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## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Florida Migrant Education Program (FL MEP) convened a Needs Assessment Committee (NAC) in January 2010 to revisit its Comprehensive Needs Assessment (CNA). The purpose of the CNA was to: examine the unique educational needs of the State's migrant students at a current point in time; use data to validate concerns and drive decision making; and develop an action plan for updating the Service Delivery Plan (SDP). The scope of the CNA included preschool-age children, K-12 students, and Out-of-School Youth (OSY). At the time of the CNA, the most current count on migrant-eligible students was 32,166 ( $90 \%$ of whom were served by the FL MEP)—the majority of whom are in elementary grade levels and of Hispanic ethnicity.

The FL MEP followed the three-phase model recommended by the U.S. Department of Education's Office of Migrant Education (OME): Explore What Is, Gather and Analyze Data, and Make Decisions. The process was enhanced by the following: strategic use of data and assistance in decision making from a Data Work Group; a small but experienced NAC; and migrant parent consultation. The highest priority solutions take into consideration the recommendations from the NAC, the Migrant Parent Advisory Council, and areas of concern that were not fully addressed in the State's first CNA (conducted in 2003-2005, referred to throughout this document as CNA1). The main findings from this second CNA (CNA2) include:

## Preschool:

Access to Services and Educational Continuity
The percentage of migrant-eligible children (ages 3-5) receiving preschool services from the MEP or other community agencies needs to increase by $12 \%$ points.

Strategies: Require development and implementation of a plan to identify and recruit hard-to-locate migrant families with preschoolaged children; identify migrant preschoolers (ages 3 to 5) as Priority for Services (PFS).

## K-12:

English Language Development The percentage of migrant English Learners (ELs) who are proficient in reading and mathematics, as measured by state assessments, needs to increase by 6\% points over the next three to five years.

Strategies: Provide comprehensive and ongoing professional development for teachers and migrant tutors on the topic of teaching academic language in a subject-specific manner.

## Graduation

The percentage of migrant students who are academically promoted to a higher grade needs to increase by $9 \%$ points over three to five years. Strategies: Establish consistent guidelines to accept out-of-state credit for courses with End-of-Course (EOC) Exams; develop an articulation agreement with the Florida Virtual School

## Health

Health needs will be determined with the assistance of follow-up consultation in preparing the SDP (see description of Implementation Committees below).

Strategies: Take health/nutrition information/workshops to migrant families; develop partnerships with local health organizations/agencies and/or local colleges or universities

## OSY

## Educational Continuity

The percentage of migrant OSY receiving support to build their capacity to access educational resources in communities where they live and work needs to increase.

Strategy: To be determined during SDP development
The percentage of FL MEP staff who have access to information on educational resources and opportunities for OSY needs to increase.

Strategy: Create a central repository of information, resources and opportunities made available to local MEPs and other interested partners

## English Language Development

The percentage of OSY (expressing an interest and then) receiving survival English skills will increase.

Strategy: Create multi-faceted pilot projects to teach English to OSY (e.g., MP3 players, mobile classes, etc.)

The FL MEP will facilitate three Implementation Committee Work Groups (Preschool, K-12, and OSY) to transition from the CNA findings to SDP implementation. The purpose of these work groups is to obtain input from State and local MEP personnel and content area experts in order to operationalize strategies, identify data where needed (e.g., health), and refine targets for building evaluation measures. The FL MEP will incorporate findings from the CNA and the work of the Implementation Committee Work Groups into its SDP.

## OVERVIEW OF THE FLORIDA MIGRANT EDUCATION PROGRAM

The Florida Migrant Education Program (FL MEP) ensures that all eligible migratory children in the State have a fair, equal and significant opportunity to obtain a high-quality education and reach, at a minimum, proficiency on challenging State academic achievement standards and State academic assessments. The program also provides appropriate support services to ensure migrant students' continued education post-graduation. The FL MEP is administered through the Florida Department of Education (FLDOE) to local educational agencies (LEAs) and consortia of LEAs. Of the State's 67 districts, all but seven receive migrant funds, either directly (30) or through the consortia (17 under the Panhandle Area Educational Consortium and 12 under the Alachua Multi-County). In 2008-2009, there were 32,166 migrant-eligible students, 29,027 (90\%) of whom were served by the FL MEP.

## Agriculture and Qualifying Work

The majority of the agricultural crops in Florida are citrus. In 2007, Florida was ranked first in the United States in the value of production of oranges, grapefruit, tangerines, sugarcane for sugar and seed, squash, watermelons, sweet corn, fresh-market snap beans, fresh-market tomatoes, and freshmarket cucumbers. Florida is also a main producer of strawberries, tomatoes, bell peppers, and cucumbers for pickles. The seasonal qualifying work that is associated with these crops ranges from production to processing, which includes: preparing the soil, planting, irrigating, laying plastic, picking, sorting, and packing. Most of these crops are grown south of what is called the "I-4 Corridor." Collier, Hillsborough, Palm Beach, and Polk are known agricultural counties. Refer to Appendix A for "Florida's Agricultural Commodities at a Glance" from the Florida Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services.

Although Florida is mostly an agricultural state, other qualifying industries exist. Fishing is found in the Panhandle near Alabama. Pine tree planting and pine bailing can be found throughout central Florida and along the Panhandle. There are a few meat-processing plants, dairies, ferneries and nurseries found throughout the north central, central, and southern parts of Florida. Eligible migrant workers who are employed within these industries are hired for 12 months or less. Qualifying work in these industries include, but are not limited to slaughtering, deboning, meat packing, planting, picking, and raking.

## PURPOSE AND SCOPE OF THE COMPREHENSIVE NEEDS ASSESSMENT

State education agencies are required to implement and evaluate projects to address the unique needs of migratory children through a State service delivery plan (SDP) based on a current statewide needs assessment (pursuant to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, Title I, Part C, Section 1306, and 34 CFR 200.83). Florida conducted its first comprehensive needs assessment (CNA1) in 2003-2005 and implemented an SDP in 2008. Given that the needs assessment must be current, the federal MEP non-regulatory guidance indicates that a state conduct a CNA every three years (U.S. Department of Education, Office of Elementary and Secondary Education, Office of Migrant Education, Non-Regulatory Guidance for the Title I, Part C Education of Migrant Children, Washington, D.C., 2010).

To this end, the FL MEP conducted a new CNA beginning in January 2010 (CNA2) as the first state to initiate a second assessment. The purpose of the CNA2 was threefold:

1. Examine the educational needs of the State's migrant students stemming from their migratory lifestyle at the current point in time.
2. Use data to validate concerns and drive decision making about services.
3. Develop an action plan to implement and evaluate evidence-based solutions and update the current SDP.

The scope of CNA2 included the following migrant populations: preschool-aged children, K-12 students, and Out-of-School Youth (OSY). This breadth of coverage differed from the initial CNA, which included only K-12 students. In examining demographic information, a significant proportion of the current migrant-eligible population is not in school and the process used to identify needs reflects this shift.

This report summarizes the methodology, findings, and action planning resulting from the CNA2. The next section provides a current snapshot of the migrant-eligible population being served as a starting point for the CNA2.

## MIGRANT STUDENT PROFILE

The migrant student profile highlights data that illustrate general trends in demographics, mobility, and academic outcomes for migrant students in the State of Florida. This information is a key beginning to the process as it
challenges assumptions about the State's students and establishes data driven decision making.

## Demographics ${ }^{1}$

There were 32,166 migrant-eligible students in 2008-09; 90\% of those were served by the MEP $(29,027)$. The totals for migrant-eligible students have been decreasing over time. Refer to Table 1.

Table 1. Migrant-Eligible Student Counts, Served versus not Served

| School <br> Year | Served | Eligible <br> Not <br> Served | Totals for <br> Migrant |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $2006-07$ | 37,568 <br> $(93 \%)$ | 2,922 <br> $(7 \%)$ | 40,490 |
| $2007-08$ | 32,167 <br> $(90 \%)$ | 3,704 <br> $(10 \%)$ | 35,871 |
| $2008-09$ | 29,027 <br> $(90 \%)$ | 3,139 <br> $(10 \%)$ | 32,166 |

Almost 60\% of migrant-eligible students are male and 40\% female, a steady trend over the past three years (Figure 1).

Figure 1. Gender Distribution of Migrant versus Non-Migrant Students


[^0]The majority of the migrant-eligible population is Hispanic (90\%). Sixty-eight percent of non-migrant students are White and Black; in the migrant student population, these groups represent less than 8\%. Refer to Figure 2 and Table 2 below.

Figure 2. Ethnic Representation in the Migrant-Eligible Student Population in School


Table 2. Percentages of Student Populations by Ethnicity, Migrant-Eligible versus Non-Migrant

| School Year |  |  | Black |  | Hispanic |  | Indian |  | Multiracial |  | White |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Migrant | NonMigrant | Migrant | NonMigrant | Migrant | NonMigrant | Migrant | Non- <br> Migrant | Migrant | NonMigrant | Migrant | NonMigrant |
| 2006-07 | 1.6 | 2.3 | 8.1 | 23.4 | 88.2 | 23.8 | 0.1 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 3.4 | 1.6 | 47 |
| 2007-08 | 2.0 | 2.3 | 7.4 | 23.4 | 89.2 | 24.4 | 0.1 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 3.7 | 1.1 | 46 |
| 2008-09 | 2.2 | 2.4 | 6.7 | 23.3 | 89.5 | 25.0 | 0.2 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 3.8 | 1.1 | 45.1 |

The majority ( $34 \%$ ) of the migrant student population is K-5. More than 93-98\% of K-12 students have been served over the past three years. Of the nonschool-age population, about a quarter of the preschool population has been identified as eligible, not served; for adult, non-high school graduates (coded as " 30 " on survey 5 ), between 12 and $25 \%$ have been identified as eligible, not served, depending on the year. Numbers have dropped over time in each grade level (Refer to Table 3 and Figures 3-4.)

