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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 [State Education Agencies] 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\(^2\) 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 5,238 children and youth were enrolled in PA-MEP for at least one day from September 1, 2017 through August 30, 2018,\(^3\) which is 44 fewer students than the prior year. At 74 percent, the largest group falls into the school-age category, followed by 17 percent who were not yet of school age (birth to age 6, not yet enrolled in a 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 (74 percent). Spanish was the most common home language (72 percent), followed by those with a language designation of Nepali (9 percent), Swahili (6 percent), or another language (14 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 4,975 children and youth (95 percent of children and youth).

Based on needs assessment data, 47 percent of 5,238 students in 2017-18 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 (4,625) were not fluent in English. Based on analysis of service data for nonfluent students age 3 and older, 93 percent received English-related services or support; 94 percent of nonfluent Priority for Service students received English-related services and 91 percent of non-Priority for Service students received English services. A majority of nonfluent K-12 students who were enrolled before June 2018 (94 percent) were coded as receiving English services through their district’s English as a Second Language (ESL) program during the school year.

---

\(^2\) 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.
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, 59 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. More than a third (35 percent) of 3,677 K-12 students had a school year interruption. 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 school days within the past year, or a move during summer term when summer education was a necessary component of the child’s education.

According to initial needs assessments, 15 percent of K-12 students were proficient in reading, and 15 percent were proficient in math (of 3,677 K-12 students).

Of the 3,127 K-12 students who were not proficient in reading, 81 percent received reading-specific supplemental services. Further analysis revealed that 84 percent of Priority for Service students with a reading need received supplemental reading services through at least one category, while 77 percent of non-Priority for Service students received supplemental reading services, providing evidence that Priority for Service students took priority for service delivery.

Of the 3,118 K-12 students not proficient in math, 74 percent received math-specific supplemental services. Further analysis indicated that 78 percent of Priority for Service students received supplemental math services, compared to 70 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 83 percent of the 421 nonfluent out-of-school youth attended or 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 5,238 students enrolled one day or more during the 2017-18 year, 4,884 (93 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 14 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, refusing services, 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 195 children who were 4 years old or older as of September 1, 2017 and not yet enrolled in kindergarten were included in analysis, of which 44 percent had a Priority for Service designation. Results for a child's last assessment, regardless of its timing, indicated that of the 195 children, 80 percent were considered ready for kindergarten by demonstrating proficiency on at least 16 of the 22 identified skills. Sixteen percent were considered in progress, or nearing kindergarten readiness, and 4 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, 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 portion of students scored in the below basic performance level. The following table provides the state academic results for 2017-18.

---

4 English fluency was determined by the child’s or youth’s PA-MEP needs assessment.
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, 18 percent of migrant students assessed scored in the proficient or advanced performance levels, which is lower than the non-migrant group (63 percent). In math, 9 percent of migrant students scored in the proficient or advanced performance levels, while 45 percent of non-migrant students did so. In science, 19 percent of migrant students scored proficient or advanced compared to 64 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 16 to 20 percentage points, further confirming the influence of English language fluency on assessment results.

### State English Proficiency Assessment

The ACCESS for ELLs\(^6\) 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 2017-18 program year, data was available for 2,445 K-12 migrant students (1,207 Priority for Service, 1,238 non-Priority for Service), which is 84 percent of all K-12 PA-MEP nonfluent students enrolled during the school year (2,902). Nonfluent students would not have data if they were not enrolled in public school in Pennsylvania at the time the assessment occurred.

---

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.

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.
Overall results indicate a majority of students (89 percent) scored in the lowest three performance levels. The largest group, at 37 percent, scored in the first level, Entering. The top three performance categories made up the remaining 11 percent of students.

Priority for Service status influences results, as 93 percent of Priority for Service students scored in the bottom three levels compared to 85 percent of non-Priority for Service students, especially in level 1, where 51 percent of Priority for Service students scored, compared to only 23 percent of non-Priority for Service students.

Slightly more than half (58 percent) of these nonfluent students with 2017-18 ACCESS for ELLs data also had 2016-17 ACCESS for ELLs data for comparison. Based on a comparison of each student’s composite scale score, 73 percent of students with two consecutive years of data improved, 8 percent maintained the same level, and 19 percent declined.

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

Of the 150 grade 12 students who had graduation information, 87 percent graduated (130 students\(^7\)). Additionally, three students – one in grade 10 and two in grade 11 – successfully graduated at the end of 2017-18 by earning additional credits and meeting requirements, bringing the total 2017-18 graduate count to 133 students.

According to promotion information for secondary students (grades 7-12) whose graduation and promotion status could be determined,\(^8\) 96 percent were promoted to the next grade or graduated, which is the same percentage for K-12 students overall.

Eight out-of-school youth earned their GED credential during 2017-18. Additionally, 17 out-of-school youth were listed as pursuing their GED.

A total 45 students dropped out during the 2017-18, after considering two students who dropped out and then re-enrolled. Two students who dropped out were known to be pursuing a GED and three received their GEDs. Students dropped out of grades 9-12, with grade 11 having the greatest number of students dropping out of school (16). Based on enrollment in grades 9-12 (961), the high school dropout rate for 2017-18 was 4.68 percent (45 of 961 students in grades 9-12), which is higher than 2016-17, when the rate was 3.22 percent.

Analysis also examined the frequency with which students who dropped out re-enrolled in school. This revealed that between Sept. 1, 2017 and Aug. 30, 2018, 10 students who had previously dropped out re-enrolled in K-12 school. Two additional students who had previously dropped out re-enrolled in school only to later drop out again.

---

\(^7\) Includes grade 12 students who dropped out and earned their GED.  
\(^8\) 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 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.
- Evidence consistently indicates that Priority for Service students are served first.
- In summer 2018, 1,362 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 2017-18 year. The average attendance rate by student was 59 percent (mean) and 67 percent (median). However, the most frequent attendance rate (mode) was 100 percent with 154 students attending all of the summer sessions offered by their site or program.
- Of 150 grade 12 students for which graduation status information was available, 86 percent graduated (129 of 150 students). In addition to grade 12 students graduating, three high school students successfully graduated by earning additional credits and meeting requirements, one student who dropped out earned their GED before the end of the year, and one out-of-school youth successfully completed an online, accredited program to earn their high school diploma, bringing the total 2017-18 graduate count to 134.
- Of graduates, 76 percent indicated that they planned to attend a two-year or four-year college.
- Eight out-of-school youth earned their GED credential during 2017-18 (an increase of two over 2016-17). Additionally, 17 out-of-school youth were identified as pursuing their GED.
- Of 1,285 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 3,229 students whose status was known graduated or were promoted.
- Of students having two years of ACCESS for ELLs data, 73 percent improved from 2017 to 2018.
• Of 207 grade 11 students, 66 percent successfully completed Algebra I or a higher level math course as of their earliest needs assessment for the year, an increase over the prior year’s 58 percent.

• Ten students who had previously dropped out re-enrolled in K-12 school, which is more students than 2016-17, when eight students who had dropped out re-enrolled in school.

• PA-MEP exceeds its target for getting and keeping out-of-school youth engaged in ESL programs and has been increasing percentages out-of-school youth engaged in job training, GED, and school entry.

• A comparison of 2017 to 2018 state reading assessment results shows that 32 percent of summer 2017 program participants improved their performance or maintained an advanced score on the state reading assessment. Evaluators also compared summer participants’ results to non-participants and found that non-participants had an improvement percentage of 29 percent for reading, which is 3 percentage points lower than summer participants. This may indicate that the summer program had a positive influence on students’ state reading assessment outcomes. This is particularly important to note because the summer program is PA-MEP’s largest direct service to students.

• Of students having both 2017 and 2018 state reading and math assessment data, 31 percent improved or maintained an advanced score in reading and 12 percent improved or maintained an advanced score in math. Compared to the prior year, reading results improved (28 percent improved or maintained an advanced level in 2016-17).
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 310 and 21 years old and has not graduated from high school or does not hold a high school equivalency certificate;
- The child is a migrant worker or has a parent, spouse, or guardian who is a migrant worker;
- 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
- 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 that oversees operations and reporting responsibilities.

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.

---

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.
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 2017-18 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 2017-18 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 2017-18 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 2017-18 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 2017-18 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.

Disclaimer: The Migrant Education Program (MEP) is authorized by Title I, Part C of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) of 1965, as amended. This tool and all its components were developed with funding from the U.S. Department of Education (ED), Office of Migrant Education (OME). The opinion expressed herein do not necessarily represent the positions or policies of the U.S. Department of Education, and no official endorsement by the U.S. Department of Education should be inferred. You are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution, alteration, or copying of this tool or its components is strictly prohibited without prior approval from the Pennsylvania Department of Education, specifically the Pennsylvania Migrant Education Program.
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 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 recently concluded PA-MEP Service Delivery Plan included objectives to be accomplished by the end of the 2016-17 year. However, the new PA-MEP Service Delivery Plan did not go into effect until the fall of 2018, so the state evaluators examined 2017-18 results within the context of the plan ending in 2016-17. The status of these objectives is outlined here and show PA-MEP’s progress toward these targets as of the end of the 2017-18 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 2017-18 year; 29 percent of migrant Priority for Service students who had both 2016-17 and 2017-18 scores made gains on reading state assessments. For comparison, 30 percent of all PA-MEP students and 30 percent of non-Priority for Service students having such scores made gains in reading.

