

**Virginia Department of Education
Migrant Education Program**

**Evaluation Report
2010-2011**



Prepared by:
META Associates
518 Old Santa Fe Trail, Suite #1-208
Santa Fe, NM 87505
duron1@aol.com

December 2011

List of Acronyms Used In the Report

AYP	Adequate Yearly Progress
CNA	Comprehensive Needs Assessment
CSPR	Consolidated State Performance Report
EL	English Learner (also ELL for English Language Learner)
ELP	English Language Proficiency
ESEA	Elementary and Secondary Education Act
ESL	English as a Second Language
GED	General Education Diploma
H.S.	High School
ID&R	Identification and Recruitment
LA	Language Arts
LEARN-2-Succeed	Literacy Education And Reading Network-2-Succeed (also L2S)
LEP	Limited English Proficient (also Limited in English Proficiency)
MEP	Migrant Education Program
MLN	Migrant Literacy Net
MPO	Measureable Program Outcome
MSIX	Migrant Student Information Exchange
NCLB	No Child Left Behind Act
PAC	Parent Advisory Council
PD	Professional Development
PFS	Priority for Services
PTA	Parent Teacher Association
OME	Office of Migrant Education
OSY	Out-of-School Youth
SDP	Service Delivery Plan
SOL	Standards of Learning
VA	Virginia
VDOE	Virginia Department of Education
VESA	Virginia ESL Supervisors Association
WIDA	World-Class Instructional Design and Assessment

Table of Contents

	Page
Introduction	1
Evaluation Methodology	3
Evaluation Context	6
Program Description.....	6
Suballocation Procedures	7
Program Implementation and Support Services	10
Student Services - Instruction	10
Student Services - Support	12
Parent Involvement	13
Professional Development and Interstate/Intrastate Coordination	15
Results	18
Reading and Language Arts Results.....	18
Mathematics Results	21
High School Graduation Results	24
Recommendations	27
Results of Services.....	27
Implementation of Services	28
Stakeholder Recommendations	29

Appendix A: Survey Forms

Appendix B: Migrant Education Programs in Virginia

List of Tables

Table 1	Measurable Program Outcomes, Sources of Data, and Evaluation Timeline.....	4
Table 2	Number of Eligible Students by Grade Level and School Year	7
Table 3	Virginia Subgranting Formula	8
Table 4	Number of Priority for Services and Limited English Proficient Students by Grade Level	9
Table 5	Students Served in the Regular and Summer Terms	9
Table 6	Staff Observations of Instructional Services	11
Table 7	Staff Ratings of Support Services.....	13
Table 8	Parent Involvement Activities and Meetings	14
Table 9	Parent Ratings of MEP Activities for Parents	14
Table 10	Staff Ratings of Parent Involvement Activities	15
Table 11	Professional Development and Intra- and Interstate Coordination Activities.....	17
Table 12	Baseline Percent of Students Attaining Proficient in Reading/Language Arts on the SOL.....	19
Table 13	Parents Reporting Increased Ability to Support their Children in Reading/LA.....	19
Table 14	Distribution of Parent Ratings of Ability to Support their Children in Reading/LA	20
Table 15	Instructional Staff Reporting that Professional Development Improves Delivery of Reading/Literacy Instruction	20
Table 16	Distribution of Staff Ratings of Professional Development in Reading/Literacy.....	20
Table 17	Mean Scores and Gains on L2S Pre-/Post-Tutorial Assessments	21
Table 18	Baseline Percent of Students Attaining Proficiency in Mathematics on the SOL.....	22
Table 19	Parents Reporting Increased Ability to Support their Children with Mathematics.....	23
Table 20	Distribution of Parent Ratings of Ability to Support their Children with Mathematics..	23
Table 21	Instructional Staff Reporting that Professional Development Supports Mathematics Instruction	23
Table 22	Distribution of Staff Ratings of Professional Development in Mathematics	24
Table 23	Parents Reporting Increased Ability to Support Youths' Graduation Goals.....	25
Table 24	Distribution of Parent Ratings of Ability to Support Youth with Graduation Goals.....	25
Table 25	Instructional Staff Reporting that Professional Development Improved Use of Dropout Prevention Strategies	25
Table 26	Distribution of Staff Ratings of Professional Development in Dropout Prevention Strategies.....	26

Introduction

This report presents an evaluation of the Migrant Education Program (MEP) in Virginia for the 2010-2011 school year including the summer months. Administered by the Virginia Department of Education (VDOE), the MEP assists divisions in helping migrant learners meet state expectations for achievement that may be negatively impacted by students' frequent migration and interrupted schooling.

The Virginia MEP conducted a comprehensive needs assessment (CNA) to identify the educational needs of migrant students in the state. Based on the results of the CNA, the Virginia MEP designed a service delivery plan (SDP) outlining how the program would meet the identified needs. The evaluation of the extent to which goals were met is defined through 10 measureable program outcomes (MPOs) in three categories: reading/language arts achievement, mathematics achievement, and high school graduation. In addition, implementation of program services was evaluated through staff and parent surveys, review of program and state records, and site visits.

A total of 954 children ages three through 21 were identified as migrant in 2010-2011, with 736 participating in instructional or support services during the regular school year and 675 in summer program services. Funds provided to migrant programs may not be sufficient to provide services to all students; therefore, the Virginia MEP identifies those students who have a priority for services (PFS) according to the federal definition. A total of 819 students (86 percent) in grades K-12 and out-of-school youth (OSY) were identified as having the highest priority.*

The division and regional MEPs implement a variety of instructional and support programs designed to meet the needs of migrant students. These include supplemental instructional services during the regular school year, summer school programs, secondary credit accrual opportunities, parent involvement activities and meetings, and professional development for staff designed to increase teachers' abilities to provide high-quality instruction.

The Virginia MEP **met all seven measureable program outcomes** for which progress was measured during the first year of implementation of the updated service delivery plan. For three additional measureable program outcomes, the baseline from which progress will be measured in subsequent years was set. Recommendations for improvement are provided in Section 6 of this report based on student achievement results, surveys, site observations, and interviews with state and local personnel.

*Note: At the time of the completion of this report, Virginia's 2010-2011 demographic data on migrant children and youth had not been finalized; therefore, the figures reported for those recruited and served are for the 2009-2010 school year.

The evaluation report contains the five sections listed below:

1. Evaluation Methodology, outlining the purpose and design of the evaluation;
2. Evaluation Context, describing the processes through which the VDOE developed service strategies and ensured that funds were allocated and used appropriately;
3. Program Implementation and Support Services, examining the extent to which services were implemented as planned and with which groups of students;
4. Results, analyzing the results of Virginia's assessments and other data addressing measureable program outcomes; and
5. Recommendations, providing suggestions for improvement strategies that will help the VDOE meet all of its measureable program outcomes.

Evaluation Methodology

Title I, Part C, of the *Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965* (ESEA) requires states to implement MEPs to provide assistance to the children of migratory workers and fishers through supplemental instruction and support services. These programs must comply with federal mandates as specified in Title I, Part C, of the ESEA, which provides MEP funds to meet the identified needs of migrant children and ensure that migrant students have the opportunity to meet the same challenging content standards and challenging student performance standards that all children are expected to meet. These migrant funds must supplement and not supplant other local and state funding.