Table 3. Student Counts and Percentages by Migrant Status and Grade Level (grouped)

| School Year | Migrant Status Term | PK |  | Elem K-5 |  | Middle |  | High |  | Adult, <br> Non-HS Grad |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | N | \% subgroup | N | \% subgroup | N | \% <br> subgroup | N | \% <br> subgroup | N | \% subgroup |
| $\begin{gathered} 2006- \\ 07 \end{gathered}$ | Served | 3,779 | 76\% | 14,815 | 97\% | 6,022 | 98\% | 7,616 | 95\% | 5,336 | 88\% |
|  | Eligible Not Served | 1,217 | 24\% | 488 | 3\% | 132 | 2\% | 379 | 5\% | 706 | 12\% |
|  | Subtotals | 4,996 |  | 15,303 |  | 6,154 |  | 7,995 |  | 6,042 |  |
|  | \% MigrantEligible |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\begin{gathered} 2007- \\ 08 \end{gathered}$ | Served | 3,220 | 75\% | 12,284 | 97\% | 4,995 | 97\% | 6,565 | 95\% | 5,103 | 75\% |
|  | Eligible Not Served | 1,083 | 25\% | 392 | 3\% | 145 | 3\% | 379 | 5\% | 1,705 | 25\% |
|  | Subtotals | 4,303 |  | 12,676 |  | 5,140 |  | 6,944 |  | 6,808 |  |
|  | \% MigrantEligible | 12\% |  |  |  | 14\% |  |  |  | 19\% |  |
| $\begin{gathered} 2008- \\ 09 \end{gathered}$ | Served | 3,157 | 73\% | 10,661 | 96\% | 4,402 | 97\% | 5,409 | 93\% | 5,397 | 84\% |
|  | Eligible Not Served | 1,164 | 27\% | 414 | 4\% | 158 | 3\% | 390 | 7\% | 1,013 | 16\% |
|  | Subtotals | 4,321 |  | 11,075 |  | 4,560 |  | 5,799 |  | 6,410 |  |
|  | \% MigrantEligible | 13\% |  | 34\% |  | $14 \%$ |  | 18\% |  | 20\% |  |

Figure 3. Representation of the Migrant-Eligible Student Population by Grade Level in School Year 2008-09


Figure 4. Migrant Student Distributions by Grade


In terms of participation rates by regular school year and summer/ intersession, 35\% of the migrant students in regular school year counts are K5; 20\% are OSY. Again, most migrant students participating in summer/ intersession are K-5-46\%; only 7\% of OSY participate in summer/ intersession.

Table 4. Participation Rates in Regular School Year (Category 1) and Summer/Intersession (Category 2)

Age / Grade
Category 1 Counts
\% of Total
Category 2 Counts
\% of Total

| Age 3 through 5 <br> (not Kindergarten) | 4,130 | $12 \%$ | 1,048 | $12 \%$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| K | 2,310 | $7 \%$ | 717 | $8 \%$ |
| 1 | 2,209 | $7 \%$ | 760 | $9 \%$ |
| 2 | 1,945 | $6 \%$ | 712 | $8 \%$ |
| 3 | 1,929 | $6 \%$ | 643 | $8 \%$ |
| 4 | 1,633 | $5 \%$ | 520 | $6 \%$ |
| 5 | 1,653 | $5 \%$ | 536 | $6 \%$ |
| 6 | 1,618 | $5 \%$ | 496 | $6 \%$ |
| 7 | 1,680 | $5 \%$ | 517 | $6 \%$ |
| 8 | 1,360 | $4 \%$ | 400 | $5 \%$ |
| 9 | 1,797 | $5 \%$ | 529 | $6 \%$ |
| 10 | 1,611 | $5 \%$ | 468 | $6 \%$ |
| 11 | 1,368 | $4 \%$ | 387 | $5 \%$ |
| 12 | 1,556 | $5 \%$ | 209 | $2 \%$ |
| Ungraded | 6,792 | $20 \%$ | - | $7 \%$ |
| Out-of-School | 33,591 | $100 \%$ | 555 | $100 \%$ |
| Total |  |  | 8,497 |  |

Source: CSPR 2007-08

Thirty-one percent of the migrant-eligible population was considered English learners (ELs) in 2008-09 (Table 5); 11\% of the non-migrant population was ELs. Although data were reported in a different manner in previous years, the percentages of ELs were about the same in 2006-07 and 2007-08 (Figure 5).

Table 5. EL Status, Migrant versus Non-Migrant, 2008-09

| Student Subgroups | EL | \% of <br> subgroup | Non EL | \% of <br> subgroup |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Migrant Served | 9,329 | 32 | 19,698 | 68 |
| Eligible Not Served | 487 | 16 | 2,652 | 84 |
| Subtotal of <br> Migrant-Eligible | 9,816 | 31 | 22,350 | 69 |
| Non-Migrant | 310,297 | 11 | $2,591,906$ | 89 |

Note: EL status includes the following codes:
LY—student is classified as limited English proficient and is enrolled in a program or receiving services that are specifically designed to meet the instructional needs of EL students

LF-student is being followed up for a two-year period after having exited from the ESOL program

LP—student (in $3^{\text {rd }}-12^{\text {th }}$ grade) tested fully English proficient on an aural/oral test and is LEP pending the reading and writing assessment or student (K-12) answered "yes" on Home Language Survey to "Is a language other than English spoken in the home?" and is pending aural/oral assessment

Figure 5. EL Status - Migrant versus Non-Migrant Students (2006-07, 2007-08)


Note: "Current" refers to database code LY (The student is an English learner and is enrolled in classes specifically designed for ELs); "former" is LF (The student is being followed up for a two-year period after having exited from the ESOL program.); and "no" refers to non-ELLs.

Students who are considered "Priority for Services" (PFS) represent $18 \%$ of the migrant-eligible population, $96 \%$ of whom are Hispanic, and over half are in elementary level grades (Tables 6-8).

Table 6. Priority-for-Services Counts (Served)

| School Year | Non-PFS | PFS | \% of Migrant <br> Served who <br> are PFS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $2006-07$ | 26,780 | 7,096 | $26 \%$ |
| $2007-08$ | 22,688 | 6,094 | $27 \%$ |
| $2008-09$ | 24,647 | 4,380 | $18 \%$ |

Table 7. PFS Students by Ethnicity

| School <br> Year | Asian | Black | Hispanic | Indian | Multiracial | White | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $2006-07$ | 2 | 954 | 6,047 | 8 | 24 | 61 | 7,096 |
| $2007-08$ | 2 | 1,025 | 5,010 | 8 | 12 | 37 | 6,094 |
| $2008-09$ | 3 | 121 | 4,185 | 12 | 12 | 47 | 4,380 |

Table 8. PFS Students by Grade Level

| Grade Level | $2006-07$ |  | $2007-08$ |  | $2008-09$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | N | $\%$ | N | $\%$ | N | $\%$ |
| PreK | 289 | $4 \%$ | 173 | $3 \%$ | 88 | $2 \%$ |
| Elem (K-5) | 3,097 | $44 \%$ | 2,806 | $46 \%$ | 2,463 | $56 \%$ |
| Middle (6-8) | 1,624 | $23 \%$ | 1,445 | $24 \%$ | 914 | $21 \%$ |
| High (9-12) | 1,864 | $26 \%$ | 1,660 | $27 \%$ | 861 | $20 \%$ |
| Adult, non HS <br> graduate | 222 | $3 \%$ | 10 | $0.2 \%$ | 54 | $1 \%$ |
| Total | 7,096 |  | 6,094 |  | 4,380 |  |

## Student Outcomes

## Reading

The percentage of migrant students (served) who score at proficiency or above in reading on the Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT) has increased over time-reaching $38 \%$ in 2008-09. The gap between migrant and non-migrant students has stayed about the same over time ( 23 or $24 \%$ ). Refer to Table 9 and Figure 6 on page 12.

## Mathematics

The percentage of migrant students (served) who score at proficiency or above in mathematics on the FCAT has also increased over time-reaching $50 \%$ in

2008-09. The gap between migrant and non-migrant has decreased slightly over time, from $23 \%$ to $16 \%$. Refer to Table 10 and Figure 7 (p. 13 below).

## Graduation

The percentage of migrant $12^{\text {th }}$ graders who graduated was 74\% (2008-09 data, $\mathrm{n}=781$ ), compared to $78 \%$ of non-migrant $12^{\text {th }}$ graders ( $\mathrm{n}=194,399$ ). Refer to Table 11 (p. 14) for graduation data. Note that in previous years, data were reported differently (by diploma and GED).

## School Readiness

At the time of the CNA2, state school readiness data were available for less than $14 \%$ of the migrant kindergarten population. Less than $10 \%$ of the population for which data were available tested "ready" for school on either assessment. The Needs Assessment Committee (NAC) examined ECHOS and FAIR data as measures of kindergarten readiness as Florida had changed state assessments over time. The Early Childhood Observation System (ECHOS) is a brief observational screening instrument designed to measure a child's performance across seven developmental areas aligned with the Florida Voluntary Prekindergarten Education Program (VPK). The State recently added the new Florida Assessments for Instruction in Reading (FAIR) to the readiness screener. FAIR includes two measures aligned with the State's VPK standards in the area of emergent literacy: 1) Broad Screen/Progress Monitoring Tool (i.e., letter naming and phonemic awareness); and 2) Broad Diagnostic Inventory (i.e., listening comprehension, vocabulary). ${ }^{2}$ Data were referenced during the CNA2 but are not necessarily representative of the population. Refer to Table 12 (p. 15).

[^1]Table 9. Migrant Student FCAT Reading Assessment Results

| State - <br> Migrant <br> Students* | SY 2005-2006 |  |  | SY 2006-2007 |  |  | SY 2007-2008 |  |  | SY 2008-09 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Tested on <br> Reading | Reading Proficient | \% Proficient | Tested on <br> Reading | Reading Proficient | \% <br> Proficient | Tested on Reading | Reading Proficient | \% <br> Proficient | Tested on <br> Reading | Reading Proficient | $\%$ <br> Proficient |
|  | 18,233 | 5,623 | 31\% | 16,847 | 5,761 | 34\% | 12,184 | 4,240 | 35\% | 10,901 | 4,104 | 38\% |

## *Served only

Figure 6. Reading Proficiency Gap between Migrant and Non-Migrant Students (\% Proficient on FCAT)

| 100\% |  |  |  | -Non-Migrant <br> -Migrant |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & 90 \% \\ & 80 \% \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| $70 \%$ |  |  |  |  |
| 60\% |  |  |  |  |
| 50\% |  |  |  |  |
| 40\% |  |  |  |  |
| 30\% |  |  |  |  |
| 20\% |  |  |  |  |
| 10\% |  |  |  |  |
| 0\% 2005-06 | 2006-07 | 2007-08 | 08-09 |  |
| Reading (\% Proficient) | 2005-06 | 2006-07 | 2007-08 | 2008-09 |
| Non-Migrant | 54\% | 57\% | 59\% | 61\% |
| Migrant | 31\% | 34\% | 35\% | 38\% |

Table 10. Migrant Student FCAT Math Assessment Results

| State - <br> Migrant <br> Students* | SY 2005-2006 |  |  | SY 2006-2007 |  |  | SY 2007-2008 |  |  | SY 2008-09 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Tested on Math | Math <br> Proficient | \% <br> Proficient | Tested on Math | Math Proficient | $\%$ <br> Proficient | Tested on Math | Math Proficient | \% <br> Proficient | Tested on Math | Math Proficient | $\%$ <br> Proficient |
|  | 18,233 | 7,848 | 43\% | 16,847 | 7,431 | 44\% | 12,176 | 5,923 | 49\% | 10,892 | 5,458 | 50\% |

