

Grade 2 Global Screening in Spring 2007

E. Grace Chesney

Background

The Montgomery County Board of Education Policy IOA, *Gifted and Talented Education*, sets as one of its purposes, “To extend each child’s intellectual boundaries and help all students achieve their highest potential.” The policy does not require students to be designated as “gifted and talented” (GT) to receive accelerated and enriched instruction. However, the Code of Maryland Administrative Regulations (COMAR) requires that students with “outstanding abilities” be “identified by professionally qualified individuals” as “gifted and talented.” In the spring of each year, the Montgomery County Public Schools (MCPS) conducts a screening of all Grade 2 students in order to meet this state mandate. MCPS refers to this process as “global screening” (Martinez, 2006).

Methodology

All Grade 2 students participated in the global screening process during the spring of 2007. As part of the process, a variety of student data was collected including parent, teacher, and staff surveys; students’ reading and mathematics instructional levels; and results of cognitive assessments including the Raven Test of Standard Progressive Matrices and the Analogies and Quantitative Reasoning subtests of the CTB/McGraw-Hill In View. Parent surveys were mailed home to all families of Grade 2 students and collected by schools. Translations of surveys were available in the five most commonly spoken languages in MCPS.

Following the collection of data, each school’s Accelerated and Enriched Instruction (AEI) Committee (formally GT Committee), chaired by an administrator, analyzed the data to make recommendations for instructional services for each student. After making recommendations for instruction, the AEI Committee used multiple criteria to identify students as gifted and talented. According to guidelines established by the AEI Committee, no single criterion can be used to exclude a student from identification and decisions not to identify cannot bar any child from receiving accelerated and enriched instruction. All students were either identified as gifted and talented, recommended for rescreening, or

not identified. At the end of the process, parents received a report and explanation of their child’s test scores (MCPS, 2007).

In collaboration with staff in the Office of School Performance (OSP) and the Department of Shared Accountability (DSA), staff in the Division of Accelerated and Enriched Instruction monitors the global screening process, analyzing student identification and performance within the county, clusters, and schools.

Student demographic data, as well as identification status and recommendations for rescreening were reviewed, analyzed, and reported.

Results

Students Screened and Identified

A total of 3,688 students (39.4%) were identified as gifted and talented in 2006–2007, compared with 3,866 (39.5%) in 2005–2006 and 3,333 (33.8%) students in 2004–2005. Analysis of the data disaggregated by students’ race/ethnicity shows that in 2006–2007, African American and Hispanic students continue to be identified at a disproportionately lower rate than their Asian American and White peers. (Appendix Tables 1–3).

Appendix Table 1 shows the results of spring 2007 Grade 2 global screening in relationship to the percentage of students identified (39.4%), recommended for rescreening (15.6%), and not identified (45.0%). These data are disaggregated by students’ race/ethnicity and services provided. The percentage of each student subgroup is represented in relationship to the number of students within the subgroup.

Appendix Table 2 shows the percentage of each student subgroup screened and identified in relationship to the total number of students in the county screened or identified. While African American students represent 22.5% of all the students screened in 2006–2007, they account for 12.7% of the total number of students identified, a decrease from the 13.1% in 2005–2006. Similarly, Hispanic

students represent 21.1% of all students screened and they account for 11.9% of the students identified, a slight increase from the 11.4% in 2005–2006. Grade 2 students who received Free and Reduced-price Meals System (FARMS), special education, and Limited English Proficiency (LEP) services also are underrepresented. Identified students who received LEP services increased from 5.6% in 2005–2006 to 6.9% in 2006–2007.

Appendix Table 3 shows the percentage of each student subgroup in relationship to the number of students screened and identified within the subgroup. For example, while 39.4% of all students in all subgroups screened are identified, African American and Hispanic students are underrepresented with 22.3% of the African American students screened identified and 22.2% of the Hispanic students screened identified. Of the Asian American students screened, 59.4% are identified and 50.4% of the White students screened are identified. Of the students receiving FARMS, 19.5% are identified and of the students receiving special education and LEP services, 17.4% and 16.9%, respectively, are identified.

Appendix Table 3 also shows that over the three-year period, the percentage of students identified overall has increased from 33.8% to 39.4%. There are similar percentage increases for all the subgroups. For example, the percentage of African American students identified has increased from 18.7% to 22.3% and for the Hispanic students the percentage increased from 17.0% to 22.2%.

Appendix Table 4 shows the number and percentage of Grade 2 students identified as gifted and talented by individual school.