States are required to evaluate the effectiveness of MEPs and to provide guidance to their local programs on how to conduct local evaluations. The U.S. Department of Education Office of Migrant Education (OME) Non-Regulatory Guidance, October 2003, indicates that evaluations allow state education agencies and local operating agencies to:

1. determine whether the program is effective and document its impact on migrant children and youth;
2. improve program planning by comparing the effectiveness of different types of interventions;
3. determine the degree to which projects are implemented as planned and identify problems that are encountered in program implementation; and
4. identify areas in which children may need different MEP services.

To achieve these results, OME requires that state educational agencies conduct an evaluation that examines program implementation and results. In evaluating program implementation, the state should answer questions such as:

- Was the project implemented as described in the approved project application?
If not, what changes were made?
- What worked in the implementation of the program?
- What problems did the program encounter?
- What improvements should be made?

In looking at program results, OME requires that a program's actual performance be compared to "measurable outcomes established by the MEP and state's performance targets, particularly for those students who have priority for service." (34 Code of Federal Regulations 200.84 and 200.85)

To investigate the effectiveness of its efforts to serve migrant children and improve those efforts based on comprehensive and objective results, the VDOE conducted a thorough evaluation of its statewide MEP. The measurable program outcomes set in the service delivery plan and aligned to the comprehensive needs assessment are listed in Table 1 along with the sources of data and the timeline for evaluation.

Table 1
Measurable Program Outcomes, Sources of Data, and Evaluation Timeline

Measurable Program Outcome	Data source	Timeline
1a By the end of the 2011-2012 school year and each year thereafter, the percentage of migrant students attaining “Proficient” or above in reading/LA on the SOL will increase.	2009-2010 CSPR	Baseline set 2010-2011
1b By the end of the 2011-2012 school year and each year thereafter, 40 percent of migrant parents who participated in parent activities will report an increased ability to support the reading/LA achievement of their child.	Parent Survey	2010-2011
1c By the end of the 2011-2012 school year and each year thereafter, 75 percent of staff who work with migrant students will report that participation in professional development in reading/LA has improved their delivery of reading/LA content instruction.	Staff Survey	2010-2011
1d By the end of the 2011-2012 school year and each year thereafter, 35 percent of migrant students participating in LEARN-2-Succeed (L2S) summer services will show one proficiency level gain between pre- and posttest on the L2S assessment.	LEARN-2-Succeed data	2010-2011
2a By the end of the 2011-2012 school year and each year thereafter, the percentage of migrant students attaining “Proficient” or above in mathematics on the SOL will increase.	2009-2010 CSPR	Baseline set 2010-2011
2b By the end of the 2011-2012 school year and each year thereafter, 40 percent of migrant parents who participated in parent activities will report an increased ability to support the mathematics achievement of their child.	Parent Survey	2010-2011
2c By the end of the 2011-2012 school year and each year thereafter, 75 percent of staff who work with migrant students will report that participation in professional development in mathematics has improved their delivery of mathematics content instruction.	Staff Survey	2010-2011
3a By the end of the 2011-2012 school year and each year thereafter, the federal graduation indicator rate for migrant students will increase.	2009-2010 CSPR	Baseline set 2010-2011
3b By the end of the 2011-2012 school year and each year thereafter, 25 percent of parents of migrant secondary students who participated in parent activities will report an increased ability to support the education and graduation goals of their child.	Parent Survey	2010-2011
3c By the end of the 2011-2012 school year and each year thereafter, 75 percent of staff who work with migrant secondary students will report that participation in professional development has improved their use of dropout prevention strategies.	Staff Survey	2010-2011

The goals of the evaluation are to:

- review services to ensure that they were implemented as intended;
- document the success of services;
- analyze information to identify the strengths of services and the areas needing improvement; and
- report the results of the evaluation to be disseminated by the VDOE staff to federal, state, and local policymakers and decision makers.

This evaluation report provides summary information on the accomplishments made toward meeting the measurable program outcomes outlined in Virginia's service delivery plan and addressed by local MEPs according to their local program applications. The *formative* phase of the evaluation examines the planning and implementation of services and the *summative* evaluation phase examines the demographics of the Virginia MEP; the dimensions of migrant student, parent, and staff participation; and student achievement, program accomplishments, and other outcomes attained through program implementation.

An external evaluation firm, META Associates, was contracted to help ensure objectivity in evaluating the Virginia MEP, to examine the effectiveness of services, and to make recommendations to help the Virginia MEP improve the quality of the services provided to its migrant students. To evaluate the services, the external evaluators and/or project staff were responsible for:

- conducting surveys with teachers and parents (See Appendix A);
- maintaining and reviewing interview records, logs, attendance sign-in sheets, meeting notes, and other anecdotal evaluation tools;
- reviewing student achievement data and other outcomes;
- observing the operation of the local MEPs and summarizing field notes about project implementation; and
- preparing an evaluation report to provide information about the extent to which program processes such as migrant student identification and recruitment, the comprehensive needs assessment, professional development, and the activities described in the Virginia service delivery plan were implemented as planned. Student outcomes and achievement related to content and performance standards also are included in the annual report.

Data analysis includes descriptive statistics using means and frequencies; trend analysis noting substantial trends in the data summarized according to notable themes; and analyses of representative self-reported anecdotes about successful program features and aspects of the program needing improvement.

Evaluation Context

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The VDOE implements the MEP, which provides services to migratory students in Virginia through seven local and regional programs. Local and regional sites that implement a program are listed in Appendix B.

The Virginia MEP reviews, monitors, and evaluates local and regional MEP plans, program applications, program implementation, and fiscal expenditures. Divisions with local and regional MEPs must sign assurances in the ESEA application for funding related to services provided to migrant students. Also, they must describe how they will coordinate with other federal programs to reduce duplication and fragmentation and increase collaboration between the programs.

Strategies for providing services to meet the needs of the population vary throughout the state depending upon the availability of other programs and services as well as upon the fiscal resources of the MEP. Supplemental services may include, but are not limited to: English as a second language (ESL) instruction; computer literacy instruction; family literacy; general education diploma (GED) preparation; and outreach/advocacy work to increase the quality of nutritional, health, and dental care. Based on the number of migratory students in a school division, programs are offered year-round and/or during the summer.

Table 2 displays the number of students found to be eligible within Virginia over the previous two years. The number of eligible students decreased in 2009-2010 from 2008-2009, which continues a trend from the past five years of an overall decrease in the number of migrant children in Virginia. Out-of-school youth comprised the largest group identified with 186 or 19 percent of the number of eligible children/youth. For students in school, numbers were the highest beginning in prekindergarten and generally decreased through early elementary school and high school. The number of eligible students in K-12 ranged from 83 kindergarteners to 22 twelfth graders.

Table 2
Number of Eligible Students by Grade Level and School Year
2008-2009 and 2009-2010

Grade	2008-2009 # Eligible	2009-2010	
		# Eligible	% of Total
Ages 3-5	116	108	11%
K	85	83	9%
1	90	73	8%
2	97	82	9%
3	65	71	7%
4	75	68	7%
5	63	56	6%
6	41	39	4%
7	46	33	3%
8	63	31	3%
9	32	47	5%
10	42	32	3%
11	27	23	2%
12	27	22	2%
OSY	302	186	19%
Total	1,171	954	100%

SUBALLOCATION PROCEDURES

As part of the requirements for Title I, Part C, every state must identify children who are at risk of failing to meet high state standards and have a disruption of schooling; likewise, every MEP in every state is required to maintain a list of eligible migrant students as well as a listing of the students actually receiving migrant services and which of those students served is considered a priority for services.