*Served only
Figure 7. Mathematics Proficiency Gap between Migrant and Non-Migrant Students (\% Proficient on FCAT)

| 100\% |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 90\% |  |  |  |  |
| 80\% |  |  |  |  |
| 70\% |  |  |  |  |
| 60\% |  |  |  |  |
| $50 \% \ldots \text { Non-Migrant }$ |  |  |  |  |
| $40 \%$ - Migrant |  |  |  |  |
| 30\% |  |  |  |  |
| 20\% |  |  |  |  |
| 10\% |  |  |  |  |
| 0\% |  |  |  |  |
| 2005-06 | 2006-07 | 2007-08 | 8-09 |  |
| Math <br> (\% Proficient) | 2005-06 | 2006-07 | 2007-08 | 2008-09 |
| Non-Migrant | 60\% | 62\% | 65\% | 66\% |
| Migrant | 43\% | 44\% | 49\% | 50\% |

Table 11a. Graduation Data for Migrant versus Non-Migrant Students (2008-09)

| Graduation <br> Rates | Graduated | Didn't <br> Graduate | No Data |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Migrant | $74 \%$ | $26 \%$ | 0 |
| Non-Migrant | $78 \%$ | $20 \%$ | $2 \%$ |
| Gap | $4 \%$ | $6 \%$ |  |

Table 11b. Graduation Data for Migrant Students in Previous Years

| SY 2005-2006 |  |  |  | SY 2006-2007 |  |  |  | SY 2007-2008 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Students Graduated with |  |  | \# of Students in Grade 12 | Students Graduated with |  |  | \# of Students in Grade 12 | Students Graduated with |  |  |
| in Grade <br> 12 | HS <br> Diploma | Special Diploma | GED |  | HS <br> Diploma | Special <br> Diploma | GED |  | HS <br> Diploma | Special Diploma | GED |
| 1871 | $\begin{gathered} 29 \% \\ (\mathrm{~N}=547) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \% \\ (\mathrm{~N}=51) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & <1 \% \\ & (\mathrm{~N}=3) \end{aligned}$ | 1679 | $\begin{gathered} 30 \% \\ (\mathrm{~N}=503) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4 \% \\ (\mathrm{~N}=63) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & <1 \% \\ & (\mathrm{~N}=3) \end{aligned}$ | 1573 | $\begin{gathered} 33 \% \\ (\mathrm{~N}=521) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \% \\ (\mathrm{~N}=39) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \% \\ (\mathrm{~N}=2) \end{gathered}$ |

Table 12. School Readiness Data for Migrant Preschoolers by Migrant Status Term, 2008-2009, as Measured by ECHOS and FAIRK

| Migrant Status Term$(\mathrm{N}=4,440)$ | ECHOS Ready |  | FAIRK Ready |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Yes | No | Yes | No |
| B—Served in BOTH Regular School Year \& Summer Term ( $\mathrm{n}=870$ ) | $\begin{aligned} & 203 \\ & (5 \%) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 35 \\ (3 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 141 \\ (3 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 97 \\ (2 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| D—Enrolled/Served only in Regular School Year (services during regular school day only) ( $\mathrm{n}=2,058$ ) | $\begin{gathered} 280 \\ (6 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 65 \\ (4 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 170 \\ & (4 \%) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 175 \\ & (4 \%) \end{aligned}$ |
| E—Enrolled/Served in Regular School Year (services during extended day/week) $(\mathrm{n}=131)$ | $\begin{gathered} 4 \\ (0.1 \%) \end{gathered}$ | 0 | $\begin{gathered} 4 \\ (0.1 \%) \end{gathered}$ | 0 |
| S—Enrolled/Served only in Summer Term $(\mathrm{n}=216)$ | $\begin{gathered} 4 \\ (0.1 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \\ (0.05 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (0.1 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \\ (0.1 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| X—Identified, Not Served $(\mathrm{n}=1,165)$ | $\begin{gathered} 11 \\ (0.2 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ (0.1 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 5 \\ (0.1 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 8 \\ (0.2 \%) \end{gathered}$ |

Note: These data include students with QAD and DOB filters for migrant.
The next section describes the three-phase model used by the FL MEP to conduct its CNA.

## METHODOLOGY

The CNA process utilized is a three-phase model based on the work of Witkin and Altschuld ${ }^{3}$, pilot tested in 2002 in conjunction with four state MEPs and the Regional Comprehensive Center Network under the auspices of OME, and refined in many states since that time. A schematic of the process is illustrated in Figure 8 (p. 17).

[^2]The CNA2 process was overseen by a core group of leaders referred to as the Management Team (MT) who set the general timeline and oversaw the entire CNA. The NAC, comprised of a broad representation of stakeholders within the MEP as well as content area experts, engaged with the work at each stage (refer to Appendix B for a membership list). The first MT meeting was held October 14, 2009 at which time the members identified who should serve on the NAC. The MT decided to focus on migrants who are not in school in addition to those in K-12 given the current demographics in the State. The MT established three teams: Preschool, K-12, and OSY.

In Phase I (Explore What Is), the NAC examined what was known about the migrant student population at that point in time and identified concerns about their unique needs; these concerns determined the focus and scope of the CNA. This first NAC meeting (NAC I) was held January 19, 2010.

In Phase II (Gather and Analyze Data), the NAC developed and collected data on indicators to measure the perceived needs. A Data Team assisted in the work at this stage. Through data analysis, the NAC identified the magnitude of the actual needs based on gaps between migrant students and their non-migrant peers (or other comparable populations), where possible. The NAC met for its second meeting (NAC II) on May 5, 2010 to analyze data.

In Phase III (Make Decisions), the NAC explored and then selected evidencebased strategies to address the confirmed needs in Phase II (the NAC III meeting was held October 14, 2010). To assist in this effort, the NAC convened Expert Work Groups in appropriate content areas to offer recommendations based on research and promising practices (held September 14-15, 2010). Data Team members facilitated the small Expert Work Groups to enable discussion about trends over time. The NAC selected highest priority "solutions" based on a set of criteria to facilitate action planning on the part of the FL MEP. These priorities will form the basis for updating the State's SDP.

The FL MEP asked for input on the CNA2 results from its migrant parent leaders at the Florida Migrant Parent Advisory Council (FMPAC) meeting on November 5-6, 2010. The FMPAC reviewed the CNA findings and voted on the strategies they identified as highest priority for serving their children. The FMPAC members did not see the voting tally from the NAC III and so were not biased by those results. The FL MEP took into consideration feedback from the FMPAC in finalizing its action plan from the CNA (described in the next section).

Figure 8. CNA Process in Action


In determining the methodology for the CNA2, the MT had to make a determination about how the CNA1 results would be utilized. On the one hand, MT members wanted to get the NAC's own thinking about the current needs of migrant students without being biased by the earlier concerns (from 20032005). On the other hand, the continuous improvement cycle builds on previous steps and the CNA2 followed an SDP in place at the time, with evaluation efforts under way to measure implementation and impact of the original recommended strategies. In order to get a true gauge of current needs, the MT decided to have the NAC explore its concerns without the CNA1 influencing their ideas. The MT also made the determination to weave in the CNA1 findings later in the process as a double check on the work (during Phase III). Elements of the current SDP informed deliberations in the decisionmaking phase. Solutions identified in CNA2 would supplement the current framework for services and, where possible, additional priorities would be added to strengthen targets already in progress.

The next section summarizes the concerns, data findings, and solution strategies identified as highest priority by the NAC, with consultation from the FMPAC.

## RESULTS

## Preschool

The initial concerns related to preschool education focused on access to services and educational support in the home. (Refer to Appendix C for a summary of initial concern statements and findings.) The NAC reviewed preschool demographic data such as migrant status and English language
learning as well as counts by the types of preschools attended. The NAC also looked at school readiness data as measured by ECHOS and FAIR. The following are highlights of the findings.

The migrant preschool population in Florida has been 12-13\% of the total migrant-eligible population over the past three years. The CNA data confirmed that about a quarter of the preschool population is identified as migranteligible not served (see Table 13). The CNA process also revealed the need for stronger data on preschool programming and school readiness. Data were available for only $14 \%$ of the preschool data set on the type of preschool attended and for school readiness measures. The preschool type information enabled the NAC to examine the programs most attended for the limited subset (e.g., District Title I and Voluntary Preschool Programs) but did not give a complete picture of what that programming looks like in practice. As noted in the Migrant Student Profile (p. 15), less than $10 \%$ of the migrant students for which school readiness data were available tested "ready" for kindergarten as measured by ECHOS and FAIR.

Table 13. Preschool Counts by Migrant Status

| School Year | Migrant Status Term | PK |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | N | $\begin{gathered} \text { \% } \\ \text { subgroup } \end{gathered}$ |
| 2006-07 | Served | 3,779 | 76\% |
|  | Eligible Not Served | 1,217 | 24\% |
|  | Subtotals <br> \% Migrant-Eligible | $\begin{gathered} 4,996 \\ 12 \% \end{gathered}$ |  |
| 2007-08 | Served | 3,220 | 75\% |
|  | Eligible Not Served | 1,083 | 25\% |
|  | Subtotals <br> \% Migrant-Eligible | $\begin{gathered} 4,303 \\ 12 \% \end{gathered}$ |  |
| 2008-09 | Served | 3,157 | 73\% |
|  | Eligible Not Served | 1,164 | 27\% |
|  | Subtotals <br> \% Migrant-Eligible | $\begin{gathered} 4,321 \\ 13 \% \end{gathered}$ |  |

The Preschool Expert Work Group deliberated on the research base related to both access and quality of preschool programs, including: interventions and models for early learning, e.g., evaluations of Migrant Even Start; parental involvement; teaching staff requirements in preschools; and cultural diversity. In identifying the most pressing concern to address at this point in time, the NAC focused on strategies related to access and parent education; the FMPAC selected the same priorities. This emphasis on access supplements the focus of the state's current SDP (based on the initial CNA) which highlighted program quality and emergent literacy skills in particular. Given the data available, it was clear to Preschool Work Group members that preschool needs to be more of a priority for LEAs, including the development and implementation of a plan to identify and recruit hard-to-locate migrant families with non-school age children, and parent education on accessing services. (The solutions considered by the Work Group based on expert input, along with the research base, are available in Appendix C.)

In light of the NAC's recommendation to focus on access, a measurable program outcome provides a target for evaluating success. The following table (Table 14) aligns the initial concern statements with the data points to establish a need statement. The need statement summarizes the gap between the current state of "what is" and the desired state of "what should be." In the absence of comparison population data, the target was set based on an analysis of the K-12 migrant-eligible population served (see Table 3 on page 5); the K-12 subgroups served ranged from $95-97 \%$. A target of $85 \%$ for the preschool population was set as a realistic but challenging goal. The table also highlights the solution strategies identified as highest priority.

