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## Program Improvement Highlights

The Mississippi Migrant Education Program (MS MEP) conducted a Comprehensive Needs Assessment (CNA) in order to validate their primary concerns related to the unique needs of their migrant children and families. The Needs Assessment Committees (NACs) charged work groups (WGs) in each of the four focus areas of 1) school readiness, 2) improving reading and math proficiency, 3) high school graduation, and 4) health to help identify research and evidence-based service delivery solutions for their consideration. WG members included experts with knowledge of research and best practices in content areas, migrant education, health, and state and local program administration. Careful analysis of information from MIS2000 (migrant database), the Mississippi Student Information System (MSIS), and qualitative information from needs assessments and qualitative surveys confirmed the need for stronger programmatic responses to:

* **Improve reading and math achievement through quality programming.**

***Reading:*** The primary recommendations for improving student reading proficiency fall into three principal categories:

1. Develop supplementary after-school, home-based, and summer instructional programs and services that provide one-on-one instruction for students who are reading below grade level.
2. Enlist the help/advice of instructors who are trained in English as a Second Language (ESL) methodology.
3. Develop home-based instruction for both parents and students in ways that promote engagement in literacy activities.

The MS MEP has increased its provision of instructional services to its students in recent years through such promising programming as their project-based summer school that focuses on literacy development and community involvement. They have attempted to partner with various organizations to sponsor programs such as leadership training for their secondary students. The MS MEP has also increased its use of intermittent staff to provide instructional support for migrant students in low incidence areas of the state.

***Math:*** In addition to providing more individual and small group instruction to migrant students who are deemed below basic in math, the CNA committee emphasized that math instructors should make use of the rich real world contexts that migrant students experience on a daily basis. For example, migrant students, who have often been involved in the world of work much sooner than most school children, likely have many skills that can be applied to the field of mathematics.

Limited English proficiency causes many migrant English language learners (ELL) to have difficulties with both math systems and terminology that may differ from their native language experiences. The committee reiterated the need for explicit instruction and practice in how to succeed on the state’s math assessment.

* **Increase participation and attendance of Pre-K migrant children in good quality Pre-K programming.**

The service delivery strategies suggested by the school readiness WG fall into the following categories:

1. Increase access and availability of Pre-K programs.
2. Develop tools such as readiness checklists that will help to guide parents and staff in building the skills that migrant preschoolers need to enter kindergarten “ready to learn.”
3. Educate both parents and migrant staff on ways they can promote school readiness, with a special emphasis on reading to and with their children and the development of fine motor skills.

Some of the cited implementation challenges are typical of rural areas with families in poverty. If there are Pre-K programs such as Head Start available, they often have wait lists and are not always able to accommodate highly mobile families. There is also often limited awareness of migrant families and their needs due to linguistic and cultural differences.

* **Encourage migrant parents to support their children’s education, from promoting school readiness to actively contributing to school success for their school-aged children.**

It is noteworthy that there are strong parent involvement and education elements in each of the areas that formed the basis of the CNA. This only serves to corroborate what research shows about the importance of including parents in a variety of ways that equips them to support their children’s well-being, academic performance and aspirations. Migrant parents are often marginalized due to their linguistic and cultural differences, and the MS MEP is committed to building bridges that enable families and educators to better communicate and forge meaningful relationships.

* **Focus on the needs of secondary migrant students and their families in order to prevent students from dropping out and to improve graduation rates.**

The principal service delivery strategies proposed by the CNA high school graduation committee are aimed at improving practices at the student, parent, and school/district levels.

***Student level****:* The MS MEP proposes to initiate a process that will assess the career acumen and interests of each migrant student beginning in 8th or 9th grade. They will then develop a student portfolio that will track the progress of each student and ensure that he or she is meeting course requirements and personal goals from year to year.

***Parent level:*** The CNA committee highlighted the need to educate parents about both high school requirements and continuing education options. The MS MEP staff feels strongly about the key role that migrant parents play in ensuring that their children graduate. If possible, parents should be included in the student’s goal setting process so that they can be full partners in planning for their children’s future.

***School/district level:*** The MS MEP will strive to ensure that migrant secondary students are benefiting from all programs that are aimed at improving student success. Programs such as mentoring, leadership academies, and after school tutoring can all help to fill educational gaps and inspire students to achieve and feel more engaged in school life.

* **Establish a uniform and coherent system of data collection at all levels.**

The Mississippi Migrant Education Service Center (MMESC) staff has been granted read-only access to the state MSIS system, enabling them to monitor the accuracy of MSIS data which can, in turn, be entered into MIS2000. With MSIS access they can also ascertain which students are ELL, and obtain migrant student test scores and other vital student information. This new ability to utilize the information in the state database should lead to more accurate Priority for Service (PFS) and ELL identification.

The MS MEP staff has laid the groundwork for further refinement of their reporting systems. These steps will serve them well as they work to develop new measures, as well as update old measures, for their Service Delivery Plan (SDP) that will enable them to better utilize data to determine if their programming is leading to improved student and family outcomes in the following areas.

* **Improve communication and collaboration among all MS MEP stakeholders and health providers in order to better meet the needs of the state’s migrant population.**

The CNA health committee proposed a variety of service delivery recommendations that focus on networking and advocating for more culturally and linguistically sensitive health services. Across Mississippi, strong partnerships have been developed at the state and local levels between MS MEP and health professionals to better serve this very vulnerable population. However, due to its supplemental and educational mandates, the MS MEP is restricted to specific types of assistance that they are able to provide in the health arena. MS MEP service providers can only help to identify which clinics and health providers have bilingual staff and refer migrant families and Out-of-School Youth (OSY) to them; educate migrant parents, students and OSY about good health practices and the availability of services in their areas; educate their local health providers on the cultural and linguistic needs of migrant families, and work in concert with them to improve communication and access to families and OSY in need of health care.

## Comprehensive Needs Assessment Results

The MS MEP completed its first SDP in 2009. However, its first CNA was conducted using 2006-07 data; there have been many changes since then. As suggested by the U.S. Department of Education Office of Migrant Education (OME), the MS MEP embarked on a full-fledged CNA process in order to ensure that its SDP continues to meet the needs of the state’s current migrant population. Since they have experienced a particularly rapid growth in their OSY population—from 6% in 2006-07 to 26% in 2011-12—the state convened a team in 2011-12 to conduct a CNA process for this specific population. OSY had not been included in the initial CNA/SDP process and it was felt that their needs required immediate attention.

Having completed the OSY CNA, the state turned its focus in 2013 to conducting a CNA that examines the broader K-12 population, as well as preschool-aged children. The most recent CNA process concentrated on the focus areas of: school readiness, proficiency in reading and math, high school graduation, and health. These results provide a framework for implementing strategies to strategically address the most critical needs of Mississippi’s migrant children. The service delivery strategies recommended by the various committees will be added to the updated state SDP, which will guide program implementation and evaluation for the next three to five years.

Figure 1 is a graphic illustration of how the CNA process fits into the data-driven continuous improvement cycle.

## The next section will provide detailed information about the primary concerns that were identified during the CNA process in each of the six focus areas, the data that was compiled to verify the concerns; and charts that list the service delivery strategies that were recommended by the various expert work groups.

## School Readiness

Table 1 contains the school readiness concern statements along with the data that may or may not validate the concerns. Please see the “Discussion of School Readiness Service Delivery Solutions” (p. 9) for an explanation of how this data was incorporated into the team’s decision-making.

Table 1: School Readiness

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Concern Statements** | **Supporting Data** |
| Migrant families do not have access to Pre-K and other community opportunities that contribute to readiness for Kindergarten. (Educational support in the home; Access to services) | The percentage of Pre-K migrant students has remained constant at about 20% over the past three years.According to the National Institute on Early Education Research (NIEER, 2007):* Hispanic children have the lowest rates of Pre-K participation; and
* Children in poverty have lower participation rates despite the growth in state and federal programs.

It has been difficult to obtain reliable data on whether there is indeed a problem with Pre-K access in MS; although, it is unlikely that Pre-K opportunities are readily available in many of the rural areas where migrant families reside.  |
| Migrant families do not have access to Pre-K and other community opportunities that contribute to readiness for Kindergarten. (cont.) | According to the Annie E. Casey Foundation “Kids Count” report (2009-11), 50% of MS children ages 3 and 4 are **not** participating in Pre-K programs. Migrant parent survey results: * 11 parents indicated that they had children of Pre-K age during the parent interviews.
	+ Of these, 10 (91%) parents stated that their child was enrolled in Kindergarten and 8 (80%) received help enrolling in Kindergarten.