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 2017-18, 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 2017-18 year. Of those students with an identified reading need, 81 percent received reading-specific supplemental services, which is slightly higher than 2016-17 where 79 percent of such students received reading instructional services. By Priority for Service status, 84 percent of Priority for Service students with a reading need received reading services, while 77 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 2017-18 for preschool-age children (ages 3+ not yet enrolled in kindergarten), but it was close. Of preschool-age children, 59 percent were enrolled in preschool, which is higher than the prior year (55 percent). By Priority for Service status, 35 percent of Priority for Service preschool-age students were enrolled in preschool compared to 75 percent of non-Priority for Service preschool-age students. However, evidence shows that most students not enrolled in preschool are not enrolled for reasons beyond their control.

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 2017-18 year. As of their last 2017-18 Kindergarten Readiness Checklist administration, 80 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 slightly lesser extent (78 percent at mastery) than students not having the Priority for Service designation (81 percent at mastery), but to a greater extent than the prior year (66 percent).

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 2017-18 year; 12 percent of migrant Priority for Service students who had both 2016-17 and 2017-18 scores made gains on math state assessments. For comparison, 11 percent of all PA-MEP students and 11 percent of non-Priority for Service students having such scores made gains in math.

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 2017-18 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 2017-18 year at 99 percent. For Priority for Service students, this percentage was 98 percent and for students without this designation, the result was 99 percent.
**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 2017-18 year at 61 percent based on completion of the high school credits and courses unit of the Diploma Project. For Priority for Service students in grades 8-12 who participated in this unit, 68 percent completed 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 53 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 not achieved for the 2017-18 year at 48 percent based on completion of the postsecondary education unit of the Diploma Project. Both Priority for Service students and non-Priority for Service student groups had the same completion percentage as the overall result: 48 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 receive instruction and/or complete at least one toolkit unit.

This objective was achieved for the 2017-18 year at 100 percent, including Priority for Service students and those without this designation.

**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 2017-18 year at 51 percent based on completion of the high school credits and courses unit of the Diploma Project but not based on parent survey data, which indicated 48 percent.

Disaggregated Diploma Project results showed more positive results for Priority for Service students than students without this designation, at 57 percent compared to 47 percent, respectively.

Of parents surveyed and responding (and having children in grades 8-12) to the comprehensive summer parent survey related to graduation requirements, 48 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, 34 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 parent survey 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 2017-18 year at 60 percent based on Diploma Project data and at 52 percent based on parent survey data.

Disaggregated Diploma Project results showed more positive results for Priority for Service students than students without this designation, at 64 percent compared to 56 percent, respectively.

On the 2017-18 parent survey, 52 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 the parent survey 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 2017-18 year for English as a Second Language (ESL) classes, but not job training or GED programs.

- 83 percent of nonfluent individuals attended and/or completed ESL classes. For Priority for Service youth, 75 percent attended or completed such classes. For youth without this designation, the percentage was 49 percent, indicating that Priority for Service youth were served first.
- 14 percent of youth attended and/or completed job training. For Priority for Service youth, 7 percent attended or completed such training. For youth without this designation, the percentage was 1 percent, indicating that Priority for Service youth were served first.
- 21 percent of youth attended and/or completed a GED program. For Priority for Service youth, 2 percent attended or completed a GED program. For youth without this designation, the percentage was 4 percent.

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 2017-18 year at 90 percent. 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 2017-18 year. Only 3 percent of parents and zero out-of-school youth in their present location for less than a year reported in the survey that both language and cultural barriers impeded their access to health care.

**GOVERNMENT PERFORMANCE AND RESULTS ACT MEASURES**

The Office of Migrant Education at the U.S. Department of Education (USDE) established recommended performance measures for the Migrant Education Program under the Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA).\(^\text{11}\)

1. The percentage of PA-MEP students (grades 3-8) proficient or higher on their state’s reading/language arts achievement test: Of 1,193 migrant students taking the 2017-18 state reading assessments in grades 3-8, 18.4 percent scored in the proficient or advanced levels, which is a slight increase over the prior year’s 18.0 percent. By Priority for Service status, 11 percent of Priority for Service students scored in the proficient or advanced levels in reading/language arts, while 22 percent of students without this designation scored at these levels. This is a decline for Priority for Service students but an improvement for students without the Priority for Service designation (2016-17 results showed 12 and 19 percent, respectively).

2. The percentage of PA-MEP students (grades 3-8) proficient or higher on their state’s mathematics achievement test: Of the 1,439 migrant students taking the 2017-18 state math assessments in grades 3-8, 9.2 percent scored in the proficient or advanced levels, which is slightly higher than the prior year (8.9 percent). By Priority for Service status, 4 percent of Priority for Service students scored in the proficient or advanced levels in math, while 14 percent of students without this designation scored at these levels. This is the same percentage for Priority for Service students the prior year, but an improvement for students without the Priority for Service designation (2016-17 was 11 percent).

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 207 grade 11 students enrolled during the 2017-18 school year, 66 percent entered grade 11 having already passed Algebra I or a higher math class based on their earliest needs assessment for the 2017-18 year, which is an improvement over the prior year’s 58 percent. Both Priority for Service and non-Priority for Service students had results showing that 55 percent. By Priority for Service status, 55 percent of grade 11 Priority for Service students entered grade 11 having already passed Algebra I or a higher math class, while 73 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 2017-18 year.

---

\(^{11}\) 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](http://www.ecfr.gov/cgi-bin/searchECFR?idno=34&q1=80&rgn1=PARTNBR&op2=and&q2=&rgn2=Part)
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 1,285 students in grades 7-12 whose graduation or promotion status could be determined, 92 percent (1,187 students) either graduated or were promoted. By Priority for Service status, 93 percent of Priority for Service either graduated or were promoted, while 92 percent of students who were not Priority for Service either graduated or were promoted.

LEADING INDICATORS

The Office of Migrant Education at the USDE also established program leading indicators.

1. An increasing percentage of ages 3-5 migrant children will receive instructional services. For 2017-18, 94 percent of migrant students in the preschool category who were at least 3 years old as of Sept. 1, 2017 received instructional services, which is a decrease over the prior year’s 96 percent.

2. An increasing percentage of Priority for Service migrant children will receive services. For 2017-18, 94.5 percent of Priority for Service students received services according to service delivery data, which is slightly lower than the prior year’s 99 percent. However, all but four students not served can be explained by very short enrollments, multiple unsuccessful attempts to provide service, or students leaving the area before their enrollment approval. Effectively, this brings PA-MEP’s service percentage for Priority for Service students to 99 percent when these considerations are included.

3. An increasing percentage of grades 7-12 migrant children will receive instructional services. For 2017-18, 83 percent of students in grades 7-12 received instructional services, which is a decrease from the prior year’s 94 percent.

4. An increasing percentage of grade 8 migrant children will score proficient or higher in mathematics. For 2017-18, 7.3 percent of grade 8 students having state math assessment data performed at the proficient or advanced levels, which is an decrease over the prior year’s 12 percent.

---

12 Instructional services includes reading, math, credit recovery, ESL, Diploma Project (student, those with values of instruction or completed), leadership programs, preschool, other instruction, 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 2017-18 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 2017-18 evaluation included any migrant child or youth eligible and enrolled for at least one day at any time Sept. 1, 2017 through Aug. 30, 2018. 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 2018.

A total of 5,238 eligible children and youth were identified as migrant for 2017-18, which is 44 fewer than the prior year (2016-17). Enrollment has been fairly stable in recent years.

![MEP Enrollment Trends](image)

---

13 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 74 percent based on students’ first 2017-18 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.

Project Area 5 had the largest number of students, followed by Project Area 4. Project Area 7 had the smallest number, which has been consistent for several years. 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 6, not yet in kindergarten).
Of all students in 2017-18, 54 percent of 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 (82 percent of out-of-school youth).

Most of Pennsylvania’s migrant students identified themselves (using federal race options) as Hispanic (74 percent of 5,238 students). While the K-12 student category was similar to the state, out-of-school youth had a higher percentage of Hispanic students (89 percent of out-of-school youth) and birth to preschool age had a lower percentage of Hispanic students (66 percent) and a higher percentage of Asian students (20 percent) than the other two categories. Individual project area racial demographics differed from state results, with Project Area 6 most 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 (72 percent of 5,238 students), which is nearly the same percentage as the prior year (70 percent of 5,282 students). The next largest group included students speaking Nepali as their home language (9 percent), followed by Swahili (6 percent). 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.

