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Executive Summary

The Pennsylvania Department of Education’s (PDE) Migrant Education Program (PA-MEP) exists to supplement the education of children of migrant workers and migrant out-of-school youth. PA-MEP is funded through a federal formula-driven allocation for the state and each project area based on child count and mobility factors. PA-MEP serves a varied population of children from birth through age 21 and their families in an effort to improve their educational outcomes, which are potentially jeopardized by obstacles such as poverty, high mobility, language barriers, cultural adjustment, and limited access to health care. PA-MEP provides a wide range of services such as: supplemental and enrichment learning opportunities; in-home support services; language and cultural support; preschool services; student leadership programs; postsecondary enrollment support; student advocacy; and efforts to increase parent involvement.

Children and youth are identified and recruited to PA-MEP based on several specific criteria related to recent qualifying moves, age, high school completion, and type of temporary/seasonal work.¹

PA-MEP divides Pennsylvania into nine project areas for program implementation and management. Each project area has a manager (three individuals manage more than one project area) who reports to PDE’s Bureau of Curriculum, Assessment, and Instruction and a staff of individuals handling various aspects of program implementation, including recruiters, student support specialists, and data specialists.

Evaluation Design

The purpose of the PA-MEP state evaluation is to examine program implementation and results and build capacity within project areas to examine results and make decisions based on evaluation findings. PDE, through Chester County Regional Education Services, contracted with the Allegheny Intermediate Unit to conduct a comprehensive external evaluation of PA-MEP as required under Title I, Part C, Sections 1301(4); 1303(e); 1304(b)(1) and (2); 1304(c)(5); 1304(d); 1306(a)(1)(C) and (D):

34 CFR 200.84 - Responsibilities of SEAs for evaluating the effectiveness of the PA-MEP. Each SEA must determine the effectiveness of its program through a written evaluation that measures the implementation and results achieved by the program against the State’s performance targets in § 200.83(a)(1), particularly for those students who have priority for service as defined in section 1304(d) of the ESEA.

In analyzing the program’s implementation and outcomes, evaluators examined extracts from MIS2000 (the PA-MEP database), student results on state academic and English language assessments, student data from the Kindergarten Readiness Checklist, project area monitoring reports, and other data. Evaluators collected data from state and local sources and then analyzed it overall for the state, for each project area, and by student category, English fluency, and/or Priority for Service status, as applicable.

DEMOGRAPHICS

A total of 5,282 children and youth were enrolled in PA-MEP for at least one day from September 1, 2016 through August 30, 2017, which is 124 more students than the prior year, and the second year in a row that the count of eligible students increased. At 73 percent, the largest group falls into the school-age category, followed by 18 percent who were not yet of school age (birth to age 6, not yet enrolled in K-12 school), and 9 percent who were out-of-school youth.

Most of the PA-MEP population was made up of individuals who identified themselves using federal race categories as Hispanic (72 percent of 5,282 children/youth). Spanish was the most common home language (70 percent), followed by those with a language designation of Nepali (10 percent), Swahili (4 percent), or another language (16 percent).

PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION RESULTS

Project areas conduct a needs assessment for each child and youth in order to identify risk factors that may influence success. PA-MEP uses the results of this needs assessment as a tool to link children and youth with services. Needs assessment data was available for 5,096 children and youth (96 percent of children and youth).

Based on needs assessment data, 43 percent of 5,282 students in 2016-17 were identified as Priority for Service at any time during the program year. Priority for Service is a designation used throughout the program and its evaluation to indicate individuals who have certain risk factors. PA-MEP staff are to use this determination to serve Priority for Service children and youth first or to prioritize individuals for service when resource limitations exist.

Overall, 84 percent of children and youth age 3 or older (4,723) were not fluent in English. Based on analysis of service data for nonfluent students age 3 and older, 96 percent received English-related services or support; 96 percent of nonfluent Priority for Service students received English-related services and 96 percent of non-Priority for Service students received English services. A majority of nonfluent K-12 students who were

---

2 The evaluation team completed the necessary confidentiality protocols for state-level data collection.

3 The PA-MEP fiscal year runs October 1 through September 30. Evaluators use an adjusted period of September 1 to August 30 in order to capture one full school year and one full summer, as this is how data is attributed.
enrolled before June 2017 (95 percent) were coded as receiving English services through their district’s English as a Second Language (ESL) program during the school year.

Preschool enrollment is one of the areas included in PA-MEP’s Comprehensive Needs Assessment and Service Delivery Plan. Of children age 3 and older and not yet enrolled in K-12 school, 55 percent were enrolled in a preschool program.

School year interruption is a main component of the K-12 needs assessment and in determining Priority for Service status for K-12 students. School year interruptions are defined as a move within the past 12 months due to the migrant lifestyle (not for vacation or illness), an absence of 10 or more consecutive days of school within the past year, or a move during summer term when summer education was a necessary component of the child’s education. More than a third (38 percent) of 3,701 K-12 students had a school year interruption.

According to initial needs assessments, 18 percent of K-12 students were proficient in reading and 20 percent were proficient in math (of 3,701 K-12 students).

Of K-12 students who were not proficient in reading (3,006), 79 percent received reading-specific supplemental services. Further analysis revealed that 87 percent of Priority for Service students with a reading need received supplemental reading services through at least one category, while 74 percent of non-Priority for Service students received supplemental reading services, providing evidence that Priority for Service students took priority for service delivery.

Of K-12 students not proficient in math (2,930), 74 percent received math-specific supplemental services. Further analysis indicated that 83 percent of Priority for Service students received supplemental math services, compared to 67 percent of non-Priority for Service students, providing evidence that Priority for Service students took priority for service delivery.

Out-of-school youth have several options for education support and their needs assessment reflects some of these, including interest or participation status related to ESL programs, Adult Basic Education and/or General Equivalency Diploma (GED) programs, job training, or school entry. With the exception of English programs, where 84 percent of the 467 nonfluent out-of-school youth attended, enrolled in, were interested in, or had completed an ESL program, and to a lesser extent job training, out-of-school youth were generally uninterested in educational programs.

While this year’s evaluation focused on service delivery with regard to specific need categories, evaluators also examined service delivery overall, as this is an element of federal Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA) measures for PA-MEP. Of the 5,282 students enrolled one day or more during the 2016-17 year, 5,023 (95 percent) were coded as having received services under one or more categories based on service delivery data or action codes indicating delivery of services. Of those individuals not having any service delivery indicated, all but nine students can be explained by being younger than 3
years old, enrolling at the end of the program year, having a short enrollment or residence, or the PA-MEP were unable to contact or locate the student after multiple attempts.

**STUDENT OUTCOMES**

**Kindergarten Readiness**

PA-MEP provides a structured method of determining kindergarten readiness for needs assessment and examining changes in kindergarten readiness over the course of the program year. The Kindergarten Readiness Checklist is an instrument that resulted from the School Readiness Expert Group working on the *Service Delivery Plan* and can be administered up to three times per year: at the beginning of the program year or upon a child’s identification; at the end of the school year; and at the end of the summer. A total of 170 children who were 4 years old or older as of September 1, 2016 and not yet enrolled in kindergarten were included in analysis, of which 52 percent had a Priority for Service designation. Results for a child’s last assessment, regardless of its timing, indicated that of the 170 children, 79 percent were considered ready for kindergarten by demonstrating proficiency on at least 16 of the 22 identified skills. Eighteen percent were considered in progress, or nearing kindergarten readiness, and 3 percent of children were classified as not yet ready for kindergarten based on the checklist.

**State Academic Assessments**

Pennsylvania annually administers several assessments in core academic areas to public school students, the Pennsylvania System of School Assessment (PSSA) in grades 3-8, the Pennsylvania Alternate System of Assessment (PASA) to students having significant cognitive disabilities in grades 3-8 and 11, and the Algebra I, biology, and literature Keystone Exams to secondary students, with students re-taking the Keystone Exams until they reach a proficient level. Their score is banked and applied to their grade 11 year, or their grade 11 Keystone Exam is used for accountability if the student had not yet reached a proficient level.

PSSA, PASA, and Keystone Exam data were available at the state level and matched to PA-MEP enrollment data. Consequently, data was available for all migrant students enrolled in a public school who took the applicable assessment. Performance levels (below basic, basic, proficient, or advanced) were used in assessment analysis. In addition to looking at the overall results, evaluators disaggregated state assessment data by grade level, English fluency\(^4\), and Priority for Service status. Priority for Service status was further disaggregated by English fluency.

Results for reading, math, and science indicate that English fluency was a factor in students’ results as fluent students tended to score in the proficient and advanced levels in greater percentages than nonfluent students. Likewise, students with a Priority for Service designation were less likely to score in the proficient or advanced levels than students who did not meet Priority for Service criteria. In each of the three content areas, the largest

---

\(^4\) English fluency was determined by the child’s or youth’s PA-MEP needs assessment.
portion of students scored in the below basic performance level. The following table provides the state academic results for 2016-17.

Table 1: 2016-17 State Assessment Results.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Content area</th>
<th>Students included</th>
<th>Advanced</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
<th>Basic</th>
<th>Below basic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Math/Algebra I</td>
<td>1,605</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading/literature</td>
<td>1,336</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science/biology</td>
<td>615</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Information was also available to allow evaluators to compare migrant students’ results to non-migrant state assessment results using summary findings provided by the PDE Assessment Office. In this comparison, results for migrant students having assessment data were compared to results for non-migrant students having assessment data. However, it is important to keep in mind that the migrant student group is a small fraction of the non-migrant group: less than 0.2 percent. Comparisons should be made with caution.

In reading/language arts, 17.9 percent of migrant students assessed scored in the proficient or advanced performance levels, which is lower than the non-migrant group (62.4 percent). In math, 9.5 percent of migrant students scored in the proficient or advanced performance levels, while 45.5 percent of non-migrant students did so. In science, 19.6 percent of migrant students scored proficient or advanced compared to 62.8 percent of non-migrant students. However, when these non-migrant results are compared to the English fluent migrant subgroup results shared previously, the gap shrinks. Instead of gaps of 36 to 45 percentage points, the gaps between migrant fluent students and non-migrant students are only 12 to 18 percentage points, further confirming the influence of English language fluency on assessment results.

State English Proficiency Assessment

The ACCESS for ELLs\textsuperscript{6} assessment is a language proficiency assessment for K-12 students and is one component of the World-Class Instructional Design and Assessment (WIDA) Consortium’s comprehensive, standards-driven system designed to improve the teaching and learning of English language learners. Pennsylvania is a part of the WIDA Consortium. The purpose of the assessment is to monitor student progress in English language proficiency on a yearly basis and to serve as a criterion to aid in determining when students have attained full language proficiency.

ACCESS for ELLs data was available for all students enrolled in a Pennsylvania public school who took the assessment. For the 2016-17 program year, data was available for 2,314 K-12 migrant students (778 Priority for Service, 1,536 non-Priority for Service), which is 82 percent of all K-12 PA-MEP nonfluent students enrolled during the school year.

\textsuperscript{5} Students who are not fluent in English and who have been enrolled in a United States school for less than one year are given the option to take state reading assessments, though no such exemption option applies to the math or science assessments.

\textsuperscript{6} While the name of the assessment is an acronym standing for Assessing Comprehension and Communication in English State-to-State for English Language Learners, ACCESS for ELLs is the formal name of the assessment.
Nonfluent students would not have data if they were not enrolled in public school in Pennsylvania at the time the assessment occurred.

Overall results indicate a fairly even distribution of students among the three lowest performance categories of the assessment, with decreasing percentages at higher performance levels. By grade level, kindergarten had the highest percentage (77 percent) of students scoring in the lowest performance level. Grades 5 and 6 had the highest percentages of students scoring in the top (most proficient) performance levels. Results by Priority for Service status show Priority for Services students were more likely to score in the lower performance levels.

**Graduation, Promotion, GED, and Dropout**

Of the 160 grade 12 students who had graduation information, 89 percent graduated (142 students). Additionally, 10 grade 11 students successfully graduated at the end of 2016-17 by earning additional credits and meeting requirements, bringing the total 2016-17 graduate count to 152 students.

According to promotion information for secondary students (grades 7-12) whose graduation and promotion status could be determined\(^7\) (1,276 students), 92 percent were promoted to the next grade or graduated. Overall, 96 percent of the 3,375 K-12 students whose status was known graduated or were promoted.

Six out-of-school youth earned their GED credential during 2016-17. Additionally, 18 out-of-school youth and one student who dropped out in 2016-17 and became out-of-school youth were listed as pursuing their GED, which also was an increase over the prior year (12 were pursuing their GED in 2015-16). In addition, one out-of-school youth had his/her home country’s diploma formally recognized, so the student was considered to have graduated.

A total of 35 students dropped out of school in 2016-17, though four of these students re-enrolled in school during the year; 80 percent of these had a Priority for Service designation. Two students who dropped out were known to be pursuing a GED and one received his/her GED. Students dropped out of grades 9-12, with grade 12 having the greatest number of students dropping out (12). Of secondary students (grades 9-12) the dropout rate based on 31 students dropping out was 3.22 percent (31 of 962 students in grades 9-12). However, Pennsylvania calculates dropout rate based on enrollment in grades 7-12. Based on this expanded population, the dropout rate is 1.26 percent.

Analysis also examined the frequency with which students who dropped out re-enrolled in school. This revealed that between September 1, 2016 and August 30, 2017, eight students who had previously dropped out re-enrolled in K-12 school.

---

\(^7\) Students whose status could not be determined included those that left the area before the end of the school year, their eligibility expired, or they arrived too late in the program year for promotion to be determined.
CONCLUSION

PA-MEP provides a variety of services to migrant children and youth and nearly all children and youth who are present a reasonable length of time receive services. Migrant children and youth face a unique set of challenges, including mobility and limited English fluency, which influences student outcomes. Despite these challenges, some students performed at proficient levels or improved academically. Based on evaluation findings, evaluators offer the following recommendations:

- Continue to focus efforts on nonfluent and Priority for Service students as well as any student who is identified as declining on academic measures or who appears to be at risk of dropping out. Special focus should be placed on Priority for Service students who are not achieving success on key program areas as identified by performance indicators.
- When resource limitations exist, ensure that children and youth who are Priority for Service, over age 3, and/or have a need in a particular area are served first.
- Continue successful collaboration efforts between summer programs and their host sites/school districts, but also take into consideration where the facility and/or resources present may be insufficient for summer program needs.
- Evaluators and PDE should continue to collaborate to review program components and new initiatives to ensure alignment and efficiency.
Program Highlights

In a lengthy report it is easy to get lost in the numbers, percentages, and graphs, no matter how helpful they are in understanding the program and its outcomes. Additionally, the evaluation report is mostly a presentation of the program year as a snapshot without much perspective of program progress. In this section, evaluators present several program highlights that showcase program success and progress. Program areas for improvement are addressed in the Reflections, Implications, and Recommendations section at the end of this report.

• Year to year, PA-MEP consistently serves nearly all eligible students who are at least 3 years old and present a reasonable amount of time.

• Evidence consistently indicates that Priority for Service students are served first.

• In summer 2017, 1,389 preschool through grade 12 students participated in PA-MEP campus-based summer programs, with 55 percent of participants being in preschool through grade 3 during the 2016-17 year. The average attendance rate by student was 62 percent (mean) and 71 percent (median). However, the most frequent attendance rate (mode) was 100 percent with 163 students attending all of the summer sessions offered by their site or program.

• Of 160 grade 12 students having graduation status information, 89 percent graduated (142 of 160 students), which is higher than the prior year, where 87 percent (138 students of 158) graduated. In addition to grade 12 students graduating, analysis revealed that 10 students who were enrolled in grade 11 successfully graduated by earning additional credits and meeting requirements, bringing the total 2016-17 graduate count to 152. This is a greater number graduates who were not in grade 12 than the prior year where two grade 10 and one grade 11 students successfully graduated.

• Of graduates, 79 percent indicated that they planned to attend a two-year or four-year college.

• Six out-of-school youth earned their GED credential during 2016-17. Additionally, 18 out-of-school youth were identified as pursuing their GED.

• Of 1,385 students in grades 7-12 whose graduation and promotion status could be determined, 92 percent were promoted to the next grade or graduated. Overall (grades K-12), 96 percent of the 3,375 students whose status was known graduated or were promoted.

• Of 198 grade 11 students, 58 percent successfully completed Algebra I or a higher level math course as of their earliest needs assessment for the year.

• Eight out-of-school youth who had previously dropped out of school re-enrolled in K-12 school during the 2016-17 program year.

• PA-MEP exceeded its instruction or completion targets for the Diploma Project for both students and parents and improved upon the prior year’s percentages.
• While Pennsylvania Priority for Service students taking state assessments in both 2015-16 and 2016-17 did not achieve the program’s target gains percentages, results show that Priority for Service students made gains to a greater extent than their peers.

• A comparison of 2016 to 2017 state reading assessment results for summer 2016 program participants indicated that 33 percent of summer 2016 program participants improved their performance or maintained an advanced score on the state reading assessment compared to 28 percent of all migrant students having these two years of data. This may indicate that the summer program had a positive influence on students’ state reading assessment outcomes.

• The dropout rate for high school students in 2016-17 was lower than the prior year (3.22 percent compared to 2015-16’s 5.03 percent). The dropout rate based on enrollment in grades 7-12, which is the state method of determining dropout rate, was 1.26 percent for 2016-17.