Ninety-nine percent of the USED allocation to Virginia is subgranted to school divisions and distributed based on the number of migrant students that meet the factors in Table 3.

**Table 3
Virginia Subgranting Formula**

Priority	Subgranting Factors	Percentage Reserved
1	<p>The number of eligible migratory children who have moved <u>most recently</u> (within 1 year) and who are classified as “priority for service.” Priority for services (PFS) children are defined as school-aged migrant students whose education has been interrupted during the regular school year <u>and</u> who are failing, or most at risk of failing to meet the state standards.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The at-risk cutoff on the Assessing Comprehension and Communication in English State by State (ACCESS) for English learners (ELs). • English Language Proficiency (ELP) Assessment should be ELP Level 2 (composite score of 2.0 – 2.9) or ELP Level 1 (composite score of 1.0 – 1.9). • The at-risk cutoff for reading/language arts and mathematics is below proficiency on the Virginia Standards of Learning assessment. <p><u>Note:</u> The count of priority for services children will also include migrant students who are behind in appropriate verified credit and credit accrual, over age for grade, or have been retained.</p>	40
2	<p>The number of eligible migratory children who are in need of or eligible for services and are <u>not included in Priority One</u>. This number includes the total number of migrant children who are counted in each category below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • eligible migratory children between the ages of three to 21 who did <u>not</u> make a move during the last 12 months but are failing in school or are most at risk of failing to meet the state standards [performance below grade level in reading, language arts, and mathematics; absenteeism; and non-age appropriate placement;] or are now out-of-school; • all elementary and secondary migrant students identified as continuation of service students; and • all eligible migratory students between (birth to age three). 	24
3	The number of children served during the prior school year.	20
4	The number of migrant students served during the prior year's summer/intersession program.	15
5	The school division's overall per-pupil expenditure is ten percent below the state average per pupil expenditure. [These funds will be allocated to each MEP based on the number of children counted in Priority Three (e.g., children served).]	1

Of the 954 eligible students (ages three through 21), 819 (86 percent) had priority for services in 2009-2010. The percent of priority for services students ranged from 73 percent of twelfth graders to 92 percent of OSY. Over three-quarters (79 percent) of eligible students were limited English proficient (LEP). For students in school, the percent of LEP students ranged from 88 percent of tenth graders to all fourth graders and varied little among grade levels. Out-of-school youth had the lowest rate of LEP (16 percent). However, they were less likely to be identified as LEP due to the small amount of assessment data for this group. The number and percent of students identified as priority for service and LEP are displayed in Table 4.

**Table 4
Number of Priority for Services and Limited English Proficient Students by Grade Level
2009-2010**

Grade	Eligible	# Priority for Services	% Priority for Services	# LEP	% LEP
Age 3-5	108	95	88%	90	83%
K	83	72	87%	82	99%
1	73	66	90%	72	99%
2	82	72	88%	79	96%
3	71	54	76%	69	97%
4	68	58	85%	68	100%
5	56	48	86%	54	96%
6	39	33	85%	36	92%
7	33	25	76%	31	94%
8	31	24	77%	29	94%
9	47	40	85%	43	91%
10	32	26	81%	28	88%
11	23	18	78%	21	91%
12	22	16	73%	21	95%
OSY	186	172	92%	29	16%
Total	954	819	86%	752	79%

The number of migrant children and youth served in the regular and summer terms was similar with 736 being served in the regular term and 675 receiving services in the summer. A total of 491 migrant children and youth with priority for services (67 percent) were served during the regular school term and 625 (93 percent) were served during the summer. The number of students served in each term and the number and percent of priority for services students served, by grade, are displayed in Table 5.

**Table 5
Students Served in the Regular and Summer Terms
2009-2010**

Grade	Served Regular Term	Priority for Services Served Regular Term		Served Summer	Priority for Services Served Summer	
		N	%		N	%
Ages 3-5	69	29	42%	81	80	99%
K	61	42	69%	50	48	96%
1	47	33	70%	60	58	97%
2	57	39	68%	56	54	96%
3	45	24	53%	63	59	94%
4	44	32	73%	52	47	90%
5	39	31	79%	38	32	84%
6	30	21	70%	33	29	88%
7	29	17	59%	28	26	93%
8	28	19	68%	20	18	90%
9	45	25	56%	28	25	89%
10	29	16	55%	28	24	86%
11	26	14	54%	23	19	83%
12	24	15	63%	17	10	59%
OSY	163	134	82%	98	96	98%
Total	736	491	67%	675	625	93%

Program Implementation and Support Services

This section provides a description of the instructional and support services provided by MEPs across Virginia as well as staff and parent perceptions of their effectiveness. The implementation of the services was examined for effectiveness through records reviews, interviews, surveys, and an examination of data available on numbers served and types of activities provided. Results of services provided as they pertain to the measureable program outcomes are provided in the section on Results. Recommendations for improvement based on this analysis are included in the section on Recommendations.

STUDENT SERVICES - INSTRUCTION

Student services include instructional services delivered by teachers and paraprofessionals in various settings such as in-class tutoring, afterschool programs, and summer school. High school graduation services include credit accrual, test preparation, English language development, and postsecondary preparation and planning.

On a survey of MEP Project Effectiveness, MEP staff were asked to rate their perception about the effectiveness of English language instruction, reading instruction, mathematics instruction, and services for out-of-school youth. All survey items received high ratings with average ratings ranging from 3.0 to 3.8 on the four-point survey scale. Of note is that more than three-quarters of respondents assigned a rating of “a lot” to the item asking the extent to which instructional services helped migrant students improve their English language skills and their reading/literacy skills. Table 6 displays the breakdown, by item, and average staff responses for the areas surveyed.

Table 6
Staff Observations of Instructional Services
2010-2011

Item	N	Not at All	Very little	Somewhat	A lot	Mean
In my opinion, instructional services helped migrant students improve their English language skills.	27	0 (0%)	1 (4%)	4 (15%)	22 (81%)	3.8
In my opinion, instructional services helped migrant students improve their reading/literacy skills.	27	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	6 (22%)	21 (78%)	3.8
In my opinion, instructional services helped migrant students improve their mathematics skills.	26	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	13 (50%)	13 (50%)	3.5
Services for migrant out-of-school youth were sufficient for helping them meet their educational and/or career goals.	22	1 (5%)	3 (14%)	14 (64%)	4 (18%)	3.0

Staff responded to an open-ended question on the Staff Survey of Project Effectiveness (Appendix A): *“How did students benefit from the services provided by the Virginia MEP?”* Staff responded positively to the item addressing improvements in academic skills as a result of programs and staff aligning services with student needs. They cited increased skills as having an impact on student confidence and success in the regular school term and the summer term as well also citing the long term benefits of support services allowing students and families to fully participate. Representative comments are listed below.

- The students and their families benefit from personal attention provided by instructors.
- Students were interacting with peers in an English-rich environment, and this is always helpful for those who spend the entire summer hearing a language other than English.
- The students were helped with subjects they didn't understand. Because of the program, the students were able to understand more about the academic subject they were struggling with.
- Students were able to attend summer school and receive additional instruction because of this program.
- Students are identified through the MEP, which allows them to receive appropriate educational services through this and other federal programs.
- Students received support in obtaining community services, navigating schools, and targeted tutoring.
- Students benefited from instructional and support services thanks to the tutors.
- Improved school performance and improved assessment scores were found. Increased connection to school was seen in both the parent and student.
- OSY benefited from support and encouragement to complete GED courses.
- Graduating seniors benefited from support in applying to colleges and scholarships.
- High school youth will be participating in summer leadership development programming.
- In the MEP, there is more interaction between parents and teachers/school personnel.
- Students received support in test preparation, homework, etc.
- There is support for parents in making connections with teachers/school personnel.