---

14 Other languages (specified) includes: Burmese, Chin, Creole, French, Indigenous Guatemalan, Indigenous Mexican, Indonesian, Karen, Khmer, Kinyarwanda, Mam, Portuguese, 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 2 and those who are 3 years 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, 2017, as September 1 is a common cut-off date for kindergarten enrollment in Pennsylvania. Children ages 3 or older made up 57 percent of the 908 migrant birth-preschool children.
Students within the K-12 category made up the majority of migrant students for the 2017-18 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_url)

**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 October 31, or within 10 working days of eligibility verification and 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 2017-18 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 4,975 students (95 percent of all students). Nearly all individuals not having a needs assessment can be explained for valid reasons including having a very brief enrollment or 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 (GPRA) measures for PA-MEP. Of the 5,238 students enrolled one day or more during the 2017-18 year, 4,884 (93 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 14 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, refusing services, 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 2017-18. If a student was not Priority for Service initially and later found to fit the criteria based on 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 a 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. A total of 2,487 students (47 percent of 5,238 students) in 2017-18 were identified as Priority for Service at any time during the program year, which is a four percentage point increase over the prior year. Out-of-school youth had the highest percentage of students designated as Priority for Service (65 percent). The preschool category had the lowest percentage of students determined to be Priority for Service (38 percent). Project Areas 2, 4, 5, and 7 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 four Priority for Service students who were enrolled a reasonable amount of time and over the age of 3 received services.

Figure 8.
PA-MEP Students by Priority for Service Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent of students</th>
<th>Not Priority for Service</th>
<th>Priority for Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All students</td>
<td>2,751</td>
<td>2,487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birth-preschool</td>
<td>585</td>
<td>343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K-12</td>
<td>2,030</td>
<td>1,853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out-of-school youth</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>497</td>
<td>493</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>574</td>
<td>745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>392</td>
<td>266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>114</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 (97 percent) and school-age students had the smallest percentage (82 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 (46 percent).

A majority of nonfluent students who were enrolled before June 2018 (94 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 93 percent of nonfluent students 3 years old or older received English-related services in some form, with 94 percent of Priority for Service students receiving services compared to 91 percent for students without the Priority for Service designation, indicating that Priority for Service students were served first. 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

Six percent of students were designated as having special needs (not gifted). School-age students had the highest percentage of these students (7.5 percent of 3,677 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, 20 percent of PA-MEP students were identified as homeless at any point during 2017-18 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 definition, out-of-school youth were not considered homeless and eligible for McKinney-Vento Act-supported programming for the 2017-18 year, where they had been eligible in prior years.

Of project areas, Project Area 3 had the largest percentage (42 percent) of students experiencing homelessness and areas 2 and 8 had the smallest (6 and 4 percent, respectively).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Area</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

---

15 Other programs may use a different definition or criteria to determine homelessness.
unaccompanied youth at any point during the year, with 56 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, 38 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), 59 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, they had very short enrollments or moved, 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 300 students over 3 years old who were enrolled in preschool according to their needs assessment, the largest portion was enrolled in Head Start (54 percent), which is an increase over the prior year (38 percent). Twelve percent were enrolled in a district preschool program; 9 percent were enrolled in PreK Counts programs; 9 percent were enrolled in a Migrant Head Start or Pathstone program; 8 percent were in a different program; 3 percent were in more than one type of program; and the remaining students...
were in Early Intervention, a formal or certified migrant preschool program; early Head Start, or some other kind of migrant preschool program (2 percent or less of students). Priority for Service students (74 students) were most likely to be enrolled in Head Start (38 percent were recorded as enrolled in Head Start).

**Reading and Math Proficiency**

According to needs assessment entries, 85 percent of school-age students were not proficient in reading and 84 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 7 had the highest percentages of proficient students for both reading and math.
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 (3,127), 80 percent received reading-specific supplemental services. Further analysis revealed that 84 percent of Priority for Service students with a reading need received supplemental reading services through one or more category, while 77 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 (3,118), 74 percent received math-specific supplemental services. Further analysis indicated that 79 percent of Priority for Service students received supplemental math services, compared to 70 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. 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-five 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 2017-18 program year. Project Area 5 had the
highest percentage of students experiencing interruption, with nearly 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; 88 percent of 1,192 secondary students were on track for graduation. Project Area 1 had the highest percentage of students on track for graduation (96 percent).
Student Concerns

Behavior, attendance, and other concerns are also part of the K-12 needs assessment, as these factors may influence academic success; 75 percent had no concerns indicated and 14 percent had no value entered.\textsuperscript{16} Of students having a concern indicated (11 percent), the largest group had an ‘other’ concern. Results by project area varied widely.
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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 five health-related needs assessment indicators (health need, dental need, medical alert, mental health need, and vision need), a majority of individuals did not have such needs identified (89-95 percent). The medical alert indicator, which is the only required health-related field in the needs assessment, was noted for the most students (11 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, 89 percent of students were identified as not having any medical concerns, 11 percent were identified as having either an acute or chronic medical concern, and less than 1 percent did not have information for this needs item. K-12 students had the highest prevalence of acute or chronic medical concerns with 12 percent having such a designation; 6 percent of out-of-school youth and 8 percent of the birth-preschool populations had such concerns indicated based on needs assessment data.

\textsuperscript{16} Student concern is not a required needs assessment field.
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 5,238 students, 2,263 (43 percent) had one or more parent (or an adult in the household in a parental role) participate in parent involvement activities (1,815), the Parent Advisory Council (46), or both (402). Birth-preschool and K-12 groups had similar participation percentages, though the K-12 participation counts are higher because the K-12 population is larger than the other groups and parents may have more formal opportunities for involvement. 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 17.](image)

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 436 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 83 percent of the 436 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 a GED program; 14 percent were interested in, enrolled in, attended, or completed job training; and 10 percent were interested or enrolled in K-12 school. The balance of youth was either not interested or their interest status was unknown.
Of the nonfluent out-of-school youth (97 percent of out-of-school youth):
- 74 percent had English language services indicated in service delivery data;
- 19 percent were noted as having completed an ESL program in this or a prior year,
- and 51 percent attended an ESL program on a regular basis.

**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 nine training opportunities. All project areas were represented at each opportunity unless otherwise noted.

Table 2: 2017-18 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>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>Migrant 101</td>
<td>5 hours</td>
<td>All staff, project areas 2-9 attended</td>
<td>Orientation for new employees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma Project Taskforce</td>
<td>4.5 hours in person, 1.5 hours virtually</td>
<td>Secondary Student Support Specialists, project areas 1 and 3-8 attended</td>
<td>Collaboration to revise the Diploma Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Delivery Plan for Project Managers</td>
<td>2 hours</td>
<td>Project Managers</td>
<td>Webinar to discuss/share the Service Delivery Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Delivery Plan for Staff</td>
<td>2 hours</td>
<td>All staff</td>
<td>Overview of the new Service Delivery Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent Coordinator and Pre-K Student Support Specialist Training</td>
<td>3 hours</td>
<td>Parent coordinators and pre-K staff</td>
<td>Training on dual language learners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out-of-School Youth Training</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>Out-of-school youth providers</td>
<td>Topics related to out-of-school youth and drop outs</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>New requirement of working with youth on the Goal Setting Workshop and Personal Learning Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-K Family Literacy Workshop</td>
<td>2 hours</td>
<td>Parents in Chester County, PA (Project Area 3)</td>
<td>Piloted parent literacy workshop created by PI consortium in Spanish.</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

From Oct. 1, 2017 through Sept. 30, 2018 PA-MEP data specialists and others were provided with various professional development 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 in March 2018 as well as extended report training for the data specialists during the conference, a two day training Oct. 5 and 6, 2017, another two day session on May 10 and 11, 2018, and again on Sept. 27 and 28, 2018.

Topics covered included an overview of changes to MIS2000 (especially changes to the student data collection), federal migrant data system updates, additional impacts on ESSA changes and discussion on child count reconciliation. A significant amount of time was spent on training data staff in using the new reporting environment. Review of the data manual and tips for using Google Docs as a collaboration tool were also provided. Sessions also always included in-depth question and answer sessions to address any issues the data specialists might have.

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.

Professional development was also offered to student support staff on the upgrades to the data instructions as well as information for recruiters at their scheduled trainings. The emphasis this year was on data quality as well as data security and safety. Technology staff also provided data orientation for a new PDE staff member in January 2018.

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) – and one statewide recruitment webinar for all recruiters and recruitment coordinators. 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.
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 2017-18.

Table 3: 2017-18 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 (3)</td>
<td>15 hours</td>
<td>PAC Officers and selected Parent Coordinators</td>
<td>ESSA, family engagement, Diploma Project, summer leadership programs, State PAC conference</td>
<td>21-36 per meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent Coordinator Professional Development (5)</td>
<td>46 hours</td>
<td>Parent Coordinators and other staff</td>
<td>Parent Café, working with culturally diverse students, math and STEM lessons, in-home and tutoring, strengthening families, interpreting, safety, identification and recruitment, family engagement, working with dual language learners</td>
<td>8-20 per session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant 101 Training (4)</td>
<td>6.5 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>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dual professional development training with parent coordinators and pre-K student support specialists</td>
<td>7.5 hours</td>
<td>Assigned Parent Coordinators, PA-MEP student support staff</td>
<td>Review the new Kindergarten Preparation Inventory process and tools</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.

**PROJECT AREA MONITORING**

Project area compliance monitoring reflects the project’s performance during the prior year. Every project area receives a full monitoring or a maintenance monitoring annually. Because the monitoring report covers a year that is different from the results contained within this report, monitoring results are not included in this report, as they may be misleading or confusing if considered in conjunction with a later year’s results.