• Of students having both 2016 and 2017 state reading and math assessment data, 28 percent improved or maintained an advanced score in reading and 15 percent improved or maintained an advanced score in math. Both of these are higher percentages than the prior year (23 percent for reading, 11 percent for math). Percentages improving were higher for both reading and math for Priority for Service students who received reading or math supplemental services, indicating that supplemental services\(^8\) may be contributing to positive academic outcomes for the students with the greatest need.

  o Of Priority for Service students in grades 3-8 who received supplemental reading services (38), 42 percent made gains on the reading PSSA from 2015-16 to 2016-17, which is higher than for non-Priority for Service students in these grades who received such services (413 students), where 27 percent made gains or maintained an advanced score.

  o Of Priority for Service students in grades 3-8 who received supplemental math services (63), 17 percent made gains on the math PSSA from 2015-16 to 2016-17, which is higher than for non-Priority for Service students in these grades who received such services (427 students), where 15 percent made gains or maintained an advanced score.

• PA-MEP improved upon or maintained performance related to the program’s leading indicators.

\(^8\) Supplemental services may be from PA-MEP, a non-migrant source, or both.
Introduction

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Pennsylvania Department of Education’s (PDE) Migrant Education Program (PA-MEP) exists to supplement the education of children of migrant workers. PA-MEP is funded through a federal formula-driven allocation for the state and each project area, based on child count and mobility factors. PA-MEP serves a varied population of children and youth from birth through age 21 and their families in an effort to improve their educational outcomes, which are potentially jeopardized by obstacles such as poverty, high mobility, language barriers, cultural adjustment, and limited access to health care. PA-MEP provides a wide range of services such as: supplemental and enrichment learning opportunities; in-home support services; language and cultural support; preschool services; student leadership programs; postsecondary enrollment support; student advocacy; and efforts to increase parent involvement.

Children and youth are identified and recruited to PA-MEP based on several eligibility criteria:

9. The child is between the ages of 3\(^{10}\) and 21 years old and has not graduated from high school or does not hold a high school equivalency certificate;

9. The child is a migrant worker or has a parent, spouse, or guardian who is a migrant worker;

9. The child has moved within the preceding 36 months in order to obtain/seek employment or accompany/join a parent, spouse, or guardian in obtaining/seeking temporary or seasonal employment in qualifying work, and that employment is a principal means of livelihood; and

9. The child has moved from one school district to another.

Pennsylvania is divided into nine project areas for the purposes of program implementation and management. Each project area has a manager (three individuals manage more than one project area) who oversees operations and reporting responsibilities.

- Chester County Intermediate Unit 24 managed Project Areas 1 and 3.
- Millersville University managed Project Areas 2, 4, and 5.
- Central Susquehanna Intermediate Unit 16 managed Project Area 6.
- Northwest Tri-County Intermediate Unit 5 managed Project Area 7.
- Lincoln Intermediate Unit 12 manages Project Areas 8 and 9.\(^{11}\)

---


10 While the focus of the program is on children and youth who are 3 years old or older, PA-MEP is permitted to serve children under 3 years old.

11 Near the end of the 2016-17 program year, Lincoln Intermediate Unit 12 ceased oversight of the PA-MEP for Project Areas 8 and 9. These regions were divided among Millersville University, Central Susquehanna Intermediate Unit, and Northwest Tri-County Intermediate Unit.
Each project area manager reports to PDE’s Bureau of Curriculum, Assessment, and Instruction and has a staff of individuals handling various aspects of program implementation, including recruiters, student support specialists, and data specialists. The following map illustrates the division of Pennsylvania into the nine project areas.

**Pennsylvania Migrant Education Counties Map**

**EVALUATION DESIGN**

PDE, through Chester County Regional Education Services, contracted with the Allegheny Intermediate Unit to conduct a comprehensive external evaluation of PA-MEP for the 2016-17 program year. Pennsylvania is required to evaluate the program in order to fulfill federal requirements under Title I, Part C, Sections 1301(4); 1303(e); 1304(b)(1) and (2); 1304(c)(5); 1304(d); 1306(a)(1)(C) and (D), as follows:

34 CFR 200.84 - Responsibilities of SEAs for evaluating the effectiveness of the PA-MEP. Each SEA must determine the effectiveness of its program through a written evaluation that measures the implementation and results achieved by the program against the State's performance targets in § 200.83(a)(1), particularly for those students who have priority for service as defined in section 1304(d) of the ESEA.

The purpose of the evaluation of PA-MEP is to examine program implementation and outcomes and to build capacity within project areas to examine results and make programming decisions based on data. The general questions that this evaluation answers include:
• To what extent are programs being implemented?
• Are migrant students meeting state accountability targets?
• To what extent are programs for migrant students impacting student outcomes?

To examine program implementation, evaluators identified current practices and instruments used to collect implementation information. During and prior to the 2016-17 school year, these sources or practices included data/report completion, program enrollment, demographics, service delivery data, annual monitoring reports, and project area reports. PA-MEP’s MIS2000 database is the primary data warehouse that all project areas use to manage, track, and query migrant child and youth information.

To look at program results, evaluators examined individual child and youth data from PA-MEP’s database pertaining to needs assessment, service delivery, graduation and drop-out status, state academic assessment results, and postsecondary plans.

Evaluators collected 2016-17 data from the ACCESS for ELLs assessments at the state level to examine migrant student academic achievement.

PA-MEP staff at the state and local level receive information and guidance in advance about what data will be collected, forms and methods of submission, and the purpose of the data/information collection as it relates to state reporting and evaluation. This occurs through annual (or more frequent) training, managers meetings, and ongoing communication. PA-MEP staff have access to PDE, contracted state evaluators, and the contracted state PA-MEP data team in the event that there are questions. Project areas are also provided local program evaluation findings, guidance on how to use evaluation results locally, and directions for running reports from MIS2000 in order to look at their own progress toward federal outcomes measures and state Service Delivery Plan goals. This provides a consistent basis for project areas to examine their progress and outcomes using similar terms and methods.

This report addresses the implementation, results, and outcomes of the PA-MEP for 2016-17 and evaluator recommendations for programmatic changes and refinement of the evaluation plan.

**HOW TO USE THIS REPORT**

The primary audience for this report is the PA-MEP team at PDE, though the results can be useful for other groups. The state evaluation of the PA-MEP for 2016-17 focused on the connection of children and youth identified as migrant to their needs, service receipt, and outcomes. Because of the volume of findings related to needs assessment and service delivery, a selection of findings related to priority areas are shared in this report. Throughout this report, a narrative explanation precedes the graphical representation of results. For ease of reading, percentages have been rounded, which may result in totals not equal to 100 percent. Additionally, in tables or graphs where “0%” appears, the reader should note that these represent values of less than 1 percent expressed as a rounded
value. Instances of 0 percent where the item truly represents zero instances or individuals have been removed from graphs. Likewise, where blank cells appear in data tables, the value is zero.

Readers should note the difference between “unknown” and “blank (no entry)” in tables and graphs. “Unknown” means that the PA-MEP staff was unable to determine the proper coding for that individual and marked that item as “unknown.” This is different from counts of “blank (no entry),” which means the staff left that particular indicator blank. Findings cannot be extrapolated from blank fields.

Some graphs contained in this report include both the number of instances (in a data table) along with an illustration of the proportional relationship of those figures. This type of graph is typically used when the categories are mutually exclusive and individual category percentages add to 100 percent. Other graphs only include the percentage of instances. This type of graph is typically used when multiple categories can apply to a single item (respondents could select all items that applied). Data tables that include percentages are also used in cases where the percentage is a more accurate representation of the program or the population being examined. The type of illustration included will indicate to the reader the most appropriate way to examine the findings. Some sections provide ranges (minimum/maximum) of results in order to demonstrate the variability of results.

The findings provided within this report should be used to guide program management and assist PDE in providing technical assistance to project areas in order to improve implementation and outcomes.

It is important to remember that children and youth may receive services from other sources so it is not possible to attribute outcomes solely to this program’s efforts.

This report includes detailed explanations of the program’s implementation and outcomes throughout the Findings section. In addition, this report includes sections that use information contained in the Findings section of this report in the context of the Government Performance and Results Act measures and program goals. The report concludes with evaluator reflections and recommendations.
Goal Achievement

Information in this section answers the evaluation question: “To what extent is Pennsylvania’s Migrant Education Program meeting established implementation and outcome expectations?”

**Measurable Performance Objectives (MPOs) from the Service Delivery Plan**

Through the Comprehensive Needs Assessment process, PA-MEP established a Service Delivery Plan that included measurable performance objectives (MPOs). The status of these objectives is outlined here. These objectives address target levels at the end of the 2016-17 program year, as identified by the most recent Service Delivery Plan. The findings shared here show PA-MEP’s progress toward these targets as of the end of the 2016-17 year.

**Reading Objective 1A:** By the end of 2016-17, 50 percent of migrant Priority for Service students will make gains on the reading PSSA.

This objective was not achieved for the 2016-17 year; 45 percent of migrant Priority for Service students who had both 2015-16 and 2016-17 scores made gains on reading state assessments. However, for comparison, 27 percent of all PA-MEP students and 26 percent of non-Priority for Service students having such scores made gains in reading, indicating that Priority for Service students made gains to a greater extent than their peers.

**Reading Objective 1B:** By the end of 2016-17, 80 percent of migrant students in grades K-6 will maintain or improve their scoring category on the summer DIBELS assessment.

This objective cannot be measured. Prior to 2016-17, the state PA-MEP team discontinued use of the DIBELS assessments. State evaluation is examining summer program information in different ways, which may offer new insight and new focus for Service Delivery Plan goals.

**Reading Objective 1C:** By the end of 2016-17, 90 percent of migrant students identified as below proficient in reading will participate in data-informed supplemental instructional reading programs.

This objective was not achieved for the 2016-17 year. Of those students with an identified reading need, 79 percent received reading-specific supplemental services, which is slightly lower than 2015-16 where 87 percent of such students received reading instructional services. By Priority for Service status, 87 percent of Priority for Service students with a reading need received reading services, while 74 percent of non-Priority for Service students were coded as such, providing evidence that efforts focused on serving Priority for Service students.
School Readiness Objective 2A: By the end of 2016-17, 60 percent of migrant children ages 3-5 will participate in preschool programming.

This objective was not achieved for 2016-17 for preschool-age children (ages 3+ not yet enrolled in kindergarten). Of preschool-age children, 55 percent were enrolled in preschool, which is lower than the prior year (66 percent). By Priority for Service status, 26 percent of Priority for Service preschool-age students were enrolled in preschool compared to 94 percent of non-Priority for Service preschool-age students.

School Readiness Objective 2B: By the end of 2016-17, 90 percent of migrant children expected to enter kindergarten the following fall will demonstrate mastery on the Kindergarten Readiness Checklist.

This objective was not achieved for the 2016-17 year. As of their last 2016-17 Kindergarten Readiness Checklist administration, 79 percent of students performed at the mastery level. Students having a Priority for Service designation performed at mastery on their last checklist administration to a lesser extent (66 percent at mastery) than students not having the Priority for Service designation (93 percent at mastery).

Math Objective 3A: By the end of 2016-17, 50 percent of migrant Priority for Service students will make gains on the math PSSA.

This objective was not achieved for the 2016-17 year; 18 percent of migrant Priority for Service students who had both 2015-16 and 2016-17 scores made gains on math state assessments. However, for comparison, 14 percent of all PA-MEP students and 13 percent of non-Priority for Service students having such scores made gains in math, indicating that Priority for Service students made gains to a greater extent than their peers.

Math Objective 3B: By the end of 2016-17, migrant students will make gains on the summer Quick Math Assessment.

This objective cannot be measured. The state team decided to discontinue use of the Quick Math assessments prior to the 2016-17 year. State evaluation is examining summer program information in different ways, which may offer new insight and new focus for Service Delivery Plan goals.

High School Graduation Objective 4A: By the end of 2016-17, 80 percent of migrant students in grades 8-12 who participate in the Diploma Project will receive instruction and/or complete at least one toolkit unit.

This objective was achieved for the 2016-17 year at 99 percent. Further, there were 210 Priority for Service students in grades 8-12 who participated in the Diploma Project and all of them (100 percent) received instruction during this year or completed or tested out of at least one toolkit unit (in this or a prior year). Students in grades 8-12 who were not designated as Priority for Service and participated in the Diploma Project had an instruction
and completion rate of 98 percent. This demonstrates success in serving Priority for Service students.

**High School Graduation Objective 4B:** By the end of 2016-17, 60 percent of migrant students in grades 8-12 will demonstrate knowledge of high school graduation requirements.

This objective was achieved for the 2016-17 year at 63 percent. Of 182 Priority for Service students in grades 8-12 who participated in this unit, 96 (53 percent) completed or tested out of the high school courses and credits unit this or a prior year. Students in grades 8-12 who were not designated as Priority for Service and participated in this unit had a completion rate of 71 percent.

**High School Graduation Objective 4C:** By the end of 2016-17, 60 percent of migrant students in grades 8-12 will demonstrate knowledge of postsecondary planning and options.

This objective was achieved for the 2016-17 year at 62 percent. Of 125 Priority for Service students in grades 8-12 who participated in the Diploma Project postsecondary planning and funding unit, 72 (58 percent) successfully completed or tested out of this unit in this or a prior year. For students who were not Priority for Service, this result was 65 percent.

**Parent Involvement Objective 5A:** By the end of 2016-17, 80 percent of migrant students in grades 8-12 whose parents participate in the Diploma Project will have their parents will receive instruction and/or complete at least one toolkit unit.

This objective was achieved for the 2016-17 year at 99 percent. All (100 percent) of the 149 Priority for Service students in grades 8-12 whose parent(s) participated in the Diploma Project received instruction, completed, or tested out at least one toolkit unit during this or a prior program year. For comparison, 99 percent of the non-Priority for Service students met these criteria. This demonstrates success in serving Priority for Service students.

**Parent Involvement Objective 5B:** By the end of 2016-17, 50 percent of migrant parents with children in grades 8-12 will demonstrate knowledge of graduation requirements.

This objective was achieved for the 2016-17 year at 59 percent based on Diploma Project data but not based on parent survey data, which indicated 38 percent.

Of the 133 Priority for Service students whose parents or families participated in the Diploma Project unit on high school credits and courses, 67 (50 percent) successfully completed or tested out of this unit. For comparison, 68 percent of the non-Priority for Service students met these criteria.

Of parents surveyed and responding (having children in grades 8-12) to the comprehensive summer parent survey related to graduation requirements, 38 percent reported that they knew most high schools require students to earn a certain number of credits and courses in
order to graduate. However, in a related question, 39 percent of respondents indicated that they had not received information about high school graduation requirements or they were not sure if they had received such information. A Priority for Service disaggregation is not possible for this indicator because this status is not applied at the family level.

**Parent Involvement Objective 5C:** By the end of 2016-17, 30 percent of migrant parents with children in grades 8-12 will demonstrate knowledge of postsecondary planning and options.

This objective was achieved for the 2016-17 year at 60 percent based on Diploma Project data but not based on parent survey data, which indicated 44 percent.

Of the 75 Priority for Service students whose families participated in this unit of the Diploma Project, 40 (53 percent) successfully completed or tested out of this unit. For comparison, 65 percent of non-Priority for Service students met these criteria.

On the 2016-17 parent survey, 44 percent of respondents indicated that they were “very familiar” or “somewhat familiar” with the requirements of the post-high school options that they and/or their child were considering. A Priority for Service disaggregation is not possible for this indicator because this status is not applied at the family level.

**Out-of-School Youth Objective 6:** By the end of 2016-17, 25 percent of out-of-school youth who express an interest will attend educational opportunities.

This objective was achieved for the 2016-17 year for ESL classes, but not job training or GED programs.

- 69 percent of individuals interested in ESL classes attended and/or completed such classes.
- 10 percent of interested individuals attended and/or completed job training.
- 20 percent of interested individuals attended and/or completed a GED program.

Nearly 90 percent of the youth included in these needs assessment elements had a Priority for Service designation. Because most of these youth had this designation, a comparison to students not having a Priority for Service designation is not included.

**Health Objective 7A:** By the end of 2016-17, 50 percent of out-of-school youth will report that they know where to obtain primary care services.

This objective was met for the 2016-17 year. Of the 45 out-of-school youth responding to the comprehensive survey in summer 2017, 89 percent indicated sources of primary care services where they would seek help if they or someone in their household needed to see a healthcare provider. Only six respondents (13 percent) responded that they were unsure where they would go if they needed to see a healthcare provider. A Priority for Service disaggregation is not possible for this indicator because data are collected at the family level.
Health Objective 7B: By the end of 2016-17, 40 percent of migrant parents and 50 percent of out-of-school youth will report that language and cultural barriers impede their access to health care.

This objective was met for the 2016-17 year.

Of 193 parent respondents to the 2016-17 comprehensive survey wellness question who had also indicated seeing a doctor or dentist in the past 12 months, 27 percent of respondents reported difficulty or frustration of some type in seeing a health or dental provider. Of these 52 respondents, 11 percent indicated that both cultural differences and language caused them frustration in seeing a doctor or dentist. An additional 25 (48 percent) indicated that either language or culture barriers caused frustration, but not both.

A total of 37 out-of-school youth responded to the wellness question concerning frustration with seeing a healthcare provider and had indicated seeing a doctor or dentist in the past 12 months; 43 percent of these indicated having one or more challenges or frustrations. Of the 16 youth indicating challenges, four (25 percent) indicated that cultural differences and language barriers impeded their access. One additional youth indicated language challenges but not cultural differences.