Only one parent indicated that there were programs for Pre-K age children in their community; data were missing for most other parents. |
| Pre-K children lack adequate development of fine motor skills (defined as: small muscle function that enables writing, grasping of small objects and fastening clothing).(Educational continuity) | Migrant staff were asked to respond to the statement: “Migrant Pre-K children have similar fine motor skills as compared to non-migrant Pre-K children.”Results:* 50% - Disagree with the statement
* 25% - Strongly disagree
* 25% - Agree

Most staff did not agree with the statement that migrant children have fine motor skills that are comparable with their non-migrant peers. As a result, the suggestion was made that this focus be added to a proposed school readiness checklist. |
| **Concern Statements** | **Supporting Data** |
| Parents of Pre-K children are not equipped to assist with preparing their children for Kindergarten.(Educational support in the home) | Migrant staff were asked to respond to the statement: “Migrant parents with Pre-K age children are well equipped to assist their children with Kindergarten readiness.”Results:* 50% - Strongly disagree with the statement
* 25% - Agree
* 25% - Neither agree nor disagree

Half of the staff either disagreed with this statement or did not know whether migrant parents are well equipped to assist their children with Kindergarten readiness. This element has led to suggestions to train parents in the elements of school readiness and provide them with instructional resources. |

|  |
| --- |
| Table 2: Evidence-based solutions recommended by the School Readiness Committee |
| **School Readiness****Need Statements** | **Recommended Service Delivery Strategies** | **Outcome Measures** | **Implementation Measures****and Documentation** | **State Education Agency Tasks** |
| **1. *Increase percentage of migrant children (ages 3-5) who participate in Pre-K programming.***(Base line data to be compiled and analyzed in 2014-15) | 1. **Provide a resource list for parents of existing Pre-K centers, childcare centers, etc.**
2. **Seek out day care centers that might be able to take on new students.**
3. **Help migrant families with enrolling students in Pre-K.**
4. Develop Pre-K information packet explaining how and why Pre-K education is important.
5. Advocate for a sliding fee scale to help parents with school fees.
 | MIS2000 | Parent survey questionsEvidence of partnerships with Pre-K providersDocument services provided to Pre-K families (e.g. assisting with enrollment, transportation, etc.)MSU has a data base that has a statewide list of Pre-K centers  | Assist with formation of state-level agreements and partnerships that lead to increased participation of migrant children in preschool programs across the state.Monitor data from MIS2000 to look for decrease in the percentage of migrant students retained in Kindergarten. |
| **2. *Increase the percentage of migrant children who demonstrate mastery on a school readiness checklist.*** (Base line data to be compiled and analyzed in 2014-15) | 1. **Meet with parents quarterly to coach them on the recommended skills. Also distribute home literacy and math activities and materials. Model how to use them.**
2. **Invite personnel from childcare centers to present at PAC and parent meetings.**
3. **Provide DVDs (e.g. Waterford Program) to parents that teach them about what their children need to be ready for Kindergarten.**
4. Educate parents on Nurturing Homes Programs (alternative to a school program).
5. Provide training to parents, former migrant students, and community members.
6. Recruit willing and able volunteers.
 | School Readiness checklist (in development)Fine motor skills should be starred in the checklist, so that everyone is aware to focus on themTrack student performance in Kindergarten | Parent survey questionsParent meeting (in-home or site-based) evaluations and feedbackKeep log of dissemination of materials | Access public domain school readiness curricula and migrant literacy materials.Train MEP staff on how to assess family literacy using the school readiness checklist.Identify and disseminate information on effective parent training opportunities and models (especially those that are proven to benefit low literacy language-minority adults.) |

**Discussion of High Priority School Readiness Service Delivery Solutions**

The data collected provided some corroboration regarding the concerns of the School Readiness committee. The staff and parent surveys that were conducted had so few respondents that it makes generalizing difficult. However, there is ample national data on Hispanics and families in poverty to bolster both concerns that migrant children are not participating in Pre-K programming as much as they should be, and that migrant parents are lacking sufficient education and awareness to assist with preparing their children for Kindergarten.

The service delivery strategies suggested by the School Readiness committee fall into the categories of 1) increasing access and availability of Pre-K programs, 2) developing tools such as readiness checklists that will help to guide parents and staff in the skills that migrant preschoolers need to enter Kindergarten “ready to learn” and 3) educating both parents and migrant staff on ways they can promote school readiness, with a special emphasis on reading to and with their children and the development of fine motor skills.

Some of the cited implementation challenges are typical of rural areas with families in poverty. If there are Pre-K programs such as Head Start available, they often have wait lists and are not always able to accommodate highly mobile families. There is also often little awareness of migrant families and their needs due to linguistic and cultural differences. Service delivery strategies include seeking out existing Pre-K programs and advocating for the inclusion of migrant children. The NAC WG also provided information on a variety of home-based Pre-K programs (e.g. HIPPY, coaching parents) and resources (e.g. PBS DVDs, Dolly Parton Foundation) that could be used by families who are unable to enroll their children in Pre-K.

The MS MEP is working to develop a school readiness checklist that is based on the MS Pre-K standards. This checklist will be used to guide educational efforts and to measure the progress of parents and children who are benefiting from instruction and support.

## Improving Reading Proficiency

Table 3 contains the improving reading proficiency concern statements along with the data that may or may not validate the concerns. Please see the “Discussion of Improving Reading Proficiency Service Delivery Solutions” (p. 12) for an explanation of how this data was incorporated into the team’s decision-making.

Table 3: Improving Reading Proficiency Concern Statements and Supporting Data

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Concern Statements** | **Supporting Data** |
| Migrant students do not speak enough English at home during summer breaks.(English language development) | 92% of migrant students are HispanicParent survey results:Language most often spoken at home by Parents:* 63% - Spanish
* 26% - English
* 11% - Spanish and English equally

Language most often spoken at home by Children:* 58% - Spanish
* 32% - English
* 10% - Spanish and English equally

A survey of migrant staff indicated that the percent of Hispanic migrant students who have opportunities to speak English during the summer ranged from 10% to 50%. |
| Migrant students do not participate consistently in supplemental instructional reading programs.(Instructional time, Educational continuity) | Migrant staff were asked:“How consistently do migrant students participate in MEP-funded supplemental instructional reading programs?”* 75% - Occasionally
* 25% - Frequently

“How consistently do migrant students participate in non MEP-funded supplemental instructional reading programs?”* 50% - Occasionally
* 50% - Not at All

MIS2000 – 2011-12:* 7% of migrant students attended MEP-funded after school programming
* 15% of migrant students attended MEP-funded summer programming

MCT2 results for 2011-12 show an average 30 point gap between migrants and non-migrants scoring proficient or advanced in grades 3 – 8.Parent survey results:63% of migrant parents reported that they had little to no information on before or after school programming opportunities for their children. |
| Migrant students do not learn to use academic-level vocabulary and, therefore, remain under-prepared to reach their full potential. | This was difficult to ascertain although the MCT2 test results for migrant students in grades 9-12 indicate that at least 53% of migrant students are in the “minimal” and “basic” ranges. |

Table 4: Evidence-based solutions recommended by the Improving Reading Proficiency Committee

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Proficiency in Reading****Need Statements** | **Recommended Service Delivery Strategies** | **Outcome Measures** | **Implementation Measures and Documentation** | **State Education Agency Tasks** |
| **3. *By the end of 2017-18, 60% of (K-5) and 15% of (6-12) migrant students will receive supplementary summer instruction in reading.*** | 1. **Continue to develop and implement theme-based summer programming centered on literacy development and community projects.**
2. Conduct site based and home based instructional visits. Utilize and partner with local libraries.
3. Design summer and after school programs with Family Literacy, Purposed Conversational English, Comprehension Strategies, etc.
 | State test resultsMIS2000Proposed ways to measure progress:* Summer pre- and post-testing
* Migrant Literacy NET
* WIDA testing
* In-house assessment programs that local schools have paid for or provided.