Following the state team monitoring visit, each project area receives feedback and a report from the monitors on strengths, areas in need of improvement, and compliance for their programs. In the event that a project area is not in compliance, a state protocol exists to support the project area and bring the program into compliance.
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. The project area monthly report format was updated in fall 2017 with a new form being initiated for December 2017. Because of the change, only December 2017 through August 2018 are included in this report, as these months provided greater detail and accuracy than the prior report forms.

Project areas, collectively, reported more 1,366 hours of professional development with the largest volume of time in the identification and recruitment and early childhood/preschool categories. Project areas were instructed that they should not include in these submissions any state-provided training, as they were captured and reported by the state team.

![Figure 18. Project Area Professional Development by Topic Category](image)

Recruitment

In the project area monthly report, managers report the number of eligible children and youth recruited to the program. Evaluators compiled this information to examine recruitment trends by project area and month. However, because of the recent reorganization of the project areas and variance in how the project areas reported...
recruitment information throughout the year, it was not possible to obtain a single recruitment count per project area per month in all circumstances. As such, only a total recruitment count per month is shown here. The purpose of this graph is to illustrate the times of the year where project areas receives more or fewer students. Based on these monthly reports, higher recruitment could be seen, perhaps not surprisingly, during the summer months with a slight elevation in February 2018.

![Figure 19. 2017-18 Total New Recruitment Counts by Month](image)

Readers should note that students may move throughout the year, including across project area lines. As such, the monthly recruitment counts cannot be added together as an annual recruitment count, as students may be new recruits in more than one month if they are among the highly mobile population.

**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 606 partners during the course of the 2017-18 program year\(^\text{17}\) with counts by project area ranging from eight to 215. Partner types varied, though the largest numbers of partners were community organizations and schools or districts being most frequent, followed by businesses and higher education. Partners contributed in various ways, though services for students, parents, or families far outnumbered other supports, such as services for PA-MEP staff or professional development, facilities/space/funding, goods or materials, volunteers, or other services.

\(^{17}\) Some organizations were listed as partners in more than one project area; this is a unique count by name. This count may still include some duplication, as variations in names reported may not allow for some duplication to be identified and some partners reported were subdivisions or different locations of an umbrella organization.
Further detail about volume of partner participation was reported in the new project area monthly reports and was available for December 2017 through August 2018. Compilation of this data showed the greatest numbers of partners contributing in July 2018 (276 partners engaged) and May 2018 (223 partners engaged), with a range by month of 86 to 276 and average of 152 partners engaged per month.

**Parent Support and Training**

The new project area monthly reports starting in December 2017 included a new reporting section on activities and training for and relate to parents of migrant students.

Over the course of the nine-month reporting period, project areas reported 50 trainings or workshops for parents, with participation ranging from one to 106 parents,\textsuperscript{18} average 16 participants with content covering such topics as kindergarten preparation, safety and health, ESL, STEM/STEAM, nutrition, academic support, family literacy, culture, and others.

Project areas also reported 167 parent engagement or support activities reaching between one and 308 parents or families, average 25 per activity. Content included academic support, support making education and health-related appointments, postsecondary education information, translation support, family welcome packets, school registration support, other advocacy and support services, and referrals to academic, community, and health services.

Parent Advisory Council (PAC) meetings at the regional and local levels were also reported here, with project areas reporting between one and three meetings per month in months where they held meetings. Attendance ranged from one to 150, with an average of 13 participants.

Finally, this reporting section included parent-related trainings and workshops for staff in addition to the trainings provided at the state level. Project areas reported 19 such events.

**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 or local 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.

\textsuperscript{18} Some project areas reported approximate counts for some events.
Of the 116 summer teachers reported, 74 percent held teaching certificates. 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 2018 six 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
- Critical thinking
- Daily learning objectives
- Flexible workspace
- Forward-thinking activities
- Inquiry/investigation
- Multiple grouping strategies
- Physical environment
- Positive reinforcement
- Program principles
- Program spirit
- Shared facilitation
- 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. Additionally, some visitor gave multiple ratings to one area because of differences by classroom or grouping. Instances where a site received both a exceptional and evident rating were rated as “evident +” and instances where a site received both an evident and not evident rating, the site was considered “not evident +.”

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.

Summer Site Visit Checklists showed a mix of ratings. One program had all items rated exceptional, evident +, or evident. Percentages of these three ratings for the other five programs ranged from 36 to 95 percent. Counts of not evident items ranged from one to 14.

Looking at the indicators by their ratings, those receiving the most exceptional ratings were positive reinforcement, flexible workspace, forward-thinking activities, and thematic learning, where three or four of the six programs had exceptional ratings. Items having the most not evident ratings were program spirit and shared facilitation, where three sites had not evident ratings.

In summer 2018, 1,362 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 2017-18 year. Of these 1,362 students, 795 (58 percent) had a Priority for Service designation. Furthermore, 86 percent were identified as not fluent in English.
Programs operated from 14 to 21 days. Attendance rate varied among participants reflecting the reality of the migrant population. Overall, the average attendance rate by student was 59 percent (mean) and 67 percent (median). However, the most frequent attendance rate (mode) was 100 percent with 154 students attending all of the summer sessions offered by their site or program.

These findings show that the majority of students were nonfluent and more than half had a Priority for Service designation, which indicates that PA-MEP reached students with key needs through its summer program. In doing this match of summer participants to the following school year term students, 1,270 (93 percent) of the summer participants remained in Pennsylvania for at least one day during the 2018-19 year as of early March 2019.

**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 116 individuals completed a staff survey at the conclusion of the summer program, reflecting responses from nine of 13 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 (49 percent) were classroom teachers during the summer, with the rest being made up of instructional or student aides (20 percent of respondents), student aides (7 percent), or other staff (24 percent). Nearly 40 percent (39 percent) indicated they held teaching certificates in Pennsylvania or elsewhere. However, of the 57 staff who selected “classroom teacher” as their role, 67 percent held teaching certificates. 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.

Eighteen 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 (80 percent) and/or academic support (74 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, which were the most frequently selected items in the previous year as well. “Other” responses that were not covered in the provided list included back-to school backpacks and supplies, more one-to-one time with new students, more field trips, and more ESL instruction and/or instruction to meet the English language skills of the students in the program.
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, though a notable portion of respondents (19 percent) indicated that they somewhat disagreed that teachers had enough information about students at the beginning of the program. 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, and positive collaboration among staff. In addition to staff having advance information about students, statements indicating some concern were program organization and access to host facility resources.

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>115</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I felt welcome and comfortable in the host school/facility.</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I had appropriate access to host facility resources (i.e. restrooms, computers, air conditioning, etc.)</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The host site classrooms/facilities were appropriate and adequate for the students assigned to them.</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The summer program environment was positive and encouraging for students.</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The summer program environment was positive and encouraging for staff.</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration among summer program staff was positive.</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The level of communication from MEP summer program administrators was adequate.</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEP provided adequate training for summer program staff.</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers had sufficient information about students at the beginning of the program in order to plan instruction.</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The summer program was well-organized.</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer program activities provided both academic and enrichment opportunities for students.</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2%</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 (31 percent), which was the top answer the prior year as well, followed closely by support or technical assistance (28 percent of respondents) and recreation opportunities (27 percent). “Other” responses reflected many of the items included in the provided list as well as technology and internet access, a narrowing of the academic focus, and additional considerations or resources for students with special needs, the youngest students, and out-of-school youth.
One of the greatest assets of the PA-MEP summer program is the staff. When asked why they choose to work for the program, more than 70 percent indicated wanting to help the students. Student diversity, past positive experience(s) with the program and wanting to gain teaching or professional experience were also selected by many respondents (40-48 percent each), 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 418 students age 7 or older completed the survey with 87 percent of respondents being 14 years old or younger. Nine of the 13 summer program sites for school-age students were represented.

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

---

**19 Evaluators discouraged programs from surveying students younger than 7 years old for language and comprehension reasons.**
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When asked what they liked most about the program, more than half of respondent students selected field trips (53 percent), followed closely by math (44 percent), and art/music (43 percent). Students were asked to select up to three of their favorite program areas.

![Figure 23](image)

Students indicated the summer program components that helped them the most from a provided list. Making new friends topped the list (35 percent of respondents), followed by learning new vocabulary (15 percent) and practice speaking English (13 percent).
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 (60 percent) reporting that the program helped a lot, 21 percent indicated the program helped some, and 14 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.

Nearly all students (89 percent of respondents) indicated that they would attend the program again if given the opportunity to do so.

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. Themes of responses included more recreation or recess, better food; art; dance, more field trips; gym class; music, and swimming, among others, with food, recreation, and field trips being the predominant responses.

**Brain Stem Youth Empowerment Camp**

During summer 2018 PA-MEP offered a week-long middle school student leadership program called Brain Stem Youth Empowerment Camp.20 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 49 students attended the summer 2018 program. The summer middle school leadership development program is held annually at a Pennsylvania college campus. 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 information about student feedback from its web-based feedback collection system to the state PA-MEP staff, which state evaluators reviewed.

Interim and post-program measures and student comments indicated positive outcomes related to students’ personal confidence, appreciation of their qualities and background, engagement with and enjoyment of the program, and feelings of empowerment.