Government Performance and Results Act Measures

The Office of Migrant Education at the United States Department of Education established recommended performance measures for the Migrant Education Program under the Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA).12

1. The percentage of PA-MEP students (grades 3-8) proficient or higher on their state’s reading/language arts achievement test: Of 1,210 migrant students taking the 2016-17 state reading assessments in grades 3-8, 18 percent scored in the proficient or advanced levels. By Priority for Service status, 12 percent of Priority for Service students scored in the proficient or advanced levels in reading/language arts, while 19 percent of students without this designation scored at these levels.

2. The percentage of PA-MEP students (grades 3-8) proficient or higher on their state’s mathematics achievement test: Of the 1,460 migrant students taking the 2016-17 state math assessments in grades 3-8, 9 percent scored in the proficient or advanced levels. By Priority for Service status, 4 percent of Priority for Service students scored in the proficient or advanced levels in math, while 11 percent of students without this designation scored at these levels.

3. The percentage of PA-MEP students who entered grade 11 and had received full credit for Algebra I or a higher math class: Of 198 grade 11 students enrolled during the 2016-17 school year, 58 percent entered grade 11 having already passed

12 Programs are required to report on specified measures under Title 34 of the Code of Federal Regulations, Part 80.40(b): http://www.ecfr.gov/cgi-bin/searchECFR?idno=34&q1=80&rgn1=PARTNBR&op2=and&q2=&rgn2=Part
Algebra I or a higher math class based on their earliest needs assessment for the 2016-17 year. By Priority for Service status, 42 percent of grade 11 Priority for Service students entered grade 11 having already passed Algebra I or a higher math class, while 75 percent of grade 11 students without this designation entered grade 11 having already passed Algebra I or a higher math class based on their earliest needs assessment for the 2016-17 year.

4. The percentage of PA-MEP students who were enrolled in grades 7-12 and graduated or were promoted to the next grade: Of the 1,385 students in grades 7-12 whose graduation or promotion status could be determined, 13% 92 percent (1,218 students) either graduated or were promoted. By Priority for Service status, 89 percent of Priority for Service either graduated or were promoted, while 94 percent of students who were not Priority for Service either graduated or were promoted.

**LEADING INDICATORS**

The Office of Migrant Education at the United States Department of Education also established program leading indicators.

1. An increasing percentage of ages 3 through 5 migrant children will receive instructional services. For 2016-17, 96 percent of migrant students in the preschool category who were at least 3 years old received instructional services, which is an increase over the prior year’s 95 percent.

2. An increasing percentage of PFS migrant children will receive services. For 2016-17, 99 percent of Priority for Service students received services according to service delivery data, which is the same as the prior year.

3. An increasing percentage of grades 7-12 migrant children will receive instructional services. For 2016-17, 93 percent of students in grades 7-12 received instructional services, which is an increase over the prior year’s 91 percent.

4. An increasing percentage of grade 8 migrant children will score proficient or higher in mathematics. For 2016-17, 12 percent of grade 8 students having state math assessment data performed at the proficient or advanced levels, which is an increase over the prior year’s 9 percent.

---

13 Approximately 5 percent of students in grades 7-12 could not be classified for graduation or promotion with data available.
14 Instructional services includes reading, math, credit recovery, ESL, Diploma Project (student, those with values of instruction or completed), leadership programs, other instruction, preschool, or 21st Century programs from PA-MEP or other sources.
Findings

DEMOGRAPHICS

Information in this section answers the evaluation question: “Who are the children and youth that PA-MEP served in the 2016-17 program year?”

In addition to examining outcomes, it is important to look at the demographics of the population included in analysis to contextualize results. The 2016-17 evaluation included any migrant child or youth eligible and enrolled for at least one day at any time September 1, 2016 through August 30, 2017. Depending on the type of analysis and data element, results provided in the Findings section may include all children and youth, all individuals within a category, all individuals having data available, or all individuals enrolled within a certain date range. When findings are provided for a sub-set of children and youth, an explanation is provided. Many findings are disaggregated by PA-MEP’s student categories: birth-preschool age, school age, and out-of-school youth. Throughout the remainder of this report, “student” will be used for individuals in any category, as learning activities occur for all groups.

The culture of the migrant population often includes frequent moves and changes in status. Additionally, students gain and lose eligibility throughout the program year. Demographic analysis is provided for all migrant students in Pennsylvania having data (a unique and unduplicated count) and also by category and project area. Demographics are reported by the individual’s earliest enrollment record for the school year or the summer record if the student was not enrolled until summer 2017.

A total of 5,282 eligible children and youth were identified as migrant for 2016-17, which is 124 more than the prior year (2015-16).

Figure 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number of Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007-08</td>
<td>6,261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-09</td>
<td>5,409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>5,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>4,984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>5,260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-13</td>
<td>5,352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-14</td>
<td>5,350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-15</td>
<td>5,084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015-16</td>
<td>5,188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-17</td>
<td>5,282</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15 The PA-MEP fiscal year runs October 1 to September 30. Evaluators use an adjusted period of September 1 to August 30 in order to capture one full school year and one full summer, as this is how the data is typically attributed.
School-age students were the largest group at 73 percent based on their first 2016-17 enrollment record. Students may change category during the year due to timing of the enrollment record, dropping out of school, enrolling in kindergarten, or out-of-school youth re-enrolling in K-12 school.

Based on individuals’ first 2016-17 enrollment record, Project Area 5 had the largest number of students, followed by Project Area 4. Project Area 7 had the smallest number. Like a student’s classification, a child’s or youth’s project area can also change during the year. Mobility being a part of the migrant lifestyle, students often move, sometimes across project area boundaries. Unless otherwise specified, students are reported based on their earliest project area enrollment for the program year. The map on page 11 illustrates the geographic location of each project area. Overall and in each project area, migrant children and youth were predominantly K-12 students. Project Areas 8 and 3 had the largest numbers of out-of-school youth. Project Areas 4 and 5 had the largest numbers of students in the preschool category (birth to age six, not yet in kindergarten).
Of all students in 2016-17, 55 percent of the 5,282 students were male. While the birth-preschool age and K-12 categories were approximately half male and half female, the majority of out-of-school youth were male (81 percent of out-of-school youth).

Most of Pennsylvania’s migrant students identified themselves (using federal race options) as Hispanic (72 percent of 5,282 students). While students in the birth through preschool and K-12 categories were similar to the state, out-of-school youth had a higher percentage of Hispanic students (86 percent of out-of-school youth). Individual project area racial demographics differed from state results, with only Project Area 6 closely resembling the overall state distribution. This is expected, as the different regions of the commonwealth tend to have different cultural and ethnic diversity.

Spanish was the most common home language (70 percent of 5,282 students), which is nearly the same percentage as the prior year (71 percent of 5,158 students). The next largest group included students speaking Nepali as their home language (10 percent), followed by Swahili (4 percent), Arabic (3 percent), and English (3 percent). Eight percent had another language specified, but the count made up less than 3 percent of the population. Two percent were coded as “other” but no language was specified. These percentages were similar for all three student categories, though out-of-school youth had a higher percentage for Spanish and the birth-preschool population had a higher percentage of students speaking Nepali. Project area differences in race and ethnicity noted previously were also reflected in home language.

---

16 Other languages (specified) includes: Burmese, Chin, Chinese, Creole, French, Indigenous Guatemalan, Indigenous Mexican, Indonesian, Karen, Khmer, Kinyarwanda, Mam, Portuguese, Pushtu/Dari, Russian, Ukrainian, and Vietnamese. These languages are coded in PA-MEP’s MIS2000 database but are not broken down in the graph because of the small percentages of each language (2 percent or less of students each).
In examining the migrant population that falls into the birth through preschool category, it is important to note that the category includes all children not yet of school age or not yet enrolled in kindergarten. PA-MEP separates these children into two age ranges: those from birth through age two and those who are 3 years old or older but not yet enrolled in kindergarten. For the purposes of needs assessment and service provision, PA-MEP focuses on those children who are at least 3 years old, though all children may be served. Evaluators calculated age based upon the child’s birthdate and September 1, 2016, as September 1 is a common cut-off date for kindergarten enrollment in Pennsylvania. Children ages 3 or older made up 55 percent of the 938 migrant birth-preschool children.
Students within the K-12 category made up the majority of migrant students for the 2016-17 program year, with grade distribution relatively similar across grade levels. Percentages by project area were similarly evenly distributed.

![K-12 Migrant Students by Grade Level and Project Area](image)

**STUDENT NEEDS AND SERVICE DELIVERY**

Information in this section answers the evaluation question: “What needs did children and youth exhibit at their earliest needs assessment and to what extent did they receive services related to those needs during the program year?”

Once confirmed as eligible, PA-MEP conducts a needs assessment for each student. The purpose of this needs assessment is to identify risk factors that may influence student success. Some of these risk factors are unique to the migrant lifestyle. PA-MEP staff use the results of this needs assessment as a tool to match students with services related to their individual needs. Additionally, if a student moved from one area of Pennsylvania to another, PA-MEP staff in the new area can review previously-documented needs in order to serve them more efficiently. The results of the needs assessment determine whether a student is identified as Priority for Service. Students are to receive their needs assessment
as soon as possible after being identified and recruited: by September 30, or within two weeks of enrollment. The needs assessment may be updated throughout the year.

Needs assessment findings in this report provide information based on a student’s needs during the year. Some needs elements are examined for their status at the beginning of the program year or the start of a student’s enrollment before any services or support were provided during the program year (usually academic-related needs), while others reflect whether or not a student met certain conditions at any point in the year to determine the prevalence of that condition in the population. For example, reading needs are examined as of the first needs assessment in order to determine if a student had an initial reading need identified and then received related services over the course of the year. Alternatively, all needs records are examined to determine if a student experienced homelessness at any point during the year. In some cases, evaluators took into consideration staff comments and needs element value changes to determine a student’s status. Students may receive new or updated needs assessments when new information becomes available or when students move or change category. For some elements, both initial and later needs results are considered for need elements.

The information that follows provides an overview of the challenges that migrant students faced during 2016-17 and provides context for the services and support that students received as a result of needs being identified.

The needs assessment is a critical piece in the operation of the PA-MEP as it provides the background necessary to determine what programming and services should be delivered. Needs data are used on a larger scale to develop the Service Delivery Plan as part of the Comprehensive Needs Assessment process. The Service Delivery Plan directs the program at the state and project area levels and provides a framework for examining the program. All programs, special initiatives, services, and decisions should support the statewide Service Delivery Plan, which in turn supports improved student outcomes. The need to improve student outcomes is the reason that the PA-MEP exists. The following logic model illustrates how these elements are connected.
Needs assessment data was available for 5,096 students (96 percent of all students). All individuals not having a needs assessment can be explained for valid reasons including having a very brief enrollment, eligibility period, refusing services, or being younger than 3 years old.

While this year’s evaluation focused on service delivery with regard to specific need categories, evaluators also examined service delivery overall, as this is an element of federal Government Performance and Results Act measures for PA-MEP. Of the 5,282 students enrolled one day or more during the 2016-17 year, 5,023 (95 percent) were coded as having received services under one or more categories based on service delivery data or action codes indicating delivery of services. Of those individuals not having any service delivery indicated, all but nine students can be explained by being younger than 3 years old, enrolling at the end of the program year, having a short enrollment or residence, or the PA-MEP were unable to contact or locate the student after multiple attempts.

Students received services from PA-MEP sources, PA-MEP in partnership with other organizations, or through other sources, through campus-based and in-home programming, during regular term (school year) and summer term. Students received services through a variety of combinations of these elements under various content areas or program types.

Project areas provide to evaluators detailed explanations of the services and programs they provide to students under each service delivery category. Each project area offers a variety of approaches, programs, activities, and curricula to each category of students. Each project area reported different activities, programs, and materials, which is expected given that each project area serves a different and varied population of students from different backgrounds and having different needs. This documentation provided evidence of implementation and background on what activities and programs were part of each of the service delivery categories.

**Priority for Service**

In addition to identifying risks for each student to facilitate connections with services, risk factors are used to prioritize students for service – a classification called Priority for Service. Criteria exist for each of the student categories and Priority for Service status was determined on an ongoing basis during 2016-17. If a student was not Priority for Service initially and later found to fit the criteria based needs assessment updates, the student became Priority for Service. If a student was Priority for Service initially and later found to change their status in one or more of the Priority for Service criteria, the student remained Priority for Service for the remainder of the program term.

The Priority for Service designation does not determine if a student receives services. As supplemental program with limited resources, Priority for Service is a mechanism designed to assist PA-MEP staff in identifying which students are to be served first and/or ensure that such students are given priority for programs or services when limited resources exist. All students meeting PA-MEP eligibility criteria may be served.
Priority for Service status is determined based on several age and needs assessment criteria. As the name implies, Priority for Service students were to receive priority for services and support over students not having this designation in situations where not all students could be served. Based on needs assessment data, 2,247 students (43 percent of 5,282 students in 2016-17 were identified as Priority for Service at any time during the program year, which is a three percentage point increase over the prior year. Out-of-school youth had the highest percentage of students designated as Priority for Service (86 percent). The school-age group had the lowest percentage of students determined to be Priority for Service (35 percent). Project Areas 1, 4, and 6 showed percentages of Priority for Service greater than the state. For the purposes of the state evaluation, any student having a Priority for Service designation at any time during the year was treated as Priority for Service for all analyses. Based on service delivery data, all but five Priority for Service students who were enrolled a reasonable amount of time and over the age of 3 received services.

Figure 8.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students’ Priority for Service Status by Category and Project Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percent of students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Priority for Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority for Service</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

English Language Fluency

Overall, 84 percent of students age 3 or older were designated as not fluent in English during the program year, which is a factor in determining Priority for Service status. These results exclude children under 3 years old, as they are still developing their language skills. Examining fluency by student category, out-of-school youth had the largest percentage of students not fluent (96 percent) and school-age students had the smallest percentage (81 percent).

Project area percentages varied considerably. Project Areas 1 and 3 had the highest percentages of students who were not fluent (95 and 92 percent, respectively). Project Area 7 had the largest percentage of fluent students (40 percent).
A majority of nonfluent students who were enrolled before June 2017 (95 percent) were coded as receiving school year English services through their district’s ESL program.

Based on past findings indicating that English fluency is a known influence on student outcomes, evaluators examined the service receipt for nonfluent students using service delivery data as evidence of implementation. This showed that 96 percent of nonfluent students 3 years old or older received English-related services in some form, with the same percentage applying to both Priority for Service students and non-Priority for Service students. The high percentage of non-Priority for Service students served may be a result of nonfluent students participating in ESL programming in school, receipt of which is not a factor of Priority for Service status, as enrollment in such instruction is determined by students’ schools.
Special Needs

Less than 6 percent of students were designated as having special needs (not gifted). School-age students had the highest percentage of these students (7 percent of 3,701 K-12 students having needs data), which is likely because of the formal protocols available for this population related to special needs.

Homeless and Unaccompanied Youth

Overall, 16 percent of PA-MEP students were identified as homeless at any point during 2016-17 based on the definition of homelessness included in the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act. In the following graph, evaluators grouped all homeless nighttime status categories together to make findings easier to interpret. These include categories of doubled up, hotels/motels, shelters/transitional housing, and unsheltered. Due to a change in program definitions, out-of-school youth were not considered homeless and eligible for McKinney-Vento Act-supported programming for the 2016-17 year, where they had been eligible in prior years.

Of project areas, Project Area 3 had the largest percentage (33 percent) of students experiencing homelessness and areas 8 and 9 had the smallest (3 percent).

Related to homeless status, PA-MEP also collected information about whether or not students were unaccompanied youth – students who were not in the physical custody of their parent or legal guardian. Five percent of students were designated as unaccompanied youth at any point during the year, with 87 percent of unaccompanied individuals being out of school youth.
Preschool Enrollment

Preschool enrollment is one area included in PA-MEP’s Service Delivery Plan. Of all students in the birth through preschool-age category, 37 percent were enrolled in a preschool program for at least part of the program year. However, of those students most likely to enroll in preschool (students ages 3 or older and not yet enrolled in kindergarten), 55 percent were enrolled in a preschool program for at least part of the year.

Information was also available related to the reasons that preschool-age students were not enrolled in preschool programs. This data element was added to assist the program in understanding whether non-participation in preschool programs was a choice or a factor of external influences. Non-participation appeared to be mostly related to program availability. For more than 80 percent of non-enrolled students, the recorded reason for not being enrolled in preschool was not a matter of choice: there were no programs in the area, no open slots, or other external factors kept them from participating. In cases where there were no slots available, notes indicated students were placed on a waiting list.

Service delivery data provided information about the types of preschool programs students attended. Of the 295 students over 3 years old who were enrolled in preschool according to their needs assessment, the largest portion was enrolled in Head Start (38 percent). Fourteen percent were enrolled in PreK Counts programs; 9 percent were enrolled in a Migrant Head Start or Pathstone program; 6 percent were in district preschool program; 6 percent were in a different program; 5 percent were in more than one type of program; 3 percent were in Early Intervention; and 19 percent of students who had a needs assessment value of enrolled in preschool had no preschool type indicated. Priority for Service students (77 students) were most likely to be enrolled in Head Start (22 percent were recorded as enrolled in Head Start).
Reading and Math Proficiency

According to needs assessment entries, 81 percent of school-age students were not proficient in reading and 79 percent were not proficient in math in all grades. Proficiency could be determined using a number of indicators, including assessment data, report card grades, PA-MEP staff professional determination, or the student’s school staff professional determination. Reading and math proficiency based upon PSSA, PASA, or Keystone Exams or state-approved assessments are factors in determining a student’s Priority for Service status. Project Areas 8 and 9 had the highest percentages of students proficient in reading (59 percent and 33 percent, respectively). For math, Project Areas 7 and 8 had the highest percentages of proficient students (37 and 61 percent, respectively).