Table 14. Summary of Preschool Findings

| Concern Statement | Available Data | What Is | What Should Be | Need | Solution Strategy |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| We are concerned that migrant preschool students need to be effectively identified, recruited, and provided access to services. <br> We are concerned that migrant preschool students do not consistently receive a highquality education. <br> (Access to services, Educational continuity) | Percentage of migrant-eligible students identified and served <br> Incomplete school readiness data <br> Small scale qualitative study of preschool programs for the FL MEP following the first CNA | $73 \%$ of migranteligible preschoolers (ages three to five) are served by the MEP in 2008-09 | $85 \%$ of migranteligible preschoolers (ages three to five) are served by the MEP or other community agencies | Percentage of migrant-eligible children (ages three to five) receiving preschool services by the MEP or other community agencies needs to increase by $12 \%$ points | MEP will require development and implementation of a plan to identify and recruit hard-tolocate migrant families with preschool-aged children <br> Migrant preschoolers (ages 3 to 5) should be identified as Priority for Services |

## K-12

The initial concerns related to the K-12 student population focused on barriers impacting educational continuity (new graduation requirements and attendance) and success (technology, English language acquisition, and transportation), as well as health (nutrition and dental hygiene). The NAC findings on English proficiency, educational continuity and health are summarized separately below. However, at the crux of the deliberations (as explicitly summarized in the group's summary) was agreement that increasing migrant student achievement, and closing the gap between migrant and non-migrant students, is paramount; this premise served as the foundation for the K-12 Work Group's suggested solutions in all areas.

## English Language Acquisition

Given the concern that their limited proficiency in academic English hinders migrant student achievement, the NAC explored demographic and academic achievement data on migrant ELs. Table 15 provides data on the EL population (2008-09). Forty-eight percent of the migrant-eligible population is classified as ELs as compared to $11 \%$ of the non-migrant population.

Table 15. EL Demographics by Migrant Status

| Migrant <br> Status Term | $\mathbf{L F}$ | $\mathbf{L P}$ | $\mathbf{L Y}$ | $\mathbf{L Z}$ | $\mathbf{Z Z}$ | $\mathbf{L F}+\mathbf{L P}+\mathbf{L Y}$ | \% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B | 407 | 7 | 2,252 | 1,066 | 1,166 | 2,666 | $54 \%$ |
| D | 1,129 | 22 | 4,823 | 3,379 | 3,812 | 5,974 | $45 \%$ |
| E | 153 | 1 | 722 | 403 | 367 | 876 | $53 \%$ |
| S |  | 1 | 11 | 2 | 4 | 12 | $67 \%$ |
| X | 41 |  | 146 | 97 | 162 | 187 | $42 \%$ |
| Subtotal for <br> Migrant | 1730 | 31 | 7954 | 4947 | 5511 | 9,715 | $48 \%$ |
| $\%$ | $9 \%$ | $0.2 \%$ | $39 \%$ | $25 \%$ | $27 \%$ |  |  |
| Z | 69,818 <br> $2 \%$ | 1,018 <br> $0.04 \%$ | 231,845 <br> $8 \%$ | 233,597 <br> $8 \%$ | $2,292,776$ <br> $81 \%$ | 302,681 | $11 \%$ |

B - Served in BOTH Regular 180 Day School Year and Summer Term*
D - Enrolled/Served ONLY in Regular SY w/ services provided during the regular school day only
E - Enrolled/Served in Regular SY w/ some or all services provided during an extended day/week
S - Enrolled/Served ONLY in Summer Term
X - Identified, NOT Served
Z - Non-migrant student

The gap between EL migrant and non-EL migrant students, based on FCAT proficiency, is $16 \%$ for reading and $20 \%$ for mathematics (see Table 16 below). The overall percentages of migrant students proficient in reading and mathematics, in addition to the gap in ELs and non-ELs in mathematics, support the concern statement that academic English is an obstacle to comprehension. These gaps are likely to be even more significant given that migrant students often miss the FCAT testing window.

Table 16. Migrant Student Proficiencies in Reading and Mathematics based on 2008-09 FCAT Data by English Learner Status

| Migrant Served | READING |  |  | MATHEMATICS |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Number Tested | Number Proficient | $\begin{gathered} \hline \% \\ \text { Proficient }^{4} \end{gathered}$ | Number Tested | Number Proficient | $\%$ <br> Proficient |
| EL | 4,225 | 1,173 | 28\% | 4,228 | 1,623 | 38\% |
| Non-EL | 6,676 | 2,931 | 44\% | 6,664 | 3,835 | 58\% |

In deliberations related to solution strategies, the K-12 Work Group examined research related to issues that impact migrant and EL students' achievement in content-based academic classes, parent involvement, and information technology in literacy. Given that the current SDP addresses raising reading and mathematics proficiency for migrant students as a whole, the K-12 Work Group focused on ELs to ensure that this subpopulation's needs are being met. The solution strategy focuses on building capacity in MEP instructional staff to teach academic language through specific subjects. This approach will enable MEP staff to better serve the needs of migrant ELs, with the intention of improving academic success.

Table 17 below summarizes the CNA findings for the $\mathrm{K}-12$ population related to English language development, including the initial concern, available data, need statement (based on "what is" and "what should be") and the solution strategy identified as highest priority.

[^3]Table 17. K-12 Needs Related to English Language Development

| Concern Statement | Available Data | What Is | What Should Be | Need | Solution Strategy |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| We are concerned that migrant ELs lack content-specific English vocabulary and comprehension. <br> (English language development) | FCAT <br> Reading (\% students scoring proficient or above): <br> Non-migrant-61\% <br> Migrant served38\% <br> Migrant ELs28\% <br> Migrant Non- <br> ELs-44\% <br> Mathematics <br> (\% students scoring proficient or above): <br> Non-migrant-67\% <br> Migrant served50\% <br> Migrant ELs38\% <br> Migrant Non-ELs-58\% | $28 \%$ of migrant ELs are proficient in reading and $38 \%$ in mathematics | The percentage of migrant ELs who are proficient in reading and mathematics needs to increase over time | Percentage of migrant ELs who are proficient in reading and mathematics needs to increase by 6\% points over the next three to five years | Provide comprehensive and ongoing professional development for teachers and migrant tutors on the topic of teaching academic language in a subject-specific manner. |

## Graduation

The NAC examined data on grade promotion, graduation rates, and Portable Assisted Study Sequence (PASS) completion data, in addition to FCAT achievement scores, in connection with concerns related to educational continuity and school completion.

Table 18 below provides information by grade promotion status. Seventy-four percent of migrant students were academically promoted as compared to $85 \%$ of their non-migrant peers (a gap of 11\%). In addition, $7 \%$ of migrant students were retained and $12 \%$ were not enrolled at the end of the year (slightly higher percentages than their non-migrant peers). More than a quarter of migrant students did not graduate (refer to Table 11a on p.14).

Table 18. Grade Promotion Status

| Grade Promotion Status |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| MIGRANT | $\mathbf{A}$ | $\mathbf{D}$ | $\mathbf{N}$ | $\mathbf{P}$ | $\mathbf{R}$ | $\mathbf{Z}$ |  |
| B | 660 | 1 | 136 | 3,735 | 360 | 3 |  |
| D | 592 | 3 | 1,886 | 9,727 | 862 | 39 |  |
| E | 127 |  | 197 | 1,217 | 96 | 6 |  |
| S | 2 |  | 1 | 11 | 1 |  |  |
| X | 23 |  | 138 | 223 | 18 | 16 |  |
| Subtotal <br> for Migrant <br> $\%$ | 1,404 | $7 \%$ | 4 | 2,358 | 14,913 | 1,337 |  |
| Z | 56,541 | 1,720 | 232,037 | $2,362,937$ | 119,896 | 19,117 |  |
| $\%$ | $2 \%$ | $0.1 \%$ | $8 \%$ | $85 \%$ | $4 \%$ | $1 \%$ |  |

A - Promoted to a higher grade without meeting levels of performance for pupil progression based on limited circumstances for exceptions or good cause
D - Student with disabilities opted to remain in school, or a non-disabled student opted to remain in school for one additional year
N - Not enrolled in a KG-12 program in the district at the end of the school year
P - Academically promoted to a higher grade, graduated, completed, or reported with withdrawal code WPO
R - Retained in same grade at the end of the school year
Z - Promotion status not applicable

The SDP addresses graduation with emphasis on staffing expertise to meet the needs of secondary students (i.e., hiring a secondary advocate). The K-12 Work Group focused its solution priorities on systems that will support credit accrual through intra- and interstate coordination to further support the FL MEP's service provision to raise graduation rates. The emphasis was on keeping students on track earlier. Solutions specifically address establishing guidelines for accepting out-of-state credit for courses and developing an articulation agreement with the Florida Virtual School (see Table 19 for a summary).

Table 19. K-12 Needs Related to Graduation

| Concern Statement | Available Data | What Is | What Should Be | Need | Solution Strategy |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| We are concerned that migrant students are not on track to graduate in four to five years. <br> (Educational continuity) | \% of students who did not graduate: <br> Migrant-26\% <br> Non-migrant-20\% <br> \% of students who were academically promoted to a higher grade (or completed): <br> Migrant-74\% <br> Non-migrant-85\% <br> Grade promotion status for migrants: <br> 74\% promoted <br> 7\% retained <br> $7 \%$ promoted without meeting performance requirements based on exception <br> $12 \%$ not enrolled at the end of the school year <br> Graduation rates: <br> Graduated- <br> Migrants - 74\% <br> Non-Migrant - 78\% <br> Didn't Graduate- <br> Migrants - 26\% <br> Non-Migrants - 20\% | $81 \%$ of migrant students are academically promoted to a higher grade | $90 \%$ of nonmigrant students are academically promoted to a higher grade | The percentage of migrant students who are academically promoted to a higher grade needs to increase by $9 \%$ points over the next three to five years | Establish consistent guidelines for districts to accept out-of-state credit for courses with End-of-Course Exams <br> Develop an articulation agreement with Florida Virtual School to allow migrant students to complete unfinished courses and earn credit from within or outside of Florida |

## Health

Health-related data on migrant students continues to be a challenge to gather; however, research supports the notion that good health is correlated to higher academic achievement. The NAC examined available data on free and reduced price lunch (all migrant students qualify for this program) and immunization status and related research literature. Data to drive this need statement were limited. However, the FMPAC identified health issues as a priority in their meeting to examine the CNA results. In light of their "votes" for highest priority issues, and the fact that health was not addressed in the first SDP, the FL MEP identified health as an area of concern to be addressed. Table 20 highlights possible strategies to address health as data are identified. Honing in on available data to further develop solution strategies will continue during the SDP revision phase following this round of CNA.

Table 20. K-12 Needs Related to Health

| Concern Statement | Available Data | Need | Solution Strategy |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| We are concerned that migrant ( $\mathrm{K}-12$ ) students and their parents lack knowledge of good nutrition and dental hygiene. <br> (Health) | To be determined | TBD | Take health/nutrition information/workshops to migrant families <br> Develop partnerships with local health organizations/ agencies and/or local colleges or universities |

Refer to Appendix D for a summary of the K-12 Work Group's concern statements, solution strategies, and the evidence base considered in their deliberations.