20 [https://www.coolspeak.net/portfolio-item/brain-stem/](https://www.coolspeak.net/portfolio-item/brain-stem/)
Camp Connect 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.21 Camp Connect is held annually at a Pennsylvania college campus. In summer 2018, 54 students participated.

A team of contracted 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, their expectation and feelings, and shared something they learned. A majority of participants responded to each survey. Overall, students shared that they were excited about the activities and Camp Connect. Also, many reported that Camp Connect was what they expected or more, though some reported that it was ‘somewhat’ what they expected each day.

Parent and Out of School Youth Comprehensive Survey 2018

During the summer and early fall of 2018, 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 Sept. 30, 2018. 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 and project area) 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.

21 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.
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 project 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 449 families and 69 out-of-school youth. A total of 437 family surveys and 71 youth surveys (total 508) were collected and used for analysis that could be matched to eligible families and youth, which resulted in a 97 percent response rate for parents/families and a 103 percent response rate for out-of-school youth. Eight out of nine project areas came within two surveys of their target count. 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 during the 2017-18 year. 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 437 family responses, 75 percent were completed by the mother, 19 percent were completed by the father, and 6 percent were completed by a guardian, adult family member in a parental role, or another adult in the household.

The 71 out-of-school youth responses were provided by the youth themselves.

As the stratified sampling process was applied within each area, respondent counts by project area followed the dispersion of families. For families, Project Area 5 had the highest count of surveys (107) followed by Project Area 4 (87). Project Area 7 had the smallest survey count (11), but this area also has the smallest student enrollment. For youth surveys, project areas 8 and 3 had the highest counts (16 and 14, respectively) while project areas 2 and 5 had the smallest (two each).

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. Every language from the sample list was represented in the collected data with 14 of the languages having a 100
percent or more response rate. Expected counts by language ranged from one to 311, average 22.

For out-of-school youth, 11 language categories (10 languages and ‘other’) were to be represented in the data, nine of which were included in the surveys collected. Seven of these had 100 percent or a greater response rate represented. Expected counts by language ranged from one to 48, average seven.

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 2016-17 results are provided. The same methods were used to determine and survey the sample group, with surveys very closely matching expected counts.

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>9</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burmese</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chin</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creole</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indigenous-Guatemalan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indigenous-Mexican</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesian</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khmer</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kinyarwanda</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mam</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nepali</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portuguese</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swahili</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukrainian</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnamese</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</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

---

22 Response rates over 100 percent occur when the count of survey respondents is greater than the target count in the sample.
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.

Most respondents (91 percent) indicated that they had been involved with the PA-MEP for three or fewer years with the rest indicating more than three years, they were not sure, or they did not answer. More than a third (38 percent) reported one year or less. This indicates that results may be notably reflective of a potentially more mobile and/or new-to-Pennsylvania population. Of all 508 respondents, 500 (98 percent) reported that they had received services from PA-MEP in the prior 12 months.

Most respondents (90 percent) indicated they were very satisfied with the services and programs they received from PA-MEP as shown in the following chart. Only three respondents indicated dissatisfaction. These results are nearly the same as the prior year.

The survey specifically asked about satisfaction related to English language support, to which respondents (total 499) indicated that they were very satisfied (82 percent), did not need English language support (9 percent), somewhat satisfied (7 percent), not sure (2 percent), or not satisfied (less than 1 percent). These percentages were similar across respondent types and project areas.

---

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.

24 The survey included a very unsatisfied option, but no one selected it.
In a related question about satisfaction with PA-MEP’s addressing of individual needs, 92 percent of 485 respondents shared that they were very satisfied, while 7 percent were somewhat satisfied, and 1 percent were not satisfied. Youth were slightly more likely to indicate lower degrees of satisfaction than families. Results by project area were similar to the overall.

Also related, 498 respondents shared if anyone in their household had received education-related translation services. Of these respondents, 60 percent had received translation support from PA-MEP, their child's school, or another source; 19 percent did not need translation support; 6 percent needed, but did not get any translation support; and 14 percent were not sure.

Respondents were mostly likely to communicate with PA-MEP a few times per month (40 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 5 and 6 showing the greatest frequency of communication.
Few respondents had declined PA-MEP services in the past year (25 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, 24 percent had declined services, with work schedule also being the main reason for doing so.

Of 508 respondents, 424 (83 percent) indicated one or more areas of need or interest, with the greatest interest in English language support (39 percent), reading/writing support (34 percent), and math support (31 percent), which were the top three selected items for family respondents as well. For youth, assistance with continuation of education was the top
response (55 percent), followed by English language support (42 percent) and career awareness (11 percent). In the following tables, the top three most-selected options are shown in bold text. Other responses were mostly specific and individual needs, such as art or music classes, parent/adult ESL, more time in the program, transportation, translation, GED assistance, and other unique needs.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service need</th>
<th>All respondents (424)</th>
<th>Families (362)</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>16%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistance with early childhood and preschool programs</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>2%</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>39%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistance with financial aid/college assistance programs</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistance with homework</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistance with math</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistance with reading and writing</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistance with SAT programs</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistance with afterschool programs</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistance with school records and transcripts</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awareness of high school graduation requirements</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career awareness</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College tours and college readiness</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More in-home tutoring programs</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent Advisory Councils</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STEM-Science Technology Engineering and Math</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>5%</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 (46)</th>
<th>PA 2 (28)</th>
<th>PA 3 (37)</th>
<th>PA 4 (90)</th>
<th>PA 5 (83)</th>
<th>PA 6 (46)</th>
<th>PA 7 (16)</th>
<th>PA 8 (51)</th>
<th>PA 9 (27)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assistance with the continuation of education for out-of-school youth</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistance with early childhood and preschool programs</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistance with English language development</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistance with financial aid/college assistance programs</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistance with homework</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistance with math</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistance with reading and writing</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistance with SAT programs</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistance with afterschool programs</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistance with school records and transcripts</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awareness of high school graduation requirements</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career awareness</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College tours and college readiness</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More in-home tutoring programs</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent Advisory Councils</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STEM-Science Technology Engineering and Math</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>11%</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 (193 respondents) the survey included questions about high school graduation and post-secondary options. Of these respondents, 30 percent had a child in grade 8, 26 percent had a child in grade 9, 28 percent had a child in grade 10, 23 percent had a child in grade 11, and 18 percent had a child in grade 12 for the coming (2018-19) school year. The following summaries include all respondents indicating they had one or more children in the target grade span.

Of 132 respondents, 48 percent indicated that they were aware that high schools had minimum credit and course requirements for graduation; 24 percent indicated they did not know and 28 percent were not sure. These percentages differed considerably by project area; however, this is likely a result of the small numbers of respondents in each of the areas.

However, when asked how many credits and/or courses their child(ren) needed to graduate from their current school, 36 respondents provided a response and these responses ranged considerably, 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 do not consider this information important. Of 192 respondents, 94 percent reported that they thought it was very important to know this information; only two reported they thought it was somewhat important and nine shared that they were not sure. Further, most acknowledged receiving graduation requirement information from PA-MEP staff, their child’s school, and/or other sources (66 percent of 188 responding); 18 percent reported that they had not received any such information and 16 percent were not sure.

Project area results showed differing percentages within each group; however, four of the nine areas had percentages exceeding the state percentage for families reporting receipt of this information. While these differences may be a result of small numbers of respondents in each area, they are still useful for exploring the extent to which areas are distributing this information, connecting families to other sources of information; or making families aware of the information they have received previously. Of those reporting having received information, that information most likely came from the PA-MEP, as respondent indicating receipt from PA-MEP was greater than or equal to counts from other sources in seven of the nine areas.

It may, however, be a factor of the family’s high school experience, as 43 percent of respondents indicated that no one in their household had completed high school. Similarly, 69 percent indicated that no one in their household had attended college.

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, 19 percent (of 191 respondents) indicated that they had not received any such information and 18 percent were not sure. Of these 191 respondents answering the question, 63 percent reported that they received information with the greatest number indicating receiving it 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, most responded that they were not sure; only 39 respondents correctly selected the SAT or ACT.

Despite this self-assessed lack of knowledge, responses indicated that parents surveyed valued education and educational achievement: 98 percent of 190 respondents indicated it was very important to them that their child graduate from high school (an increase over the prior year’s 95 percent) the same percentage as the prior year) and 95 percent (of 191) 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 93 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 41 percent, 55 percent, and 20 percent selecting these options (of 193 respondents), respectively. Lesser-selected options included technical school (17 percent), job training (16 percent), and the armed forces/military (10 percent). Eighteen percent indicated that they were unsure, had a different plan, or they did not respond. In a related question about how familiar they were with the requirements for the post-high school options they were considering, 37 percent reported that they were somewhat familiar (they know some things but still need more information), 25 percent reported that they were not sure, 24 indicated they were unfamiliar (they have considered the options but do not know much about specific requirements), and 14 percent indicated they were very familiar. Three respondents did not answer the question.

When asked what they would like more information about, 60 percent wanted to know more about four-year college; 49 percent wanted to know more about community college or two-year college; 43 percent wanted to know more about high school graduation requirements; 24 percent wanted to know more about technical school; 23 percent wanted to know more about job training; 23 percent wanted to know more about applying for a job; and 14 percent wanted to know more about the armed forces/military. Ten percent responded they did not want any information or they were not sure.