Figure 13. K-12 Students' Math Proficiency Status

Figure 14. K-12 Students' Reading Proficiency Status
After examining the needs data, evaluators incorporated service delivery data to determine if students with needs received services in line with those needs. Reading and math service delivery and supplemental program data provided evidence that students with reading or math needs received services in line with those needs.

Of K-12 students who were not proficient in reading (3,006), 79 percent received reading-specific supplemental services. Further analysis revealed that 87 percent of Priority for Service students with a reading need received supplemental reading services through one or more category, while 74 percent of non-Priority for Service students received supplemental reading services, providing evidence that Priority for Service students took priority for service delivery.

Of K-12 students not proficient in math (2,930), 74 percent received math-specific supplemental services. Further analysis indicated that 83 percent of Priority for Service students received supplemental math services, compared to 67 percent of non-Priority for Service students, providing evidence that Priority for Service students took priority for service delivery.

School Year Interruption

School year interruption is a critical component of the K-12 needs assessment and is one of the Priority for Service criteria. School year interruptions are defined as a move within the past 12 months due to the migrant lifestyle (not for vacation or illness), an absence of 10 or more consecutive days of school within the past year, or a move during summer term when summer education was a necessary component of the child’s education. Thirty-eight percent of K-12 students experienced some type of interruption in the past 12 months based on either their initial or a subsequent needs assessment during the 2016-17 program year. Project Area 1 had the highest percentage of students experiencing interruption, with more than half of K-12 students experiencing some type of interruption in academic instruction.
On Track for Graduation

The K-12 needs assessment also examined a student’s progress toward graduation for students in grades 8-12, which is a factor in determining Priority for Service status; 92 percent of 1,222 secondary students were on track for graduation. Project Areas 3 and 9 had the highest percentages of students on track for graduation (98 percent).

![Grades 8-12 Students' On Track for Graduation Status](image)

Student Concerns

Behavior, attendance, and other concerns are also part of the K-12 needs assessment, as these factors may influence academic success; 74 percent had no concerns indicated and 14 percent had no value entered. Of students having a concern indicated (12 percent), the largest group had an ‘other’ concern. Results by project area varied considerably.

![K-12 Student Concern Status](image)

17 Student concern is not a required needs assessment field.
Health and Wellness

Migrant student health and wellness is an interest area for the PA-MEP, as health and medical concerns may interfere with a student’s educational success. PA-MEP has several needs assessment indicators related to health and wellness. For each of the four health-related needs assessment indicators (health need, dental need, medical alert, and mental health need), a majority of individuals did not have such needs identified (87-97 percent). The medical alert indicator, which is the only required health-related field in the needs assessment, was noted for the most students (10 percent) and is explained in greater detail below. For medical alert, health need, and mental health, K-12 students had the highest percentage of individuals with needs identified. For vision and dental needs, the out-of-school youth group had the highest percentage of individuals with identified needs.

For the medical alert indicator, 87 percent of students were identified as not having any medical concerns, 13 percent were identified as having either an acute or chronic medical concern, and 1 percent did not have information for this needs item. K-12 students had the highest prevalence of acute or chronic medical concerns with 14 percent having such a designation; 7 percent of out-of-school youth and 9 percent of the birth-preschool populations had such concerns indicated based on needs assessment data.

Parent Involvement

Parent involvement is an area of interest as evidenced by service delivery measures and parent survey efforts. PA-MEP tracks which students have one or more parents participate in parent involvement and Parent Advisory Council activities. Of the 5,282 students, 2,450 (46 percent) had one or more parent (or an adult in the household in a parental role) participate in parent activities (2,146), the Parent Advisory Council (51), or both (253). Birth-preschool and K-12 groups had very similar participation percentages, though the K-12 participation counts are considerably higher because the K-12 population is larger than the other groups. Out-of-school youth had the smallest participation rates; which may not be surprising given that these individuals are often not living with their parents and parents may not be nearby. This is also the smallest participant group in the program.

Figure 18.
Educational Programs and Reasons for Leaving School for Out-of-School Youth

The majority of out-of-school youth reportedly left school because they needed to work (73 percent of 488 youth).

Out-of-school youth have several options for education support. Several elements of the out-of-school youth needs assessment examine student interest or participation status related to ESL programs, Adult Basic Education and/or GED programs, job training, or school entry. With the exception of English programs, where 84 percent of the 467 nonfluent out-of-school youth attended, enrolled in, were interested in, or had completed an ESL program, out-of-school youth were generally uninterested in educational programs: 21 percent were interested in, enrolled in, attended, or completed job training; 19 percent were interested in, enrolled in, attended, or completed a GED program; and 5 percent were interested or enrolled in K-12 school. The balance of youth was either not interested (73-90 percent) or their interest status was unknown.

Of the nonfluent out-of-school youth, 24 percent were noted as having completed an ESL program in this or a prior year, and 34 percent attended such a program on a regular basis. Additionally, it is worth noting that 35 youth (7 percent of 467) who started the year as not interested or interested in ESL were attending or had completed such a program by the end of the summer 2017. One of PA-MEP’s informal goals is to advocate for students to become involved in some type of educational opportunity, even if they are not able to or interested in attending school, and this change in status may be evidence of success in advocacy.

STATE-PROVIDED PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

While individual project areas provided professional development and training to their own staff, PA-MEP staff at the state level provided various training opportunities. Information in this section answers the evaluation question: “To what extent did professional development occur at the state level to support program implementation?”

In addition to professional development opportunities for specific topics (described in the following pages), PDE provided or sponsored six training opportunities. All project areas were represented at each opportunity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opportunity</th>
<th>Total Duration</th>
<th>Audience</th>
<th>Topics Covered and Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Annual PA-MEP state conference</td>
<td>12 hours</td>
<td>All staff</td>
<td>Strands of workshop topics relevant to all roles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wellness meeting</td>
<td>3 hours</td>
<td>Out-of-school youth providers and parent coordinators</td>
<td>Originally planned as a wellness meeting, but became a Comprehensive Needs Assessment committee meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma Project sharing session</td>
<td>3 hours</td>
<td>Secondary Student Support Specialists</td>
<td>Staff shared successful activities related to implementing the Diploma Project</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PDE also provided information, professional development, and technical assistance through monthly project area managers’ meetings and annual monitoring site visits.

**Professional Development for Data**

Between October 2016 and September 2017, PA-MEP data specialists were provided with various professional development opportunities by staff from Central Susquehanna Intermediate Unit 16, PDE's contractor for data and systems management. This included an institute at the annual migrant conference, a two-day training in December 2016 and another two-day session on May 11 and 12, 2017.

Topics covered included overview of changes and updates to MIS2000, MSIX (the national migrant education data system), the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA), and the Consolidated State Performance Report. Review of the PA-MEP data manual, advanced Microsoft Office training, and introductory Microsoft Power BI training were also provided. Sessions also always included in-depth question and answer sessions to address any issues the data specialists had.

In addition to the four staff members of the statewide data team, data specialists and backup staff from all regions were represented at the trainings.

---

**Table 2 continued: 2016-17 PDE Training Opportunities.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opportunity</th>
<th>Total Duration</th>
<th>Audience</th>
<th>Topics Covered and Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-K webinar</td>
<td>1.5 hours</td>
<td>Pre-K and parent coordinators</td>
<td>Content included lesson planning, parent and teacher tips, information on navigating the state Standards Aligned System (SAS) for lessons and standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparing for Goal Setting Workshop and Personal Learning Plan Implementation</td>
<td>1 hour</td>
<td>Out-of-school youth providers</td>
<td>Strategies for implementing the new requirement of working with youth on the Goal Setting Workshop and Personal Learning Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Module series: Educating the Educator (Lesson Planning) 8:42 min., Educator 2.0: I Do, We Do, You Do 5:02 min., Educator 2.0: Graphic Organizers 6:25 min., Educator 2.0: Effective Questioning 4:28 min., ESL Fundamentals 7:08 min.</td>
<td>Approximately 30 minutes total</td>
<td>Student Support Specialists</td>
<td>Lesson planning, graphic organizers, questioning, ESL. Modules were originally housed at Keystone on Demand and are now available at live.cciu.org</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Professional Development for Parent Involvement

The PA-MEP parent involvement coordinator held several parent involvement professional development opportunities for PA-MEP staff and others during 2016-17.

Table 3: 2016-17 Parent Involvement Training Opportunities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opportunity</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Audience</th>
<th>Topics Covered</th>
<th>Attendance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parent Advisory Council (PAC) Officers’ Meetings (5)</td>
<td>25 hours</td>
<td>PAC Officers and selected Parent Coordinators</td>
<td>Discussion of PA-MEP program elements such as the Service Delivery Plan and ESSA, PAC work plan, activity planning, planning and review of state PAC conference, discussion of solutions to budget reductions</td>
<td>15-23 per meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Parent Advisory Council Conference</td>
<td>2 days</td>
<td>PAC members, PA-MEP staff</td>
<td>Sessions on IEPs and behavior plans, immigration, education discrimination, and how to keep families together during difficult times</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent Coordinator Professional Development (5)</td>
<td>30 hours</td>
<td>Parent Coordinators and other staff</td>
<td>Harvesting and parenting, Parent Café, working with culturally diverse students, math and STEM lessons, in-home and tutoring, strengthening families, discussion of PA-MEP needs and concerns in order to contribute to the Comprehensive Needs Assessment process and updating of the Service Delivery Plan</td>
<td>14-39 per session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant 101 Training (3)</td>
<td>24 hours</td>
<td>PA-MEP staff and assigned Parent Coordinators</td>
<td>Presentation to new staff on responsibilities and expectations, state and federal guidelines, program requirements/mandates, and the Service Delivery Plan</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Delivery Plan Wellness Follow-up Training, Dual Parent/Out-of-School Youth Training</td>
<td>7.5 hours</td>
<td>Assigned Parent Coordinators, PA-MEP staff</td>
<td>Review the parent/health summer survey and discuss proposed goals</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additionally, the PA-MEP parent involvement coordinator provided formal and informal technical assistance and training on an ongoing basis upon request, at state managers’ meetings, and during project area monitoring visits.
Professional Development for Recruitment

The state recruitment coordinator reported holding two professional development series during the program year – one series of trainings for recruitment coordinators (four per year) and one series of trainings for recruiters (three times per year and during the state PA-MEP conference). These training sessions focused on implementation of PA-MEP recruitment in line with state and federal policies and guidance. Each project area was required to have its recruitment coordinator and recruitment staff members participate in each training opportunity offered.

PROJECT AREA MONITORING

Project area compliance monitoring differed for 2016-17 in light of changes to ESSA. However, every project area received either a full monitoring or a maintenance monitoring. Monitoring visits covered compliance during the prior year (2015-16).

Each project area received feedback and a report from the state team monitors on strengths, areas in need of improvement, and compliance for their programs.

PROJECT AREA MONTHLY REPORTS

The purpose of the monthly project area reports was for project areas to report on various implementation elements and provide information to the state PA-MEP office that is needed for compliance and program planning. Monthly reports covered information that was not or could not be collected or examined in other ways.

Professional Development and Training

Project areas provided details about training and professional development in which their staff participated. Project areas, collectively, reported more than 500 instances of professional development. However, because of staff overlap and some organizations managing more than one project area and based on a review of information submitted, evaluators believe that figure includes some duplication. However, because of inconsistencies in event naming it is not possible to determine the extent to which events were duplicated in reports. As such, a general overview of findings is included here, rather than specific counts and percentages. As a reminder, each project area differs in size, staff, number of students, population types, and needs. This information is provided in order to get a sense of what is going on at the project area level, not as an indicator of quality.

Results of project area professional development reports indicate that peak professional development times were September 2016 through March 2017. Activities were predominantly information sharing sessions and staff meetings.
Project areas also offered professional development and outreach for others. Project areas reported more than 300 such outreach events, with some duplication possible given the management of more than one project area for some organizations. These events peaked in terms of numbers in October, November, and January.

**Partnerships**

PA-MEP staff are not employees of school districts. This arrangement has made partnerships a critical component to PA-MEP success. Project areas reported having 516 partners during the course of the 2016-17 program year.¹⁸ Partner types varied, though the largest numbers of partners were community organizations, businesses, and schools or districts. Partners contributed in various ways, with those most frequently indicated being services for students, parents, or families; facilities or space; and goods and services. Businesses were most commonly listed as providing referrals and employment verification.

**SUMMER PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION**

One of the summer programming opportunities the PA-MEP provides is a summer program that combines additional instructional and language support as well as recreational and cultural experiences. In some cases PA-MEP summer programming is in collaboration with school ESL programs, 21st Century Community Learning Centers programs, or other state-wide initiatives. Summer programming provides PA-MEP’s most comprehensive and intensive supplemental support.

To ensure quality programming, PA-MEP strives to recruit certified teachers for summer classroom instruction and conducts unannounced site visits utilizing a program checklist to monitor and document program instruction in a consistent way across the project areas.

Of the 114 summer teachers reported, 82 percent were certified teachers.¹⁹ Of the 21 teachers that were not certified, seven were associated with preschool/prekindergarten grades or were teacher assistants. In addition to the designated classroom or content-specific teacher(s), programs often had additional assistant teachers, teacher aides, student support specialists, or parent volunteers.

In summer 2017 nine summer programs received an unannounced site visit from PA-MEP state staff. The state visitor reviewed each using the Summer Site Visit Checklist, a tool resulting from collaboration of the state evaluation team and PDE. The checklist included 22 items identified as best practices and important to the PA-MEP program.

- Advance planning
- Behavior management
- Checks for learning
- Collaborative learning
- Creativity/creative thinking
- Physical environment
- Positive reinforcement
- Program principles
- Program spirit
- Shared facilitation

---

¹⁸ Some organizations were listed as partners in more than one project area; this is a unique count by name.
¹⁹ One teacher had a West Virginia certificate but not a Pennsylvania certificate.
• Critical thinking
• Daily learning objectives
• Flexible workspace
• Forward-thinking activities
• Inquiry/investigation
• Multiple grouping strategies

• Skill building
• Staff/youth interaction
• Thematic learning
• Youth engagement
• Youth voice
• Youth-produced work

For each program each of these indicators received a rating: exceptional, evident, not evident, or not applicable. The summer program visitors provided comments on each indicator, overall highlights, and program recommendations. Each program received a copy of its checklist so that comments, highlights, and recommendations could be used for program improvement.

Of the nine visits, Summer Site Visit Checklists documented that four received exceptional or evident ratings for all reviewed items. Five of the programs had one or more not evident ratings: one program had 16 not evident ratings, one had three not evident ratings, and three sites had one not evident rating. The balance of items was rated as evident or exceptional. None of the projects had any items that were not applicable.

Looking at the indicators by their ratings, those receiving the most exceptional ratings were youth engagement, checks for learning, collaborative learning, and skill building, where six or seven programs had exceptional ratings. Items having the most not evident ratings included daily learning objectives, where three programs had not evident ratings, and behavior management, positive reinforcement, and program principles, where two sites had not evident ratings.

In summer 2017, 1,389 preschool through grade 12 students participated in PA-MEP campus-based summer programs, with 55 percent of participants being in preschool through grade 3 during the 2016-17 year. Of these 1,389 students, 759 (55 percent) had a Priority for Service designation. Furthermore, 87 percent were identified as not fluent in English.

Programs operated from 10 to 21 days. Attendance rate varied among participants reflecting the reality of the migrant population. Overall, the average attendance rate by student was 62 percent (mean) and 71 percent (median). However, the most frequent attendance rate (mode) was 100 percent with 163 students attending all of the summer sessions offered by their site or program.

Because the summer 2017 programs occurred after the administration of 2016-17 state assessments, it is not possible at this time to examine academic outcomes from summer 2017 programming. However, it may be possible to look back next year at both achievement and progress based on 2017-18 data for students participating in summer 2017 programs. The findings above showing that the majority of students were nonfluent and more than half had a Priority for Service designation indicates that PA-MEP reached students with key needs through its summer program.
Additionally, as a broader program and state outcome, evaluators compared the list of participating summer program students to the list of students who were PA-MEP-eligible and known to be present in Pennsylvania in school year 2017-18 for at least one day in order to get a sense of the extent to which summer program efforts may be retained and possibly benefit Pennsylvania in the 2017-18 year. Another way of considering this was to determine the extent to which PA-MEP and Pennsylvania supported students during the summer program (PA-MEP’s most intensive service) who then left the state in the fall. While the summer program efforts arguably benefitted the students themselves, the benefit will not translate to improved program outcomes for the state if many students left following the summer program. Also, knowing this helps in considering how much PA-MEP will be able to determine in any supplemental future summer 2017 academic achievement analysis.

In doing this match of summer participants to the following school year term students, evaluators found that 1,269 (91 percent) of the summer participants remained in Pennsylvania for at least one day during the 2017-18 year as of mid-February 2018.