- School-aged students receiving one-on-one tutoring made good academic progress.
- Families benefitted from migrant education support services such as help in enrolling children for school, facilitating school physicals and eye glasses, referrals for Medicaid.
- The students I worked with benefited by receiving help with homework and test review, explaining school communications to parents, and focusing on literacy and mathematics skills.
- Students gained a lot of academic support which led to more progress in school—the migrant education program was very helpful for them.
- We found that individual assistance to struggling students, professional development at all schools on WIDA, and how to use results to impact instruction were all of benefit.

STUDENT SERVICES - SUPPORT

The Virginia MEP, in conjunction with local service agencies and community programs, provides services to families to facilitate the learning of migrant children and youth. Services include medical and dental screenings, nutrition, transportation, referrals, and other services that are directed at meeting students' identified needs.

Migrant education program staff responded to a question on the Staff Survey of Project Effectiveness (Appendix A), indicating the extent to which they believed supportive services were effective in helping students participate in their education. Over 90 percent of respondents indicated that the supportive and supplemental services contributed to participation by assigning a rating of “somewhat” or “a lot” to a support services survey item. Of note is that none of the respondents indicated that support services were not effective. The average rating on a four-point scale was 3.6. Table 7 displays the breakdown of how staff rated this survey item.

Table 7
Staff Ratings of Support Services
2010-2011

Item	N	Not at all	Very little	Somewhat	A lot	Mean
Support services (e.g., medical/dental, transportation, referrals) were effective in helping students participate in their education.	26	0 (0%)	2 (8%)	6 (23%)	18 (69%)	3.6

PARENT INVOLVEMENT

Migrant parents play a key role in planning the educational programs in which their children participate. Parent involvement in program planning enables them to understand the MEP, have informed conversations with MEP and school staff about their children’s education, and assist in improving the MEP.

The VDOE coordinates with agencies to broaden its resources for involving and supporting parents and families. The VDOE is available for assistance with parent and community support; adult education; family literacy; health education; and home study. In addition, Title I supports parent involvement by enlisting parents to help their children achieve in school. Migrant parents are consulted in an ongoing and timely way in the planning, review, and improvement of the MEP.

Parent involvement and training opportunities include local Parent Advisory Council (PAC) meetings for year-round project sites, local parent trainings and events, school volunteer opportunities, and migrant-specific parent meetings. State level Migrant PAC meetings are held annually and as needed. Migrant parents interested in attending a PAC meeting or viewing notes taken during a meeting are able to do so through contacting their local MEP or the state MEP office.

Local MEPs and the state provided a total of 40 parent involvement activities (some in conjunction with other school programs and service providers) for 463 migrant parent participants (duplicated count). The parent involvement activities and the number of participants for each MEP are displayed in Table 8.

**Table 8
Parent Involvement Activities and Meetings
2010-2011**

MEP	Types of Meetings	Number of Meetings	Number of Participants (duplicated count)
Accomack County	Back to School night, PAC meetings, literacy night, and summer program parent involvement	4	137
Albemarle County (Regional)	Parent-teacher conferences, participation in program design, and parent focus groups	4	80
Carroll County (Regional)	Family Night	1	1
Shenandoah Valley (Regional)	PAC meetings, participation in program design, and other activities	4	45
Northampton County	Solid Foundation Team Training, Parent Involvement Committee, and participation in program design	6	65
Nottoway County (Regional)	Open house, parent meetings, Parent Teacher Association (PTA) meetings, parent/teacher conferences, and participation in program design	14	73
Westmoreland County	Mathematics and Literacy Nights, English Learner Parent Night, College Fair, and participation in program design meetings	7	62
Total		40	463

On the Parent Survey, respondents were asked to indicate the extent to which they felt more involved in their children's education as a result of the migrant education program activities. Ninety-six percent (96 percent) of respondents assigned a rating of "some" or "very much" involvement in their child's education because of the MEP. The average rating was 3.6 on the four-point scale. Table 9 displays the distribution of ratings.

**Table 9
Parent Ratings of MEP Activities for Parents
2010-2011**

Item	N	Not at all	Very little	Some	Very much	Mean
Do you feel like you are more involved in your child's education because of the migrant program or school?	93	1 (1%)	3 (3%)	28 (30%)	61 (66%)	3.6

On the parent survey, parents listed the types of activities they attended. The most common activities listed were parent/teacher conferences, migrant program parent meetings, and parent advisory council meetings (including PTA). A list of activities attended follows.

- Parent/teacher conferences
- Migrant program parent meetings
- Events about how to help their children in school
- English Learner Open House
- English Learner Technology Night
- Latino Night with guest speakers
- PAC meetings
- Field trips
- School conferences and family programs with parent involvement
- Mathematics Night

On the staff survey, staff rated the extent to which activities for migrant parents facilitated involvement in the education of their children. Over 90 percent of the staff responding assigned a rating of “somewhat” or “a lot” to the item about involvement of parents. The average rating was 3.2 on the four-point scale. Table 10 displays the distribution of staff ratings for parent involvement activities.

Table 10
Staff Ratings of Parent Involvement Activities
2010-2011

Item	N	Not at all	Very little	Somewhat	A lot	Mean
Activities for migrant parents facilitated their involvement in the education of their children.	26	1 (4%)	1 (4%)	15 (58%)	9 (35%)	3.2

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT AND INTERSTATE/INTRASTATE COORDINATION

The Virginia MEP participated in a consortium incentive grant beginning in 2010: Literacy Education And ReadinG Network-2-Succeed (LEARN-2-Succeed). This consortium of 14 states is designed to address the reading needs of migrant students by creating online student tutorials that align with the Migrant Literacy NET (MLN) reading lessons; screening assessments; and an online electronic student portfolio to document student learning and progress. The MLN can be accessed by migrant educators across the country. All materials developed through this consortium are housed on the MLN Web site (www.migrantliteracynet.com). Virginia made the decision to participate during the 2009-2010 school year while the comprehensive needs assessment and service delivery plan were being updated because the goals of this consortium closely align with the needs and strategies identified by the state of Virginia.

In addition to interstate coordination through LEARN-2-Succeed, interstate/intrastate coordination occurs through professional development (e.g., migrant-specific trainings at identification and recruitment (ID&R) meetings, MEP coordinator meetings, data collection and records trainings, Migrant Student Information Exchange (MSIX) training, and CNA-SDP Update Committee meetings).

Professional development (PD) for instructional practices also was provided in strategies for English learners, effective evidence-based practices, and differentiated instruction. A total of 58 trainings and meetings were attended by 567 attendees (duplicated count). The Virginia MEP and its regional coordinating school divisions have professional development processes, strategies, and activities in place. Virginia promotes process standards and content standards aimed at staff development for promoting student achievement and student learning. The MEP and regional/local operating agencies offer professional development activities such as:

- Meetings for local MEP staff three to four times each year;
- Statewide and regional trainings and meetings for recruiters, as needed;
- Local and regional data collection training;
- Regional parent involvement activities; and
- National MEP conferences, ID&R forums, and MEP Consortium Incentive Grant meetings and workgroups.

