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Overview

Mission

The mission of the North Carolina Migrant Education Program (NCMEP) is to help migrant students and youth meet high academic challenges by overcoming the obstacles created by frequent moves, educational disruption, cultural and language differences, and health-related problems.

NCDPI supports locally-based Migrant Education Programs in:

- Identifying and recruiting migrant students.
- Providing high quality supplemental and support services.
- Fostering coordination among schools, agencies, organizations, and businesses to assist migrant families.
- Collaborating with other states to enhance the continuity of education for migrant students.

Purpose

The NCMEP is federally funded as part of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA). The purpose of the Migrant Education Program, otherwise known at Title I, Part C, of ESEA, is to assist the States to:

- **Support** high-quality and comprehensive educational programs for migratory children to help reduce the educational disruptions and other problems that result from repeated moves.
- **Ensure** that migratory children who move among the States are not penalized in any manner by disparities among the States in curriculum, graduation requirements, and State academic content and student academic achievement standards.
- **Ensure** that migratory children are provided with appropriate educational services (including supportive services) that address their special needs in a coordinated and efficient manner.
- **Ensure** that migratory children receive full and appropriate opportunities to meet the same challenging State academic content and student academic achievement standards that all children are expected to meet.
- **Design** programs to help migratory children overcome educational disruption, cultural and language barriers, social isolation, various health-related problems, and other factors that inhibit the ability of such children to do well in school and to prepare such children to make a successful transition to postsecondary education or employment.
- **Ensure** that migratory children benefit from State and local systemic reforms.
Legislative Requirements

Section 1306(a)(1) of Title I, Part C of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 2001 requires State Education Agencies (SEAs) and local operating agencies to identify and address the special educational needs of migrant children in accordance with a comprehensive plan that:

- Is integrated with other Federal programs, particularly those authorized by ESEA;
- Provides migrant children an opportunity to meet the same challenging State academic content and student academic achievement standards that all children are expected to meet;
- Specifies measurable program goals and outcomes;
- Encompasses the full range of services that are available to migrant children from appropriate local, State, and Federal educational programs;
- Is the product of joint planning among administrators of local, State, and Federal programs, including Title I, Part A, early childhood programs, and language instruction education programs under Part A or B of Title III; and
- Provides for the integration of services available under Part C with services provided by such other programs.

Sec. 200.83 of the Code of Federal Regulations (34 CFR) outlines the responsibilities of SEAs to implement projects through a comprehensive needs assessment and a comprehensive State plan for service delivery, as follows:

a) An SEA that receives a grant of MEP funds must develop and update a written comprehensive State plan (based on a current statewide needs assessment) that, at a minimum, has the following components:

1) Performance targets. The plan must specify—
   (i) Performance targets that the State has adopted for all children in reading and mathematics achievement, high school graduation, and the number of school dropouts, as well as the State's performance targets, if any, for school readiness; and
   (ii) Any other performance targets that the State has identified for migratory children.

2) Needs assessment. The plan must include an identification and assessment of—
   (i) The unique educational needs of migratory children that result from the children's migratory lifestyle; and
   (ii) Other needs of migratory students that must be met in order for migratory children to participate effectively in school.

3) Service delivery. The plan must describe the strategies that the SEA will pursue on a statewide basis to achieve the performance targets in paragraph (a)(1) of this section by addressing—
   (i) The unique educational needs of migratory children consistent with paragraph (a)(2)(i) of this section; and
   (ii) Other needs of migratory children consistent with paragraph (a)(2)(ii) of this section.

4) Evaluation. The plan must describe how the State will evaluate the effectiveness of its program.

b) The SEA must develop its comprehensive state plan in consultation with the State Parent Advisory Council or, for SEAs not operating programs for one school year in duration, in consultation with the parents of migratory children. This consultation must be in a format and language that the parents understand.

c) Each SEA receiving MEP funds must ensure that its local operating agencies comply with the comprehensive State plan.
The Non-Regulatory Guidance published by the Office of Migrant Education (OME) in 2010 summarizes the statutory requirements of the Service Delivery Plan as follows:

1. **Performance Targets.** The plan must specify the performance targets that the State has adopted for all migrant children for: reading; mathematics; high school graduation/the number of school dropouts; school readiness (if adopted by the SEA); and any other performance target that the State has identified for migrant children. (34 CFR 200.83(a)(1))

2. **Needs Assessment.** The plan must include identification and an assessment of: (1) the unique educational needs of migrant children that result from the children’s migrant lifestyle; and (2) other needs of migrant students that must be met in order for them to participate effectively in school. (34 CFR 200.83(a)(2))

3. **Measurable Program Outcomes.** The plan must include the measurable outcomes that the Migrant Education Program (MEP) will produce statewide through specific educational or educationally-related services. (Section 1306(a)(1)(D) of the statute.)

4. Measurable outcomes allow the MEP to determine whether and to what degree the program has met the special educational needs of migrant children that were identified through the comprehensive needs assessment. The measurable outcomes should also help achieve the State’s performance targets.