**SUMMER PROGRAM STAKEHOLDER FEEDBACK**

With PA-MEP’s supplemental purpose, most of PA-MEP’s direct services to students occur during the summer when students have fewer options for academic and support programs and services. Information in this section answers the evaluation question: “What feedback did stakeholders provide related to PA-MEP summer programs?”

**Staff Survey**

A total of 113 individuals completed a staff survey at the conclusion of the summer program, reflecting responses from 12 of 19 summer programs. Survey respondents were a mix of new and veteran summer staff, with 34 percent being with the program five or more years, 27 percent being involved for the first time, and the balance being involved between two and four years. Half of respondents (56 percent) were classroom teachers during the summer, with the rest being made up of instructional or student aides (30 percent of respondents), in-home providers (10 percent), and site coordinators (4 percent). Nearly half of respondents (48 percent) indicated they were certified teachers in Pennsylvania or elsewhere. However, of the 63 staff who selected “classroom teacher” as their role, 75 percent were certified teachers. Survey respondents self-identified their role in their survey responses; it is possible that individuals identifying themselves as classroom teacher may have been an assistant teacher.

Nineteen percent of respondents indicated that they were a former migrant student or parent of a migrant student, indicating a first-hand understanding of the migrant lifestyle and related challenges. This also allows participating students to more easily relate to or identify with summer program staff.
The survey asked respondents about different aspects of the summer program. Content included their opinions on benefits for students, areas of possible improvement or enhancement, and items or support that would be helpful for the summer program. When asked to indicate the top three benefits of the program, most respondents selected English language instruction and support (83 percent) and/or academic support (65 percent of respondents). These answers were the top two selected choices in previous years.

From a list of options, summer staff selected the things or support that would be helpful to them in the implementation of the summer program. Respondents most frequently selected technology or computers and/or arts and crafts supplies. These were the most frequently selected items in the previous year as well. “Other” responses that were not covered in the provided list included Spanish-speaking or other language staff, supplemental lessons, access to a copy machine, Internet access, basic supplies, STEM (Science, Technology, Engineering, Math) supplies, information about students’ needs, college information, college interns, a larger space, and more educational field trips.
The survey asked respondents to indicate their level of agreement with statements related to summer program implementation. These statements are shown in the following table along with the percentage of respondents selecting each agreement level. Most respondents selected one of the agree options, with strongly agree responses outnumbering all other options. Statements with the highest percentages of strong agreement were related to the program having a positive and encouraging environment, feeling welcome and comfortable in the host facility, provision of academic and enrichment activities, and positive collaboration between MEP and partners. Statements indicating some concern were those related to access to student information at the beginning of the program, program organization, access to host facility resources, and level of communication from summer program administrators.

Table 4: Summer Staff Survey Results.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Total Respondents</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Somewhat agree</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Does not apply</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The collaboration between MEP and partners was positive.</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I felt welcome and comfortable in the host school/facility.</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I had appropriate access to host facility resources (i.e. restrooms, computers, air conditioning, etc.)</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The host site classrooms/facilities were appropriate and adequate for the students assigned to them.</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The summer program environment was positive and encouraging for students.</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The summer program environment was positive and encouraging for staff.</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration among summer program staff was positive.</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The level of communication from MEP summer program administrators was adequate.</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEP provided adequate training for summer program staff.</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers had sufficient information about students at the beginning of the program in order to plan instruction.</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The summer program was well-organized.</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer program activities provided both academic and enrichment opportunities for students.</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to benefits and needs, respondents selected from a list the ways in which the program or its implementation could be improved or enhanced. Respondents most frequently indicated a longer program (41 percent), which was the top answer the prior year as well. A third of respondents indicated that communication could be improved or enhanced. “Other” responses reflected many of the items included in the provided list as well as opportunities for physical activity, better facilities, materials with Spanish instructions, cultural learning, access to technology, more busses, more staff, and better organization.
Figure 21.

In what areas, if any, do you see an opportunity for the program to be improved or enhanced?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College student/stud ent teacher participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnerships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program length (longer)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program length (shorter)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support/Technical assistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training/Professional development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None at this time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One of the greatest assets of the PA-MEP summer program is the staff. When asked why they choose to work for the program, most provided responses focused on wanting to help the students; cultural learning (for students and staff); enjoyment; personal or professional growth or experience; past positive experience(s) with the program; and/or supplemental income, among other reasons.

Despite the needs and challenges mentioned in survey responses, respondents were generally very positive about the students and/or the program and their summer program experience.

**Student Survey**

In addition to the staff survey, participating students completed a brief survey about their experience in PA-MEP summer programs. The survey was available online and on paper. A total of 589 students age 7 or older completed the survey with 86 percent of respondents being 14 years old or younger. Fourteen of the 18 summer program sites for school-age students were represented, plus students participating in PA-MEP in-home summer programs.

In the graphs that follow, the total number of respondents is indicated in each graph (n), as not all respondents answered each question.

---

20 Evaluators discouraged programs from surveying students younger than 7 years old for language and comprehension reasons.
When asked what they liked most about the program, students most frequently selected field trips (51 percent), followed closely by math (260 respondents, 44 percent), and art/music (259 respondents, 44 percent). Students were asked to select up to three of their favorite program areas.

Figure 22.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Area</th>
<th>Percent of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Art/Music</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Trips</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practice speaking English</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading/English/Language Arts</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation/Recess</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Studies</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Students indicated the summer program components that helped them the most from a provided list. Making new friends topped the list (42 percent), followed by learning new vocabulary (17 percent) and practice speaking English (13 percent).

Figure 23.
Nearly all students indicated that they thought the summer program helped them to some degree to feel ready for school in the fall, with more than half (51 percent) reporting that the program helped a lot, 28 percent indicated the program helped some, and 16 percent indicated it helped a little. Five percent indicated that the program did not help.

Students were positive about the program, commenting that they liked the program, had fun, learned new things, made new friends, and practiced English, among other responses. Student responses for why they would come back again and how they would describe the program to a friend followed similar trends.

Students indicated that they would attend the program again if given the opportunity to do so (86 percent of respondents). Of those who indicated that they would not attend the program again and provided an explanation (39 students), 33 percent of these students indicated that they knew they would not be eligible to come back the following year and/or they would not be in the area. Other explanations included not being sure of their plans for next year, needing to work, being bored at the summer program, and having other plans, among others.

The survey asked students what they would add to the PA-MEP summer program if they were asked to help plan the program; approximately 60 percent of survey respondents provided a substantive answer. Many students responded that they liked the program the way it was, with others wanting better food; art; computers or technology; more field trips; gym class; more math; music; more games; more reading time; more staff; and swimming/pool access, among others, with better food, swimming, and field trips being the predominant responses.

### Brain Stem Youth Empowerment Camp

During August 2017 PA-MEP offered a week-long middle school student leadership program called Brain Stem Youth Empowerment Camp.\(^{21}\) The Brain Stem program (Brilliance, Resilience, and Achievement In STEM) is designed to support students towards academic success by overcoming challenges through STEM projects, team building exercises, lectures, and other tasks related to developing 21st century skills. Activities were aligned with academic standards, which were specified on the program’s itinerary. A total of 47 students attended the program at Keystone College in La Plume, PA. Students completed an application to attend the program. The program selected students to participate based on an application essay, staff recommendation, and Priority for Service status.

The Cool Speak company implemented the program. PA-MEP staff organized the logistics of the program and recruited college students serve as counselors and to assist with program implementation.

Students completed several surveys from Cool Speak during the program. As such, PA-MEP did not ask students to complete a separate survey. Cool Speak provided summary

---

\(^{21}\) [https://www.coolspeak.net/portfolio-item/brain-stem/](https://www.coolspeak.net/portfolio-item/brain-stem/)
information about student feedback from its web-based feedback collection system to the 
state PA-MEP staff, which state evaluators reviewed.

Post-program measures and student comments indicated gains in students' personal 
confidence, self-awareness, appreciation of their qualities and background, engagement 
with and aspirations for education, confidence in STEM, and feelings of empowerment.

**Camp Connect STEM vs. STEAM High School Student Leadership Institute**

The Camp Connect program is a week-long residential summer program designed to encourage college attendance among migrant students who have demonstrated leadership potential in high school. The experience is supposed to enhance participants' leadership potential through a series of interactive workshops, lectures, and discussion groups that promote academic development, verbal communication skills, civic engagement and responsibility, research skills, STEM/STEAM (STEM plus Arts) learning, hands-on learning activities, college enrollment and retention, and personal development. High school students who were interested in participating in the week-long residential program completed an application and submitted personal essays. PA-MEP staff used these essays, student report cards, ACCESS for ELLs data (students had to score at least at the developing level), and a recommendation letter from each student's teacher, counselor, or PA-MEP student support specialist to select students to participate.\(^{22}\) Camp Connect was held in July 2017 at Keystone College in La Plume, PA, where 34 students participated.

A team of educators and PA-MEP state staff implemented and managed the program, supported by college student facilitators. Various presenters from higher education institutions and community organizations contributed workshop sessions.

Students completed a daily survey on that day's activities related to their satisfaction with the activities, meeting workshop objectives, content being organized and relevant, adequacy of time for questions, STEM/STEAM learning, feelings of inclusiveness, contributions to career goals, and enjoyment. All or nearly all students responded to each survey. Most questions asked students to rate their opinion or response on a four-point scale that included agree, somewhat agree, somewhat disagree, and disagree. Nearly all students selected one of the two agree responses for each item every day, with agree responses outnumbering somewhat agree responses. Likewise, the final survey included questions where students selected their level of agreement using the same scale. Content of the survey included the keynote speaker's presentation being interesting and useful, activities helping students bond, contributions of the program in helping students with their career goals, college planning, STEM/STEAM learning, and questions about specific activities. For all questions, all or nearly all respondents agreed to some extent with agree responses outnumbering somewhat agree responses. The survey also included a series of reflective questions about activities that were part of the program.

\(^{22}\) Priority for Service is not a factor in selection for the Student Leadership Institute, though such students may participate. The Student Leadership Institute is intended to be an enrichment opportunity. Priority for Service elements are more explicitly addressed through the other PA-MEP summer programs.
PARENT AND OUT OF SCHOOL YOUTH COMPREHENSIVE SURVEY 2017

During the late summer and early fall of 2017, the PA-MEP administered a survey to parents and out-of-school youth relative to Service Delivery Plan focus areas. The survey was intended to gather feedback and information from participants about needs, interests, and current behaviors so the program can make informed decisions about planning programs and services.

The survey was conducted between approximately July 15 and September 30, 2016. A similar survey was administered the prior year in order to examine change over time. State evaluators and the PA-MEP state data team collaborated to establish a geographically and culturally representative (based on home language) sample of survey participants. A target 25 percent response rate was established by project area, family/out-of-school youth, and home language variables in order to ensure representative results while collecting fewer surveys due to the great time investment that such surveys take.

This stratified random sample was pulled from the state migrant database based on current PA-MEP families and out-of-school youth who were believed to still be in the area. Home languages were sampled in proportions reflecting their prevalence in the project area, with at least one family or youth representing each home language in the area, even if only one family spoke that language in the area. Each project area received a primary list of families and out-of-school youth and an alternate list of families and out-of-school youth. Staff were instructed that those on the primary list should be attempted first, but if they could not be located or could not be surveyed for another reason, they were to select an alternate from the alternate list having the same home language. If they ran out of alternates, they could request additional families/youth from the state data team.

The target counts for survey collection were 442 families and 75 out-of-school youth. A total of 474 surveys (402 parent/family surveys and 72 youth surveys) were collected and used for analysis that could be matched to eligible families and youth, which resulted in a 91 percent response rate for parents/families and a 96 percent response rate for out-of-school youth. Based on the match of surveys to the provided sample list and response rate, evaluators are confident that the results are likely representative of Pennsylvania’s PA-MEP population. Family surveys often represent more than one child, so the number of family surveys collected is far smaller than the number of children they represent.

Of the 402 family responses, 52 percent were completed by the mother, 23 percent were completed by the father, and the rest were a guardian, adult family member in a parental role, both parents together, or a high school student when a parent was unavailable.

Of the 72 out-of-school youth responses, 94 percent were provided by the youth themselves, while the rest were provided by the youth’s mother or an adult family member in a parental role.
Of the 474 surveys, Project Area 4 had the largest count.

![Figure 24. Counts of Surveys Collected by Type and Project Area](image)

Evaluators followed up with each project area several times to ensure that all applicable surveys had been collected in the online system, and in those cases where there were discrepancies, conversations occurred relative to the reasons for the discrepancies. In most cases, the differences were due to family or youth mobility – a defining characteristic of the migrant population – and exhausting options on the alternate list and having no additional options for a particular home language.

By language, surveyed respondents were representative. For families surveyed, 18 languages were to be represented, plus an ‘other’ category. Three languages from the sample list were not represented in the collected data and this was a result of very small counts of families speaking these languages.

For out-of-school youth, 11 language categories (10 languages and ‘other’) were to be represented in the data, all of which were included in the surveys collected. Ten of these were 100 percent or nearly 100 percent represented as on the sample lists and one language was 50 percent represented.

Overall, despite some differences, results appear to be generally representative of Pennsylvania’s migrant population in each of the sample criteria. Also, responses overall tended to reflect themes of responses from past years’ feedback and needs examinations, further confirming that results are likely representative of the larger population. Where possible and meaningful, comparisons to 2015-16 results are provided. Results from 2015-16 included 511 surveys, with 428 being family respondents and 83 being out-of-school youth respondents. The same methods were used to determine the sample group.

For both families and youth, Spanish had the largest survey count, followed by Nepali.
Table 5: Surveyed Families and Youth by Home Language.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Home Language</th>
<th>Families</th>
<th>Out-of-school youth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arabic</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burmese</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chin</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creole</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indigenous-Mexican</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesian</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khmer</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kinyarwanda</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mam</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nepali</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portuguese</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swahili</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the following item summaries, the count or percentage of respondents selecting that item is provided. Respondents may not have answered all questions. In these cases, counts and percentages are based on the number of surveys having a response for that particular item. Results are provided overall for all respondents, by type, and by project area.

Nearly all respondents (93 percent) who provided a response indicated that they had been involved with the PA-MEP for three or fewer years. Nearly half (45 percent) indicated one year or less. This indicates that results may be notably reflective of a potentially more mobile and/or new-to-Pennsylvania population.

Figure 25.

---

23 While PA-MEP eligibility is 36 months, individuals may re-qualify for additional 36-month terms with qualifying moves, which accounts for those indicating more than three years.
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Most respondents (91 percent) indicated they were very satisfied with the services and programs they received from PA-MEP as shown in the following chart. Only two respondents indicated dissatisfaction. The percentage of respondents indicating they were very satisfied this year is an increase of nearly 10 percentage points over the prior year, where 82 percent of respondents indicated they were very satisfied.

![Figure 26. Satisfaction with Services and Programs Provided by the PA-MEP](image)

In a related question, 87 percent of respondents indicated they were very satisfied with how well PA-MEP and/or school addressed their or their child’s needs and 11 percent indicated they were somewhat satisfied; only 2 percent indicated dissatisfaction. Results were fairly consistent across respondent types and project areas.

![Figure 27. Satisfaction with How Well Your/Your Child’s Needs are Being Addressed by PA-MEP and/or School](image)

Respondents were mostly likely to communicate with PA-MEP a few times per month (39 percent) or monthly (23 percent), with lesser percentages reporting the other frequency options. These are nearly the same percentages as the prior year. Youth were more likely to report lesser frequency of communication or service. Results by project area differed considerably, with Project Areas 1, 2, and 5 showing the greatest frequency of communication.
Few respondents had declined PA-MEP services in the past year (24 percent), with the largest portion of those declining services citing their work schedule as their reason for declining services, especially for out-of-school youth. In the prior year, 26 percent had declined services, with work schedule also being the main reason for doing so.

Of the 474 respondents, 434 (92 percent) indicated one or more areas of need or interest. There was most interest in homework assistance (45 percent), reading and writing support (40 percent), and math support (39 percent), which were the top three selected items for family respondents as well. For out-of-school youth, assistance with continuation of education was the top response (63 percent), followed by English language support (42 percent) and career awareness (16 percent). In the following tables, the top three most-selected options are shown in bold text. Other responses were mostly specific and
individual needs, but there were a few requests for more in-home services and a longer summer program.

Table 6: Interest or Need for Additional Services by Respondent Type.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service need</th>
<th>All respondents (434)</th>
<th>Families (372)</th>
<th>Out-of-school youth (62)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assistance with the continuation of education for out-of-school youth</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistance with early childhood and preschool programs</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistance with English language development for your child or yourself (if an out-of-school youth, PA-MEP cannot provide ESL to parents)</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistance with financial aid/college assistance programs</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistance with homework</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistance with math</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistance with reading and writing</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistance with Saturday programs</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistance with afterschool programs</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistance with school records and transcripts</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awareness of high school graduation requirements</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career awareness</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College tours and college readiness</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More in-home tutoring programs</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent Advisory Councils</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STEM-Science Technology Engineering and Math</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7: Interest or Need for Additional Services by Project Area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service need</th>
<th>PA 1 (49)</th>
<th>PA 2 (28)</th>
<th>PA 3 (57)</th>
<th>PA 4 (84)</th>
<th>PA 5 (86)</th>
<th>PA 6 (51)</th>
<th>PA 7 (11)</th>
<th>PA 8 (40)</th>
<th>PA 9 (28)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assistance with the continuation of education for out-of-school youth</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistance with early childhood/preschool programs</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistance with English language development</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistance with financial aid/college assistance programs</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistance with homework</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistance with math</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistance with reading and writing</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistance with Saturday programs</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistance with afterschool programs</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistance with school records and transcripts</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awareness of high school graduation requirements</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career awareness</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College tours and college readiness</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More in-home tutoring programs</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent Advisory Councils</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STEM-Science Technology Engineering and Math</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
High School Graduation and Post-secondary Education

The survey included a section specifically for families with children in grades 8-12, as these grades are a particular focus for the program and several program goals related to this population. For those respondents who indicated that they had one or more children enrolled in grades 8-12 the survey included questions about high school graduation and post-secondary options; 147 respondents answered one or more of the questions in this section of the survey. Of these respondents, 22 percent had a child in grade 8, 32 percent had a child in grade 9, 31 percent had a child in grade 10, 25 percent had a child in grade 11, and 17 percent had a child in grade 12 for the coming (2017-18) school year.