DIBELS  | Home visitor logs (Common format needs to be developed) | Monitor MIS2000 data to ensure that there is an increase in the percentage of migrant students (identified as “below proficient”) who receive supplemental summer instruction in reading. |
| **4. *Increase percentage of migrant students (identified as “below proficient” in reading) who participate in supplemental instructional reading programs during the regular term.***(Base line data to be compiled and analyzed in 2014-15) | 1. **Provide individualized, organized instruction with 1 to 3 student-teacher ratio using multisensory techniques.**
2. **Target the PFS students first. Strive to educate all migrant students about the importance of after school and summer programming.**
3. **Ensure that struggling students in low incidence areas are identified and served. They often slip through the cracks.**
4. Conduct home visits with age-appropriate activities. Perhaps develop a volunteer network (e.g. community colleges with service learning requirement).
5. Increase networking with community agencies and churches.
 | MIS2000State test resultsWIDA resultsBenchmark reading assessments (such as Accelerated Reading) that are available in school districtsPre- and Post- reading Lexile levels | Home visitor logs (Common format needs to be developed) | Convene a team to establish criteria for the designation of “below proficient” in reading.Monitor state testing data to ensure that there is an increase in the percentage of migrant students (identified as “below proficient”) who are exhibiting growth in reading.Ensure that standardized reporting forms are developed and used to track services provided and student progress. |

**Discussion of High Priority Improving Reading Proficiency Service Delivery Solutions**

The Improving Reading Proficiency committee focused on their top concerns which relate to the need for more strategic and tailored supplementary instructional support for migrant students who have been deemed “below basic” according to state reading and/or local reading assessments. The data show that these students are often ELL and require data-informed differentiated instruction in order to catch up with their grade-level peers.

As previously discussed, there is still a need to improve the methods that the MS MEP is using to determine the language proficiency levels of their students. The MIS2000 data indicate that only 16% of migrant students are ELL. Considering that over 90% of migrant students are Hispanic, it is unlikely that the low ELL figures are accurate. The ideal approach would be for districts to test all students with a home language other than English with the WIDA (World-Class Instructional Design and Assessment) language proficiency test and enter their status accurately and in a timely manner on MSIS. Unfortunately, this ideal is only sometimes achieved and the MS MEP often finds itself in the uncomfortable position of relying on non-standard determinations of a migrant student’s abilities and needs.

The primary recommendations for program improvement fall into three principal categories: 1) Develop supplementary after-school, home-based and summer instructional programs and services that provide one-on-one instruction for students who are reading below grade level. 2) Enlist the help/advice of instructors who are trained in ESL methodology. 3) Develop home-based instruction for both parents and students that facilitates engagement in literacy activities. Maintaining open lines of communication with migrant parents helps MS MEP staff to more quickly identify which students are most in need and to enlist active family participation in any services that have been recommended.

The MS MEP has increased its provision of instructional services to its students in recent years through such promising programming as their project-based summer school that focuses on literacy development and community engagement. It has attempted to partner with various organizations to sponsor programs such as leadership training for their secondary students. The MS MEP has also increased its use of intermittent staff to provide instructional support for migrant students in low incidence areas of the state.

## Improving Math Proficiency

Table 5 contains the improving math proficiency concern statements along with the data that may or may not validate the concerns. Please see the “Discussion of Improving Math Proficiency Service Delivery Solutions” (p. 15) for an explanation of how this data was incorporated into the team’s decision-making.

Table 5: Improving Math Proficiency Concern Statements and Supporting Data

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Concern Statements** | **Supporting Data** |
| Migrant students face inequalities in service provision across regions and districts.(Access to Services) | * 75% of recruiters/advocates strongly agreed that migrant students in some areas of Mississippi have more access to migrant-funded services than other areas of the state.
 |
| Migrant students’ intermittent English language support interferes with the development of their mathematical skills. (English language development) | MIS2000 In 2011-12:* 7% of migrant students attended MEP-funded after school programs.
* 15% of migrant students attended MEP-funded summer programs.

MCT2 Math results for 2011-12 show an average 15 point gap between migrants and non-migrants scoring proficient or advanced in grades 3–8.• 43% of migrant students who took the MCT2 Math test in grades 9-12 scored below proficient in 2011-12. |

Table 6: Evidence-based solutions recommended by the Improving Math Proficiency Committee

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Improving Math Proficiency****Need Statements** | **Recommended Service Delivery Strategies** | **Outcome Measures** | **Implementation****Measures and Documentation** | **State Education Agency Tasks** |
| ***5. By the end of 2017-18, 60% of (K-5) and 15% of (6-12) migrant students will receive supplementary summer instruction in mathematics.*** | 1. **Provide individualized, organized instruction with 1 to 3 teacher-student ratio using multisensory techniques.**
2. **Target the PFS students first. Strive to educate all migrant students about the importance of after school and summer programming.**
3. Work with parents to encourage their support and offer help with logistics.
4. Ensure that struggling students in low incidence areas are identified and served. They often slip through the cracks.
5. Increase networking with community agencies and churches.
 | State test resultsWIDA resultsBenchmark math assessments that are used by school districtsDevelop a tool for summer pre- and post-testing | Home visitor logs (Common format needs to be developed) | Monitor MIS2000 data to ensure that there is an increase in the percentage of migrant students (identified as “below proficient”) who receive supplemental summer instruction in mathematics. |
| **6. *Increase percentage of migrant students (identified as “below proficient” in math) who participate in supplemental instructional math programs during the regular school term.***(Base line data to be compiled and analyzed in 2014-15) | 1. Focus instruction on using contexts in lessons that relate to migrant learners and the real world challenges they face.
 | State test resultsWIDA resultsBenchmark math assessments that are used by school district | MIS2000Home visitor logs (Common format needs to be developed) | Convene a team to establish criteria for the designation of “below proficient” in math.Monitor state testing data to ensure that there is an increase in the percentage of migrant students (identified as “below proficient”) who are exhibiting growth in mathematics.Ensure that standardized reporting forms are developed and used to track services provided and student progress. |

**Discussion of High Priority Improving Math Proficiency Service Delivery Solutions**

The Improving Math Proficiency committee also worked on the issue of reading and came up with many similar solutions to improving math instruction. The average gap between migrant and non-migrant students on the MC2T Math Assessment was not quite as wide (15%) as the reading gap (30%). However, there is still a critical need to improve the math abilities and performance of Mississippi’s migrant students.

In addition to providing more individual and small group instruction to migrant students who are deemed below basic in math, the committee emphasized that math instructors should make use of the rich real world contexts that migrant students experience on a daily basis. For example, migrant students, who have often been involved in the world of work much sooner than most school children, are likely to have many skills that can be applied to the field of mathematics.

Limited English proficiency causes many migrant ELL students to have difficulties with both math systems and English terminology that may differ from their native language experiences. The committee reiterated the need for explicit instruction and practice in how to succeed on the state’s math assessment.

## High School Graduation

Table 7 contains the high school graduation concern statements along with the data that may or may not validate the concerns. Please see the “Discussion of Improving High School Graduation Service Delivery Solutions” (p. 20) for an explanation of how this data was incorporated into the team’s decision-making.

Table 7: High School Graduation Concern Statements and Supporting Data

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Concern Statements** | **Supporting Data** |
| Secondary-aged migrant students begin to lose hope of completing school and choose to drop out. (Educational continuity, School engagement) | The latest national study on graduation rates (National Center for Education Statistics, 2013) shows Hispanics in MS graduating at a rate of 63.8%. The state average is 68%. |
| Migrant students lose motivation to continue in school for a variety of reasons (e.g. begin to earn money, uninformed ideas about what economic success is in the U.S.). (School engagement) | A student survey was conducted which provided limited insight into why they stay in school; the primary reasons cited were: “I want to graduate.”“I want to learn English.”“I want to be a professional to help my parents.” |
| Migrant students do not have exposure to culture-specific role models that encourage educational attainment and its value. (School engagement) | Student survey results:Question: What role models encourage education and its value for you?None (N = 4)My mother (N = 6)My mom and dad (N = 5)Question: What role models encourage education and its value for your children?None (N = 8)Don’t know (N = 2)Both parents (N = 6)Mother (N = 3)Father (N = 1)50% of recruiters/advocates “strongly agreed” and 25% “agreed” that migrant students do not have exposure to culture-specific role models.The committee responded to this need by suggesting the provision of mentoring services and goal setting for secondary youth.  |
| **Concern Statements** | **Supporting Data** |
| Credit recovery/credit assessment needs are unmet. (Educational continuity) | Question (for secondary-aged migrant students only – those between ages 14-18 or enrolled in grades 9-12): Do you participate in credit recovery?No (N = 4)Only one recruiter/advocate indicated serving two migrant high school students who are in need of credit recovery. Neither of these students have access to appropriate credit recovery options.The committee suggested development of a student portfolio that will enable both the MS MEP and migrant students to keep track of credits and plan for ways to stay on track to graduation. |

Table 8: Evidence-based solutions recommended by the High School Graduation Committee

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **High School Graduation****Need Statements** | **Recommended Service Delivery Strategies** | **Outcome Measures** | **Implementation Measures and Documentation** | **State Education Agency Tasks** |
| ***7. Increase percentage of migrant students (grades 8-12) who receive assistance with credit accrual, career planning, and goal-setting.*** (Base line data to be compiled and analyzed in 2014-15) | 1. **Develop and implement a plan to assess where students are with their credits.**
2. **Connect students with alternative pathways (such as GED). Use the case management team approach for these high-need students.**
3. **The MS MEP will identify different tiers of need among the migrant students:**