As outlined later in this report, the PA-MEP implements its Diploma Project to support families and students toward graduation and postsecondary education. Also, the CAMP (College Assistance Migrant Program) is offered to support students’ postsecondary option awareness. Of the 186 respondents answering, 49 percent indicated that they did not participate in any information sessions about the Diploma Project or CAMP, they were not familiar with these programs, or they were not sure. Of those that indicated awareness or participating in an information session, 42 percent indicated the Diploma Project and 19 percent indicated CAMP.
In order to determine the extent to which surveyed families and youth actually participated in the Diploma Project, the survey ID was matched to Diploma Project participation data for 2017-18 and prior years. The Diploma Project covers student goal setting (self-assessment and self-advocacy); high school credits and courses; assessments; English language proficiency; and preparing for and funding postsecondary education.

Of the 193 respondents who indicated that they had one or more children in grades 8-12, 79 (41 percent) reported that they participated to some extent in the Diploma Project. However, in comparing the survey IDs to Diploma Project data, 87 families (45 percent) participated in the Diploma Project in either 2017-18 (83) or a prior year (four).

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; 213 respondents answered questions in the wellness section of the survey (171 parents, 42 youth).

Survey results revealed that 34 percent respondents use a primary care or family doctor as their primary source of care, followed by community clinics (30 percent). Six 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, respondent access levels, and also may be affected by small numbers of respondents by from each area.

---

25 The Diploma Project was changed in scope for 2017-18, so it is not entirely comparable to prior years.
Figure 31.

The survey asked respondents to indicate what, if any, challenges or frustrations they had experienced related to seeing a healthcare professional. Out of 207 respondents answering this question, only 58, or 28 percent, indicated that they had experienced some level of difficulty or frustration with seeing a doctor or dentist. The rest answered that they had not experienced any difficulty (64 percent) or they had not needed to see a health professional in the past year (8 percent). Youth were slightly more likely to report difficulty than families.

Looking at project area results, seven of the nine areas showed relatively small percentages reporting challenges. However, project areas 1 and 9 had more than half of their respondents report challenges or frustration with seeing medical or dental professionals.

Cost or lack of insurance and language topped the list of challenges with more than half of respondents selecting this obstacle (62 percent) and 50 percent indicated language barriers or communication challenges. These were top frustrations in prior surveys as well. Family results closely followed the overall results, while youth responses were more focused on cost or lack of insurance and no knowing how to find a provider. Other responses were focused on individual needs or unique challenges.

When asked what they wanted to know about local health and wellness services, 57 percent wanted general information, which was the top answer in the prior year as well. Approximately a quarter of respondents wanted to know about insurance acceptance and/or what to do if you do not have insurance. For families, the portion wanting general information was higher (62 percent) than youth (38 percent), while youth were more interested in what to do if they do not have insurance (36 percent) or if translation or someone who speaks their language is available (29 percent). These were similar results in the prior year as well.
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 2017-18 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 195 preschool students who were four years old or older as of September 1, 2017, which is 73 percent of four- or five-year-old students who were not yet enrolled in kindergarten.26 These students would be most likely eligible for kindergarten enrollment the following year. Slightly less than half of included students (44 percent) 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 (87 percent) had their last assessment at the end of the summer – the closest to kindergarten enrollment – 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) (99 percent of students were at the mastery level);
2. Identify and locate body parts (99 percent of students were at the mastery level);

26 Many students not having kindergarten readiness data can be explained by short/partial year enrollments.
3. Demonstrate coordination of body movements in active/gross motor play (run, jump, climb) (98 percent of students were at the mastery level);
4. Experiment with a variety of writing tools and surfaces (96 percent of students were at the mastery level); and
5. Speak in simple sentences (96 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) (59 percent of students were at the mastery level);
2. Connect story events with personal experiences (65 percent of students were at the mastery level);
3. Create an illustration and write about it (68 percent of students were at the mastery level); and
4. Describe pictures in books using detail (69 percent of students were at the mastery level).

Evaluators also examined improvement status for those students having two or more administrations (172 students). Of these students, 37 percent demonstrated sufficient skills to be in the mastery level at both their initial and last checklist administrations, 54 percent improved from their first to last assessment, 8 percent scored in the same non-mastery level at both assessments, and 1 percent declined.
Perhaps most important is a student’s performance on their last kindergarten readiness assessment, regardless of its timing. Of the 195 students, 80 percent demonstrated proficiency on at least 16 of the 22 identified skills. The smallest group (4 percent) was not yet ready for kindergarten.

Comparison of 2017-18 results to the prior year (2016-17) showed that the percentage of students scoring at the mastery level was one percentage point higher for 2017-18 than the prior year, the percentage in progress for 2017-18 was one point lower, and the percentage not yet ready was the same for both years.
A similar comparison was done for progress results 2017-18 and 2016-17, which showed a slightly lower percentage of students scoring at mastery on both administration in 2017-18 compared to 2016-17, but a slightly higher percentage of students improving. The percentages of students showing no change and declining were lower for 2017-18 than for the prior year.

In response to special reporting obligations from Pennsylvania’s participation in the Migrant Education Program Preschool Initiative and results reporting through META Associates, PA-MEP state evaluators also looked specifically at reading and math proficiency. The reading portion of the Kindergarten Readiness Checklist contained four indicators and math contained five indicators. Using a 75 percent demonstration of skills as a guide — in line with the overall instrument scoring — evaluators considered a student to be at a mastery level for an individual content area if they demonstrated three or four of the four reading skills and four or five of the five math skills.

Based on this analysis, 64 percent of students (125 of 195 assessed) successfully demonstrated three or four of the four reading skills in 2017-18, which is slightly lower than 2016-17, where 72 percent (129 of 179 students) successfully demonstrated three or four of the four reading skills.
Similar analysis was done for math, which had five indicators. For math, 68 percent of students (134 of 195 assessed) successfully demonstrated four or five of the five math skills in 2017-18, which is slightly lower than 2016-17, where 73 percent (131 of 179 students) successfully demonstrated four or five of the five math skills.

For the 2017-18 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 1,305 migrant students (406 Priority for Service students and 899 non-Priority for Service students), which is 68 percent of the 1,912 migrant students in grades 3-8 and 11 who were enrolled in PA-MEP during the 2017-18 school year (prior to June 2017).

Math assessment results include 1,564 migrant students (684 Priority for Service students and 880 non-Priority for Service students), which is 82 percent of the 1,912 migrant students in grades 3-8 and 11 who were enrolled in PA-MEP during the 2017-18 school year (prior to June 2017).

Science assessment results include 590 migrant students (241 Priority for Service students and 349 non-Priority for Service students), which is 78 percent of the 758 migrant students in grades 4, 8, and 11 who were enrolled in PA-MEP during the 2017-18 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, 40 percent for reading/literature, 71
percent for math/Algebra I, and 51 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 19 percent for science/biology, which are nearly the same as the prior year.

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 (47 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 – 11 percent of students – than their non-Priority for Service peers (22 percent of non-Priority for Service students scored proficient or advanced).

---

27 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.

28 Students taking the PASA do not take the PSSA.
Results by grade level show the largest portions of proficient or advanced students in grades 4 and 7 (20 and 23 percent, respectively).

English fluency also influences math results. Of fluent students, 25 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 (4 percent) is lower than their non-Priority for Service peers (13 percent). Again, fluency is more influential on results: 11 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 28 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 3 and 4 (14 and 12 percent, respectively), though grades 4 and 5 had the greatest numbers of advanced students.

Science results are similar; fluency appears to be the greatest influence. While 47 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: 13 percent of Priority
for Service students scored at proficient levels compared to non-Priority for Service students, where 23 percent scored at proficient levels.

Figure 43.

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 (31 percent).

Figure 44.

For the 2017-18 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 (62.7 percent). In math, 8.8 percent of migrant students scored in the proficient or advanced performance levels, while 44.8 percent of non-migrant students did so. In science, 18.6 percent of migrant students scored proficient or advanced compared to 64.1 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 approximately 45 percentage points, the gaps between migrant fluent students and non-migrant students are only 15 to 20 percentage points, further confirming the influence of language on assessment results.

In terms of percentage distribution, these results are very similar to the prior year.