The following summaries include all respondents indicating they had one or more children in the target grade span. Eight of the nine project areas were represented; none of the respondents in Project Area 7 had children in the specified grades.

Of 142 respondents, 38 percent indicated that they were aware that high schools had minimum credit and course requirements for graduation; 27 percent indicated they did not know and 35 percent were not sure.

However, when asked how many credits and/or courses their child(ren) needed to graduate from their current school, only 19 respondents provided a response, indicating that although families may be aware that there are minimum requirements, they may not know what the requirements are. This is a particular challenge for migrant families, as the local control nature of Pennsylvania schools allows, to some degree, for schools to set some of their own graduation requirements. This means that if families move from one school district to another, they may be subject to different graduation requirements in their new district. Families may or may not be aware that such differences exist.

This does not mean that families have not received information about graduation requirements; 57 percent of respondents to this section of the survey indicated that they
received high school graduation requirement information from one or more sources. However, 19 percent indicated that they had not received any information about high school graduation requirements and 20 percent were not sure. Project Area 4 had the highest counts of responses that families were unsure or had not received information (64 percent of Project Area 4 respondents), followed by Project Area 5, where 57 percent of respondents selected one of these two options. Of those reporting having received information, that information most likely came from the PA-MEP.

This potential lack of knowledge does not appear to be a result of lack of importance; 92 percent of respondents shared that they thought it was very important to know about high school graduation requirements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent of respondents</th>
<th>All responses</th>
<th>PA 1</th>
<th>PA 2</th>
<th>PA 3</th>
<th>PA 4</th>
<th>PA 5</th>
<th>PA 6</th>
<th>PA 7</th>
<th>PA 8</th>
<th>PA 9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I received information about graduation from PA MEP staff</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I received information about graduation from my child’s school</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I received information about graduation from another source</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have not received any information about high school graduation requirements</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I’m not sure</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Figure 31.**

- **Figure 32.**
It may, however, be a factor of the family’s high school experience, as 53 percent of respondents indicated that no one in their household had completed high school. Similarly, 79 percent indicated that no one in their household had attended college. Project area results for these questions differ considerably, mostly because of the small and differing counts of respondents from each area.

This lack of college experience may increase the need to share information with students and families about post-high school education options. When asked how they had received information about such options, 47 percent (of 147 respondents) indicated that they had not received any such information, they were not sure, or they did not answer the question. Project Area 5 had the largest percentage of respondents who had not received information or were unsure (68 percent). Of those who reported receiving information about post-high school options, most received information from PA-MEP, alone or from other sources as well.
When presented with a list of assessments and asked to indicate which of the listed assessments was usually required for college, 72 percent responded that they were not sure; 20 percent correctly selected the SAT or ACT.

Despite this self-assessed lack of knowledge, responses indicated that parents surveyed valued education and educational achievement: 95 percent of 147 respondents indicated it was very important to them that their child graduate from high school (the same percentage as the prior year) and 93 percent indicated that it was very important to them that their child continue their education after high school in college or another school (an increase over the prior year’s 83 percent).

Parents appear to rely on the PA-MEP as a resource for education information. When prompted to indicate who they ask when they have questions about high school graduation requirements and post-high school education opportunities, PA-MEP staff were most frequently selected, followed by guidance counselors. This was the same trend as the prior year.

Respondents appeared to be most interested in 2- and 4-year college options, followed by job opportunities, with 52 percent, 53 percent, and 46 percent selecting these options, respectively. Lesser-selected options included job training (24 percent), technical school (22 percent), and the armed forces/military (18 percent). Sixteen percent indicated that they were unsure, none of these were options, or they did not provide a response to this item. In a related question about how familiar they were with the requirements for the post-high school options they were considering, 39 percent reported that they were somewhat familiar (they know some things but still need more information), 36 percent reported that they were not sure, 21 indicated they were unfamiliar (they have considered
the options but do not know much about specific requirements), and 4 percent indicated they were very familiar. Seven respondents did not answer the question.

As outlined later in this report, the PA-MEP implements its Diploma Project to support families and students toward graduation and postsecondary education. In order to determine the extent to which surveyed families and youth participated in the Diploma Project, the survey ID was matched to Diploma Project participation data for the 2015-16 and 2016-17 years. The Diploma Project includes five units with content and guiding student-centered questions:

1. Goal setting (self-assessment and self-advocacy);
2. High school credits and courses;
3. Assessments;
4. English language proficiency; and
5. Preparing for and funding postsecondary education.

Of the 147 respondents who indicated that they had one or more children in grades 8-12, 65 (44 percent) participated to some extent in one or more of the five Diploma Project units.

Of these 65, 58 (89 percent) had indications that they (as a student or as a family) received instruction in or completed the unit on high school credits and courses. Interestingly, on the prior question about receipt of information about high school graduation requirements, eight of these respondents indicated that they had not received any information about high school graduation requirements and another 10 reported that they were not sure or they did not answer the question. Of these respondents, five had participated in the Diploma Project unit both as a student and as a family, three had participated as a family only, and 10 had participated as a student only; it is possible that the students may not have shared information with their families.

Furthermore, of the 65 who participated to some extent in the Diploma Project, 47 (72 percent) received instruction or completed (as a student or as a family) the unit on postsecondary education planning. Like high school graduation, those participating in this unit were checked for their response to the prior question about how they have received information about postsecondary education options. Eight of these responded that they had not received information and another six indicated that they were not sure or they did not provide a response to this question. Of these respondents, four had participated in the Diploma Project unit both as a student and as a family, three had participated as a family only, and seven had participated as a student only; it is possible that the students may not have shared information with their families.

Wellness

The PA-MEP Service Delivery Plan includes health and wellness performance elements. As such, questions were included in the survey relative to these items. The purpose of the wellness component of the survey was to gauge the extent to which newly-settled migrant families and youth have access to healthcare and the barriers they face in utilizing such services. Only individuals or families in their current residence for less than a year were to
answer these questions; 248 respondents answered questions in the wellness section of the survey (199 parents, 49 youth).

Survey results revealed that 38 percent respondents use a primary care or family doctor as their primary source of care, followed by community clinics (29 percent). Eight percent reported that they did not know where they would go if they needed to see a healthcare provider. Family responses mostly reflected the overall results. Out-of-school youth were more likely to select options other than a primary care or family doctor and also more likely to not know where they would go if they had a health need. Results differed considerably by project area, which may be reflective of the types of healthcare providers present in the region as well as respondent access.

The survey asked respondents to indicate what, if any, challenges or frustrations they had experienced related to seeing a healthcare professional. Sixty-eight respondents indicated some level of difficulty or frustration with seeing a doctor or dentist (27 percent of respondents to the wellness section of the survey). Cost or lack of insurance and language and communication challenges topped the list of challenges with nearly half of respondents selecting each option (47 percent of respondents each). Cost or lack of insurance was a greater barrier for youth (81 percent of youth selected this challenge), while differences in cultural expectations, language and communication, and not knowing how to find a provider were top challenges for families (47 percent of respondents selected one or more of these options). Other responses were focused on individual needs or unique challenges.
When asked what they wanted to know about local health and wellness services, most wanted general information, which was the top answer in the prior year as well. Translation or communication resources followed in frequency. These answers were the most frequent for both respondent types.

Figure 37.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cause of Frustration/Difficulty</th>
<th>All responses</th>
<th>Family</th>
<th>Youth</th>
<th>PA 1</th>
<th>PA 2</th>
<th>PA 3</th>
<th>PA 4</th>
<th>PA 5</th>
<th>PA 6</th>
<th>PA 7</th>
<th>PA 8</th>
<th>PA 9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cost or lack of insurance</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference in cultural expectations</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language barrier, difficulty communicating</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need to work, getting time off for appointment</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No providers nearby</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not knowing how to find a provider</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time to go to the appointment</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 38.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Information Sought</th>
<th>All responses</th>
<th>Family</th>
<th>Youth</th>
<th>PA 1</th>
<th>PA 2</th>
<th>PA 3</th>
<th>PA 4</th>
<th>PA 5</th>
<th>PA 6</th>
<th>PA 7</th>
<th>PA 8</th>
<th>PA 9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General information</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to make an appointment</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If translation is available or if someone in the office speaks my language</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance accepted</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What to do if I don’t have insurance</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where or how to find a provider</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
STUDENT OUTCOMES

Information in this section answers the evaluation question: “To what extent are migrant students performing at expected levels and/or showing improvement?”

Kindergarten Readiness

PA-MEP’s kindergarten readiness protocol provides a structured method of determining kindergarten readiness for students’ needs assessment and for examining changes in kindergarten readiness during the program year. The Kindergarten Readiness Checklist is an instrument that resulted from the School Readiness Expert Group working on the Service Delivery Plan and is based on research and prior experience indicating the areas important to success in kindergarten, some of which correlate directly to Pennsylvania Early Learning Standards.

During the 2016-17 program year, the initial assessment was to be administered during September or within two weeks of being recruited, the middle administration was to occur at or near the end of the school year, and the final assessment was to be done after completion of the summer term to see a student’s final status for the year. All students expected to enroll in kindergarten the following year were to have at least the initial assessment completed. Students still present and eligible during the subsequent times should have had the readiness checklist completed again.

The checklist included 22 skills in five categories. Students proficient in 16 to 22 of the skills were considered to be at a mastery level. Students proficient in eight to 15 of the skills were considered in progress, and students with seven or fewer skills were considered not ready for kindergarten. Determination of skill proficiency was left to the professional opinion of the student support specialist working with the student, based on information or data gathered from preschool teachers, parents, or observation.

Results were available for a total of 179 preschool students who were four years old or older as of September 1, 2016, which is 65 percent of four- or five-year-old students who were not yet enrolled in kindergarten. These students would be most likely eligible for kindergarten enrollment the following year. Half (51 percent) of included students had a Priority for Service designation.

For all skills a greater percentage of students demonstrated mastery at summer-end than at prior administrations. So even considering some differences in the student groups assessed, it appears that, overall, students as a whole were moving toward or maintaining readiness for kindergarten. Considering the majority of students (73 percent) had their last assessment at the end of the summer, the areas where students appear to be strongest included the following areas:

1. Coordinate eye and hand movements to perform a task (string beads, work puzzles, zip / button) (98 percent of students were at the mastery level);

24 Many students not having kindergarten readiness data can be explained by short/partial year enrollments.
2. Experiment with a variety of writing tools and surfaces (97 percent of students were at the mastery level);
3. Demonstrate coordination of body movements in active/gross motor play (run, jump, climb) (97 percent of students were at the mastery level); and
4. Identify and locate body parts (97 percent of students were at the mastery level).

Also based on the end-of-summer administration, the following appear to be the three areas of greatest need for some students (the smallest percentages of students demonstrating mastery):
1. Share information through pictures and dictated words (ex: Create a picture about a nonfiction topic and talk about it with the teacher) (70 percent of students were at the mastery level);
2. Recognize numbers one to 10 (72 percent of students were at the mastery level); and
3. Connect story events with personal experiences (74 percent of students were at the mastery level).

Evaluators also examined improvement status for those students having two or more administrations (145 students). Of these students, 41 percent demonstrated sufficient skills to be in the mastery level at both their initial and last checklist administrations, 45 percent improved from their first to last assessment, 11 percent scored in the same non-mastery level at both assessments, and 3 percent declined.

![Figure 39. Kindergarten Readiness Change from First to Last Administration (n=145)]
Perhaps most important is a student’s performance on their last kindergarten readiness assessment, regardless of its timing. Of the 179 students, 79 percent demonstrated proficiency on at least 16 of the 22 identified skills. The smallest group (4 percent) was not yet ready for kindergarten.

Academic Achievement

For the 2016-17 program year, analysis included state assessment data from PSSA, PASA, Keystone Exams, and ACCESS for ELLs. Results provided are for all migrant students who had adequate and appropriate data for analysis. Percentages were calculated based on the number of students having data and included in analysis, and do not represent all K-12 students. For each assessment, the number of students included in the analysis is provided (overall and by Priority for Service and fluency status), as it differs by assessment.

Pennsylvania annually administers several assessments in core academic areas to public school students. The Pennsylvania System of School Assessment (PSSA) is administered in grades 3-8. The Pennsylvania Alternate System of Assessment (PASA) is administered to special education students having significant cognitive disabilities in grades 3-8 and 11. The Algebra I and literature Keystone Exams are administered to secondary students starting in grade 9. Students can re-take the Keystone Exams until they reach a proficient level. Their score is then banked and applied to their grade 11 year, or their grade 11 Keystone Exam is used for accountability if the student had not yet reached a proficient level. Results from these state assessments are provided together in this section, as each is administered to different student groups, so there is no possibility that a student is included more than once and each assessment is used for the same accountability purposes.

PSSA, PASA, and Keystone Exam data were available at the state level and matched to PA-MEP enrollment data. Consequently, data was available for all migrant students enrolled in a public school who took the applicable assessment. Students may not have
assessment data because they were not present and enrolled in Pennsylvania public schools at the time of the assessment or the meet one or more of the exemption criteria.

Based on assessment accommodations guidelines, English language learners who have been enrolled in a United States school for less than 12 months have the option to participate in the reading state assessments. However, all English language learners who are enrolled in a public United States school must participate in the math and science assessments. Students in their first 12 months of United States school enrollment are included in state outcomes calculations for participation, but not for performance. The possible reading exemption may contribute to a lower number of students being included in analysis as compared to math or science results.

In addition to looking at the overall results, evaluators disaggregated state assessment data by grade level, English fluency, and Priority for Service status. Priority for Service status was further disaggregated by fluency.

Reading assessment results include 1,336 migrant students (252 Priority for Service students and 1,084 non-Priority for Service students), which is 71 percent of the 1,877 migrant students in grades 3-8 and 11 who were enrolled in PA-MEP during the 2016-17 school year (prior to June 2017).

Math assessment results include 1,605 migrant students (447 Priority for Service students and 1,158 non-Priority for Service students), which is 86 percent of the 1,877 migrant students in grades 3-8 and 11 who were enrolled in PA-MEP during the 2016-17 school year (prior to June 2017).

Science assessment results include 615 migrant students (168 Priority for Service students and 447 non-Priority for Service students), which is 81 percent of the 758 migrant students in grades 4, 8, and 11 who were enrolled in PA-MEP during the 2016-17 school year (prior to June 2017).

Students may not have state assessment data for several reasons. These students and their families tend to move frequently, which is inherent in the migrant lifestyle. As such, students are not always enrolled in school for a full year. They may move to a district after the assessment is administered or they may leave Pennsylvania prior to the assessment administration. Students only need to be present and eligible for PA-MEP in Pennsylvania for a minimum of one day to be included in the program’s school year student count. Additionally, nonfluent students may not take the reading assessment if they meet the exemption criteria explained previously.

The following graph illustrates students’ results on the state academic assessments: PSSA, PASA, or Keystone Exams. In each of the three content areas, the largest portion of students scored in the below basic performance level, 44 percent for reading/literature, 68 percent for math/Algebra I, and 50 percent for science/biology. Reading/literature and science/biology had the largest portions of students scoring at proficient or advanced levels: 18 percent for reading/literature and 20 percent for science, which are increases in
the percentage of students scoring at these levels compared to the prior year where only 16 percent of students performed at proficient levels in each content area.

The next set of graphs show state assessment results (PSSA, PASA, or Keystone Exams) disaggregated by English fluency and Priority for Service status, with Priority for Service status further disaggregated by fluency. As a reminder, PSSA is reported for students in grades 3-8, PASA is reported for students in grades 3-8 and 11 with cognitive disabilities, and Keystone Exams results are reported for grade 11. For students in grade 11 and taking the PASA, the PASA is used instead of the Keystone Exam. This analysis method reflects the way that Pennsylvania reports accountability at the federal level.

In reading, fluency is a factor in academic achievement, as nearly half of fluent students (44 percent) scored in the proficient or advanced levels while 9 percent of their nonfluent peers scored in these levels. Priority for Service also appears to influence outcomes, as the percentage of Priority for Service students, overall, who scored in the proficient or advanced levels is lower – 13 percent of students – than their non-Priority for Service peers (19 percent of non-Priority for Service students scored proficient or advanced).

---

25 English fluency was determined by the student’s PA-MEP needs assessment and ACCESS for ELLs assessment data. One student’s English fluency was unknown. This student is not included in the results by fluency categories, but is included in overall and Priority for Service categories.

26 Students taking the PASA do not take the PSSA.
Results by grade level indicate that largest portions of proficient or advanced students in grades 4 and 6.