**Three proposed tiers:****1 – Needing to make up credits****2 – Tutoring for those at risk of failing****3 – Monitoring****4. Form clubs and leadership groups where migrant students can relate to and develop peer networks. Include the use of virtual technology to conduct the meetings.** 5. Assure that all migrant students, specifically 8th and 9th graders, are assessed on their career aptitude and assist them in selecting the appropriate courses depending on the results of the assessment.6. Assign a buddy/mentor to help them get through and guide them during their high school years.\*This should be a peer and/or adult mentor. | MIS2000Dropout percentages by yearConduct a student survey every 2-3 years to assess the support they have received to set personal educational goals | Keep a portfolio on each student which includes:* Career assessment
* Credit assessment
* Education background
* Interests
* Annual goal-setting and monitoring of goals

Document partnerships that have been established with local dropout prevention programs | Convene a team to develop a secondary student portfolio process.Disseminate training and resources for staff that focus on secondary issues.Assist with the selection of appropriate career choice instruments.Monitor migrant data sources to look for a decrease in number of dropouts in grades 9-11. |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **High School Graduation****Need Statements** | **Recommended Service Delivery Strategies** | **Outcome Measures** | **Implementation Measures and Documentation** | **State Education Agency Tasks** |
| **8. *Increase percentage of migrant high school students who have earned the required number of credits to graduate within 4-5 years.***(Base line data to be compiled and analyzed in 2014-15) | 1. **Assist with credit accrual and provide students with a variety of options available to them (e.g. college, technical school, GED, etc.).**
2. **Work closely with teachers to ensure that students are not falling behind. Develop early warning systems.**
3. **Make sure that there are specific plans and goals established with all secondary students and their parents.**
4. Educate migrant parents and students on the school/graduation requirements of students. Migrant staff should also be educated about key graduation requirements.
5. Seek out districts that have a GED instructor available and trained to teach migrant students.
6. MS MEP could fund intermittent staff to monitor the performance of the secondary students.
7. Seek alternative pathways for meeting all credits required (e.g. graduating in 5 years as opposed to 4, using distance learning options).
 | MIS2000Conduct a student survey every 2-3 years to assess their knowledge of high school graduation requirements | Keep a file on each student which includes:* Career assessment
* Credit assessment
* Education background
* Interests
* Annual goal-setting and monitoring of goals

MSIS data is not always available in a timely mannerMSIX is an additional source of information for interstate studentsDocument effective credit accrual strategies. | Convene a team to develop a secondary student portfolio process.Provide state-level support to expand the opportunities for credit accrual.  |

**Discussion of High Priority High School Graduation Service Delivery Solutions**

The MS MEP strives to improve in all areas, and is particularly focused on showing measurable improvement in the goals set forth in the Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA). In addition to showing progress in reading and math test scores, there are two key elements of the GPRA that apply to the critical focus area of high school graduation; the goals are to: 1) decrease the percentage of migrant students who will drop out from secondary school [grades 7-12]; and 2) increase the percentage of migrant students who will graduate from high school. These GPRA goals closely mirror the major concerns identified by the High School Graduation committee.

The principal service delivery strategies are aimed at improving practices at the student, parent, and school/district levels. Beginning with the student level, the MS MEP proposes to initiate a process that will assess the career acumen and interests of each migrant student beginning in 8th or 9th grade. A portfolio will then be developed to track the progress of each student and ensure that he or she is meeting course requirements and personal goals from year to year. The NAC proposed an interesting idea: assess individual migrant student’s needs using a variety of criteria, and place them into three suggested broad service categories: 1) *high need,* students who are missing and need to make up credits; 2) *moderate need*, students who are at risk of failing and would benefit from tutoring; and 3) *low need, s*tudents who need monitoring and support on an as-needed basis.

Migrant students should be introduced to the full range of options that are available to them after high school (e.g. 2 or 4 year colleges, technical schools, etc.) Since only 7% of the MS migrant population was high school age in 2011-12, this individualized approach to goal setting and support is considered doable. Even though the number of high school age students is relatively small, the MS MEP is constantly striving to both keep them in school beyond age 17 and provide them with alternative options such as pursuing a GED if they have dropped out.

Other strategies for students include providing them with successful role models and mentors with whom they can identify and relate on a personal level. The High School Graduation committee also focused on the need to monitor migrant students’ course work and credits and provide them with strategic ways to make up missing credits when necessary either due to mobility and/or failing a course. MS virtual public schools provide assistance to make up credits; however, slots are not always available. Some school districts have their own virtual networks and/or offer summer programs for students missing credits.

At the parent level,the committee highlighted the need to educate parents about both high school requirements and continuing education options. The MS MEP staff feel strongly about the key role that migrant parents play in ensuring that their children graduate. If possible, parents should also be included in the student’s goal setting process so that they can be full partners in planning for their children’s future.

Lastly, at the school/district level, the MEP will endeavor to ensure that migrant secondary students are benefiting from all the programs that are aimed at improving student success. Programs such as mentoring, leadership academies, and after school tutoring can all help to fill educational gaps and inspire students to achieve and feel more engaged in school life. The committee also recommended that MS MEP staff communicate with administrators and teachers on a more frequent basis about the unique cultural and linguistic needs of their migrant students.

## Health

Table 9 contains the health concern statements along with the data that may or may not validate the concerns. Please see the “Discussion of Improving Health Service Delivery Solutions” (p. 26-27) for an explanation of how this data was incorporated into the team’s decision-making.

Table 9. Health Concern Statements and Supporting Data

| **Concern Statements** | **Supporting Data** |
| --- | --- |
| Migrant students’ vision, hearing, and dental needs are not met.(Health) | Migrant staff survey results:Statement: Migrant students’ vision, hearing and dental needs are met.* 33% - Strongly disagree
* 33% - Disagree
* (No one “agreed” with this statement)

Clear need was established to increase access to primary care |
| Mental health needs of migrant children are not identified and treated properly.(Health, Access to services) | Migrant staff survey results:Statement: In general, migrant students mental health needs are identified properly.* 67% - Strongly disagree
* 33% - Disagree

Statement: In general, migrant students mental health needs are treated properly.* 33% - Strongly disagree
* 33% - Disagree
* (No one “agreed” with this statement)

This result was also unanimous, however, it was determined that this focus should be put on hold until more basic health needs are addressed.  |
| Migrant students and families do not have access to user-friendly health services and support.(Health, Access to services) Migrant students and families do not have access to user-friendly health services and support. (cont.) | Parent survey results:Question: Do you know where to get the health resources you and your family need (such as a doctor or health care provider)? Do you use these resources when you need them? If not, why not?Yes (N = 17)Yes we use these resources (N = 15)Question: If you have access to health care providers, do they communicate in a language you understand?No (N = 19)Sometimes (N = 4)A little bit (N = 1)Yes (N = 8)Question: If you have access to health resources, can you get materials such as brochures in a language you understand?No ( N = 18)Sometimes (N = 4)Yes (N = 9)Student survey results:Question: Do you and your family know where to get the health resources you need (such as a doctor or health care provider)?Yes (N = 17)Question: If you know where to get health resources, do you use these resources when you need them?No (N = 2)Sometimes (N = 2)Yes (N = 14)Question: If you use these health care providers, do they communicate in a language you understand?Sometimes (N = 2)Sort ofA little bitYes (N = 13)Yes because I speak English, but not my parentsIt is notable that the survey results of parents and students are different. In general, the students are more well-informed and indicate that they understand the health providers. It is clear that many families have knowledge of where health providers are, but cite language-related difficulties. |
|  | Migrant staff survey results:Statement: In general migrant students and families have access to user-friendly health services and support.* 67% - Disagree
* 33% - Agree

Health Provider/Community Advocate survey results:Statement: In general migrant families are knowledgeable about healthy hygiene practices.* 50% - Disagree
* 33% - Neither agree nor disagree
* 17% - Agree

Statement: In general migrant parents are knowledgeable about dental care.* 68% - Disagree
* 25% - Neither agree nor disagree
* 8% - Agree

Statement: In general migrant parents are knowledgeable about healthy nutrition.* 67% - Disagree
* 33% - Agree
 |
| Migrant students and families do not have access to user-friendly health services and support. (cont.) | Most MEP staff and health care providers disagree with the statements that migrant parents are knowledgeable about how to access health services. They also show concern for parents’ knowledge of good hygiene, dental care and nutrition.Health Provider/Community Advocate survey comments:Priority health needs:* 36% - Prenatal care
* 27% - Diabetic information and care
* 27% - Dental care