The types of professional development, number of opportunities provided, and the number of participants are displayed in Table 11.

Table 11
Professional Development and Intra- and Interstate Coordination Activities
2010-2011

MEP	Types of Professional Development	Number of Meetings	Number of Participants (duplicated count)
Accomack County	MEP advisory board, coordinators' meeting, LEARN-2-Succeed, and National Aeronautics and Space Administration workshop	7	30
Albemarle County (Regional)	ESL Strategies, ID&R Training, OME Conference, coordinators' meeting, CNA-SDP Update Committee, and LEARN-2-Succeed	12	33
Carroll County (Regional)	MSIX Training, WIDA Institute, coordinators' meeting, ESL strategies, and Elementary PD	6	45
Shenandoah Valley (Regional)	MSIX Training, Reading Strategies for ESL students, VESA Conference, LEARN-2-Succeed, Vision to Practice Conference, coordinators' meeting, and CNA-SDP Update Committee	8	12
Northampton County	CNA-SDP Update Committee, LEARN-2-Succeed, ID&R Training, Asking Quality Questions training, and workshops on differentiated instruction, reading strategies, literacy interventions, and MSIX training	10	251
Nottoway County (Regional)	Coordinators' meeting, LEARN-2-Succeed, data collection and MSIX trainings	4	6
Westmoreland County	Coordinators' meeting, English learner Strategies, MSIX training, CNA-SDP Update Committee, and LEARN-2-Succeed	11	190
Total		58	567

On the Staff Survey of Project Effectiveness, staff responded to items about the quality of professional development and about the extent of their learning during the trainings. The results of these responses directly address the Virginia measurable program outcomes and are presented and discussed in the section on Results.

Results

This section provides a summary of migrant education program results as indicated by progress made toward meeting the Virginia MEP measureable program outcomes. Sources of data include student assessments, demographic data from the state MEP database, Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR), coordinator surveys, staff surveys, and parent surveys. The results are presented according to each of Virginia's three measurable program outcomes: reading and language arts achievement, mathematics achievement, and high school graduation.

READING AND LANGUAGE ARTS RESULTS

Measureable Program Outcome 1a: By the end of the 2011-2012 school year and each year thereafter, the percentage of migrant students attaining "Proficient" or above in reading/LA on the SOL will increase.

The Virginia Standards of Learning (SOL) describe the state's expectations for student learning and achievement in grades K-12 in reading/language arts (LA). Students in grades three through eight and high school are assessed for the purposes of determining Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP). The migrant program, through the service delivery plan, has determined that an increase in the percentage of migrant students attaining proficiency in reading/LA is an objective for the migrant program. The proficiency rates displayed in Table 12 represent the baseline proficiency rates for 2010-2011 from which progress will be measured beginning in the 2011-2012 school year.

Proficiency rates for migrant students on the SOL tests in reading/LA in 2009-2010 ranged from 75 percent of fourth graders proficient to 88 percent of high school students proficient. Overall, 80 percent, or 134 of the 168 students assessed, scored in the proficient range. (Note that the number of migrant students assessed is less than number of migrant students identified because many migrant families move during the school year to follow agricultural cycles resulting in migrant students not being present during the testing window.) In order to meet the measureable program outcome for the subsequent school year, the percentage of migrant students attaining the proficient level will need to increase from the baseline of 80 percent; therefore, the 2010-2011 school year data will need to show at least 81 percent of migrant students as being proficient in reading/LA on the SOL.

Table 12
Baseline Percent of Students Attaining Proficient in Reading/LA on the SOL
2010-2011

Grade	Number Assessed	# Proficient	% Proficient
3	34	28	82%
4	32	24	75%
5	25	19	76%
6	21	17	81%
7	21	16	76%
8	18	15	83%
HS	17	15	88%
Total	168	134	80%

Measureable Program Outcome 1b: By the end of the 2011-2012 school year and each year thereafter, 40 percent of migrant parents who participated in parent activities will report an increased ability to support the reading/LA achievement of their child.

Parents responded to the Parent Survey, which asked them to rate their agreement with statements about activities provided through the MEP. Parents rated the extent to which activities from the migrant program helped them learn new ways to help their child with reading on a four-point scale where 1 = Not at all; 2 = Very little; 3 = Some; and 4 = Very much. A total of 94 parents responded to the survey item.

Ninety-eight percent (98 percent) reported that the migrant program helped increase their ability to help their child with reading by at least a little (ratings 2 through 4), **meeting the measureable program outcome**. Two respondents indicated “not at all” to the statement. Of note is that 90 percent of respondents marked “some” or “very much” (ratings 3 and 4) to the statement. The mean rating was 3.5 on the four-point scale. The number of respondents and the number and percent reporting increased ability to support their children in reading are presented in Table 13. The distribution of parent ratings is presented in Table 14.

Table 13
Parents Reporting Increased Ability to Support their Children in Reading/LA
2010-2011

To what extent...	N	% Reporting Increased Ability	% Reporting No Increase	Measureable Program Outcome Met?
Did activities from the migrant program help you learn new ways to help your child with reading?	94	92 (98%)	2 (2%)	Yes

Table 14
Distribution of Parent Ratings of Ability to Support their Children in Reading/LA
2010-2011

To what extent...	N	Not at all	Very little	Some	Very much	Mean
Did activities from the migrant program help you learn new ways to help your child with reading?	94	2 (2%)	8 (9%)	28 (30%)	56 (60%)	3.5

Measurable Program Outcome 1c: By the end of the 2011-2012 school year and each year thereafter, 75 percent of staff who work with migrant students will report that participation in professional development in reading/LA has improved their delivery of reading/LA content instruction.

On the Staff Survey of Project Effectiveness, staff rated the extent to which professional development was effective in improving the delivery of instruction in reading and literacy. Ratings were provided on a four-point scale where 1 = Not at all; 2 = Very little; 3 = Somewhat; and 4 = A lot. A total of 22 staff responded to the survey item.

All staff responding assigned a rating of “somewhat” or “a lot”, **meeting the measurable program outcome**. No staff indicated “not at all” or “very little”. The mean rating on the four-point scale was 3.6. Table 15 displays the number and percent reporting improvement in reading/literacy instruction. Table 16 displays the distribution and mean of staff ratings.

Table 15
Instructional Staff Reporting that Professional Development
Improves Delivery of Reading/Literacy Instruction
2010-2011

The extent that...	N	Percent Reporting Support	Percent Reporting no Support	Measurable Program Outcome Met?
Professional development overall was effective in improving my delivery of instruction to migrant students in reading/literacy.	22	22 (100%)	0 (0%)	Yes

Table 16
Distribution of Staff Ratings of Professional Development in Reading/Literacy
2010-2011

The extent that...	N	Not at all	Very little	Somewhat	A lot	Mean
Professional development overall was effective in improving my delivery of instruction to migrant students in reading/ literacy.	22	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	9 (41%)	13 (59%)	3.6

Measureable Program Outcome 1d: By the end of the 2011-2012 school year and each year thereafter, 35 percent of migrant students participating in LEARN-2-Succeed (L2S) summer services will show one proficiency level gain between pre- and posttest on the L2S assessment.

The purpose of LEARN-2-Succeed is to help migrant students improve their reading proficiency so they are successful students and lifelong learners. LEARN-2-Succeed is designed to address the reading/literacy needs of migrant students by creating online student tutorials that align with the Migrant Literacy Net (MLN) reading lessons, screening assessments, and an online electronic student portfolio to document student learning and progress easily accessed by migrant educators across the country. Students are assessed prior to beginning tutorials and after completing at least three tutorials. Based on the results, they are assigned a score and proficiency level.