English fluency also influences math results. Of fluent students, 26 percent scored in the proficient or advanced levels on state math assessments, while 5 percent of their nonfluent peers scored in these levels. Math results show smaller percentages scoring in the proficient or advanced levels in math than reading.

The percentage of Priority for Service students, overall, who scored in the proficient and advanced levels is lower than their non-Priority for Service peers. Again, fluency is more influential on results: 17 percent of fluent Priority for Service students scored in the proficient or advanced levels (compared to nonfluent Priority for Service students at 4 percent) and 26 percent of non-Priority for Service, fluent students scored in the proficient or advanced levels (compared to nonfluent non-Priority for Service students at 6 percent). Priority for Service status and English fluency influenced state math assessment outcomes.
Results by grade level show the greatest percentages of proficient or advanced students in grades 4 and 11; however, grades 3 and 4 had the largest numbers and percentages of advanced students.

Science results are similar; fluency appears to be the greatest influence. While 50 percent of fluent students scored in the proficient or advanced levels, 12 percent of nonfluent students scored in these levels. Priority for Service is also a factor: 10 percent of Priority for Service students scored at proficient levels compared to non-Priority for Service students, where 23 percent scored at proficient levels.
Like reading and math, science results are most positive at the elementary level, with grade 4 having the largest percentage of students scoring at proficient or advanced levels (32 percent).

For the 2016-17 year, information was available to allow evaluators to compare migrant students’ results to non-migrant state assessment results using summary findings provided by the PDE Assessment Office. In this comparison, migrant students having assessment data were compared to non-migrant students having assessment data. However, it is important to keep in mind that the migrant student group is a small fraction of the non-migrant group: less than 0.2 percent. Comparisons should be made with caution.

In reading/language arts, 17.9 percent of migrant students assessed scored in the proficient or advanced performance levels, which is lower than the non-migrant group (62.4 percent). In math, 8.9 percent of migrant students scored in the proficient or advanced performance levels, while 45.5 percent of non-migrant students did so. In science, 19.6
percent of migrant students scored proficient or advanced compared to 62.8 percent of non-migrant students. However, when these non-migrant results are compared to the fluent migrant subgroup results shared previously, the gap shrinks. Instead of gaps of 36 to 45 percentage points, the gaps between migrant fluent students and non-migrant students are only 12 to 18 percentage points, further confirming the influence of language on assessment results.

Figure 48.

Tables 8-16 present the comparison of migrant and migrant subgroup results and migrant to non-migrant results by assessment, content area, and grade level.

Table 8: Migrant State Reading PSSA/PASA Results by Subgroup and Grade Level.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Number Scored</th>
<th>Percent Advanced</th>
<th>Percent Proficient</th>
<th>Percent Basic</th>
<th>Percent Below Basic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All migrant students</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>52.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All migrant students</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>33.9</td>
<td>41.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All migrant students</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>38.6</td>
<td>47.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All migrant students</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>33.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All migrant students</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>55.0</td>
<td>30.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All migrant students</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>52.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All migrant students</td>
<td>State Total</td>
<td>1,210</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>39.0</td>
<td>43.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant Priority for Service</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>59.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant Priority for Service</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>62.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant Priority for Service</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>30.9</td>
<td>65.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant Priority for Service</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>36.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant Priority for Service</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>34.6</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant Priority for Service</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>63.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant Priority for Service</td>
<td>State Total</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>29.8</td>
<td>57.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 8 continued: Migrant State Reading PSSA/PASA Results by Subgroup and Grade Level.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Number Scored</th>
<th>Percent Advanced</th>
<th>Percent Proficient</th>
<th>Percent Basic</th>
<th>Percent Below Basic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Migrant non-Priority for Service</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td>51.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant non-Priority for Service</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>35.4</td>
<td>36.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant non-Priority for Service</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>41.1</td>
<td>41.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant non-Priority for Service</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>46.0</td>
<td>32.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant non-Priority for Service</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>58.3</td>
<td>27.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant non-Priority for Service</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>37.7</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant non-Priority for Service</td>
<td>State Total</td>
<td>985</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>41.1</td>
<td>39.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9: Migrant State Literature Keystone Exam Results.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Number Scored</th>
<th>Percent Advanced</th>
<th>Percent Proficient</th>
<th>Percent Basic</th>
<th>Percent Below Basic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All migrant students</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>55.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant Priority for Service</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>40.7</td>
<td>44.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant non-Priority for Service</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>58.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10: State Reading/Literature Results, Migrant to Non-migrant Comparison by Grade Level.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Number Scored</th>
<th>Percent Advanced</th>
<th>Percent Proficient</th>
<th>Percent Basic</th>
<th>Percent Below Basic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Migrant students</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>52.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant students</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>33.9</td>
<td>41.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant students</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>38.6</td>
<td>47.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant students</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>33.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant students</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>55.0</td>
<td>30.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant students</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>52.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant students</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>55.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant students</td>
<td>State Total</td>
<td>1,335</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>38.0</td>
<td>44.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-migrant students</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>129,197</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>46.8</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-migrant students</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>129,424</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>11.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-migrant students</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>28,274</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>42.8</td>
<td>28.8</td>
<td>11.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-migrant students</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>127,332</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>41.0</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-migrant students</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>129,899</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>39.6</td>
<td>36.6</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-migrant students</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>127,675</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>42.3</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-migrant students</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>126,338</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>63.0</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-migrant students</td>
<td>State Total</td>
<td>898,139</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>44.3</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 11: Migrant State Math PSSA/PASA Results by Subgroup and Grade Level.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Number Scored</th>
<th>Percent Advanced</th>
<th>Percent Proficient</th>
<th>Percent Basic</th>
<th>Percent Below Basic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All migrant students</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>64.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All migrant students</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>66.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All migrant students</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td>63.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All migrant students</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>67.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All migrant students</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>79.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All migrant students</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>80.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All migrant students</td>
<td></td>
<td>State Total</td>
<td>1,460</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>21.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant Priority for Service</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>75.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant Priority for Service</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>88.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant Priority for Service</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>78.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant Priority for Service</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>79.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant Priority for Service</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>95.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant Priority for Service</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>81.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant Priority for Service</td>
<td></td>
<td>State Total</td>
<td>409</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>13.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant non-Priority for Service</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>59.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant non-Priority for Service</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>58.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant non-Priority for Service</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>36.7</td>
<td>55.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant non-Priority for Service</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>63.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant non-Priority for Service</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>75.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant non-Priority for Service</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>80.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant non-Priority for Service</td>
<td></td>
<td>State Total</td>
<td>1,051</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>23.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 12: Migrant State Algebra Keystone Exam Results.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Number Scored</th>
<th>Percent Advanced</th>
<th>Percent Proficient</th>
<th>Percent Basic</th>
<th>Percent Below Basic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All migrant students</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>47.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant Priority for Service</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>47.4</td>
<td>42.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant non-Priority for Service</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>49.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 13: State Math/Algebra Results, Migrant to Non-migrant Comparison by Grade Level.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Number Scored</th>
<th>Percent Advanced</th>
<th>Percent Proficient</th>
<th>Percent Basic</th>
<th>Percent Below Basic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Migrant students</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>64.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant students</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>66.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant students</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td>63.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant students</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>67.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant students</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>79.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant students</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>80.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant students</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>47.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant students State Total</td>
<td>1,604</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>68.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-migrant students</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>130,098</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>26.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-migrant students</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>130,395</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>26.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-migrant students</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>129,074</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>25.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-migrant students</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>127,771</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td>29.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-migrant students</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>130,212</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>24.9</td>
<td>37.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-migrant students</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>127,761</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>40.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-migrant students</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>127,501</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-migrant students State Total</td>
<td>902,812</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 14: Migrant State Science PSSA/PASA Results by Subgroup and Grade Level.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Number Scored</th>
<th>Percent Advanced</th>
<th>Percent Proficient</th>
<th>Percent Basic</th>
<th>Percent Below Basic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All migrant students</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>44.0</td>
<td>24.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All migrant students</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>71.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All migrant students State Total</td>
<td>474</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>45.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant Priority for Service</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>44.7</td>
<td>38.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant Priority for Service</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>70.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant Priority for Service State Total</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>38.1</td>
<td>50.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant non-Priority for Service</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>43.7</td>
<td>18.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant non-Priority for Service</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>71.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant non-Priority for Service State Total</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>29.9</td>
<td>43.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 15: Migrant Biology Keystone Exam Results by Subgroup.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Number Scored</th>
<th>Percent Advanced</th>
<th>Percent Proficient</th>
<th>Percent Basic</th>
<th>Percent Below Basic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All migrant students</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>65.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant Priority for Service</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>65.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant non-Priority for Service</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>64.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Prior year (2015-16) state assessment results were also available for migrant students in reading and math. In order to determine students' progress, or improvement status, they had to have two consecutive years of state assessment data. In this case, a student had to have a 2015-16 performance level and a 2016-17 performance level in the given content area. Non-consecutive results are not comparable to the current year for determining improvement. Likewise, gains cannot be calculated for science because the assessments are not administered in consecutive years.

A total of 602 students had 2015-16 and 2016-17 results for reading and 737 had such results for math that could be included in analysis. Students who scored at the advanced level in both years were classified as did not need to improve. This classification applied to 1 percent of students in reading and in math. Students moving to a higher performance level were considered as improved: moving from proficient to advanced, basic to proficient or advanced, or below basic to basic, proficient, or advanced. In reading, 27 percent of students improved and 14 percent improved in math. Students scoring in the same performance level both years, except advanced, were classified as no change; 65 percent of students scored in the same performance level in reading and 77 percent did so in math. Students classified as declined were those who scored in a lower performance level in 2016-17 than they had in 2015-16: advanced to proficient, basic, or below basic; proficient to basic or below basic; or basic to below basic. In reading, 7 percent of students declined and in math, 8 percent declined from 2015-16 to 2016-17.
The ACCESS for ELLs assessment is a language proficiency test for K-12 students and is one component of the World-Class Instructional Design and Assessment (WIDA) Consortium’s comprehensive, standards-driven system designed to improve the teaching and learning of English language learners. Pennsylvania is a part of the WIDA Consortium.

The purpose of ACCESS for ELLs is to monitor student progress in English language proficiency on a yearly basis and to serve as a criterion to aid in determining when students have attained full language proficiency. The test was designed to represent the social and academic language demands within a school setting as outlined in the assessment’s English Language Proficiency Standards, Kindergarten through Grade 12. Pennsylvania administers the assessment between late January and late February to all K-12 students enrolled in public school districts who were identified by their school or district as not fluent in English.

Since the assessment is given once at mid-year, it cannot be used to determine the impact of current year programming, but it can provide insight into current year English language learner status.

ACCESS for ELLs data were available at the state level and matched to PA-MEP enrollment data. In the graphs that follow, ACCESS for ELLs results are provided for all nonfluent migrant students having data and then disaggregated by Priority for Service status and grade level. Language proficiency levels include entering, emerging, developing, expanding, bridging, and reaching. A student's composite scale score is used to determine the extent and kind of English services a child receives from the district in which they are enrolled. The composite scale score is also used to exit a child from district-provided ESL services.

27 While the name of the assessment is an acronym standing for Assessing Comprehension and Communication in English State-to-State for English Language Learners, ACCESS for ELLs is the formal name of the assessment.
Changes were made to the ACCESS for ELLs assessment and score interpretation for 2017. Accordingly, the WIDA Consortium advised against comparing 2017 ACCESS for ELLs results to earlier assessments. As such, only 2017 results are provided in this report.

ACCESS for ELLs data was available for all students enrolled in a Pennsylvania public school who took the assessment. For the 2016-17 program year, data was available for 2,314 migrant students in kindergarten through grade 12 (778 Priority for Service, 1,536 non-Priority for Service), which is 82 percent of all K-12 PA-MEP nonfluent students enrolled during the school year (2,838) prior to June 2017. Nonfluent students would not have data if they were not enrolled in public school in Pennsylvania at the time the assessment occurred.

Overall results indicate a majority of students (89 percent) scoring in the lowest three performance levels with a fairly even distribution of students among these levels: 33 percent scored in level 1 and 28 percent scored in each of levels 2 and 3. Risk factor indicating Priority for Service status influence results, as 94 percent of Priority for Service students scored in the bottom three levels compared to 86 percent of non-Priority for Service students, especially in level 1, where 50 percent of Priority for Service students scored, compared to only 24 percent of non-Priority for Service students. By grade level, kindergarten had the highest percentage (70 percent) of students scoring in the lowest performance level. Grades 5 and 6 had the highest percentages of students scoring in the top two (most-proficient) performance levels.

Figure 50.
Completion of Higher Level Math Courses

One of the federal Migrant Education Program performance measures addresses the frequency with which students entering grade 11 had previously successfully completed Algebra I or a higher level math course. PA-MEP examines this element for all high school students as well as grade 11 specifically.

There were 894 high school students included in needs assessment data, who had information available related to math course completion and were enrolled during school year 2016-17. Of these, 43 percent had successfully completed Algebra I or a higher level math course as of their earliest needs assessment for the year. Particular to grade 11, of the 198 students, 58 percent had successfully completed Algebra I or a higher level math course as of their earliest needs assessment. Grade 12 students had a higher percentage (75 percent of 172 students) and grade 10 was lower (40 percent of 260 students). Grade 9 was the lowest (14 percent of 264 students). These findings exclude students who arrived during summer 2017 for the first time this program year.

Graduation, GED, and Promotion

Migrant students have a higher risk of not graduating from high school because of the mobile nature of the migrant lifestyle. One of the areas of focus for the PA-MEP is to keep students in school and ensure that they graduate. A total of 17229 students were enrolled in grade 12 during the 2016-17 school year, of which 160 students had graduation information available and were eligible to graduate. Of these students, 89 percent graduated (142 of 160 students), which is higher than the prior year, where 87 percent (138 of 158 students) graduated.

![Figure 51. Grade 12 Students' Graduation Status for School Year 2016-17](image)

---

29 This figure excludes two students coded as grade 12 but not enrolling until August 2017.
30 Nine students left Pennsylvania prior to the end of the school year. One student had special needs and would not be eligible for graduation until 21 years of age.
Of students graduating, 30 percent had a Priority for Service designation. Of the 18 students who did not graduate, 11 students (61 percent) were Priority for Service.

In addition to grade 12 students graduating, analysis revealed that 10 students who were enrolled in grade 11 successfully graduated in 2016-17 by earning additional credits and meeting requirements, bringing the total 2016-17 graduate count to 152 students.

Because of changes to how graduation rate is calculated at the state level (a cohort method is used) evaluators are unable to compare state and PA-MEP rates using the methodology described above. PDE calculates migrant graduation rate using the cohort method and posts this information to its website. However, at the time of this report's production, 2016-17 cohort graduation rate information was not yet available. For an approximation, 2015-16 graduation rate information was available and indicated that the migrant graduation rate was 62.43 percent, which was lower than the state's graduation rate of 85.16 percent. Again, these are 2015-16 rates and caution should be used in comparing this information for 2016-17.

PA-MEP also collected information on completion of GED programs for those youth who dropped out of school having not yet earned a high school diploma. Six out-of-school youth earned their GED credential during 2016-17, which is an increase over the prior year where two students earned their GED credential. Additionally, 18 out-of-school youth and one student who dropped out in 2016-17 and became out-of-school youth were listed as pursuing their GED, which also was an increase over the prior year (12 were pursuing their GED). In addition, one out-of-school youth had their diploma from their home country formally recognized, so the student was considered to have graduated.

Grade promotion for students in grades 7-12 was another area of inquiry, as the federal Government Performance and Results Act measures include an item related to secondary grade level promotion. According to promotion information for secondary students (grades 7-12) whose graduation and promotion status could be determined31 (1,385 students), 92 percent were promoted to the next grade or graduated. Of the students in grades 7-12 promoted or graduated (1,276), 426 (33 percent) had a Priority for Service designation. Of the students not promoted or graduated (109), 52 (48 percent) had a Priority for Service designation. It appears that students with risk factors making them Priority for Service may also increase their risk for not graduating or being promoted.

Overall, 96 percent of the 3,375 K-12 students whose status was known graduated or were promoted.

**Dropout Prevention**

According to PDE’s website,32 a dropout is defined as “a student who, for any reason other than death, leaves school before graduation without transferring to another

---

31 Students whose status could not be determined included those that left the area before the end of the school year, their eligibility expired, or they arrived too late in the program year for promotion to be determined.
school/institution” and explains that the dropout rate is “the total number of dropouts for the
school year [divided] by the fall enrollment for the same year.” Evaluators calculated the
2016-17 dropout rate by dividing the number of students who dropped out by the number of
secondary students enrolled during this program year minus any 2016-17 program year
enrollments that occurred after August 25, 2017.\(^{33}\)

Students dropping out were determined by identifying students who dropped out during the
course of the 2016-17 program year as well as by identifying students were enrolled in K-
12 school during the prior year (2015-16) and not identified as dropping out but classified
as an out-of-school youth in 2016-17, meaning that they were determined to have dropped
out between the last PA-MEP interaction in 2015-16 and their initial enrollment for the
2016-17 program. Of students enrolled in PA-MEP during the 2016-17 program year, 35
dropped out, which is fewer students dropping out than 2015-16 where 49 dropped out.
However, other program data indicated that four of these students re-enrolled in school
later in the 2016-17 program year, bringing the net count of students dropping out to 31.