Other comments:* + The main priority we have is prenatal care for the women. Migrant women often go to three or four Ob-Gyn clinics and have outstanding balances there. They are not able to pay for the care or the vitamins. They then go to the emergency room when they are in labor.
	+ Dental and prenatal
* Lack of access to healthcare due to language barriers, transportation issues and lack of healthcare insurance, undiagnosed diabetes, hypertension and obesity.
	+ General healthcare
	+ Diabetic information, high rate of diabetes and lack of knowledge about how to treat or change their lifestyle for a longer life.
	+ Hypertension
	+ Pap smear testing
	+ Need for more informational tools to help them know what to ask during their visits. Know where to go with certain illnesses and know and understand their diagnosis and medicine information.
	+ Dental care, prenatal care, preventative measures, general medicine/health checkup routine
	+ Hygiene Education
 |

Table 10: Evidence-based solutions recommended by the Health Committee

| **Health****Need Statement** | **Recommended Service Delivery Strategies** | **Outcome Measures** | **Implementation Measures and Documentation** | **State Education Agency Tasks** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***9. Increase percentage of migrant parents who report that they know where to obtain primary care services.***(Base line data to be compiled and analyzed in 2014-15) | **1. Inform parents about vision and dental needs, symptoms, and the necessity of screenings through state and local PAC meetings, school district parent nights, and the distribution of informational materials in a language that they can understand. Information about Children’s Health Insurance Program (CHIP), Medicaid, how to make an appointment, etc.** **2. Begin collaborative relationships with community health centers in the Delta, Calhoun/ Pontotoc/ Chickasaw counties, Scott County, Forrest/Jones/Lamar Counties.** **3. Promote referrals to Women Infants and Children (WIC) and other existing resources. Provide county lists of existing resources and assistance. Provide informational packets at all events by collaborating with community health agencies.**4. Include screening consent and informational forms, in a language that they can read in school registration packets. Create a list of school interpreters. Connect schools in need of interpreters with possible community volunteers.5. MS MEP can provide nutritious food and wellness activities in all MEP funded services. Collaborate with community health agencies to provide summer programs, health fairs and mobile health clinics. | Conduct a targeted Health Survey every 2-3 years in order to determine if the performance goals for migrant parents are being met.Parent Survey questions | Document referralsDocument all collaboration efforts and partnerships with health care agencies.Revamp the needs assessmentPossible questions might include:1. When was the last time you or someone in your family visited a doctor? If no or never seen, why not?2. What was the reason you went to the doctor?3. How did you find out about the doctor? 4. Did you need someone to translate for you? 5. Are you familiar with local health providers? Which ones?6. Do you know what the school requires if your child is sick? | Collaborate with health care providers to improve access to health care for migrant families. |

**Discussion of High Priority Health Service Delivery Solutions**

The Health committee proposed a variety of service delivery recommendations that focus on networking and advocating for more culturally and linguistically sensitive health services. Across Mississippi strong partnerships have been developed at the state and local levels between MS MEP and health professionals, since they both serve a very vulnerable population. However, due to its supplemental and educational mandates, the MS MEP is restricted to specific types of assistance that they are able to provide in the health arena. MS MEP service providers can help to identify which clinics and health providers have bilingual staff and refer migrant families to them. They can educate migrant parents and students about good health practices and the availability of services in their areas. MS MEP staff can also educate their local health providers on the cultural and linguistic needs of their migrant families, and work in concert with them to improve communication and access to families in need of health care.

The health survey conducted with parents, students, and MS MEP staff revealed a number of interesting insights into what services are most critical. The issue of availability of linguistic and culturally appropriate health services is mixed. However, the majority of migrant parents and MS MEP staff indicated that these accommodations are not consistently available. Students surveyed were more likely to say that the health care they receive is appropriate and in a language they can understand. This may be due to their close connections with their schools.

One area that warranted particular attention was the provision of appropriate mental health services. None of the MS MEP staff surveyed believed that migrant students suspected of having a disability were either assessed or treated appropriately. Their recommendations focus on ensuring that schools and districts use qualified bilingual staff when necessary and on educating families about mental health assessments and services in their area. The committee cited many concerns about the cultural differences that can sometimes lead to migrant families’ reluctance to accept any special help that is offered for a child with learning problems and/or a disability. Even though this has been identified as a key area of concern, the committee agreed that this focus should be of secondary importance because of its complexity and because it is primarily an issue that is within the purview of school districts’ special education departments.

The Health committee formulated a number of interesting suggestions regarding using existing meetings, programming, and MS MEP practices as opportunities to raise awareness and educate migrant families and students about such important topics as nutrition and preventative care. For example, they suggested that migrant parent meetings could be avenues for disseminating health-related information and advice. In addition, summer and after school programming for migrant students could include relevant topics such as good nutrition and hygiene.

The many health risk factors associated with migrant housing and lifestyle (e.g. exposure to pesticides, diabetes, baby bottle tooth decay) are well documented. The OME has increased its emphasis on this area of concern because the topic of health has been absent from most state SDPs. The MEP has always focused on the needs of the whole child, and they must continue to play a key role in ensuring that migrant students’ success in school is not hindered by health-related problems and/or issues. The MS MEP is committed to placing a priority on partnering with health providers and better educating parents and their children, with the aim of increasing and improving the availability and accessibility of health care for migrant families.

## Out-of-School Youth

Table 11 contains the Out-of-School Youth concern statements along with the data that may or may not validate the concerns. Please see the “Discussion of Improving Out-of-School-Youth Solutions” (p. 31) for an explanation of how this data was incorporated into the team’s decision-making.

Table 11: Out-of-School Youth

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Concern Statements** | **Supporting Data** |
| Limited English proficiency may be an obstacle to accessing services.(English language development, Access to services) | * 90% of OSY expressed an interest in learning English.
* 80% of migrant recruiters agreed that lack of English language proficiency is a barrier to accessing services for the OSY they serve.
 |
| OSY need practical English language skills and vocabulary.(English language development) | * 68% of OSY reported that they speak “No English.”
* 24% of OSY reported that they “Speak and understand basic greetings only.”
* Less than 1% reported that they “Speak and comprehend English well.”
 |
| OSY need knowledge of computer skills/internet.(Instructional time, Access to services) | * 77% of OSY reported that “I do not have the computer skills I need”.
* 66% of OSY reported that “I want to learn more about the internet and computers.”
 |
| OSY need information on nutrition, STD’s and other health topics.(Health) | * 5 of 8 health providers stated that “Migrant youth need additional information about nutrition”.
* 100% of health providers stated that “Migrant youth do not have the knowledge they need about STD’s”.
* 100% of health providers stated that language barriers are the major obstacle they encounter when serving migrant youth.
 |
| OSY may not have transportation to access services.(Access to services) | * 86% of OSY reported that they need transportation.
* 97% of OSY reported that they do not have a driver’s license.
 |

Table 12: Evidence-based solutions recommended by the Out-of-School Youth Committee

| **Out-of-School Youth****Need Statements** | **Recommended Service Delivery Strategies** | **Outcome Measures** | **Implementation Measures and Documentation** | **State Education Agency Tasks** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***10. Increase percentage of OSY (who express an interest) receiving mini-lessons (in-person and/or using technology)***(Base line data to be compiled and analyzed in 2014-15)  | **1. Conduct needs and resource assessments for each OSY.** **Possible questions:****When are you available?****Best location?****Are audio lessons an option?****2. Target services to regions based on:****Technology resources accessibility and availability (e.g. CDs, IPods, on-line), teachers and/or volunteers available in an area.**3. Assess OSY preferences for job skill development. Work with MSU Research Curriculum Unit (RCU) to identify surveys, curriculums, CDs, training, etc. and modify for OSY.4. Continue to pilot and utilize SOSOSY materials. | Spreadsheet with key student informationMini-lessons should be an integral part of the educational programming.Track contact hours dedicated to mini-lessons (both face-to-face and using technology). | Detailed needs assessmentPortfolio assessment and record of lessons | MS is a SOSOSY Consortium state.Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) has insisted that OSY enroll in school.The individual needs of this type of student should be determined and addressed. Perhaps there should be differing approaches andpriorities for OSYunder 17 who are required to attend school v. OSY who have reached the age when dropping out of school is permitted. |
| ***11. Increase percentage of OSY who report that they know where to obtain primary care services.***(This Need Statement mirrors the Health Need Statement #9.)***Increase percentage of OSY who report that they know where to obtain primary care services.* (cont.)**(Base line data to be compiled and analyzed in 2014-15) | **1. Find resources and information available from local health care providers pertaining to STD’s, nutrition and other key topics.****2. Organize/Arrange transportation for health fairs, clinic visits and mobile health clinics.****3. Develop a flyer based on resources available at the Health Department to be distributed to OSY/add to their hygiene bags.**4. Request Health Department training for recruiters.5. Provide services onsite when possible.6. Negotiate with service providers to provide OSY appointment blocks. | Conduct a targeted Health Survey every 2-3 years in order to determine if the performance goals for OSY are being met. | Possible OSY Survey questions:1. When was the last time you visited a doctor? If no or never, why not?2. What was the reason you went to the doctor?3. How did you find out about the doctor? 4. Did you need someone to translate for you? How do you know them? 5. Are you familiar with local health providers? Which ones?6. When was the last time you saw the dentist?Document all collaboration efforts and partnerships with health care agencies. | Adjust reporting requirements and definitions as needed to better capture Out-of- School Youth services provided statewide. |

**Discussion of High Priority Out-of-School Youth Service Delivery Solutions**

The Out-of-School Youth committee considered the sources of data they have on their OSY and made a number of recommendations on how to better assess and design instruction that meets the educational needs of this hard-to-serve, limited English proficient population. There are indications that the OSY service categories in the MIS2000 database need further refinement.