## Out-of-School Youth

The current SDP does not address the needs of OSY as this subgroup was not a significant percentage of the migrant demographic at the time of the first CNA. Given the increase of OSY in the state over time, the NAC focused on addressing the needs of both the dropout recovery and the here-to-work subgroups. Therefore, the initial concerns focused on both opportunities to continue education and to develop survival English skills.

The OSY count used at the time of the CNA was 1,884 ( $78 \%$ were served by the MEP). ${ }^{5}$ Sixty-three percent of OSY were male; $85 \%$ were Hispanic. Data were also available from Florida's participation in the Solutions for OSY Consortium, an MEP Consortium Incentive Grant (SOSY) through a profile survey. The profile from the OSY surveys ( $\mathrm{n}=1,172$ ) is found in Appendix E. Of the survey respondents, $95 \%$ were here-to-work and $86 \%$ indicated that they do not speak English.

In deliberations related to solutions, the OSY Work Group, in conjunction with experts in this area, reviewed the plethora of SOSY materials and discussed ways for districts to evaluate what might work best for their population (as there is no one universal solution for OSY). Deliberations focused on collaboration with existing organizations (e.g., the National Center for Farmworker Health, the High School Equivalency Program, etc.) to utilize resources already available. The NAC selected access to information a priority as a result of these discussions, both at the MEP staff level (centralizing available resources in a repository) and at the OSY level (building OSY capacity to access services in communities where they work and reside). The NAC also prioritized solutions related to increasing basic English skills. Table 21 highlights the findings from the CNA process. (Refer to Appendix E for a summary of concern statements and solution strategies.)

[^4]Table 21a. OSY Needs Related to Educational Opportunities

| Concern Statement | Available Data | What Is | What Should Be | Need | Solution Strategy |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| We are concerned that migrant OSY and parents lack information on opportunities available for youth to continue/ reconnect with their education. <br> (Educational continuity, Access to services) | Here-to-Work-95\% <br> Dropout Recovery-4\% <br> Unknown-1\% <br> Average age-19 <br> Interested in Opportunities: <br> Learning English-58\% <br> Job training-9.4\% <br> Earning diploma-9\% <br> Not sure-5\% <br> Not interested-2.3\% <br> Last grade completed: <br> Mode-6th (24\%) <br> Average-6.8 <br> Less than $2 \%$ completed $12^{\text {th }}$ grade <br> Candidate for: <br> HS diploma-1\% <br> Adult Basic Ed-22\% <br> Audio Files-16\% <br> Life Skills-11\% <br> GED-6\% <br> ESL-4\% <br> Job Training-3\% <br> Received: <br> Educational materials-73\% <br> Support services-67\% <br> OSY Welcome bag-91\% <br> Educational referrals-32\% | $73 \%$ of the OSY surveyed received educational materials and $32 \%$ received educational referrals <br> However, the OSY profile data on materials received is not representative of the entire FL OSY population as the data were collected from a quarter of the districts | Increase the percentage of Florida districts completing needs assessments and providing educational resources to OSY | Level 1: The percentage of migrant OSY receiving support to build their capacity to access educational resources in communities where they live and work needs to increase <br> Level 2: The percentage of FL MEP staff who have access to information on educational resources and opportunities for OSY needs to increase | Utilize Out-of-School <br> Youth Consortium materials (www.osymigrant.org). <br> Distribute materials upon first contact with OSY. <br> Create a central repository of information, resources and opportunities; make available to district MEP programs and other interested partners |

Table 21b. OSY Needs Related to Survival English

| Concern Statement | Available Data | What Is | What Should Be | Need | Solution Strategy |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

## IMPLICATIONS

These findings serve as a road map for revising the current SDP to incorporate the more current needs assessment. The Expert Work Groups suggested evaluation measures to assist the FL MEP in tracking implementation and impact. Those ideas are summarized below in Table 22.

Table 22. Evaluation Ideas for CNA Findings

| Concern Statement | Solution Strategy | Suggested Evaluation Measures |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PRESCHOOL <br> We are concerned that migrant preschool students need to be effectively identified, recruited, and provided access to services. <br> We are concerned that migrant preschool students do not consistently receive a high-quality education. | MEP will require development and implementation of a plan to identify and recruit hard-tolocate migrant families with preschool-aged children <br> Migrant preschoolers (ages 3 to 5) should be identified as Priority for Services (PFS) | MEP PFS log for preschool students <br> Tracking of referred services (i.e., personal contacts, written documentation with outcomes) <br> MEP grants must document research-based evidence for program components <br> Research-based assessments will be administered to all participating students |
| K-12 <br> We are concerned that migrant ELs lack content-specific English vocabulary and comprehension. | Provide comprehensive and ongoing professional development for teachers and migrant tutors on the topic of teaching academic language in a subject-specific manner. | Achievement test results <br> Workshop evaluations <br> Teacher/Tutor selfassessments |
| We are concerned that migrant students are not earning enough credits to graduate in 45 years. | Establish consistent guidelines for districts to accept out of state credit for courses with End-of-Course Exams <br> Develop an articulation agreement with Florida Virtual School to allow migrant students to complete unfinished courses and earn credit from within or outside of Florida | Credit accrual <br> Completion of courses <br> Satisfaction of graduation requirements <br> Participation and performance in advanced coursework <br> Report on number of students who would miss end-of-course exams due to mobility |


| Concern Statement | Solution Strategy | Suggested <br> Evaluation Measures |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| K-12 (cont'd) <br> We are concerned that <br> migrant (K-12) students <br> and their parents lack <br> knowledge of good <br> nutrition and dental <br> hygiene. | Take health/nutrition <br> information/workshops to <br> migrant families | Parent and student surveys <br> Develop partnerships with <br> local health <br> organizations/agencies and/or <br> local colleges or universities |
| Records of distribution of <br> materials |  |  |
| Attendance rates |  |  |
| Student achievement results |  |  |

## Next Steps

In order to transition from the CNA findings to SDP revision and implementation, the FL MEP will facilitate three Implementation Committees (Preschool, K-12, and OSY). The purpose of these groups is to obtain input from State and local MEP personnel and content area experts in order to operationalize the strategies and ensure fidelity to the research-based solutions as the SDP is revised to incorporate findings from CNA2. The Committees will assist in targeting data collection where needed, e.g., health, and refining targets as appropriate. The following examples illustrate some of the issues that each of the Implementation Committees might work on:

- Preschool: The committee can offer insights into defining access to quality preschool programs. Drawing upon current early learning research, what are the necessary elements of a preschool program that demonstrate effectiveness in preparing preschoolers for kindergarten? To better understand "school readiness" measures, the committee might discuss the shift in state assessment measures and what the current assessments (FAIR in addition to ECHOS) indicate are necessary skills for Florida kindergarteners.
- K-12: The committee can explore the issues of migrant health more fully by identifying data elements that will assist the FL MEP in examining the current state of how nutrition and dental hygiene impact achievement. What resources and research may help target this area of exploration? For solution strategies that are more developed, e.g., professional development for migrant teachers and tutors in academic English, the committee can add specificity by examining professional development standards as well as research into English language acquisition.
- OSY: The committee can identify solution strategies that focus on building OSY capacity to access educational resources in communities where they live and work. What models currently exist that might illustrate what elements of service provision are effective in helping OSY access educational resources as they migrate? The committee can explore more deeply evaluation measures related to community-based English language programming (e.g., defining intensity of participation by contact hours, assessing gains).

The committees will also foster buy-in from program staff who will be responsible for implementing the strategies at the local level.

Once the Implementation Committees have deliberated, the FL MEP will revise its existing SDP to incorporate new priorities from the CNA2 and develop evaluation measures accordingly. These revisions will be rolled out to the local
programs through the application process and the evaluation reporting template.

## CONCLUSIONS

The FL MEP conducted its second round of CNA to ensure that the State's SDP reflects a current assessment of the unique needs of Florida's migrant student population. This CNA2 allowed the program to examine migrants who are not attending K-12 schools-preschoolers and OSY-populations that have become more predominant in the demographics since the time of the CNA1.

## Lessons Learned

The approach taken in the CNA2 was to facilitate the three-phase model with some important variations that served the process well in looking at lessons learned. These include the following:

- More strategic use of data-The existing evaluation framework and reporting template provided additional information that had not been available for the CNA1. These data sources allowed for a more intensive examination of the gaps in migrant student achievement. The establishment of the Data Work Group facilitated more productive analysis of available information at the Expert Work Group meeting where strategies were identified for the needs. The data analysis provided a more comprehensive diagnosis of the needs, which in turn leads to a more targeted intervention. The Data Work Group members facilitated this stronger diagnosis/intervention connection. The Data Work Group should be engaged in all phases of the CNA.
- Smaller NAC-The MT strategically selected a small team to serve as the NAC to make the process less cumbersome while maintaining a breadth of expertise and experience. The first NAC included over 30 members. The guiding principle in this iteration of the CNA was to keep the group small to facilitate decision making and to draw in outside experts as needed.
- Migrant parent consultation-Migrant parent participation is recommended for the CNA process and consultation is required for development of the SDP. The FL MEP addressed parent input proactively by consulting with the FMPAC on the findings and referring to their priorities in finalizing the action items from the CNA2 to inform the SDP. The FL MEP will consult with the FMPAC as well in the revision of the SDP. Getting input early on ensures that migrant parents are active participants in the decision making process.

The FL MEP will continue to strengthen data collection to inform the program as it moves forward in operationalizing the findings from this most recent CNA2. In updating its SDP and evaluation framework, the FL MEP will continue to address the most pressing needs of its migrant student population based on evidence, stakeholder input (including parents as decision makers), and research-informed practices.