Students Recommended for Rescreening

Of the 9,364 students screened, 15.6% (or 1,458 students) were recommended to be rescreened in spring 2008 (Appendix Table 1). Students recommended for rescreening were proportionate to overall system demographics.

Discussion

The essential outcome of the global screening process is to ensure that the gifts of all students are revealed, documented, and developed throughout their years in MCPS. However, the data collected for this process only meet the narrow scope of identification and the application of a label to students. The data indicate that among students identified as gifted and talented,

African American and Hispanic students continue to be underrepresented while White and Asian American students continue to be overrepresented. This finding is consistent with data collected in 2005–2006 (Martinez, 2006). This pattern suggests that new steps must be taken to reach equitable identification results. The data do not inform the system as to the extent to which accelerated and enriched instructional programming is available among schools. To analyze equity in delivery of advanced instructional programming, MCPS would need a stronger data collection focus on services instead of analyzing only identification. Steps have been made in this direction with the collection of data for Math 6 in Grade 5 and Algebra 1 in Grade 8, but additional data points are necessary to form a more comprehensive analysis.

Recommendations

1. Staff in OSP, DSA, and the AEI Committee should continue to closely monitor the process and examine the issues of access to rigorous and challenging instruction prior to and after Grade 2.
2. Further study of the implementation of the global screening process at the local school level is necessary. Steps should include analyzing the composition of the AEI Committee and its role in recommending appropriate services as well as any implications for professional development.
3. MCPS should address the variance among schools in expectations, instruction, and services provided to students. To reach this goal, MCPS should build on the current collection of data in mathematics to develop a system that documents and communicates enrollment and performance in accelerated and enriched instruction.
4. The primary talent development model included in the kindergarten curriculum revision should be implemented and evaluated. Primary talent development is designed to reveal, nurture, develop, and document student strengths prior to global screening. By nurturing creative and critical thinking skills, it is expected that the strengths and talents of more students will be revealed both in the classroom and during the global screening process. Data should be collected and analyzed to determine consistent implementation of the model as well as the effectiveness in reducing the pattern of disproportionate identification.

References

Martinez, C. (2006). *Grade 2 Global Screening in Spring 2006*. Rockville, MD: Montgomery County Public Schools. Rockville, MD.

Montgomery County Public Schools. (1995). *Policy IOA, Gifted and Talented Education*. Rockville, MD: Author

Montgomery County Public Schools. (2007). *Procedures for Recognition of Elementary Students for Gifted and Talented Service*. Rockville, MD: Author

Grade 2 Global Screening in Spring 2007

Appendix

Table 1

Number and Percentage of Grade 2 Students Screened and Identified, Recommended to be Rescreened, or Not Identified in 2006–2007 by Race/Ethnicity and Services Provided
(Percentage relative to number of students in subgroup)

		Screened		Identified		Recommended to be Rescreened		Not Identified	
		<i>N</i>	<i>N</i>	%	<i>N</i>	%	<i>N</i>	%	
All Students		9,364	3688	39.4	1,458	15.6	4,218	45.0	
	Females	4,585	1790	39.0	703	15.3	2,092	45.6	
	Males	4,779	1898	39.7	755	15.8	2,126	44.5	
Race/Ethnicity									
African American		2,111	470	22.3	353	16.7	1,288	61.0	
	Females	1,039	237	22.8	163	15.7	639	61.5	
	Males	1,072	233	21.7	190	17.7	649	60.5	
Asian American		1,442	857	59.4	183	12.7	402	27.9	
	Females	719	427	59.4	90	12.5	202	28.1	
	Males	723	430	59.5	93	12.9	200	27.7	
Hispanic		1,978	439	22.2	341	17.2	1,198	60.6	
	Females	971	210	21.6	170	17.5	591	60.9	
	Males	1,007	229	22.7	171	17.0	607	60.3	
American Indian		37	10	27.0	3	8.1	24	64.9	
	Females	23	5	21.7	2	8.7	16	69.6	
	Males	14	5	35.7	1	7.1	8	57.1	
White		3,796	1,912	50.4	578	15.2	1,306	34.4	
	Females	1,833	911	49.7	278	15.2	644	35.1	
	Males	1,963	1,001	51.0	300	15.3	662	33.7	
Services Provided									
FARMS		2,685	524	19.5	457	17.0	1,704	63.5	
	Females	1,328	259	19.5	217	16.3	852	64.2	
	Males	1,357	265	19.5	240	17.7	852	62.8	
Special Education		803	140	17.4	80	10.0	583	72.6	
	Females	216	31	14.4	16	7.4	169	78.2	
	Males	587	109	18.6	64	10.9	414	70.5	
LEP		1,497	253	16.9	269	18.0	975	65.1	
	Females	693	108	15.6	124	17.9	461	66.5	
	Males	804	145	18.0	145	18.0	514	63.9	