A total of 133 students were assessed, and 96 (72 percent) improved, **meeting the Measureable Program Outcome**. The mean gain of 25.7 percentage points was significant at the .001 level. Table 17 displays the mean scores and gains on the L2S pre- and post-tutorial assessments.

Table 17
Mean Scores and Gains on L2S Pre-/Post-Tutorial Assessments
2010-2011

Total Assessed	Mean Pretest Score	Mean Posttest Score	Mean Gain	Significance (p<.05)	# (%) Improving	Measureable Program Outcome met?
133	39.7	65.4	+25.7	<.001	96 (72%)	Yes

MATHEMATICS RESULTS

Measureable Program Outcome 2a: By the end of the 2011-2012 school year and each year thereafter, the percentage of migrant students attaining “Proficient” or above in mathematics on the SOL will increase.

The Virginia SOL describe the state’s expectations for student learning and achievement in grades K-12 in mathematics. Students in grades three through eight and high school are assessed for the purposes of determining AYP. Though the migrant student breakout does not count toward a school or division’s AYP status, the migrant program, through the Virginia MEP service delivery plan, has determined that an increase in the percentage of migrant students attaining the proficient level in mathematics is an objective for the migrant program. The proficiency rates displayed in Table 18 represent the baseline proficient rates for 2010-2011 from which progress will be measured in the 2011-2012 school year.

Proficiency rates for migrant students on the SOL tests in mathematics in 2009-2010 ranged from 60 percent of sixth graders proficient to 89 percent of high school students proficient. Overall, 78 percent, or 173 of the 222 assessed, were proficient. (Note that the number of migrant students assessed is less than the number of migrant students identified because many migrant families move during the school year to follow agricultural cycles and are not present in the state during the testing window.) In order to meet the measureable program outcome for the subsequent school year, the percentage of migrant students attaining proficiency will need to increase from 78 percent to at least 79 percent.

Table 18
Baseline Percent of Students Attaining Proficiency in Mathematics on the SOL
2010-2011

Grade	Number Assessed	# Proficient	% Proficient
3	37	31	84%
4	33	24	73%
5	29	20	69%
6	20	12	60%
7	17	13	76%
8	22	16	73%
HS	64	57	89%
Total	222	173	78%

Measureable Program Outcome 2b: By the end of the 2011-2012 school year and each year thereafter, 40 percent of migrant parents who participated in parent activities will report an increased ability to support the mathematics achievement of their child.

Parents responded to the Parent Survey, which asked them to rate their agreement with statements about activities provided through the MEP. Parents rated the extent to which activities from the migrant program helped them learn new ways to help their child with mathematics using a four-point scale where 1 = Not at all; 2 = Very little; 3 = Some; and 4 = Very much. A total of 88 parents responded to the survey item.

Ninety-nine percent (99 percent) reported that the migrant program helped increase their ability to help their child with mathematics by at least a little (ratings 2 through 4), **meeting the measureable program outcome**. One respondent indicated that he or she did not agree (rating of 1) with the statement. Of note is that 89 percent of the respondents indicated that they agreed to the statement “some” or “very much” (ratings 3 and 4). The mean rating was 3.4 on the four-point scale. The results of the survey as they apply to measureable program outcome 2b are displayed in Table 19. The distribution of parent ratings is presented in Table 20.

Table 19
Parents Reporting Increased Ability to Support their Children with Mathematics
2010-2011

To what extent...	N	% Reporting Increased Ability	% Reporting No Increase	Measureable Program Outcome Met?
Did activities from the migrant program help you learn new ways to help your child with mathematics?	88	87 (99%)	1 (1%)	Yes

Table 20
Distribution of Parent Ratings of Ability to Support their Children with Mathematics
2010-2011

To what extent...	N	Not at all	Very little	Some	Very much	Mean
Did activities from the migrant program help you learn new ways to help your child with mathematics?	88	1 (1%)	9 (10%)	33 (38%)	45 (51%)	3.4

Measureable Program Outcome 2c: By the end of the 2011-2012 school year and each year thereafter, 75 percent of staff who work with migrant students will report that participation in professional development in mathematics has improved their delivery of mathematics content instruction.

On the Staff Survey of Project Effectiveness, staff were asked to rate the extent to which professional development was effective in improving the delivery of instruction in mathematics. Ratings were provided on a four-point scale where 1 = Not at all; 2 = Very little; 3 = Somewhat; and 4 = A lot. A total of 21 staff responded to the survey item.

All staff responding indicated that professional development improved the delivery of instruction “very little,” “somewhat,” or “a lot” (ratings 2 through 4), **meeting the measureable program outcome**. No staff indicated that they did not agree with the statement. The mean rating on the four-point scale was 3.2. Table 21 displays the number and percent reporting improvement in instruction. Table 22 displays the distribution and average of staff ratings.

Table 21
Instructional Staff Reporting that Professional Development
Supports Mathematics Instruction
2010-2011

The extent that...	N	Percent Reporting Support	Percent Reporting no Support	Measureable Program Outcome Met?
Professional development overall was effective in improving my delivery of instruction to migrant students in mathematics.	21	21 (100%)	0 (0%)	Yes

Table 22
Distribution of Staff Ratings of Professional Development in Mathematics
2010-2011

The extent that...	N	Not at all	Very little	Somewhat	A lot	Mean
Professional development overall was effective in improving my delivery of instruction to migrant students in mathematics.	21	0 (0%)	5 (24%)	7 (33%)	9 (43%)	3.2

HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATION RESULTS

Measureable Program Outcome 3a: By the end of the 2011-2012 school year and each year thereafter, the federal graduation indicator rate for migrant students will increase.

The graduation rate for migrant students in Virginia that was reported on the 2009-2010 CSPR, Part I, was 55.8 percent. This rate reflects the 2008-2009 school year as graduation and dropout rates in the CSPR are available approximately a year following other achievement and outcome data. This rate is the baseline from which progress will be measured in subsequent years.

Measureable Program Outcome 3b: By the end of the 2011-2012 school year and each year thereafter, 25 percent of parents of migrant secondary students who participated in parent activities will report an increased ability to support the education and graduation goals of their child.

Parents responded to the Parent Survey, which asked them to rate their agreement with statements about activities provided through the MEP. Parents rated the extent to which the migrant program helped them learn new ways to help their child with graduation goals using a four-point scale where 1 = Not at all; 2 = Very little; 3 = Some; and 4 = Very much. A total of 35 parents indicated that they had students in high school and responded to the survey item.

Of the parents surveyed, 91 percent reported that the migrant program helped increase their ability to help their children with graduation goals by at least a little (ratings 2 through 4), **meeting the measureable program outcome**. Three respondents (9 percent) indicated that they agreed “Not at all” (rating 1) with the statement. Of note is that 83 percent of respondents assigned ratings of “some” or “Very much” (ratings 3 and 4). The average rating was 3.2 on the four-point scale. The results of the survey as they apply to measureable program outcome 3b are presented in Table 23. The distribution of parent ratings is presented in Table 24.