Figure 45.
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>205</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>37.1</td>
<td>43.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All migrant students</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>38.8</td>
<td>41.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All migrant students</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>40.3</td>
<td>41.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All migrant students</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>33.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All migrant students</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>56.1</td>
<td>20.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All migrant students</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>44.0</td>
<td>42.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All migrant students</td>
<td>State Total</td>
<td>1,193</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>44.1</td>
<td>37.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant Priority for Service</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>35.4</td>
<td>52.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant Priority for Service</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>34.1</td>
<td>56.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant Priority for Service</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>34.3</td>
<td>55.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant Priority for Service</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>51.2</td>
<td>39.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant Priority for Service</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>53.3</td>
<td>28.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant Priority for Service</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>61.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant Priority for Service</td>
<td>State Total</td>
<td>416</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>40.1</td>
<td>48.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant non-Priority for Service</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>37.9</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant non-Priority for Service</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>41.6</td>
<td>32.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant non-Priority for Service</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>43.3</td>
<td>34.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant non-Priority for Service</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>49.2</td>
<td>30.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant non-Priority for Service</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>57.5</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant non-Priority for Service</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>50.5</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant non-Priority for Service</td>
<td>State Total</td>
<td>777</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>46.2</td>
<td>31.5</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>112</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>63.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant Priority for Service</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>60.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant non-Priority for Service</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>64.9</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>205</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>37.1</td>
<td>43.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant students</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>38.8</td>
<td>41.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant students</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>40.3</td>
<td>41.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant students</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>33.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant students</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>56.1</td>
<td>20.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant students</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>44.0</td>
<td>42.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant students</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>63.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant students</td>
<td>State Total</td>
<td>1,305</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>42.3</td>
<td>39.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-migrant students</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>124,223</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>44.3</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-migrant students</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>128,079</td>
<td>24.9</td>
<td>34.7</td>
<td>30.7</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-migrant students</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>128,541</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>45.3</td>
<td>31.9</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-migrant students</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>127,120</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>36.2</td>
<td>32.4</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-migrant students</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>126,048</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>44.1</td>
<td>35.9</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-migrant students</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>126,705</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>46.9</td>
<td>30.9</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-migrant students</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>123,096</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>62.4</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-migrant students</td>
<td>State Total</td>
<td>883,812</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>44.8</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>7.7</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>254</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>66.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All migrant students</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>71.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All migrant students</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All migrant students</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>71.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All migrant students</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>81.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All migrant students</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>80.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All migrant students State Total</td>
<td>1,439</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>72.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant Priority for Service 3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>81.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant Priority for Service 4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>83.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant Priority for Service 5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>80.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant Priority for Service 6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>79.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant Priority for Service 7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>86.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant Priority for Service 8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>88.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant Priority for Service State Total</td>
<td>658</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>83.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant non-Priority for Service 3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>54.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant non-Priority for Service 4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>60.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant non-Priority for Service 5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>55.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant non-Priority for Service 6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>64.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant non-Priority for Service 7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>78.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant non-Priority for Service 8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>73.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant non-Priority for Service State Total</td>
<td>781</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>63.8</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>125</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>44.0</td>
<td>51.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant Priority for Service 11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>32.7</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant non-Priority for Service 11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>52.9</td>
<td>44.3</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>254</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>66.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant students</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>71.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant students</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant students</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>71.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant students</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>81.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant students</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>80.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant students</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>44.0</td>
<td>51.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant students</td>
<td>State Total</td>
<td>1,564</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>70.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-migrant students</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>125,004</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>31.2</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-migrant students</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>128,961</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>30.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-migrant students</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>129,287</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>29.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-migrant students</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>127,712</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>30.7</td>
<td>30.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-migrant students</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>126,568</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>38.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-migrant students</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>127,085</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>41.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-migrant students</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>124,090</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>41.4</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-migrant students</td>
<td>State Total</td>
<td>888,707</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>29.3</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>261</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>24.9</td>
<td>42.5</td>
<td>26.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All migrant students</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>68.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All migrant students</td>
<td>State Total</td>
<td>465</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>34.2</td>
<td>44.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant Priority for Service</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>46.8</td>
<td>30.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant Priority for Service</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>77.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant Priority for Service</td>
<td>State Total</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>34.9</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant non-Priority for Service</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant non-Priority for Service</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>60.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant non-Priority for Service</td>
<td>State Total</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>33.6</td>
<td>39.7</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>125</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>74.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant Priority for Service</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>77.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant non-Priority for Service</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>72.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Prior year (2016-17) 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 2016-17 performance level and a 2017-18 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 604 students had 2016-17 and 2017-18 results for reading and 772 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 2 percent of students in reading and 1 percent 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, 30 percent of students improved and 11 percent improved in math. Students scoring in the same performance level both years, except advanced, were classified as no change; 57 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 2017-18 than they had in 2016-17: advanced to proficient, basic, or below basic; proficient to basic or below basic; or basic to below basic. In both reading and math, 11 percent of students declined from 2016-17 to 2017-18.
The ACCESS for ELLs\textsuperscript{29} 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 \textit{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\textsuperscript{30} 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.

\textsuperscript{29} 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.

ACCESS for ELLs data was available for all students enrolled in a Pennsylvania public school who took the assessment. For the 2017-18 program year, data was available for 2,445 migrant students in kindergarten through grade 12 (1,207 Priority for Service, 1,238 non-Priority for Service), which is 84 percent of all K-12 PA-MEP nonfluent students enrolled during the school year (2,902) prior to June 2018. Students only have data if they were enrolled in public school in Pennsylvania at the time the assessment occurred.

Overall results indicate a majority of students (89 percent) scored in the lowest three performance levels. The largest group, at 37 percent, scored in the first level, Entering. The second and third levels, Emerging and Developing, were nearly the same at 27 and 26 percent, respectively. The top three performance categories made up the remaining 11 percent of students.

Priority for Service status influences results, as 93 percent of Priority for Service students scored in the bottom three levels compared to 85 percent of non-Priority for Service students, especially in level 1, where 51 percent of Priority for Service students scored, compared to only 23 percent of non-Priority for Service students. By grade level, kindergarten had the highest percentage (84 percent) of students scoring in the lowest performance level. Grades 4 and 5 had the highest percentages of students scoring in the top two (most-proficient) performance levels.

Slightly more than half (58 percent) of these nonfluent students with 2017-18 ACCESS for ELLs data also had 2016-17 ACCESS for ELLs data for comparison. Based on a comparison of each student’s composite scale score as directed by the ACCESS for ELLs Interpretive Guide, 73 percent of students with two consecutive years of data improved, 8 percent maintained the same level, and 19 percent declined. There is no ‘did not need to improve’ category here because once a student reaches the highest level, they are typically
Students in kindergarten with two consecutive years of data most likely repeated the grade. Students are not tested using ACCESS for ELLs at the pre-K level.
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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 150 students were enrolled in grade 12 during the 2017-18 school year and had graduation information available. Of these students, 86 percent graduated (129), which is slightly lower than the prior year, where 89 percent graduated. However, one student who dropped out received their GED before the end of the program year.

![Figure 49. Grade 12 Students' Graduation Status for School Year 2017-18](image)

Of the 129 grade 12 students graduating, 29 percent had a Priority for Service designation. Of the 21 students who did not graduate, 43 percent were Priority for Service.

In addition to grade 12 students graduating, analysis revealed that three students who were enrolled in grade 11 (2) or grade 10 (1) successfully graduated in 2017-18 by earning additional credits and meeting requirements. Also, an out-of-school youth successfully completed an accredited online high school program and was considered a graduate. This brings the total 2017-18 graduate count to 133 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, 2017-18 cohort graduation rate information was not yet available. For an approximation, 2016-17 graduation rate information was available and indicated that the migrant graduation rate was 67.82 percent, which was lower than the state’s graduation rate of 86.57 percent. Again, these are 2016-17 rates and caution should be used in comparing this information for 2017-18.

---

32 Nine students left Pennsylvania prior to the end of the school year. These students were excluded from analysis.

* One grade 12 student dropped out but then earned their GED in the 2017-18 year.
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. Eight out-of-school youth earned their GED credential during 2017-18, which is an increase over the prior year where six students earned their GED credential. Additionally, 17 youth were listed as pursuing their GED, which is one fewer than the prior year.

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 determined (1,285 students), 92 percent were promoted to the next grade or graduated. Of the students in grades 7-12 promoted or graduated (1,187), 520 (44 percent) had a Priority for Service designation. Of the students not promoted or graduated (98), 40 (41 percent) had a Priority for Service designation.

Overall, 96 percent of the 3,677 K-12 students whose status was known graduated or were promoted.

**Dropout Prevention**

According to PDE’s website, a dropout is defined as “a student who, for any reason other than death, leaves school before graduation without transferring to another 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 2017-18 dropout rate by dividing the number of students who dropped out by the number of secondary students enrolled during this program year minus any 2017-18 program year enrollments that occurred after Aug. 25, 2018.

Students dropping out were determined by identifying students who dropped out during the course of the 2017-18 program year as well as by identifying students were enrolled in K-12 school during the prior year (2016-17) and not identified as dropping out but classified as an out-of-school youth in 2017-18, meaning that they were determined to have dropped out between the last PA-MEP interaction in 2016-17 and their initial enrollment for the 2017-18 program.

Of students enrolled in PA-MEP during the 2017-18 program year, 47 dropped out, which is more students dropping out than 2016-17 where 35 dropped out, but still fewer than 2015-16 when 49 students dropped out. However, other program data indicated that two of these students re-enrolled in school later in the 2017-18 program year, bringing the net count of students dropping out to 45.

---

33 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.


35 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 2017-18 grade level assigned and would not have been present for nearly all of the 2017-18 academic term.
Of the 45 students dropping out, 33 percent (15) had a Priority for Service designation.

Two students who dropped out were known to be pursuing a GED and three received their GEDs.

Students dropped out of grades 9-12, with grade 11 having the greatest number of students dropping out of school (16). Based on enrollment in grades 9-12 (961), the high school dropout rate for 2017-18 was 4.68 percent (45 of 961 students in grades 9-12), which is higher than 2016-17, when the rate was 3.22 percent.