Table 2

Number and Percentage of Grade 2 Students Screened and Identified in 2004–2005 through 2006–2007 by Race/Ethnicity and Services Provided
(Percentage relative to screened or identified for entire county)

	2004–2005				2005–2006				2006–2007			
	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	9,875		3,333		9,782		3,866		9,364		3,688	
Race/Ethnicity												
African American	2,196	22.2	411	12.3	2,213	22.6	506	13.1	2,111	22.5	470	12.7
American Indian	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	37	0.4	10	0.3
Asian American	1,568	15.9	710	21.3	1,454	14.9	830	21.5	1,442	15.4	857	23.2
Hispanic	2,079	21.1	354	10.6	2,011	20.6	439	11.4	1,978	21.1	439	11.9
White	3,995	40.5	1,840	55.2	4,072	41.6	2,090	54.1	3,796	40.5	1,912	51.8
Services Provided												
FARMS	2,950	29.9	432	13.0	2,432	24.9	557	14.4	2,685	28.7	524	14.2
Special Education	1,017	10.3	138	4.2	876	9.0	159	4.1	803	8.6	140	3.8
LEP	1,149	11.6	176	5.3	1,015	10.4	217	5.6	1,497	16.0	253	6.9

Note: Due to small numbers, data for American Indian students were not reported prior to 2006–2007, so column totals and percentages may not sum.

Table 3

Number and Percentage of Grade 2 Students Screened and Identified in 2004–2005 through 2006–2007 by Race/Ethnicity and Services Provided
(Percentage relative to number of students in subgroup)

	2004–2005			2005–2006			2006–2007		
	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	9,875	3,333	33.8	9,782	3,866	39.5	9,364	3,688	39.4
Race/Ethnicity									
African American	2,196	411	18.7	2,213	506	22.9	2,111	470	22.3
American Indian	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	37	10	27.0
Asian American	1,568	710	45.3	1,454	830	57.1	1,442	857	59.4
Hispanic	2,079	354	17.0	2,011	439	21.8	1,978	439	22.2
White	3,995	1,840	46.1	4,072	2,090	51.3	3,796	1,912	50.4
Services Provided									
FARMS	2,950	432	14.6	2,432	557	22.9	2,685	524	19.5
Special Education	1,017	138	13.6	876	159	18.2	803	140	17.4
LEP	1,149	176	15.3	1,015	217	21.4	1,497	253	16.9

Note: Due to small numbers, data for American Indian students were not reported prior to 2006–2007.

Table 4

Number and Percentage of Grade 2 Students
Identified as Gifted and Talented by School in 2004–2005 through 2006–2007