Appendix A
Florida's Agricultural and Commodities at a Glance


## Appendix B

Management Team and NAC Members

| Name \& Title | Emall | Phone | Role |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Carol Gagliano Acting Director FL MEP | Carol.Gagliano@fldoe.org | 850.245.0709 | Program Head, Evaluation Mgmt. Team |
| Dr. Debra Allen Senior Administrator Orange County MEP | allend@ocps.net | 407.317.3940 | Migrant Coordinator, Early Childhood Education |
| Dr. Linda Evans Assistant Professor USF | evans@coedu.usf.edu | 813.974.7888 | Higher Education |
| Linda Fleming Program Specialist FL DOE | linda.fleming@fldoe.org | 850.245.0400 | Student Data |
| Brigita Gahr Migrant Coordinator Collier County MEP | GahrBr@collier.k12.fl.us | 239.377.1862 | Large Migrant Program, OSY |
| Barbara Mainster Executive Director RCMA | barbara@rcma.org | 800.282.6540 | Pre-K |
| Linda Osborne Migrant Coordinator Putnam County MEP | osborne 1@firn.edu | 386.698.4710 | Medium Migrant Program |
| Maria Pouncey Program Coordinator PAEC | pounceym@paec.org | 850.875.3806 | Consortium Migrant Program, MPAC |
| Susan Pratt Teacher Collier County | prattsu@collier.k12.fl.us | $\begin{aligned} & 239.353 .9363 \\ & \text { (Home) } \\ & 239.989 .6353 \\ & \text { (Cell) } \end{aligned}$ | K-12 Educator |
| Ray Melecio Coordinator FL ID\&R Office | raymelecio@escort.org | 866.963.6677 | ID\&R <br> Mgmt. Team |
| Tom Hanley Assistant Director ESCORT | tomhanley@escort.org | 800.451.8058 | Facilitator <br> Mgmt. Team |
| Margot Di Salvo Sr. Administrative Assistant FL ID\&R Office | mdisalvo@escort.org | 866.963.6677 | Logistics, Scribe Mgmt. Team |

## Appendix C Summary of Preschool CNA Findings

## Initial Concerns

- $25 \%$ are not receiving comprehensive services.
- Migrant pre-k children do not receive quality education consistently (Quality issue: requirements for staff, qualifications of staff inconsistent - not only degreed but well trained in early childhood). Language minority pre-k students have difficulties transitioning and adjusting to pre-k programs/services (lack of bilingual personnel for ease of transition, adjustment).
- Inconsistencies across curriculum - every program can select their own curriculum must be scientifically-based research.
- Lack of strong curriculum directed at migrant pre-k.
- Lack of cultural competence among staff is a barrier to parents feeling welcome or engaged.
- Requirements for volunteering and participating in school-based activities often will create a barrier for some parents due to background checks.
- Lack of bilingual teachers in pre-k setting - Spanish, different dialects.
- Low literacy levels and language development of parents in an individual's first language creates difficulty when providing support in the home/school.
- Inconsistency in provision of "support-in-the-home" training for parents across pre-k programs.
- Not enough children/parents using libraries and parent resource centers.
- Participating children not consistently receiving dental and health screenings (including children with disabilities who are not receiving timely identification - mental, physical).
- Children and families do not have adequate access to bilingual mental health professionals.
- Migrant pre-k face safety issues within some homes (unsafe facilities; domestic violence, abuse; leaving kids under 12 yrs. old at home by themselves).
- Non-participating children are not receiving health screenings and services; needs not met (CAN'T GET DATA)
- Pre-k children's access to services is hindered by: families' lack of transportation; driver's license issues; families' need for translation services; families' lack of knowledge regarding services; and families' concerns regarding cost of services.
- Concerns of immigration status - undocumented families have difficulties in accessing health services, including nutrition (WIC).
- Even if access to services is available, the reading level used in some written material creates a handicap (inability to read/understand) for most of our parents (differentiated parent involvement materials).


## Pre-Kindergarten Expert Work Group

- Mary Anderson - Teacher on Special Assignment for Pre-k, Escambia County Public Schools
- Wendy Bradshaw - MA/MAT Program Recruiter, Infant-Toddler Developmental Specialist, University of South Florida
- Phyllis Cooley - Migrant Services Coordinator, Panhandle Area Educational Consortium
- Dr. San Juanita de la Cruz - District Supervisor, Office of Early Childhood Programs, Miami-Dade Public Schools
- Data Team Member: Dr. Debra Allen - Coordinator, Migrant Education Program, Orange County Public Schools


## CONCERN STATEMENT:

## We are concerned that migrant pre-k students do not consistently receive a high-quality education.

## Proposed Solutions

- Migrant Education Program (MEP) pre-k readiness programs should be labeled as Priority for Services
- MEP must allocate a specific funding base for implementing high-quality pre-k programs
- MEP must implement Title I standards for pre-k staff qualifications
- MEP must require the utilization of research-based practices in pre-k programs
- MEP must ensure continuity of services throughout the calendar year


## Evaluation Ideas

- MEP Evaluation
- MEP Priority for Service log for pre-k students
- Review of personnel files to ensure qualifications are met
- MEP grants must document research-based evidence for program components
- Research-based assessments will be administered to all participating students


## Referenced Research

- FLDOE (2010). Results of 2009 Kindergarten Screening. Memo to District School Superintendents. Retrieved from http://www.fldoe.org/news/2010/2010 06 01/Memo1-6-10.pdf.
- Levin, M., Gamse, B., Swartz, J., Tao, F., Tarr, H. (1997). National evaluation of the Even Start Family Literacy Program: Report on Migrant Even Start Projects.
- Ribando, C. (2002). Life on the move: The unique needs of migratory children. Master's thesis, University of Texas at Austin, United States-Texas. Retrieved from ERIC database (Record ED473468).
- Rosenbaum, R.P., Smith, J., Zhang, G. (2006). Labor market and teaching staff considerations for making early childhood education work for migrant Head Start teachers: The case of Michigan Migrant Head Start. Journal of Early Childhood Teacher Education, 27 (1), 87-102.
- U.S. Department of Education (2004). Serving preschool children under Title I: Non-regulatory guidance. Retrieved from www2.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/preschoolguidance.doc.


## CONCERN STATEMENT:

We are concerned that migrant pre-k students and their families do not participate fully in services because of cultural barriers.

## Proposed Solutions

- MEP should provide cultural competence training for staff
- MEP should utilize effective communication strategies based on the needs of the family
- Spoken language
- Appropriate readability levels in home language written communication
- Culturally respectful communication
- Support of home-school connections (i.e. home visitation, family night, newsletters)
- MEP should provide individualized supports for specific family needs


## Evaluation Ideas

- MEP Evaluation
- Samples of written communication and parent communication logs
- All education and training activities must include an evaluation component
- A cultural competence assessment for service providers


## Referenced Research

- Essa, E., Burnham, M., \& National Association for the Education of Young Children. (2009). Informing our practice: Useful research on young children's development. Washington, DC: National Association for the Education of Young Children.
- Ribando, C. (2002). Life on the move: The unique needs of migratory children. Master's thesis, University of Texas at Austin, United States-Texas. Retrieved September 22, 2010, from ERIC database (Record ED473468).
- Rogoff, B. (2003) The cultural nature of human development Oxford University Press, New York.
- Durand, Tina M. (2008) 'Celebrating diversity in early care and education settings: moving beyond the margins', Early Child Development and Care, 180:7, 835 - 848. doi 10.1080/03004430802466226.


## CONCERN STATEMENT:

We are concerned that migrant pre-k students do not have adequate opportunities to develop early literacy and language skills at home.

## Proposed Solutions

- MEP will provide literacy and language development for families and children
- Home-school connections (i.e. home visitation, family night, newsletters)


## Evaluation Ideas

- All education and training activities must include an evaluation component
- Documentation of parental involvement in activities (i.e. attendance sheets, agendas, visitation logs)
- Pre-k and kindergarten assessment scores


## Referenced Research

- Boyce, L.K., Innocenti, M.S., Roggman, L.A., Norman, V.K., Ortiz, E. (2010). Telling stories and making
books: Evidence for an intervention to help parents in migrant Head Start families support their children's language and literacy. Early Education and Development, 21 (3), 343-371.
- Hart, B. \& Risley, T.R. (2003). The early catastrophe: The 30 million word gap. American Educator, 27, (pp. 4-9).
- Levin, M., Gamse, B., Swartz, J., Tao, F., Tarr, H. (1997). National evaluation of the Even Start Family Literacy Program: Report on Migrant Even Start Projects.
- Lonigan, C.A., \& Shanahan, T. (2009). Developing early literacy: Report of the National Early Literacy Panel. Executive Summary. A scientific synthesis of early literacy development and implications for intervention. National Institute for Literacy.
- Ward, P.A., \& Franquiz, M.E. (2004). An integrated approach: Even Start family literacy model for migrant families. In Scholars in the Field: The Challenges of Migrant Education.


## CONCERN STATEMENT:

We are concerned that migrant pre-k students need to be effectively identified, recruited, and provided access to services.

## Proposed Solutions

- MEP will require development and implementation of a plan to identify and recruit hard-to-locate migrant families with non-school age children
- Provide recruitment materials and announcements using methods that address the needs of this specific population
- Provide personal contacts for referrals to services (i.e. pre-k diagnostic services, social services, health services)
- Partnership with community agencies to share successful access strategies
- MEP will create a plan for inter-program collaboration to facilitate services
- MEP will conduct outreach activities (i.e. physical and mental health services, Child Find screenings, safety education, social service agencies, educational and motivational experiences)
- MEP will provide parent education on how to effectively access and utilize services


## Evaluation Ideas

- MEP Evaluation
- Track number of non-school age children identified
- Samples of recruitment materials
- Tracking of referred services (i.e. personal contacts, written documentation with outcomes)
- Documentation of parental involvement in activities (i.e. attendance sheets, agendas, visitation logs)


## Referenced Research

- Hanley, T., \& Melecio, R. (2004). Ideas and strategies for identification and recruitment. In Scholars in the Field: The Challenges of Migrant Education.
- Quandt, S.A., Clark, H.M, Rao, P., \& Arcury, T.A. (2007). Oral health of children and adults in Latino migrant and seasonal farmworker families. Journal of Immigrant Minority Health, 9 (3), 229-235. doi: 10.1007//s10903-006-9033-7.
- Ribando, C. (2002). Life on the move: The unique needs of migratory children. Master's thesis, University of Texas at Austin, United States-Texas. Retrieved September 22, 2010, from ERIC database (Record ED473468).
- Ward, P.A., \& Franquiz, M.E. (2004). An integrated approach: Even Start family literacy model for migrant families. In Scholars in the Field: The Challenges of Migrant Education.
- Weathers, A. , Minkovitz, C., O'Campo, P., \& Diener-West, M. (2004). Access to care for children of migratory agricultural workers: Factors associated with unmet need for medical care. Pediatrics, 113 (4),

276-282.

## Pre-Kindergarten

## Priority for Services

- Low literacy level of parents (in English, non-completion of school)
- Children not being served at all in any programs
- Below average scores on academic pre-assessments
- Meets definition of homeless
- Low scores on home literacy environment checklist


## Appendix D Summary of K-12 CNA Findings

## Initial Concerns

- New graduation requirements and attendance and school performance impact educational continuity for migrant students.
- Placement is a factor, the students are not always placed at same level across states/districts - core factors are inconsistent across states or from district to district.
- Supplemental support needs to be added to instructional time.
- Instructional time varies according to curriculum set-up - children need to be placed quickly into appropriate programs.
- Migrant students have other obligations which impact their participation in extracurricular activities (outside regular school day schedule).
- Migrant students demonstrate a lower level of school engagement due to lack of crosscultural awareness across the student body to understand and appreciate differences (benchmark).
- Language (academic English) is an obstacle for migrant students because textbook content, particularly in higher grades, is at higher level English than the migrant student's reading \& comprehension level; students are good decoders but still lack comprehension.
- Parents need to be given instruction on how to provide support in the home including how to organize materials; educators need to think outside the box to develop innovative ways that students can continue to learn in the home
- Migrant students lack access to internet, which is essential to educational support in the home.
- Students and parents must be taught good nutrition and dental hygiene - helps students to be connected with peers.
- Children are not screened often enough for vision and hearing and lack appropriate follow up.
- Because of language barriers and mobility, migrant students do not have opportunities to participate in gifted programs, honors classes, AP classes, ESE, career academy, virtual ed.
- Transportation presents a problem.