The MS MEP has been active in the Strategies and Opportunities for Out-of-School Youth (SOSOSY) national consortium from its inception. The team members have developed many useful and innovative tools, and have populated their website with a wide variety of practical resources and strategies. The SOSOSY goal statement provides the best description of its mission: “The goal of SOSOSY is to design, develop, and disseminate a system to identify and recruit, assess, and develop/deliver services to migrant OSY, provide professional development to support these activities, and institutionalize SOSOSY services into Mississippi’s plans to elevate the quantity and quality of services to this large, underserved population.”

The OSY committee cited the need to focus on a number of fronts in their efforts to improve both the quantity and quality of MS MEP services. Their main initiatives are to:

1) Select a quick English oral proficiency assessment for use with OSY interested in educational offerings. This would enable programs to more effectively choose lessons that are tailored to the basic proficiency level of an OSY who has shown an interest in educational programming. Too often, youth who desire English instruction are provided with lessons that are either too easy or too difficult for them.

2) Encourage use of the SOSOSY tools and resources that enable service providers to match an OSY student’s abilities and interests with a comprehensive list of available services.

3) Devise alternatives for youth who are interested in furthering their education, but are unable to attend classes. This is an area that may be best addressed through the increasing use of technology-based learning. A majority of the OSY who were surveyed expressed an interest in learning English, as well as a desire to improve their knowledge of how to utilize technology that would enable them to access English lessons. This is a primary focus for programs serving OSY because of the limited time that OSY have to dedicate to face-to-face sessions.

4) Provide OSY with the information they need to obtain needed health care and wellness education. The committee suggested that every region strive to collaborate with local and state health agencies to better address the needs of this isolated, mostly male, population. The OSY who were surveyed stated that they lack transportation which limits their ability to visit local clinics. Inviting health educators and service providers to where OSY reside is one possible fix for this dilemma.

**ALIGNMENT ACROSS MS MEP SERVICES**

The comprehensive state *Service Delivery Plan* provides a framework for improving programs with the primary goals of increasing the academic achievement and graduation rates of Mississippi’s migrant students.

The *Service Delivery Plan* also serves to align all MS MEP services to ensure consistency and efficiency. To that end, this section provides a brief description of the MS MEP’s plans and policies for:

1. Parent Involvement
2. Identification and Recruitment
3. Priority for Service Students
4. Student Records Transfer

**Parent Involvement**

Educational support in the home is a critical factor in the academic achievement of students. This factor is one of the core areas of concern for migrant students, as migrant parents often value formal education but lack the resources and information needed to help their children in a manner consistent with school expectations. In addition, a home language other than English is often a barrier for home-school communications. Outreach to migrant parents is a central component of the strategies outlined in the Mississippi SDP. The CNA process included input from migrant parents on their perceptions of student needs through qualitative survey data. The outcome goals for school readiness, in particular, address the need to work with migrant parents to provide them with the tools and resources needed to foster educationally-enriched home environments. Raising graduation rates also requires that migrant parents be furnished with key information on district and state expectations that will lead to more of their children finishing high school and pursuing continuing education options.

To ensure that migrant families are central to the MS MEP, the state has hired a Parent Coordinator who, in September 2013, began to configure and implement a new state parent advisory council (PAC). The first meeting, held on September 28th, helped to orient new PAC members to the purpose of the MS MEP and the importance of parent involvement in decision making, and building parent leadership skills. The parents also received information on topics such as legal matters and health care, which were chosen from the results of a survey they completed before the PAC conference. In return, the MS MEP received valuable input from the parents as to the usefulness of specific programs and services that are provided to its families.

In the following months, local PAC meetings took place in Forest, Carthage and Hattiesburg, and individual parental involvement home visits were conducted in areas with low concentrations of migrant students, such as Utica, Hazlehurst, Canton and Purvis. Parental involvement home visits were also conducted with families who live in areas where PACs are active, but who were unable to participate for religious, health or other reasons. These visits will continue in other locations until the whole state is covered. The Parent Coordinator has also initiated contacts with parent coordinators for Title I, Part A and Title III programs in schools in order to foster collaboration and inform them about the unique needs of migrant students.

The aim of regional and local PACs, and parental involvement home visits, is to recruit parents for the statewide PAC, and to inform them about its purpose, function and procedures. In addition, migrant parents are given information about specific local services and programs available to them, and the MS MEP is able to hear directly from parents about which needs are greatest in each of the various locations.

At the second statewide PAC meeting, which took place on May 3, 2014, MS MEP staff reviewed information that describes the benefits and services of the program and the importance of staying involved in their children’s education. This meeting also included consultation with members regarding the specific services outlined in the state SDP. Parent feedback and approval are key features of the development of any SDP because it makes them feel that their opinions are valued, and facilitates awareness of how they can contribute to their children’s success in school.

The next statewide PAC meeting is tentatively planned for October 2014. The state meeting is a forum for strengthening parent capacity for joint planning and decision making, and ensuring that parents have the information and skills needed to support their children’s academic success. Information is presented in a format and language that parents understand. The vast majority of migrant families in Mississippi are of Hispanic origin with very limited or no knowledge of English. The remaining ones are American with English as their native language. Therefore, all MS MEP staff involved in direct contact with migrant families (e.g. recruiters, ID&R coordinator, and parental involvement coordinator) are fluent in both English and Spanish; and all materials are made available in both English and Spanish, including PAC meetings’ flyers, agendas, and evaluation forms.

**Identification and Recruitment**

Along with the change in MS MEP administration from three regional centers to one service center, the program has been working to restructure its identification and recruitment (ID&R) efforts. A new ID&R manual was developed and implemented in January 2009. The ID&R Coordinator and staff then received training on determining eligibility, networking with families and community organizations, interviewing families, completing Certificates of Eligibility (COEs), and other ID&R basics. With assistance from an outside consultant (the Eastern Stream Center on Resources and Training), the MS MEP has identified a plan of action to improve ID&R efforts under the new structure. The priorities include:

1. Visit families listed in the system as migrant and reconnect them to the migrant program. This step will support quality control as well as foster communication with families, particularly in the central and southern regions of the state.
2. Update communications in writing and on the state website explaining the program and offering contact information.
3. Facilitate access for MMESC staff to upload and validate COE data in the state student database.
4. Update Mississippi’s COE and State ID&R Manual to ensure that it meets OME’s regulations.
5. Hire additional recruiters/advocates, particularly for OSY.

In addition to these improvements, the ID&R Coordinator will stay in regular contact with recruiters, including meeting bi-monthly and maintaining frequent communication through weekly email calendars and ongoing submissions of completed COEs.

Quality control will also continue to be a focus for the state. The MS ID&R Manual provides an overview of quality control in the state, excerpted below:

In Mississippi, the ID&R quality control procedures include the following:

* Proper and adequate training of all staff making eligibility determinations and completing COEs, as well as proper and adequate training of all staff reviewing, certifying and monitoring ID&R activities, including the review of COEs in Mississippi;
* Use of an approved interview protocol to obtain information from families and/or children;
* Proper and consistent instructions for the completion of the COEs;
* Effective and accepted process for resolving eligibility questions;
* Effective and efficient procedures for reviewing COEs before determining eligibility;
* Effective process for the re-interview of migrant families; and
* Fair corrective actions for local operating agencies failing to implement proper and adequate ID&R activities.