Elementary School	2004–2005			2005–2006			2006–2007		
	Screened <i>N</i>	Identified <i>n</i>	%	Screened <i>N</i>	Identified <i>n</i>	%	Screened <i>N</i>	Identified <i>n</i>	%
Ashburton	92	42	45.7	87	32	36.8	86	36	41.9
Bannockburn	61	34	55.7	49	34	69.4	60	38	63.3
Lucy V. Barnsley	72	25	34.7	61	24	39.3	72	27	37.5
Beall	99	27	27.3	103	46	44.7	89	41	46.1
Bel Pre	132	23	17.4	132	54	40.9	137	38	27.7
Bells Mill	67	31	46.3	78	33	42.3	72	40	55.6
Belmont	65	27	41.5	66	24	36.4	79	21	26.6
Bethesda	72	42	58.3	67	41	61.2	66	35	53.0
Beverly Farms	100	50	50.0	99	47	47.5	101	53	52.5
Bradley Hills	58	36	62.1	66	41	62.1	62	52	83.9
Broad Acres	83	23	27.7	64	14	21.9	64	20	31.3
Brooke Grove	75	21	28.0	55	17	30.9	65	23	35.4
Brookhaven	65	15	23.1	51	19	37.3	56	15	26.8
Brown Station	55	11	20.0	50	15	30.0	52	10	19.2
Burning Tree *	86	n/a	n/a	94	n/a	n/a	89	n/a	n/a
Burnt Mills	89	27	30.3	76	18	23.7	53	15	28.3
Burtonsville	113	28	24.8	98	25	25.5	88	23	26.1
Candlewood	63	21	33.3	50	16	32.0	54	25	46.3
Cannon Road	57	26	45.6	61	18	29.5	63	23	36.5
Carderock Springs	42	24	57.1	64	37	57.8	52	30	57.7
Rachel Carson	115	44	38.3	121	46	38.0	111	64	57.7
Cashell	65	29	44.6	44	22	50.0	45	21	46.7
Cedar Grove	94	25	26.6	92	35	38.0	102	33	32.4
Clarksburg	87	22	25.3	117	49	41.9	55	18	32.7
Clearspring	86	27	31.4	69	24	34.8	68	15	22.1
Clopper Mill	86	21	24.4	50	23	46.0	59	19	32.2
Cloverly	81	21	25.9	85	26	30.6	74	27	36.5
Cold Spring	76	33	43.4	71	39	54.9	50	27	54.0
College Gardens	56	24	42.9	74	38	51.4	100	45	45.0
Cresthaven	92	21	22.8	98	29	29.6	n/a	n/a	n/a
Captain James E. Daly	90	19	21.1	74	19	25.7	78	13	16.7
Damascus	60	14	23.3	47	20	42.6	42	9	21.4
Darnestown	62	26	41.9	64	30	46.9	74	34	45.9
Diamond	74	30	40.5	67	33	49.3	73	34	46.6
Dr. Charles R. Drew	55	7	12.7	66	20	30.3	63	15	23.8
DuFief	66	30	45.5	85	51	60.0	75	32	42.7
East Silver Spring	77	24	31.2	56	31	55.4	60	32	53.3
Fairland	81	23	28.4	91	26	28.6	78	13	16.7
Fallsmead	84	33	39.3	94	57	60.6	72	46	63.9
Farmland	97	45	46.4	97	60	61.9	97	59	60.8
Fields Road	78	16	20.5	78	30	38.5	73	30	41.1

Continued

Elementary School	2004–2005			2005–2006			2006–2007		
	Screened	Identified		Screened	Identified		Screened	Identified	
	<i>N</i>	<i>n</i>	%	<i>N</i>	<i>n</i>	%	<i>N</i>	<i>n</i>	%
Flower Hill	83	17	20.5	88	26	29.5	66	23	34.8
Flower Valley	76	24	31.6	78	36	46.2	57	24	42.1
Forest Knolls	81	38	46.9	85	37	43.5	88	38	43.2
Fox Chapel	75	24	32.0	81	20	24.7	71	17	23.9
Gaithersburg	107	16	15.0	60	18	30.0	72	15	20.8
Galway	112	38	33.9	103	30	29.1	112	23	20.5
Garrett Park	80	36	45.0	75	41	54.7	76	46	60.5
Georgian Forest *	82	n/a	n/a	70	n/a	n/a	69	n/a	n/a
Germantown	77	22	28.6	87	20	23.0	46	13	28.3
Glen Haven	88	20	22.7	77	22	28.6	72	21	29.2
Glenallen	73	20	27.4	64	24	37.5	54	17	31.5
Goshen	115	21	18.3	122	32	26.2	90	30	33.3
Great Seneca Creek	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	92	39	42.4
Greencastle	99	16	16.2	90	32	35.6	93	23	24.7
Greenwood	105	37	35.2	99	59	59.6	96	40	41.7
Harmony Hills	76	18	23.7	81	28	34.6	81	14	17.3
Highland	101	19	18.8	95	24	25.3	90	20	22.2
Highland View	45	19	42.2	48	19	39.6	50	30	60.0
Jackson Road	63	14	22.2	91	48	52.7	75	31	41.3
Jones Lane	89	47	52.8	80	39	48.7	87	38	43.7
Kemp Mill	98	29	29.6	82	25	30.5	85	22	25.9
Kensington Parkwood	86	42	48.8	72	38	52.8	74	31	41.9
Lake Seneca	54	7	13.0	61	22	36.1	40	16	40.0
Lakewood	92	34	37.0	88	50	56.8	105	57	54.3
Laytonsville	85	29	34.1	74	28	37.8	77	37	48.1
Little Bennett	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	111	33	29.7
Luxmanor	53	28	52.8	58	36	62.1	57	33	57.9
Thurgood Marshall	73	30	41.1	69	27	39.1	85	27	31.8
Maryvale	91	25	27.5	97	39	40.2	91	50	54.9
Spark M. Matsunaga	169	71	42.0	204	99	48.5	147	85	57.8
S. Christa McAuliffe	109	34	31.2	91	16	17.6	108	26	24.1
Ronald McNair	117	24	20.5	126	49	38.9	108	29	26.9
Meadow Hall	63	14	22.2	59	18	30.5	57	22	38.6
Mill Creek Towne	57	17	29.8	77	27	35.1	73	22	30.1
Monocacy	30	11	36.7	39	12	30.8	37	14	37.8
Montgomery Knolls	107	35	32.7	79	31	39.2	83	44	53.0
New Hampshire Estates	90	20	22.2	74	33	44.6	91	24	26.4
Roscoe Nix	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	98	26	26.5
Oakland Terrace	126	42	33.3	118	57	48.3	101	34	33.7
Olney	94	31	33.0	106	41	38.7	100	37	37.0
William Tyler Page	66	16	24.2	64	16	25.0	63	27	42.9
Poolesville	67	22	32.8	73	14	19.2	69	22	31.9
Potomac	80	44	55.0	89	50	56.2	97	50	51.5
Judith A. Resnik	104	21	20.2	92	18	19.6	84	15	17.9
Dr. Sally K. Ride	101	26	25.7	86	27	31.4	81	27	33.3
Ritchie Park	64	31	48.4	68	33	48.5	81	41	50.6