## K-12 Expert Work Group

- Linda Evans - Assistant Professor, Foreign Language Education, University of South Florida
- Juanita Torres - Migrant Education Program Coordinator, Suwannee County Public Schools
- Susan Pratt - Educator, Lake Trafford Elementary School, Collier County Public Schools
- Beatriz Vidales - Education Specialist, Migrant Education Program, Miami-Dade Public School
- Jodi Bell - Title I Coordinator, Migrant Education Program, Hendry County Public Schools
- Data Team Member: Julie McLeod - Supervisor, Federal Program Evaluation, Hillsborough County Public Schools


## CONCERN STATEMENT:

We are concerned that migrant K-12 students lack access to and training in the use of computer technology and the internet, which are essential to education support in the home.

## Proposed Solutions to Close the Achievement Gap:

- Equip each qualified student/school-age siblings/family with a wireless technology package ie: I-Pad, ITouch, I-Phone, laptop, notebook, e-readers, etc. This plan must include student/parent usage contract and high-speed internet service plan
- Schedule daily tutorial support via virtual classroom curriculum
- Create electronic portfolio to facilitate student - teacher communication and teacher - teacher communication when students move
- Provide access to and training in the use of computer-based and/or online programs such as:
- Word processing, spreadsheet, presentation, weblog (written, voice and video) and wiki software
- FCAT Explorer
- Virtual media center/textbooks
- Language acquisition programs
- Florida Virtual School
- PASS/Mini-PASS


## Evaluation Ideas

- Student Tool for Technology Literacy (ST2L): http://www.flinnovates.org/sttl used as part of EETT federal grant
- Track distribution and usage of technology
- Surveys (parent, student, and teacher)
- Achievement results
- Pre and post technology proficiency test results


## Referenced Research

- Chang, M. \& Kim, S. (2009). Computer access and computer use for science performance of racial and linguistic minority students. Journal of Educational Computing Research, 40(4), 469-501.
- De-Marcos, L., et al (2010). An experiment for improving students performance in secondary and tertiary education by means of M-Learning auto-assessment. Computers \& Education, 55(3), 1069-1079.
- Lacina, J. (2008). Learning English with iPods. Childhood Education, 84(4), 247-249.
- Langman, J. \& Fies, C. (2010). Classroom response system-mediated science learning with English language learners. Language and Education, 24(10), 81-99.
- Lai, C.H., Yang, J.C., Chen, F.C., Ho, C.W. \& Liang, J.S. (2009). Mobile-technology-supported experiential learning. International Journal of Instructional Media, 36(1), 41-53.
- McLean, C.A. (2010). A space called home: An immigrant adolescent's digital literacy practices. Journal of Adolescent \& Adult Literacy, 54(1), 13-22.
- Meyertholen, P., Castro, S.V., \& Salinas, C. (2004). Project SMART: Using technology to provide continuity fo migrant children. In Salinas, C. \& Franquiz, M.E. (Eds.), Scholars in the Field: The Challenges of Migrant Education. Charleston, WV: AEL, Inc.
- Moving Education, University of Texas at Austin http://www.utexas.edu/features/archive/2004/migrant.html
- One Laptop per Child, OLPC Corp., http://laptop.org/en/vision/index.shtml.
- Suhr, K.A., Hernandez, D.A., Grimes, D. \& Warschauer, M. (2010). Laptops and fourth-grade literacy: Assisting the jump over the fourth-grade slump. Journal of Technology, Learning, and Assessment, 9(5).
- Sun, Y. (2009). Voice blog: An exploratory study of language learning. Language, Learning \& Technology, 13(2), 88-104.
- Tapscott, D. (1998). Growing Up Digital: The Rise of the Net Generation. New York: McGraw-Hill, 255-264, 266-279.
- Warschauer, M. \& Matuchniak, T. (2010). New technology and digital worlds: Analyzing evidence of equity access, use, and outcomes. Review of Research in Education, 34(1), 179-225.


## CONCERN STATEMENT:

We are concerned that new graduation requirements and attendance and school performance impact
educational continuity for migrant K-12 students.

## Proposed Solutions to Close the Achievement Gap:

- Develop articulation agreements with other states to allow students to take End-of-Course and Advanced Placement (AP) exams if they migrate prior to administration
- Establish consistent guidelines for districts to accept out of state credit for courses with End-of-Course Exams
- Establish consistent guidelines for districts to accept credits for courses taken in other districts within Florida
- Develop an articulation agreement with Florida Virtual School to allow migrant students to complete unfinished courses and earn credit from within or outside of Florida


## Evaluation Ideas

- Credit accrual
- Completion of courses
- Satisfaction of graduation requirements
- Participation in advanced coursework
- Performance in advanced coursework
- Report on number of students who would miss end-of-course exams due to mobility


## Referenced Research

- Watson, J. \& Gemin, B. (2008). Using Online Learning for At-Risk Students and Credit Recovery. North American Council for Online Learning.


## CONCERN STATEMENT:

We are concerned that transportation presents a problem for migrant K-12 students and their families.
Lack of transportation impacts migrant students and their families in a variety of ways, including:
P Participation in extended day/year activities (tutoring, clubs, sports, summer school, community service, student performances, etc.)
Parent participation in school activities, workshops, meetings, conferences, etc.

## Proposed Solutions to Close the Achievement Gap:

- Take academic and informational programs to locations convenient for migrant families
- Provide bus passes and/or pre-paid gas cards
- Purchase a migrant vehicle, perhaps to be shared by several schools
- Engage the interest of local businesses - including car dealerships - that might be willing to make a donation
- Network with local churches for donated use of church vans for school events
- Create transportation links and provide them in schools: public transportation information, (including maps of bus routes) and assistance in organizing carpooling


## Evaluation Ideas

- Participation
- Surveys
- Transportation purchase and service logs


## Referenced Research

- District level migrant secondary student surveys
- Evans, L.S., (Research study; report in development) Factors Affecting the Academic Achievement of Migrant Students.
- Best Practices and Biggest Obstacles in Educating Hispanic Migrant Students: http://www.google.com/search?hl=en\&rls=com.microsoft\%3A*\&q=lack+of+migrant+students+and+pare nts+participation+in+school+activities+due+to+transportation\&btnG=Search\&aq=f\&aqi=\&aql=\&oq=\&gs_r fai=
- Migrant Farmworkers in the United States:
http://www.google.com/search?hl=en\&rls=com.microsoft\%3A*\&q=school+transportation+for+children+ of+migrant+workers+in+the+USA\&btnG=Search\&aq=f\&aqi=\&aql=\&oq=\&gs_rfai=
- Hispanic/Latino Focus Group: http://waushara.uwex.edu/latinostudy.html
- Examining the Underutilization of Parent Involvement in the Schools:
http://scholar.google.com/scholar?start=10\&q=lack+of+migrant+students+and+parents+participation+in +school+activities+due+to+transportation\&hl=en\&as_sdt=40000\&as_vis=1
- Parent Involvement, Cultural Capital, and the Achievement Gap Among Elementary School Children: http://aer.sagepub.com/content/43/2/193.abstract


## CONCERN STATEMENT:

We are concerned that language (academic English) is an obstacle for migrant K-12 students because textbook content, particularly in higher grades, is at higher level English than the migrant students' reading and comprehension level; students are good decoders but still lack comprehension.

## Proposed Solutions to Close the Achievement Gap:

- Offer teachers (ESL \& content teachers) \& migrant tutors workshops specifically targeted to teaching academic language in a subject-specific manner
- Consider using the Why Reading is Hard materials as the foundation, and incorporating promising technology
- Provide a content-language teaching toolkit that includes the Why Reading is Hard series to be used for targeted professional development
- Provide workshops/sessions to students to train them in metacognitive strategies to handle content language in a more productive manner


## Evaluation Ideas

- Achievement test results
- Workshop evaluations


## Referenced Research

Note: This is not an exhaustive review of the research in this area, but rather a representative sample of research that explores issues that impact migrant students' academic achievement in content-based academic classes. More titles available upon request.

- August, D. \& Shanahan, T. , eds. (2006). Developing literacy in second language learners: Report of the National Literacy Panel on language minority children and youth. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Coleman, R. \& Goldenberg, C. (2010). What does research say about effective practices for English learners? Part II: Academic language proficiency. Kappa Delta Pi, 46(2), 60-65.
- Guerrero, M.D. (2004). Acquiring academic English in one year: An unlikely proposition for English language learners. Urban Education, 39(2), 172-199.
- Hadaway, N. L. (2009). A narrow bridge to academic reading. Educational Leadership, 66(7), 38-41.
- Lopez, O. S. (2010). The digital learning classroom: Improving English language learners' academic success in mathematics and reading using interactive whiteboard technology. Computers in Education, 54(4), 901-15.
- McElvain, C.M. (2010). Transactional literature circles and the reading comprehension of English learners in the mainstream classroom. Journal of Research in Reading, 33(2), 178-205.
- Menken, K. \& Kleyn, T. (2010). The long-term impact of subtractive schooling in the educational experiences of secondary English language learners. International Journal of Bilingual Education \& Bilingualism, 13(4), 399-417.
- Meyer, L. (2000). Barriers to meaningful instruction for English Learners. Theory into Practice, 39, 228-236
- van Rooyen, D. \& Jordaan, H. (2009). An aspect of language for academic purposes in secondary education: Complex sentence comprehension by learners in an integrated Gauteng school. South African Journal of Education, 29(2), 271-287.
- Why Reading is Hard - Center for Applied Linguistics, http://www.cal.org/wrih/. Featuring Catherine Snow and Lily Wong Fillmore.
- SPECIAL ISSUE of journal: Theory Into Practice (2010), V. 49(2). Topic - Integrating English language learners in content classes. 9 research articles on ELLs in content classes and the implications of language learning for academic success.


## CONCERN STATEMENT:

We are concerned that migrant k-12 students and parents must be taught good nutrition and dental hygiene helps students to be connected with peers.