Further, the MMESC will:

* 1. Review the COE as part of the state quality control plan;
	2. Further verify information on the COE, if needed;
	3. Confirm or overrule any previous eligibility determination, if needed, based on findings from a thorough verification process;
	4. Search the database for existing COEs on migrant children;
	5. Update any existing COE or create a new COE for each recruited child as appropriate;
	6. Validate eligibility determinations on new COEs;
	7. Input new COEs into the state student database;
	8. Provide on-going training with recruiters via bimonthly recruitment meetings and one-on-one shadowing of recruiters and ID&R coordinator;
	9. Update the state’s ID&R Manual to reflect the latest guidance from OME on recent eligibility cases;
	10. Provide training, guidance, and leadership to recruiters to engage migrant parents and involve them in the state PAC (parent involvement coordinator); and
	11. Continue to organize, lead, and execute recruitment sweeps in each region during the region’s peak qualifying work periods of the year (ID&R coordinator).

The manual also covers information on training for recruitment staff, reviewing and approving COEs, resolving eligibility questions, re-certifying migrant families, and re-interviewing migrant families and youth, all of which are components of the state’s quality control for the ID&R system. The state will implement a plan to update the manual yearly ensuring that the state is staying current on the latest guidance from OME.

**Priority for Service Students**

Below is the definition of a PFS student that has been developed by the MS MEP.

1. The student experienced a school year interruption, which could constitute not only a move across school district lines but also an accumulation of ten or more days absent that are related to his/her migratory lifestyle (e.g. sickness related to exposure to pesticides, etc.).
2. A student who is “failing or at-risk of failing.”

Students who score below proficient on state assessment (MCT 2 and SATP 2) in reading or mathematics or have two of the following “at-risk” factors:

* Limited English Proficiency (LEP) designation
* Individualized Education Plan (IEP)
* RTI designation of Tier II or III
* Medical disability, vision or hearing problem, etc.
* Behavioral/social issues that result in learning difficulties
* Failing grades in reading or mathematics on student report cards

**Student Record Transfer**

The MS MEP is authorized under Sections 1301-1309 of Part C of Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), as amended by the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act, to collect the necessary set of minimum data elements to be transferred between State MEPs. The United States Department of Education (USDOE) developed and maintains the Migrant Student Information Exchange (MSIX) system which State and Local Education Agencies use to transfer records on a national level. (Source: *MSIX Policies and Procedures Manual)*

In particular, State Education Agencies (SEAs) are required under Section 1304 (b)(3) and 1308 (b) to promote interstate and intrastate coordination by providing educational continuity through the timely transfer of pertinent school records (including health information) when children move from one school to another, whether or not the move occurs during the regular school year. This responsibility includes carrying out activities that provide for educational continuity through the timely transfer of pertinent school records, including health information, for migratory children, whether or not they move during the regular school year. (Source: *MSIX Policies and Procedures Manual)*

The MMESC uses MIS2000 as its record system. The state education agency (SEA) (or, in this case, MMESC) uploads information from MIS200 to the National MSIX data system. Recruitment staff and program coordinators have been trained to search for student information on the MSIX data system.

All MS MEP program data is collected by the recruiters, program coordinators and the state Data Coordinator. It is submitted to and entered by the state Data Coordinator. The records include, but are not limited to: testing data, supplemental services, health information, and attendance records. A portion of the data beyond eligibility is collected from MSIS.“The MSIS *“was created to comply with the Performance Based Accreditation Model established by the Education Reform Act of 1982. This creation was strengthened by further legislation in 1994. This legislation placed an emphasis on the accurate reporting of student attendance and personnel at the school level – it required that there be no more summary data sent to the State Department of Education. MSIS was created to capture the data necessary to comply with this state legislation as well as federal requirements for reporting.”* (Source: *Mississippi Depart of Education*, retrieved from URL [http://www.mde.k12.ms.us/management-information-systems/ms-student-information-system-(msis)](http://www.mde.k12.ms.us/management-information-systems/ms-student-information-system-%28msis%29))

The MMESC has read-only access to MSIS to gather the necessary minimum data elements needed for entry into MIS2000 and upload into MSIX.

Figure 2 illustrates the cycle of data for a typical migrant child who moves from one state to another. The process begins anew for each state.

The Data Coordinator will abide by all proposed regulations to implement and support the MSIX and minimum data elements as set forth in the Federal Register of December 27, 2013. (Source: *OMB.**No.1810-6083)*

Table 13 *(OMB. No.1810-6083 proposed changes)*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Reporting Activity** | **Description** | **Timeframe** |
| 1. Start-up Data Submission -200.85(b)(2)(i) | Collect and submit to MSIX minimum data elements (applicable to child’s age and grade level) for every migrant child whom the SEA considered eligible for MEP services within one year preceding the effective date of the regulations. | No later than 90 calendar days after the effective date of these regulations  |
| 2. Newly Documented Migratory Children 200.85(b)(3)(i)(A) | Collect and submit to MSIX all minimum data elements (applicable to child’s age and grade level) for newly documented migrant students. | Within 10 working days of documenting the child’s eligibility for the MEP |
| 3. Newly Documented Migratory Children with Secondary School Records in the Same State -200.85(b)(3)(i)(B) | Collect and submit all applicable minimum data elements from the most recent secondary school previously attended by the student within the same State.  | Within 10 working days of documenting the child’s eligibility for the MEP |
| 4.\* Newly Documented Migratory Children with Secondary School Records from Another State -200.85(b)(3)(i)(B) | Notify MSIX if one of its local operating agencies obtains records from a secondary school previously attended by the migrant student in another State. | Within 30 calendar days of receipt of records by an LEA |
| 5. End of Term Submission -200.85(b)(3)(ii)  | Collect and submit to MSIX all minimum data element updates and newly available minimum data elements for migratory children who were eligible for the MEP during the term and for whom the SEA previously submitted data | Within 30 calendar days of the end of an LEA or local operating agency’s fall, spring, summer, or intersession terms |
| 6. Change of Residence Submission -200.85(b)(3)(iii) | Collect and submit to MSIX all newly available MDEs and MDE updates that have become available to the SEA or one of its local operating agencies. | Within four working days of receiving notification from MSIX that migratory child has changed residence to a new local operating agency within the State or to a new State |
| 7. Parental Request for MSIX Data Correction -200.85(e)(1)(ii) | If an SEA determines that data previously submitted to MSIX should be corrected as the result of a request from a parent, guardian, or migrant student, the SEA shall submit revised data to MSIX to correct the previously submitted data. | Within four working days of the SEA’s determination to correct the data previously submitted to MSIX |
| 8. Response to ED -200.85(e)(3) | Submit information requested by USDOE needed to respond to an individual’s request to amend a record under the Privacy Act. | Within 10 working days of USDOE’s request |

## Conclusion and Next Steps

The state SDP provides a framework that enables the MS MEP to focus on high priority service delivery strategies and to determine their effectiveness in meeting the needs of its migrant students. The MS MEP uses a number of data sources to collect and analyze information to evaluate program services:

* Counts on students identified and served (MIS2000 database);
* Document review of services provided (school year and summer programming), particularly related to PFS students;
* Onsite monitoring reviews (record examination, interview responses and observations);
* Migrant student achievement and gap analysis (MCT2 scores); and
* Quality control efforts for the ID&R system.

The SDP outlines a number of evaluation measures that enable the MS MEP to track implementation and determine whether its programming is having the desired impact on migrant student achievement.

The diverse representation of the NAC that oversaw the CNA process brought considerable expertise to bear on the data analysis and decision making process. They highlighted the importance of making evaluation a key component of the MS MEP and ensuring that the data collection and analysis phase is integrated into the state’s broader evaluation framework.

The participants in the CNA committees were very inspired by the process. Many of them commented that they are looking forward to refining their ability to implement new strategies and to measure whether their program services are proving to be successful in improving student and family outcomes. Every WG grappled with the challenge of meeting the needs of the “most difficult to serve” PFS students. The CNA/SDP priorities will benefit the PFS students, and it was acknowledged that the MS MEP will have to dedicate more time and energy to finding and serving the migrant students and families with high mobility and multiple risk factors.

The following section describes the major elements that are on the MS MEP’s “to do” list in order to responsibly implement its SDP and to lay the groundwork for a comprehensive evaluation system. The recommendations are divided into the different CNA focus areas.

**School Readiness**

* Compile a list of existing Pre-K programs by area and seek out additional state and local resources that could benefit migrant families with young children. The MS MEP should focus on ensuring that all of their preschool-aged children receive some form of assistance with development of their school readiness skills. This assistance can be provided through educating parents, in their homes and/or at parent meetings, about specific ways in which they can support their child’s literacy and furnishing them with the necessary materials.
* The School Readiness committee recommended that the MS MEP develop and use a school readiness checklist that will enable the program to assess whether their migrant children are benefiting from their Pre-K instruction. They need to agree on a standard format and write up guidance on how the checklist should be used to track children’s growth.
* The MS MEP also needs to focus its services on facilitating migrant children’s registration and smooth entry into kindergarten. The state office can help by developing partnerships with Pre-K providers and ensuring that MMESC staff have access to, and knowledge of, the most up-to-date information on preschool issues and resources.