Continued

Elementary School	2004–2005			2005–2006			2006–2007		
	Screened	Identified		Screened	Identified		Screened	Identified	
	<i>N</i>	<i>n</i>	%	<i>N</i>	<i>n</i>	%	<i>N</i>	<i>n</i>	%
Rock Creek Forest	83	35	42.2	84	40	47.6	84	37	44.0
Rock Creek Valley	58	23	39.7	59	20	33.9	54	17	31.5
Rock View	78	23	29.5	86	37	43.0	73	22	30.1
Lois P. Rockwell	80	26	32.5	73	22	30.1	53	18	34.0
Rolling Terrace	125	49	39.2	91	42	46.2	88	44	50.0
Rosemary Hills	164	104	63.4	163	97	59.5	189	110	58.2
Rosemont	62	13	21	88	20	22.7	89	33	37.1
Sequoyah	81	19	23.5	82	28	34.1	70	18	25.7
Seven Locks	44	30	68.2	46	31	67.4	48	25	52.1
Sherwood	80	22	27.5	89	33	37.1	85	27	31.8
Sargent Shriver	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	79	30	38.0
Sligo Creek	103	50	48.5	111	53	47.7	105	32	30.5
Somerset	69	37	53.6	58	44	75.9	63	43	68.3
South Lake	81	18	22.2	81	19	23.5	79	19	24.1
Stedwick	103	28	27.2	75	25	33.3	87	27	31.0
Stone Mill	100	60	60	104	65	62.5	99	46	46.5
Stonegate	67	34	50.7	64	24	37.5	81	35	43.2
Strawberry Knoll	75	19	25.3	72	19	26.4	73	15	20.5
Summit Hall	89	17	19.1	66	12	18.2	69	12	17.4
Takoma Park	128	76	59.4	135	70	51.9	139	77	55.4
Travilah	94	33	35.1	76	43	56.6	77	44	57.1
Twinbrook	77	24	31.2	82	40	48.8	68	22	32.4
Viers Mill	118	35	29.7	95	23	24.2	53	16	30.2
Washington Grove	63	20	31.7	67	21	31.3	45	14	31.1
Waters Landing	108	22	20.4	118	31	26.3	104	27	26.0
Watkins Mill	104	20	19.2	108	23	21.3	73	13	17.8
Wayside	99	46	46.5	112	64	57.1	92	58	63.0
Weller Road	93	17	18.3	85	12	14.1	63	27	42.9
Westbrook	48	40	83.3	51	41	80.4	52	45	86.5
Westover	41	17	41.5	40	27	67.5	57	28	49.1
Wheaton Woods	106	30	28.3	109	53	48.6	51	21	41.2
Whetstone	86	30	34.9	92	31	33.7	78	23	29.5
Wood Acres	100	47	47	97	38	39.2	115	55	47.8
Woodfield	64	23	35.9	71	30	42.3	74	22	29.7
Woodlin	93	36	38.7	93	54	39.8	66	25	37.9
Wyngate	76	37	48.7	86	40	46.5	98	57	58.2

* Burning Tree and Georgian Forest elementary schools are participating in a pilot program. In these schools, the multiple pieces of data collected during the global screening process are used solely to recommend appropriate accelerated and enriched instruction, and not to assign a label. All other schools use the multiple pieces of data collected during the global screening process both to recommend appropriate accelerated and enriched instruction and to assign a label.