Of the 35 students dropping out, 80 percent (28) had a Priority for Service designation.

Three of the students who dropped out did so after their PA-MEP eligibility ended.

Two students who dropped out were known to be pursuing a GED and one received his/her
GED.

Students dropped out of grades 9-12, with grade 12 having the greatest number of students
dropping out of school (12). The 2016-17 high school dropout rate is 3.22 percent (31 of
962 students in grades 9-12), which is lower than 2015-16, where 5.03 percent (47 of 935
students in grades 9-12) dropped out.

In addition to examining the number and rate of students dropping out of school, it is also
useful to look at whether the dropout rate of migrant students is in line with the state rate.
Pennsylvania calculates dropout rate based on grades 7-12 enrollment. At this report’s
writing, Pennsylvania’s 2016-17 dropout rate was not yet available. For an approximation,
the 2015-16 state dropout\(^{34}\) rate was 1.67 percent. Based on the expanded 7-12
enrollment, PA-MEP’s comparative 2016-17 dropout rate is lower than the state rate at 1.26
percent (31 students dropping out of 2,466 students enrolled in grades 7-12).

Students dropping out were small percentages of students in these grades; grade 12 was
the highest, where grade 12 students dropping out were 6.9 percent of the 2016-17 grade
12 population.

\(^{33}\) Some school districts begin their school year before September 1. Students are supposed to retain their prior school
year grade level classification until their next fall school year enrollment. Students enrolling for the first time at the very
end of the program year would likely have their 2016-17 grade level assigned and would not have been present for nearly
all of the 2016-17 academic term.

\(^{34}\) Pennsylvania dropout data was collected from [http://www.education.pa.gov/Data-and-Statistics/Pages/Dropouts.aspx](http://www.education.pa.gov/Data-and-Statistics/Pages/Dropouts.aspx)
Analysis also examined the frequency with which students who dropped out re-enrolled in school. This revealed that between September 1, 2016 and August 30, 2017, eight students who had previously dropped out re-enrolled in K-12 school, which is fewer students than 2014-15, where 11 students who had dropped out re-enrolled in school. However, a comparison of migrant out-of-school youth who had previously dropped out from 2015-16 and students enrolled in 2016-17 K-12 school revealed an additional two students who re-enrolled in K-12 school for 2016-17.

**Postsecondary Plans**

Each year, PA-MEP asks students nearing graduation what they plan to do after high school. Postsecondary plan data was available 138 of the 151 2016-17 graduates. Seventy-nine percent of graduates indicated that they planned to attend a two-year (44 percent) or four-year college (35 percent). The third-largest percentage indicated that they planned to go to work (14 percent).
It is important to keep in mind that a student’s postsecondary plan may be indicative of the choices available locally. Some project areas include large, urban areas where there are numerous colleges and universities available, while other areas are more rural with fewer options in close proximity. Students may not have the resources or options to relocate for postsecondary education.

**Diploma Project**

The Diploma Project is an outcome of the most recent Comprehensive Needs Assessment where concerns were raised and validated related to student and family understanding of graduation and postsecondary planning and requirements. PDE assembled a team of educators and stakeholders to develop the Diploma Project Toolkit content to support PA-MEP staff in implementing the initiative and supporting students and their families. The 2016-17 year was the fourth year of implementation.

The toolkit, which was targeted toward students in grades 8-12 and their families, contains five units with content and guiding student-centered questions:
1. Goal setting (self-assessment and self-advocacy);
2. High school credits and courses;
3. Assessments;
4. English language proficiency; and
5. Preparing for and funding postsecondary education.

The toolkit included sections containing tips for students and parents, learning checks, and action plans to examine whether students and parents gained new knowledge. The Diploma Project Toolkit was available in English and translated forms.

A total of 500 (40 percent of 1,251 students in grades 8-12) students in grades 8-12 had information for one or more of the student unit categories. Additionally, 12 out-of-school youth and 43 students in grades 6-7 participated in the student units. A total of 323 students in grades 8-12 (26 percent of grades 8-12) had data indicating their parent(s) or family participated in one or more family units, plus 10 out-of-school youth and 35 students in grades 6 and 7. The following results, however, represent the students in grades 8-12 only as this is the target population for this initiative and the population for whom the performance targets are established.

For each unit, the largest portions of students completed the unit this year (52-58 percent). Another 24-37 percent received instruction this year but did not complete the unit yet. Between 6 and 17 percent tested out or completed the unit in a prior year.

---

35 Out-of-school youth who were identified as having interest in returning to school or furthering their education were permitted to participate in the Diploma Project in an attempt to re-engage them in school. Additionally, project areas have found the goal setting unit particularly helpful with out-of-school youth. Students in grades 6-7 may have participated themselves, or they may have had an older sibling(s) through which their parents/families participated.
Of those having parent or family data, the results were similar. Between 50 and 65 percent participants within each unit completed the unit in 2016-17, with another 19-41 percent receiving instruction in 2016-17. Between 9 and 20 percent tested out or completed the unit in a prior year.
Out-of-School Youth Assessment

As part of PA-MEP’s participation in the SOSOSY Consortium36 PA-MEP is annually asked to provide certain information about its efforts and outcomes in supporting the out-of-school youth population. In the past, PA-MEP had limited options for documenting the outcomes of out-of-school youth. Using information from the SOSOSY Consortium, state evaluators and PDE collaborated to create an assessment format to gather information about out-of-school youth completion of specific lessons and activities contained in a workbook provided to PA-MEP staff. The 2016-17 program year was the third year this tool was used and was to cover students served May through August 2016. The initiative included a language screener and seven lesson categories, titled For Your Health, Finanza Toolbox, Vermont Mini-Lessons, Math for Living, Parenting, Legal Rights, and Healthy House, each with several lessons and accompanying tests.

A total of 131 youth had language screener results that could be analyzed for one or more of the six testing areas (skills): 3 percent had a score for one area, 47 percent had a score for two areas, 29 percent had a score for three areas, 5 percent had a score for four areas, less than 1 percent had a score for five areas, and 16 percent had a score for each of the six tested areas. Areas tested included beginning listening, beginning speaking, intermediate/advanced speaking, beginning literacy, reading, and intermediate/advanced writing. The graph that follows shows the results for each tested skill area, for those students tested in that area (n), the number and proportion of students achieving a percentage correct in the range of 0-25 percent, 26-50 percent, 51-75 percent, or 76-100 percent based on the number of items in each skill test. The largest percentages of youth who scored in the highest outcomes category (76-100 percent) were for the beginning reading (76 percent) and intermediate/advanced speaking (59 percent).

Figure 57.

36 The SOSOSY Consortium is known by its acronym. SOSOSY stands for Strategies, Opportunities, and Services for Out-of-School Youth.
For those youth having a score for each of the six skill areas, a combined language screener score could be determined. Students received a total score (out of 50 possible points) and percentage based on these components. Of the 21 youth having a combined result, 28 youth (90 percent) scored above 75 percent on the language screener assessment.

Youth may have participated in any combination or number of lessons, depending on what was relevant for that youth; 116 youth had pre/post data for one to five lessons (average two lessons). The SOSOSY Consortium is interested in and asks participating states to determine the number and percentage of youth who make gains of 20 percent or more on each lesson. The following graphs illustrate (1) youth having one or more lessons with a pre-test and post-test compared to the number of youth having at least one lesson showing a gain of 20 percent or more and (2) the number of lessons with a pre/post-test compared to the number of lessons where youth showed a gain of 20 percent of more. Excepting Vermont Mini Lessons and Math for Living, all youth tested achieved a 20 percent or greater gain from pre to post.
Prior Year (2015-16) Summer Program Student State Assessment Outcomes

PA-MEP summer programs may be examined through a comparison of prior year and post-participation state assessment results. Because the state assessments occur in the spring of the year following participation, it is not possible to include these results in the prior year’s report, as the report is prepared prior to the assessment administration. As such, results in this section are for students participating in summer 2016 programs (part of the 2015-16 program year) who had 2016-17 state assessment data available through the PA-MEP.

A total of 1,424 students in preschool through grade 12 (their 2015-16 grade level) participated in summer 2016 programs, with 640 of these being in state assessment grades (3-8 and 11). Of these students, 539 could be matched to 2016-17 reading assessment data, which is 84 percent of the summer program participants from state assessment grades. Additionally, 560 could be matched to 2016-17 math state assessment data, which is 88 percent of the summer program participants from state assessment grades.

For reading, of those 539 summer 2016 program participants having 2017 data, 2 percent scored in the advanced performance level, 17 percent scored proficient, 35 percent scored basic, and 46 scored in the below basic performance level. For those students having both 2016 and 2017 state reading assessment data (262) – where 2016 was the spring before the summer program participation and 2017 was the spring after the summer program participation, 2 percent scored in the advanced performance level on both tests and were classified as did not need to improve, 31 percent improved their performance level from 2016 to 2017, 61 percent scored in the same performance level both years, and 6 percent declined from 2016 to 2017, meaning they scored in a lower performance level in 2017 than they had in 2016.
Comparing summer program change from 2016 to 2017 to all migrant students having these years of data, 33 percent of summer program participants improved their performance or maintained an advanced score compared to 28 percent of all migrant students having two years of data. This may indicate that the summer program had a positive influence on students’ state reading assessment outcomes.

For math, of those 560 summer 2016 program participants having 2017 data, 3 percent scored in the advanced performance level, 9 percent scored proficient, 26 percent scored basic, and 62 scored in the below basic performance level. For those students having both 2016 and 2017 state math assessment data (352) 1 percent scored in the advanced performance level on both tests and were classified as did not need to improve, 14 percent improved their performance level from 2016 to 2017, 76 percent scored in the same performance level both years, and 9 percent declined from 2016 to 2017, meaning they scored in a lower performance level in 2017 than they had in 2016.
Comparing summer program change from 2016 to 2017 to all migrant students having these years of data, 15 percent of summer program participants improved their performance or maintained an advanced score, which is the same percentage for all migrant students having two years of data.
Reflections, Implications, and Recommendations

Through data analysis of results submitted by project areas, MIS2000, and PDE several overall themes emerged, which informed the following recommendations.

PROGRESS ON PREVIOUS RECOMMENDATIONS

The following recommendations appeared in the 2015-16 PA-MEP evaluation report. Where possible, updates or continued recommendations are provided.

1. **Nonfluent students and Priority for Service students should receive extra academic focus. Priority for Service students should receive additional supports in key interest areas.** While PA-MEP continues to demonstrate that Priority for Service students are more likely to receive services than students without the designation, continued focus is needed to ensure that Priority for Service students are getting services they need to succeed. Ensuring all nonfluent students are connected to English services in the district or through PA-MEP is as critical as ensuring that Priority for Service students are being serviced first. Fluent students and those who were not Priority for Service performed better than their respective nonfluent and Priority for Service peers on state assessments. English language fluency appears to be the greatest factor in academic success; however, disaggregation of program objectives at the state and federal levels show that Priority for Service students achieve success to a lesser degree as a population than students without the Priority for Service designation.

2. **Project areas should review or consider strategies for identifying and serving students at risk for dropping out in order to provide services or support that may contribute to students remaining in school.** The 2016-17 year showed an improvement in the dropout rate from 5.03 percent to 3.22 percent. PA-MEP should continue its emphasis or strategies focused on dropout prevention in order to build on this progress.

3. **Based on evaluation guidance and focus areas provided by the United States Department of Education’s Office of Migrant Education as well as state initiatives, PA-MEP’s evaluators, MIS2000 staff, and PDE should review current data collection and reporting practices and content to ensure their continued relevance, and where possible, collaborate to reduce the data burden or simplify reporting.** Data should only be collected if it contributes useful and necessary information. As program needs and priorities change, data collection must evolve to ensure that these priority areas can be examined. Evaluators and the state team should review data collection and reporting protocols to ensure continued relevance, and where possible, reduce the data and reporting burden on PA-MEP staff. The state team will be meeting in spring 2018 to review and refine data collection efforts.
4. **PA-MEP staff should (continue to) increase efforts intended to engage out-of-school youth in GED programs and provide services to these individuals to support their completion of such programs.** Six out-of-school youth earned their GED credential during 2016-17. This is an increase over 2015-16 where two students earned this credential. PA-MEP should continue efforts focused on engaging youth in such programs and supporting them towards completion.

5. **PDE and state evaluators should examine goals and program focus areas to establish current priority areas and appropriate new measures.** PA-MEP’s updated Service Delivery Plan was released in February 2018 to take effect July 1, 2018. State evaluators will review the plan in light of data available and as needed recommend adjustments to data and evaluation efforts.

6. **PDE and project managers should (continue to) consider staff and student feedback when planning the summer program.** For the prior year (2015-16), several areas were identified for possible improvement: getting information about students for planning purposes, better or more communication, and more training for staff. Based on 2017 survey data, areas of need may include better access to summer facility resources and/or adequate and appropriate classrooms, better organization, a continued need for access to student information, better/more communication, and more educational recreation opportunities. All of these have been recurrent themes of past years’ survey responses as well.

7. **Based on a review of findings from 2016-17 and prior years, moving forward PA-MEP should continue to focus on the following three areas:**
   - The needs of Priority for Service students, especially those identified as not achieving success related to state and federal performance measures;
   - Dropout prevention and follow up services, including GED programs, for students who drop out; and
   - Students who are not fluent in English.

Evaluation findings from this and past years show consistently that these areas are continuing or increasing areas of need.

8. **Project areas should identify strategies to engage more families and students in the target grades in the Diploma Project.** Data recorded for the Diploma Project for 2016-17 shows improvements on each related measure such that PA-MEP exceeded its targets related to this initiative. Project areas should increase attention on the Diploma Project with Priority for Services students, with particular emphasis on high school graduation and courses and postsecondary planning (units specified in the Service Delivery Plan).

9. **PA-MEP should continue to capitalize on positive summer program attendance and participants’ continued presence in Pennsylvania for students whose eligibility continues by reinforcing summer instruction throughout the**
following school year. The state evaluation team should examine 2017-18 academic assessment results and gains from 2016-17 to 2017-18 once those data become available in order to determine possible program impact. Program attendance at summer programs showed many students with high attendance percentages. More than 90 percent of the participating students remained in Pennsylvania and PA-MEP eligible for 2016-17, making it possible that program impact may be seen in subsequent examinations. A comparison of 2016 to 2017 state reading assessment results for summer 2016 program participants indicated that 33 percent of summer 2016 program participants improved their performance or maintained an advanced score on the state reading assessment compared to 28 percent of all migrant students having these two years of data. This may indicate that the summer program had a positive influence on students’ state reading assessment outcomes.

10. In content, service delivery, or project areas where results or outcomes appear especially positive, PDE and/or evaluators should examine implementation strategies more closely to determine what is going on and, if possible, use that information to inform decision making about replication. While project areas and students are unique, it may be helpful for project areas to know what strategies others are using successfully in order to improve their own programs.

The following considerations are made based on stakeholder surveys and feedback. PA-MEP may want to conduct further examination to determine the extent to which these factors are prevalent for the overall population before acting on any large-scale initiatives; however, they are worth considering as survey responses appeared to be a valid cross-section of the population based on the random sample.

11. PA-MEP should ensure that its staff members are familiar with their region’s schools’ requirements and education options so they are prepared for parents who ask questions. Also, PA-MEP staff members should know who at the school or district can effectively answer such questions in the event that the PA-MEP staff member does not know the answer. Staff should consider respondent levels of knowledge of post-secondary options to identify and provide information. Survey results indicate that parents seek out assistance from PA-MEP staff for information about high school graduation and post-secondary options.

12. PA-MEP project areas should consider strategies for disseminating general information about local health/wellness services and as possible, information about language and insurance.
RECOMMENDATIONS BASED ON 2016-17 FINDINGS

The following recommendations are based on new or updated findings from the 2016-17 state evaluation. While some may be similar to prior year recommendations, specific focus or details make these recommendations unique.

1. The percentage of preschool-age children enrolled in preschool programs decreased from 2015-16 to 2016-17 from 66 percent to 55 percent. Project areas should revisit preschool enrollment efforts to ensure that eligible children are connected to preschool programs.

2. The percentage of migrant students identified as in need of reading support and subsequently receiving such support decreased from 87 percent in 2015-16 to 79 percent in 2016-17. Project areas should revisit supplemental reading service and program efforts to ensure that eligible children are connected to relevant programs based on student needs.

3. While still exceeding the established performance target, the percentage of out-of-school youth attending or completing ESL classes decreased from 80 percent in 2015-16 to 69 percent in 2016-17. Project areas should monitor such program enrollment and participation and encourage participation where appropriate.

4. The percentage of students in grade 11 having already successfully completed Algebra I or a higher level math class decreased from 71 percent in 2015-16 to 58 percent in 2016-17. Project areas should encourage students to take Algebra I or higher level math courses in advance of grade 11 and provide supplemental math support to encourage students’ success in these courses.

5. Five of the nine summer program sites visited had one or more not evident ratings. Project areas should use the summer program site visit checklist during summer program planning and staff training in order to ensure that program components and expectations are present and evident. PA-MEP state office staff should consider a refresher in the spring, perhaps at a project manager meeting, to review the summer program checklist, clarify expectations, and share examples of program implementation.

The evaluation of the PA-MEP is intended to provide program results and information that PDE and local program staff can use to make informed decisions about program changes, improvement, and implementation. Results and recommendations are based upon the data available.