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 2017-18 dropout rate was not yet available. For an approximation, the 2016-17 state dropout rate was 1.72 (slightly higher than 1.67 percent in 2015-16). Based on the expanded 7-12 enrollment and net dropout count of 45, PA-MEP’s comparative 2017-18 dropout rate is higher than the state rate at 3.02 percent (45 students dropping out of 1,489 students enrolled in grades 7-12).

Students dropping out were small percentages of students in these grades; grade 11 was the highest, where grade 11 students dropping out were 7.4 percent of the 2017-18 grade 11 population.

---

Analysis also examined the frequency with which students who dropped out re-enrolled in school. This revealed that between September 1, 2017 and August 30, 2018, 10 students who had previously dropped out re-enrolled in K-12 school, which is more students than 2016-17, where eight students who had dropped out re-enrolled in school.

---

36 Pennsylvania dropout data was collected from [https://www.education.pa.gov/Data-and-Statistics/Pages/Dropouts.aspx](https://www.education.pa.gov/Data-and-Statistics/Pages/Dropouts.aspx)
Postsecondary Plans

Each year, PA-MEP asks students nearing graduation what they plan to do after high school. Postsecondary plan data was available for 116 of the 133 2017-18 graduates. Seventy-six percent of graduates indicated that they planned to attend a two-year (36 percent) or four-year college (40 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 Pennsylvania’s 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 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 483 students in grades 8-12 (38 percent of 1,266 students in grades 8-12) had information for one or more of the Diploma Project categories.

A total of 471 students in grades 8-12 had data indicating that they participated in one or more of the five student Diploma Project units. For units 1-4, the largest percentages had completed the unit in either this or a prior year (52-75 percent), while most or all of the remaining students were classified as in progress. For the last unit, however, the instruction/in progress percentage (49 percent) was just slightly higher than the completed percentage (48 percent).

A total of 219 students in grades 8-12 had parent/family Diploma Project data for one or more units. For these students, units 2-5 had the highest completion percentages (51-83 percent), while unit 1, goal setting, had a lower completion percentage (48 percent) than the instruction/in progress group (52 percent).
Out-of-School Youth Assessment

As part of PA-MEP’s participation in the SOSOSY Consortium PA-MEP is annually asked to provide certain information about its efforts and outcomes in supporting the out-of-school youth population. 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 2017-18 program year was the fourth year this tool was used and was to cover students served May through August 2018. The initiative included a language screener and eight lesson categories, titled For Your Health, Finanza Toolbox, Vermont Mini-Lessons, Math for Living, Parenting, Legal Rights, Healthy House, and Mental Health each with several lessons and accompanying tests.

A total of 106 youth had language screener results that could be analyzed for one or more of the six testing areas (skills): 5 percent had a score for one area, 5 percent had a score for two areas, 54 percent had a score for three areas, 17 percent had a score for four areas, 10 percent had a score for five areas, and 9 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 listening (48 percent) and reading (43 percent).

---

37 The SOSOSY Consortium is known by its acronym. SOSOSY stands for Strategies, Opportunities, and Services for Out-of-School Youth.
For the 10 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 10 youth having a combined result, eight youth (80 percent) scored above 75 percent on the language screener assessment, one scored in the 51-75 percent range, and one scored in the 0-25 percent range.

Youth may have participated in any combination or number of lessons, depending on what was relevant for that youth; 72 youth had pre/post data for one to six 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 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 and counts of 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. No students completed parenting lessons. Overall, for most lesson categories, students who completed the pre/post lessons achieved a 20 percent or greater gain and lessons attempted typically showed a 20 percent gain.
Additionally, 2017-18 was the first year that information was collected on youth setting and achievement of goals. Of 240 youth reported, 49 (20 percent) participated in a goal setting workshop, 51 (21 percent) developed a personal learning plan with a goal, and 21 youth (9 percent) participated in activities related to post-secondary awareness, career awareness, or other related activities. Twelve youth (5 percent) were identified as participating in all three. Of the 49 youth reported as participating in a goal setting workshop, 24 (49 percent) were reported as achieving a score of 8 on the goal setting workshop rubric, which is the benchmark established for the project.

All 51 of the youth who were reported as developing a personal learning plan and goal had a number of goal steps reported, which ranged from one to six steps (average 2.7 steps). Fifty students (98 percent) accomplished one or more steps of their goal; 42 students accomplished 50 percent or more of their goal’s steps; and nine students completed all steps of their goal.
Prior Year Summer Program (2017) 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 2017 programs (part of the 2016-17 program year) who had 2017-18 state assessment data available through the PA-MEP.

A total of 1,389 students in preschool through grade 12 (their 2016-17 grade level) participated in summer 2017 programs, of which 571 were in grades 3-8 (grades where two years of comparable state assessment data were possible) and 340 having both 2016-17 and 2017-18 reading and/or math state assessment data.

For reading, 238 summer 2017 participants had both 2017 and 2018 data. A comparison of their 2017 and 2018 performance levels showed that 1 percent scored in the advanced performance level on both assessments, 32 percent improved, 56 percent scored in the same performance level on both assessments, and 11 percent declined.

For math, 332 summer 2017 participants had both 2017 and 2018 data. A comparison of their 2017 and 2018 performance levels showed that 1 percent scored in the advanced performance level on both assessments, 12 percent improved, 76 percent scored in the same performance level on both assessments, and 11 percent declined.

Evaluators further compared summer participants’ results to the results of students who did not participate in PA-MEP summer programs and had two years of state assessment data. In doing so, non-participants had an improvement percentage of 29 percent for reading (3 percentage points lower than summer participants) and 12 percent for math (2 percentage points lower than summer participants), indicating that summer programs may contribute to improved state assessment outcomes.
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 2016-17 Recommendations

The following recommendations appeared in the 2016-17 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. While 2016-17 showed an improved (decreased) dropout rate over 2015-16, 2017-18 year showed a decline from 3.22 percent of grades 9-12 in 2016-17 to 4.68 percent for 2017-18. PA-MEP should continue its emphasis or strategies focused on dropout prevention.

3. Based on evaluation guidance and focus areas provided by the USDE’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.
4. **PA-MEP staff should (continue to) increase efforts intended to engage out-of-school youth in high school equivalency programs and provide services to these individuals to support their completion of such programs.** Eight out-of-school youth earned their GED credential during 2017-18. This is an increase over 2016-17 where six students earned this credential. PA-MEP should continue efforts focused on engaging youth in such programs and supporting them towards completion.

5. **Based on a review of findings from 2017-18 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 2017-18 and past years show consistently that these areas are continuing or increasing areas of need.

6. **Project areas should identify strategies to engage more families and students in the target grades in the Diploma Project.** While data recorded for the Diploma Project for 2017-18 shows that PA-MEP met or exceeded five out of six targets related to this initiative, three areas showed a declining percentage and two areas had the same percentage as the prior year. Project areas should increase attention on the Diploma Project.

7. **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.

8. **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.

9. **PA-MEP project areas should consider strategies for disseminating general information about local health/wellness services and as possible, information about language and insurance.** 2017-18 survey results indicate that parents and youth continue to be interested in this information.

10. **Project areas should continue to reinforce preschool enrollment efforts to ensure that eligible children are connected to preschool programs.** The percentage of preschool-age children enrolled in preschool programs increased from 2016-17 to 2017-18 from 55 percent to 59 percent.

11. **Project areas should continue to connect eligible children to relevant programs based on student needs.** 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, but increased slightly to 80 percent for 2017-18.

12. **Project areas should continue to monitor program enrollment and participation and encourage participation where appropriate.** 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, but increased to 83 percent for 2017-18.

13. **Project areas should continue to 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.** The percentage of students in grade 11 having already successfully completed Algebra I or a higher level math class had declined from 2015-16 to 2016-17; however, this indicator increased from 58 percent in 2016-17 to 66 percent in 2017-18.

14. **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. Four of the six summer program sites visited had one or more not evident ratings.
RECOMMENDATIONS BASED ON 2017-18 FINDINGS

The following recommendations are based on new or updated findings from the 2017-18 state evaluation. While some may be similar to prior year recommendations, specific focus or details make these recommendations unique.

1. **Project areas should examine possible reasons for slight declines in overall service delivery and – if needed – implement strategies to (continue to) ensure that students receive services they need.** A possible explanation for the slight decline in overall service delivery percentages is a decline in staff. The state office shared informally that most of the areas lost staff in 2017-18. In some cases, those staff were not replaced and in others, staff were replaced by part-time staff.

2. **PA-MEP should consider options to increase focus and effort on those indicators and groups in greatest need (i.e. nonfluent and Priority for Service students and students identified as at risk of dropping out) in order to support them toward improved outcomes.** While this may mean that overall service delivery percentages may decrease temporarily, the improved results for the students with the greatest needs would elevate the program, may increase efficiency, and make it easier for the program to serve students effectively. Currently, the program is attempting to serve all eligible students and all their needs. However, with a smaller staff it will become more important to approach the needs of students more strategically and efficiently in order to maintain or improve performance. Also, a more focused approach is more sustainable and may lead to less staff turnover.

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.