Table 23
Parents Reporting Increased Ability to Support Youths' Graduation Goals
2010-2011

To what extent...	N	% Reporting Increased Ability	% Reporting No Increase	Measureable Program Outcome Met?
If you have a high school student, did you learn new ways to help your child with school and graduation goals?	35	32 (91%)	3 (9%)	Yes

Table 24
Distribution of Parent Ratings of Ability to Support Youth with Graduation Goals
2010-2011

To what extent...	N	Not at all	Very little	Some	Very much	Mean
If you have a high school student, did you learn new ways to help your child with school and graduation goals?	35	3 (9%)	3 (9%)	12 (34%)	17 (49%)	3.2

Measureable Program Outcome 3c: By the end of the 2011-2012 school year and each year thereafter, 75 percent of staff who work with migrant secondary students will report that participation in professional development has improved their use of dropout prevention strategies.

On the Staff Survey of Project Effectiveness, staff rated the extent to which professional development was effective in improving the use of dropout prevention strategies with migrant secondary students. Ratings were provided on a four-point scale where 1 = Not at all; 2 = Very little; 3 = Somewhat; and 4 = A lot. A total of 19 staff responded to the survey item.

Of the staff surveyed, 95 percent responded that professional development improved the use of strategies "Very little," "Somewhat," or "A lot" (ratings 2 through 4), **meeting the measureable program outcome**. Over three-fourths (84 percent) assigned a rating of somewhat or a lot (ratings 3 and 4). One respondent indicated that he or she did not agree. The mean rating on the four-point scale was 3.1. Table 25 displays the number and percent reporting improvement in instruction as it applies to measureable program outcome 3c. Table 26 displays the distribution and average staff rating.

Table 25
Instructional Staff Reporting that Professional Development
Improved Use of Dropout Prevention Strategies
2010-2011

The extent that...	N	Percent Reporting Support	Percent Reporting no Support	Measureable Program Outcome Met?
Professional development improved my use of dropout prevention strategies with migrant secondary students.	19	18 (95%)	1 (5%)	Yes

Table 26
Distribution of Staff Ratings on Professional Development in
Dropout Prevention Strategies
2010-2011

The extent that...	N	Not at all	Very little	Somewhat	A lot	Mean
Professional development improved my use of dropout prevention strategies with migrant secondary students.	19	1 (5%)	2 (11%)	11 (58%)	5 (26%)	3.1

Recommendations

This section of the report provides recommendations for action based on the data collected for the evaluation of the Virginia MEP. Recommendations are summarized based on observations, staff and parent surveys, results of student assessments, and communication with VDOE and local MEP staff. Recommendations are made for implementation as well as for addressing the measureable program outcomes.

RESULTS OF SERVICES

The Virginia MEP is assessing progress toward seven measureable program outcomes in 2010-2011 and establishing the baseline for three additional measureable program outcomes. The program is **commended for meeting four of the 2010-2011 measureable program outcomes**.

In the two goal areas of **reading/language arts and mathematics**, the program met the four 2010-2011 measureable program outcomes. Of the parents surveyed, 98 percent responded that the program activities helped them learn new ways to help their child with reading and 99 percent said the same for mathematics. This exceeded the target of 40 percent for both measures. In addition, 91 percent of parents indicated that the program activities helped them learn new ways to help their child with **graduation goals**, exceeding the target of 25 percent. It is recommended that the Virginia MEP re-examine the targets to ensure that they are appropriate for helping the MEP maintain continuous growth.

Baseline proficiency rates were established for the two measureable program outcomes in **reading/language arts and mathematics** relating to proficiency on the SOL. To ensure that migrant student proficiency rates on these assessments increase, it is recommended that the program determine which students have scores that are near proficiency but still not at the proficiency level. By identifying the skills that students are missing and providing additional instruction to help students gain the missing skills, it is expected that proficiency rates will be increased. In addition, several staff and parents noted that factors outside of instruction (such as concerns about family, immigration, a lack of transportation, and medical needs) may impact a student's ability to do well on the assessment. The program should continue its efforts to meet student needs through appropriate services and coordination with other service providers.

The Virginia MEP should examine the wording of measureable program outcome 1d as the LEARN-2-Succeed consortium assessment no longer is scored using proficiency level but rather by percentage gains between pre- and post-tutorial assessments. It is suggested that the service delivery plan committee consider changing the measureable program outcome to read, "By the end of the 2011-2012 school year and each year thereafter, 35 percent of migrant

students participating in LEARN-2-Succeed summer services will show a gain between pre- and posttest on the L2S tutorial assessment.”

The baseline **graduation rate** was set and progress will be measured against the initial rate of 55.8 percent. The Virginia MEP should re-examine the timeline for reporting on measureable program outcome 3a, which states “By the end of the 2011-2012 school year and each year thereafter, the federal graduation indicator rate for migrant students will increase.” Currently, graduation rate data is obtained from the CSPR which reflect information from the previous school year. This means that the effects of any new interventions implemented by the MEP will not be seen until two years after initial implementation. Because graduation rates are calculated over a four-year period (and migrant students only are eligible for three years unless a new qualifying move is made), it is likely to take much longer than two years for the effects of interventions to show up in graduation rate calculations.

IMPLEMENTATION OF SERVICES

Staff ratings on the quality and impact of instructional and support services revealed that the vast majority of MEP services had met their purpose and in some cases exceeded expectations. The variability and quantity of services provided indicate a depth of services targeted to the specific needs of migrant students.

Parents indicated on surveys that they appreciated the services provided by the Virginia MEP. They also indicated that they would like to be more involved in the education of their children but often did not know the best way to accomplish this. Some requested greater communication the progress of their children and ideas for how to help them be successful in school. To the extent that resources allow, the program should increase the information provided to parents on helping their children succeed through strategies that can be implemented in the home.

On professional development surveys and in narrative comments, staff indicated the areas in which training was most needed were strategies for parent involvement and coordination activities, supplemental resources, and support services to assist migrant students and families. To the extent that funds and resources allow, the Virginia MEP should provide this targeted staff professional development, which will have the added benefit of addressing the measureable program outcomes associated with involving parents in the education of their children.

Regarding the extent that services for migrant out-of-school youth were sufficient to help meet their educational and/or career goals, the vast majority affirmed their being sufficient; however, the mean rating on this item was somewhat lower than that for other questions about services in English language instruction, reading/literacy, and mathematics. In addition, out-of-school migrant youth account for almost 20 percent of all migrant students identified in Virginia, a larger number and percentage than any of the in-school grade levels. It is recommended that the MEP examine opportunities such as participation in the Solutions for Out-of-School Youth Consortium

Incentive Grant that would help the Virginia MEP build capacity for increasing the educational attainment and career preparedness of eligible migrant youth who have dropped out of school.

STAKEHOLDER RECOMMENDATIONS

Staff and parents rated aspects of the MEP highly and provided information about how program services had benefitted migrant students. However, in the interest of continuous program improvement, both parents and staff provided suggestions on the surveys for ways in which the MEP could better meet migrant students' needs.

On the **Staff Survey of Project Effectiveness**, the two most common suggestions pertained to professional development and parent involvement. Staff indicated a strong need for professional development regarding the effective strategies for helping build capacity to serve mobile students. In addition, staff are interested in ways to increase parent involvement, help build parent skills to work with their children in the home, and acquire strategies for parents to be more involved in school. Suggestions were provided for organizing the recruitment and service delivery components handled by advocates. A summary of suggestions are listed below.