## Proposed Solutions to Close the Achievement Gap:

- Hire/train migrant person to coordinate/find community resources
- Take health/nutrition information/workshops to the migrant families
- Develop partnerships with local health organizations/agencies and/or local colleges or universities
- Develop student/age-appropriate health/hygiene materials for students to take home
- Create information modules (online, print and/or workshop-based) for health-related professionals in the schools (school nurses, PE teachers, coaches, etc.) to meet needs of migrant students
- Distribute welcome bags with information materials and sample hygiene products


## Evaluation Ideas

- Parent and student surveys
- Records of distribution of materials
- Attendance rates
- Student achievement results
- Sign-in sheets for workshops
- Documentation of coordination and/or hiring


## Referenced Research

- Oral health issues among migrant farmworkers: http://goliath.ecnext.com/coms2/gi_0199-1555745/Oral-health-issues-among-migrant.html
- Health Issues of Migrant \& Seasonal Farmworkers:
http://phsj.org/files/Migrant\ and\ Seasonal\ Farm\ Worker\ Health/Migrant\ and\ Se asonal\%20Farm\%20Workers\%20-\%20JHCPU.pdf
- National Center for Farmworkers Health:http://www.ncfh.org/docs/fsORAL\ HEALTH\ FACT\ SHEET.pdf
- Basch, C. L. (2010). Healthier Students Are Better Learners: A Missing Link in School Reforms to Close the Achievement Gap
- http://econ.byu.edu/faculty/showalter/Assets/Papers/Child_Health_Academic_Achievement__eide_.pdf
- Making the Connection: Health and Student Achievement, Society of State Directors of Health, Physical Education and Recreation (SSDHPER)


## CONCERN STATEMENT:

We are concerned that migrant k-12 students are not screened often enough for vision and hearing and lack appropriate follow-up.

## Proposed Solutions to Close the Achievement Gap:

- Add vision and hearing screening to migrant students' school registration
- Develop tracking system to ensure that students are screened at a minimum annually and that follow-up is conducted
- Add "Does your child wear glasses?" to the district emergency card or other information to which the classroom teacher has immediate access
- Hire migrant health person to coordinate screenings and service follow-ups
- Develop/enhance business partnerships with health professionals (ie. for free screenings, glasses, and replacements)
- Coordinate with district and/or state assistive technology for referral, evaluation, and follow-up


## Evaluation Ideas

- Log of referrals/screenings
- Surveys
- Documentation of coordination and partnerships
- Documentation of tracking system


## Referenced Research

- http://www.optometrists.org/therapists_teachers/Harvard_study_literacy.html


## K-12

## Priority for Services

General comment: The K-12 Work Group thinks that perhaps the PFS indicators should be somewhat differentiated for elementary and secondary level students.

Language level/academic proficiency - A major concern for both elementary and secondary Density of family structure - Eligibility for homeless (both elementary and secondary)

## Elementary

Retention at 3rd grade - Perhaps creating a greater emphasis on needs in grades K-2
Migrant students and Response to Intervention (RTI) - Coordination of services

## Secondary

Missing end-of-course exams
Out of school suspensions
Ds/Fs in core classes

## Appendix $E$ Summary of OSY CNA Findings

## Initial Concerns

- OSY students lack proper and adequate assessments of skills in home language.
- OSY migrant need flexible instructional schedules and options.
- OSY migrant have different achievement levels - instruction options available may not address the different levels.
- OSY recovery have an increased sense of isolation (recovery youth unable to "relate" socially and academically to school setting).
- OSY here to work have no cultural connection with the setting/system.
- School engagement is hindered by language issues especially for those speaking dialects who understand little Spanish or English.
- OSY here to work are in need of survival English skills.
- OSY recovery lack the English language skills necessary to participate in a regular school setting.
- OSY experience lack of parental or spousal encouragement to return to school.
- OSY/parents lack information on opportunities available for youth to continue/reconnect their education.
- Lack of child care for OSY parents inhibits participation in educational settings.
- OSY here to work lack proper health services (access).
- OSY lack awareness of proper/adequate health education (STD, hygiene, etc.).
- OSY access to services is hindered by: lack of social security number (limited post secondary education options, placement in technical/vocational services); lack of knowledge of requirements required by service providers by staff (thinking that a SSN is needed stops OSY from looking/securing services).
- Limited resources for students who lack SSN.
- Lack of access to health services (not opened at night or weekends); Lack of access to educational services (flexible times).
- OSY lack transportation to services.

OSY lack access/knowledge regarding technology.

## Out-of-School Youth Expert Work Group

- Michael Hay - Director, Migrant Education Program, Eastern Kentucky University
- Shirley Caban-Tellez - Specialist III, Community College and Workforce Education, Florida Department of Education
- Patrick Doone - Director, HEP and CAMP, University of South Florida
- Andrew Tattrie - Coordinator, Migrant Education Program, Polk County Public Schools
- Data Team Member: Kirk Vandersall - Managing Director, Arroyo Research Services


## CONCERN STATEMENT:

We are concerned that migrant Out-of-School Youth (OSY) students and parents lack information on opportunities available for youth to continue/reconnect their education.

## Proposed Solutions

- Create a central repository of information, resources and opportunities; make available to district MEP programs and other interested partners
- Require districts to compile specific resources and opportunities available for OSY
- Monitor and evaluate district use of partners to promote education alternatives and provide support for dissemination of information (e.g. Mexican Consulate, National Farmworker Jobs Program (NFJP), High School Equivalency Program (HEP), College Assistance Migrant Program (CAMP), and other Alternative Ed Programs, Colleges, Schools, and Community Agencies)
- Monitor and evaluate district information sharing e.g. Handouts/Flyers on graduation requirements, alternative Ed options, ESOL classes, adult school, Tech school, etc.


## Evaluation Ideas

- Survey or monitor districts regarding:
- Use of partners for OSY information sharing
- Information distribution strategies and counts
- Survey targeted district partners regarding:
- Services and referrals to OSY's
- District coordination of OSY outreach
- Attendance/Enrollment in OSY/Alternative Ed. programs
- Increased Graduation Rate

Referenced Research

- www.osymigrant.org
- The Help! Kit - A Resource Guide for Secondary Teachers of Migrant English Language Learners: ESCORT/SERVE - 2001
- Out of School Immigrant Youth. Public Policy Institute of California: 2007
- Literacy Education for Adult Migrant Farmworkers: ERIC Digest: 1991


## CONCERN STATEMENT:

We are concerned that migrant OSY students here to work are in need of Survival English Skills.

## Proposed Solutions

Provide resources, examples, funding, and monitor for:

- Creating a central repository of information, resources and opportunities for OSY English learning, including alternative scheduling examples for districts and partnership case studies
- Creating state-level intensive programs focused on teaching OSY English
- Creating multi-faceted pilot projects to teach OSY's English
- Mobile English classes via van/bus
- iPOD project
- Sed de Saber project
- Backpack Project - contents might include survival English resources, Spanish/English dictionaries, hygiene products, and resources/contacts for other educational, health, and community resources
- Collaborative partnerships with libraries, churches, and other community agencies to provide English classes
- English classes specifically for migrant OSY in their home, neighborhood, or community center classes would be in the evenings or the weekends.
- Other ideas...


## Evaluation Ideas

- Percentage of district programs that participate in the recommended OSY programs
- Percentage of OSY's that receive Survival English Materials
- Percentage of district OSY's that attend English Programs
- Outcome data from students in OSY English programs
- OSY program expenditures on here to work English programs


## Referenced Research

- www.osymigrant.org
- The Help! Kit - A Resource Guide for Secondary Teachers of Migrant English Language Learners: ESCORT/SERVE - 2001
- Out of School Immigrant Youth. Public Policy Institute of California: 2007
- Literacy Education for Adult Migrant Farmworkers: ERIC Digest: 1991
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## Out-of-School Youth

## CONCERN STATEMENT:

## We are concerned that migrant OSY students need flexible instructional schedules and options.

## Proposed Solutions

- Require OSY components in LEA Migrant applications and budgets. These should address:
- Flexible scheduling
- Staffing
- Transportation
- Capacity Building (OSY Programs and Activities)
- Differentiating services for Recovery vs. Here to Work
- Assure that OSY recovery efforts connect with district and other alternative programs with flexible scheduling
- Monitor for flexible schedules and optional programs as listed below
- State funded Summer Institutes
- State funded Evening and Weekend Programs modeled after the HEP and other retrieval English language programs
- District drop-out recovery programs


## Evaluation Ideas

- Evidence of planning and implementation of OSY specific services as listed in MEP application, budget, evaluation and monitoring systems
- Flexible scheduling
- Transportation
- Number of staff, partners, referrals, attendance, student outcomes on assessments
- Recovery vs. Here-to-Work Differentiation
- LEA MEP reporting of referrals to other alternative education programs with flexible scheduling
- Count of OSY participating in alternative education programs


## Referenced Research

- www.osymigrant.org
- The Help! Kit - A Resource Guide for Secondary Teachers of Migrant English Language Learners: ESCORT/SERVE - 2001
- Out of School Immigrant Youth. Public Policy Institute of California: 2007
- Literacy Education for Adult Migrant Farmworkers: ERIC Digest: 1991
- Kerka (2004) Strategies for Serving Out-of-School Youth, Ohio Learning Work.
- Schorr, L. \& Schorr, D (1989). Within Our Reach: Breaking the Cycle of Disadvantage. New York: Anchor.
- Cranston, A., Browder, C., Doone, P., Hromalik, D., Martinez, Y., Mendez, R. \& Nixon, A., (1996). Retrieving and rebuilding: The high school equivalency program for migrant youth. Proceedings of the $8^{\text {th }}$ Annual National Dropout Prevention Conference 139-150. Tampa: Institute for At-Risk Infants, Children \& Youth and Their Families.
- Martinez, Y. \& Cranston, A. (1996). Migrant students in the education process: Barriers to school completion. The High School Journal, 80(1) 28-38.
- Ward, P. (2002). Out-of-school youth proceedings report, Seminar on Migrant Out-of-School Youth. Portland: Interstate Migrant Education Council.


## Out-of-School Youth

## Priority for Services

- Indicate any interest in receiving education services
- Indicate any interest in participating in language acquisition programs
- Are within $[x]$ credits of graduating
- Dropped out of high school within the past year
- Have experienced a migratory event in the last [x] months
- OSY who are the head of the household
- Single parent female OSY
- OSY with a criminal record (?)

The SOSY Profile Data Summary is available in PDF by clicking on the icon below.


2010_OSYSurveys-u
pdated08.10.10.pdf


[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ Unless otherwise noted, the data source for migrant demographics is the FLDOE's Survey 5.

[^1]:    ${ }^{2}$ Florida Department of Education. (2010). Results of 2009 kindergarten screening: Memo to district school superintendents. Available online at: http://www.fldoe.org/news/2010/2010 06 01/Memo1-6-10.pdf.

[^2]:    ${ }^{3}$ Witkin, B.R., \& Altschuld, J.W. (1995). Planning and conducting needs assessments: A practical guide. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.

[^3]:    ${ }^{4}$ A correction was made to the reading proficiency data for ELs and non-ELs during the writing of this final report.

[^4]:    ${ }^{5}$ The OSY Work Group set specifications to obtain counts from the FL DOE (Survey 5) based on age, QAD, and school and migrant status codes. The FL MEP also identified data reporting errors and later determined the count of OSY was closer to 6,000 . The sample size of 1,884 represents only about a quarter of the districts in the state.