**Improving Reading and Math Proficiency**

* The MS MEP needs to continue to refine and expand its efforts to provide high quality individualized, differentiated instruction for its students who are deemed below proficient in reading and/or math. They need to continue to focus on improving the quality and intensity of their summer programming and targeted tutorial support during the regular school term.
* During the summer, the different sites will conduct pre- and post-testing in both reading and math. This will enable the MS MEP service providers to determine whether their migrant students are improving in substantive ways. During the regular school term, it will be necessary to develop and use a common reporting format in order to be able to document type and intensity of the instruction being provided.
* The Improving Reading Proficiency committee also recommended that a team should establish criteria for which students will be considered “below proficient” in reading and/or math. This is especially important for those migrant students who have not participated in the state assessments.

**High School Graduation**

* A principal focus of the High School Graduation committee was to underscore the importance of providing individualized support to meet the most critical needs of secondary migrant students. Since there are so few secondary aged students in Mississippi, the team recommended that the most effective approach might be to keep a portfolio on every student that includes elements such as:
* Career assessment
* Credit assessment
* Education background
* Interests
* Annual goal-setting and monitoring of goals
* The MMESC will need to convene a team that will be responsible for developing a standard portfolio format, and will establish guidance and share resources that will enable staff to work within a common framework and track the progress of all secondary students from year to year. The portfolio should also prove to be a helpful document that can be sent with a student who moves to another state or district. The MSIX system is an important resource for storing and receiving information on highly mobile students.
* In addition, the state office could support the effort by ensuring that the MMESC is aware of both state and district programs and resources that enable students to make up missed credits.

**Health**

* Health is a new and important feature of the state’s SDP. The MS MEP has always understood that they must focus on the needs of the whole child in order for him or her to thrive. One way that they can begin a dialogue around health with their families and OSY would be to include a series of health-related questions during home visits and/or during parent meetings. The questions could be used as an informal pre- and post- assessment of a migrant family’s or OSY’s level of knowledge about the availability and accessibility of primary care services in their areas.

Possible questions might include:

1. When was the last time you or someone in your family visited a doctor? If never seen, why not?

2. What was the reason you went to the doctor?

3. How did you find out about the doctor?

4. Did you need someone to translate for you?

5. Are you familiar with local health providers? Which ones?

6. Do you know what the school requires if your child is sick?

* It will also be important to provide migrant families and OSY with up-to-date information on where they can obtain primary care services and which health providers have bilingual staff.

**Out-of-School Youth**

* OSY are notoriously difficult to serve primarily because they are focused on working and are highly mobile. Most of the OSY who express an interest in learning want to improve their English skills. At present, the MS MEP tracks a number of factors related to their OSY population. The Out-of-School Youth committee made a recommendation that the MS MEP should establish a common reporting format that will enable service providers to track contact hours dedicated to mini-lessons (both face-to-face and using technology).

Many of the mini-lessons provided on the SOSOSY website have built-in pre- and post-assessment features. By documenting contact hours, which lessons are being used, and (when possible) how the OSY performed on the lessons, it would go a long way toward proving that the needs of this population are being met in substantive ways.

As the program implements the SDP in 2014-15, the MS MEP is in the process of writing an evaluation framework that will outline: performance indicators; data elements to measure impact and effectiveness; methods and sources for data collection; and a timeline for collecting, analyzing, and reporting results. The evaluation framework development process will include input from MMESC staff and PAC members. MS MEP and MMESC staff will be trained on evaluation issues, including data collection protocols and instruments. These evaluation efforts will help to inform how best to target MEP funds to achieve state performance targets and MEP goals to meet the unique needs of migrant students in the state.

## Appendix A

## List of Acronyms Used

COE Certificate of Eligibility

CNA Comprehensive Needs Assessment

ELLs English language learners

ESEA Elementary and Secondary Education Act

ESL English as a Second Language

GPRA Government Performance and Results Act

ID&R Identification and recruitment

MIS2000 Migrant database

MMESC Mississippi Migrant Education Service Center

MS MEP Mississippi Migrant Education Program

MSIS Mississippi Student Information System

MSIX Migrant Student Information Exchange

NAC Needs Assessment Committee

NCLB No Child Left Behind

OME Office of Migrant Education

OSY Out-of-School Youth

PAC Parent advisory council

PFS Priority for Service

SEAs State Education Agencies

SDP Service Delivery Plan

SOSOSY Strategies and Opportunities for Out-of-School Youth

USDOE United States Department of Education

WG Work group

## Appendix B

**MS CNA Draft Concern Statements (3/11/13)**

**School Readiness (Pre-K)**

* Migrant families do not have access to Pre-K and other community opportunities that contribute to readiness for Kindergarten. (Educational Support in the Home)
* Pre-K students lack adequate development of fine motor skills. (Educational Continuity)
* Pre-K parents are not equipped to assist with preparing their children for Kindergarten. (Educational Continuity)

**Reading (K-12)**

* Migrant students do not speak enough English at home during summer and breaks. (English Language Development)
* Migrant children with disabilities are required to go through a longer eligibility and intervention process than regular students, and are sometimes denied special education services that are needed. (Access to Services)
* Migrant students do not participate consistently in supplemental instructional reading programs. (Instructional Time)
* Migrant students do not learn to use academic-level vocabulary, and therefore, remain under-prepared to reach their full potential in the work force. (English Language Development)

**Mathematics (K-12)**

* Migrant students face inequality in service provision across regions and districts. (Access to Services)
* Migrant students’ intermittent English language support interferes with the development of their mathematical skills. (English Language Development)

**High School Graduation**

* Secondary-aged migrant students begin to lose hope of completing school and choose to drop out. (Educational Continuity, Student Engagement)
* Migrant students do not have exposure to culture-specific role models that encourage educational attainment and its value. (School Engagement)
* Credit recovery/credit assessment needs are unmet. (Educational Continuity)
* Migrant students lose motivation to continue in school for a variety of reason (e.g. begin to earn money, uninformed ideas about what economic success is in the U.S.). (School Engagement)

**Parent Involvement**

* Parents do not have sufficient knowledge or resources to encourage their children or engage personally in school-related activities. (School Engagement)
* Children do not have anyone at home capable of assisting with school work. (Educational Support in the Home)

**Health**

* Students vision needs are not met.
* Mental health needs of migrant children are not identified and treated properly.
* Students and families do not have access to user-friendly health resources and support.
* Parents are not informed or sufficiently aware about issues such as hygiene, dental care and nutrition, which affect migrant student health. (Health)

## Appendix C

**MS CNA Expert Work Group Members**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Title** | **Organization** |
| Devon Brenner | Professor and Dept. Head | MS State |
| Patrice Boone | Branch Director | MDE |
| Theresa Brown | Technical Assistant Coordinator | America Reads |
| Scott Clements | Director | MDE – Office of Healthy Schools |
| Janie Curlow-New | Director | TK, Martin Center – MS State |
| Dr. Lynn Darling | Director | Early Childhood Institute – MS State |
| Gabriella Davis | ID & R Coordinator | MMESC |
| Taylor Dearman | Special Projects Coordinator | MMESC |
| Geroldean Dyse | Chief Executive Officer | SE Mississippi Rural Health Initiative, Inc. |
| Dr. Limmie Flowers | Consultant | NISL School Leadership Coaching  |
| Lyn Fogle | Assistant Professor | MSU English Dept./TESOL |
| Tania Hanna | Assistant Professor | USM |
| Trina Heidelberg | School Attendance Officer | MDE |
| Jacqueline Jackson | Interim Director – Kids College | Jackson State University |
| Marion Jones | Executive Director | PREPS – MS State |
| Aurella Jones-Taylor | Chief Executive Officer | Aaron E. Henry Community Health Center |
| Dr. Germain McConnell | Director of Academic Affairs | MS School for Mathematics and Science |
| Dr. Alice McGowan | Director – Early Childhood | Jackson State University |
| Inez Melendez | Recruiter/Advocate | Delta – North Central region |
| Kelly Moser | Assistant Professor | MS State |
| Jeannette Ratliff | Registered Nurse | Aaron E. Henry Community Health Center |
| Blair Reed | Data/Assessment Coordinator | MMESC |
| Lydia Rios | Case Manager | MS Delta Council for Farmworker Opportunities |
| Deana Sanders-Vivians | Technical Assistant Coordinator | School of Human Science–Extension Service |
| Damian Thomas | Division Director | Alternative Education/GED - MDE |
| Nikisha Ware | Executive Director | Jackson State University–MS Learning Institute |