- Offer more training--the more knowledgeable we are, the more the students benefit.
- Improve the structure of the tutorials so that more students are served.
- Provide more emphasis on mathematics, especially in problem solving.
- Hire more bilingual teachers to assist migrant students who do not understand English.
- Continue this excellent program.
- Provide more training opportunities for advocates/recruiters on service delivery.
- Improve services for out-of-school youth.
- Increase parent activities and make them more academically focused.
- Train staff to work with major situations like reunification, death, bullying, and other situations that affect students' well-being.
- Provide a full-time recruiter to allow advocates to devote all their time to working with migrant students and families.
- Include trainings on working with youth dealing with immigration trauma and identity crises and effective youth leadership development in migrant and immigrant students.
- Offer trainings and discussions on strategies for getting parents involved in helping with homework.
- Continue to provide individual tutoring and supplemental services.
- Make strong community ties with other agencies to ensure awareness of other players and make other agencies aware of what the MEP has to offer.

Parents of migrant children noted a desire to be involved in their children's education and asked for increased information on ways they can help their children, have more time with tutors, and continue summer programs. Many parents mentioned that they were grateful for the services provided and would like to see them continue. A summary of recommendations are listed below.

- Implement a four- or six-week summer program as two-week summer programs are too short; very good, but events are too short.
- Provide more trainings for parents and students.
- Offer training and information on ways to build adolescent character development, how to apply for student scholarships, and ways to help our children study more.
- Provide classes for the children who are behind and need extra help.
- Offer free daycare during afterschool programs.
- Offer more programs for high school students
- Provide more preschool spaces so all the young children can start school before kindergarten.
- Offer classes on parenting in Spanish.
- Offer more in-home tutoring to help our children succeed.
- Continue in-home tutoring and English language development.
- Ensure that materials sent home are in Spanish and English. Continue and expand interpretation services.
- Provide adult ESL classes or arrange with community agencies to provide ESL.
- Provide bilingual books in my child's classes and provide books in Spanish that children can take home to allow us to read to our children.
- Continue to offer tutoring to my children.
- Offer classes in reading in English for parents.
- Provide information about literacy and books to practice with our children at home.
- Increase the frequency of in-home tutoring.
- Increase the number of teachers and the funds to help children with reading and mathematics.
- Offer more parent involvement events.
- Provide more help for parents of students in high school to help them graduate.
- Provide more teachers trained in strategies for English learners.

APPENDIX A

Survey Forms

Staff Survey of Project Effectiveness

Virginia Migrant Education Program

Site: _____

Directions: Rate your agreement with each of the prompts by marking one of the boxes. Mark N/A (not applicable) for questions that do not apply to your area of instruction.

The extent that ...	Not at all	Very little	Some-what	A lot	N/A
1. <u>Professional development</u> overall was effective in improving my delivery of instruction to migrant students in reading/literacy .					
2. <u>Professional development</u> overall was effective in improving my delivery of instruction to migrant students in math .					
3. <u>Professional development</u> improved my use of dropout prevention strategies with migrant secondary students.					
4. Support services (e.g., medical/dental, transportation, referrals) were effective in helping students participate in their education.					
5. In my opinion, <u>instructional services</u> helped migrant students improve their English language skills .					
6. In my opinion, <u>instructional services</u> helped migrant students improve their reading/literacy skills .					
7. In my opinion, <u>instructional services</u> helped migrant students improve their math skills .					
8. Activities for migrant parents facilitated their involvement in the education of their children.					
9. Services for migrant out-of-school youth were sufficient for helping them meet their educational and/or career goals.					

How did students benefit from the services provided by the Virginia MEP?

What suggestions do you have for improving migrant education services?



Parent Survey on Project Effectiveness

Please circle the number that best matches your opinion.

Thank you!

To what extent...

	Not at all	Very little	Some	Very much	N/A*
1. Did activities from the migrant program help you learn new ways to help your child with reading ?	1	2	3	4	N/A
2. Did activities from the migrant program help you learn new ways to help your child with math ?	1	2	3	4	N/A
3. Do you feel like you are more involved in your child's education because of the migrant program or school?	1	2	3	4	N/A
4. If you have a high school student , did you learn new ways to help your child with school and graduation goals?	1	2	3	4	N/A
5. Did you participate in a school event for parents? (examples: parent/teacher conferences, parent trainings, parent advisory council)	1	2	3	4	N/A

*N/A=Not Applicable

If you attended a school event for parents, what type of event did you attend?

What suggestions do you have for improving the migrant education program?



Encuesta a Los Padres en Cuanto la Efectividad del Programa

Encierre en un círculo el número que mejor se aproxima a su opinión acerca del proyecto. ¡Gracias!

¿Qué tanto...?

	No de Nada	Muy Poco	Algo	Mucho	N/A*
1. ¿Le ayudaron las actividades del programa migrante aprender estrategias para ayudar a sus hijos con la lectura ?	1	2	3	4	N/A
2. ¿Le ayudaron las actividades del programa migrante aprender estrategias para ayudar a sus hijos con matemáticas ?	1	2	3	4	N/A
3. ¿Le ayudó el programa migrante ser más involucrado(a) en la educación de sus hijos?	1	2	3	4	N/A
4. Si tiene hijo(a) en high school , ¿aprendió estrategias para ayudar a su hijo(a) con su educación y sus metas para graduar?	1	2	3	4	N/A
5. ¿Participó en un evento escolar para los padres? (por ejemplo, conferencia de padres/maestros, capacitación, concilio de padres)	1	2	3	4	N/A

*N/A=No me pertenece

Si asistió a un evento para los padres, ¿Qué tipo de evento asistió?

¿Qué sugerencias tiene para mejorar el programa de educación migrante?



APPENDIX B

Migrant Education Programs in Virginia



Virginia Migrant Education Program Directory

COORDINATOR	PROGRAM NAME	SCHOOL DIVISIONS SERVED <small>(Services vary within each program.)</small>	TELEPHONE <u>NUMBER and E-MAIL</u>
Sandra Drummond	Accomack Migrant Education Program	Accomack County	Phone: (757) 787-7941 E-mail: sdrummond@nhs.accomack.k12.va
Sharon Root	Albemarle Regional Migrant Education Program	Albemarle, Augusta, Culpeper, Fluvanna, Greene, Hanover, Madison, Nelson, Orange, and Rockbridge Counties; Charlottesville, Staunton, and Waynesboro Cities	Phone: (434) 296-3872 Ext. 8 E-mail: root@k12albemarle.org
Linda Dalton	Southwestern Regional Migrant Education Program	Carroll, Floyd, Grayson, Patrick, Scott, Smyth, and Washington, Counties; City of Galax	Phone: (276) 728-3191 E-mail: ldalton@ccpsd.k12.va.us
Karen Aita	Northampton Migrant Education Program	Northampton County	Phone: (757) 678-5151 Ext. 2023 E-mail: kaita@ncpsk12.com
Michelle Wallace	Nottoway Regional Migrant Education Program	Amelia, Cumberland, Lunenburg, Nottoway, and Prince Edward Counties	Phone: (434) 645-9596 E-mail: wallace.michelle@nottowayschools.org
Kim Hartzler-Weakly	Shenandoah Valley Regional Migrant Education Program	Clarke, Fauquier, Frederick, Rockingham, and Shenandoah Counties; Harrisonburg and Winchester Cities	Phone: (540) 568-7083 E-mail: hartzlkm@jmu.edu
Esmeralda Medina	Westmoreland County Migrant Education Program	Westmoreland County	Phone: (804) 493-8018 E-mail: medinaea@wmlcps.org