.3
Watkins Mill	104	20	19.2	108	23	21.3
Whetstone	86	30	34.9	92	31	33.7
Woodfield	64	23	35.9	71	30	42.3
Cluster 6 Elementary Schools						
Bel Pre	132	23	17.4	132	54	40.9
East Silver Spring	77	24	31.2	56	31	55.4
Forest Knolls	81	38	46.9	85	37	43.5
Georgian Forest*	82	1	1.2	70	0	0.0*
Glen Haven	88	20	22.7	77	22	28.6
Glenallan	73	20	27.4	64	24	37.5
Highland	101	19	18.8	95	24	25.3
Highland View	45	19	42.2	48	19	39.6
Kemp Mill	98	29	29.6	82	25	30.5
Montgomery Knolls	107	35	32.7	79	31	39.2
New Hampshire Estates	90	20	22.2	74	33	44.6
Oakland Terrace	126	42	33.3	118	57	48.3
Rock View	78	23	29.5	86	37	43.0
Rolling Terrace	125	49	39.2	91	42	46.2
Sligo Creek	103	50	48.5	111	53	47.7
Takoma Park	128	76	59.4	135	70	51.9
Woodlin	93	36	38.7	93	54	39.8

* Burning Tree and Georgian Forest participated in screening, but did not identify students