5. **Service Delivery.** The plan must describe the SEA’s strategies for achieving the performance targets and measurable objectives described above. The State’s service delivery strategy must address: (1) the unique educational needs of migrant children that result from the children’s migrant lifestyle, and (2) other needs of migrant students that must be met in order for them to participate effectively in school. (34 CFR 200.83(a)(3))

6. **Evaluation.** The plan must describe how the State will evaluate whether and to what degree the program is effective in relation to the performance targets and measurable outcomes. (34 CFR 200.83(a)(4))

In addition, the Non-Regulatory Guidance identifies components that may be contained in the SDP, including the policies and procedures an SEA will implement to address other administrative activities and program functions, such as:

- **Priority for Services.** A description of how, on a statewide basis, the State will give priority to migrant children who: (1) are failing, or most at risk of failing, to meet the state’s challenging academic content and student achievement standards, and 2) whose education has been interrupted during the regular school year.

- **Parent Involvement.** A description of the SEA’s consultation with parents (or with the State parent advisory council, if the program is of one school year in duration) and whether the consultation occurred in a format and language that the parents understand.

- **Identification and Recruitment.** A description of the State’s plan for identification and recruitment activities and its quality control procedures.

- **Student Records.** A description of the State’s plan for requesting and using migrant student records and transferring migrant student records to schools and projects in which migrant students enroll.

Based on the Non-Regulatory Guidance of the OME, the NCMEP will update and revise the Service Delivery Plan when:

- The Comprehensive Needs Assessment has been updated due to significant demographic changes or state assessment results.
- There have been changes in the state performance targets.
- There are major changes in the focus of activities and services that the MEP will provide.
- There is a change in the design of the evaluation.
Comprehensive Needs Assessment

The MEP Comprehensive Needs Assessment (CNA) is part of a continuous improvement cycle, in which evaluation of past results guides the assessment of current needs which, in turn, guides the development of a plan for service delivery, actual implementation of the plan, and a new evaluation process. The following diagram of the process is based on the Office of Migrant Education CNA Toolkit (2012).
Preliminary Work

The initial phase of the project is to collaborate with various stakeholders and to enlist team members who will work on the project at various steps. In NCMEP, we asked a group of MEP practitioners from across the state including recruiters, directors, and other program staff along with parents, youth, and community members in the areas of health, education, and advocacy to participate. In addition, MEP staff at the state level participated throughout the process.

The bulk of the work was completed through in-person meetings, webinars, and conference calls. For parents and youth, four meetings were held, three as face-to-face and one as a webinar. MEP staff and other stakeholders, along with a number of parents, met three additional times to discuss information. Two webinars were held to discuss the findings of the student profile and the preliminary needs assessment.

The Service Delivery Plan will be compiled by the current CNA/SDP team, based on feedback from the Comprehensive Needs Assessment. At the same time, preliminary design of the program evaluation will occur, based on the previous State Program Evaluation conducted by Meta Associates in 2010.

Members of the team are frequently updated on progress through the monthly MEP Updates and through presentations at the biannual Service Area Meetings.

Creation of the MEP Student Profile

During the fall of each year the update of the NCMEP Student Profile begins. There are numerous data sources that are used, including:

- Reports from the Accountability Division of NCDPI
- Reports of Discipline and Dropout data from the Student Support Services Section of NCDPI
- The Annual Agricultural Statistics Report from the North Carolina Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services
- Data from the NCMEP MIS2000 Database and annual EDEN Reports
- Data from Migrant Student Information Exchange (MSIX) system.
- Data from Focus Groups and other meetings held throughout the year.
- Data from surveys of students, parents, and staff conducted by NCMEP.

This data is compiled into an annual or cumulative report on the statewide status of migratory students in North Carolina. The document is annually posted to the NCMEP website after being reviewed by volunteer members of the NCMEP CNA/SDP Committees.

In future years, much of this data will reside in the Common Education Data Analysis and Reporting System (CEDARS), an initiative of the North Carolina Department of Public Instruction, increasing access to many types of data, and improving efficiency through its designated dashboards.
Exploration of “What is…”

This process is based on previous concerns (former CNAs) and new concerns identified during the initial team meetings. In addition, the results of the previous State Program Evaluation are incorporated. The Office of Migrant Education’s “Seven Areas of Concern” provides the structure for rich discussion of concerns as follows:

- Instructional time
- Educational continuity
- English language development
- School engagement
- Educational support in the home
- Health
- Access to Services

In addition, the team reflects on the goal areas of migrant education: School Readiness, Reading and Mathematics Achievement, and High School Graduation and how each of these goals is affected by the areas of concern.

Based on analysis of the information, the committee develops statements of concern, based on indicators revealed by the student profile and other information they have seen. In the current CNA, the parent team and youth developed a list of concern statements in face to face meetings. Staff and two community stakeholders also developed concern statements, both at the parent meeting and at a subsequent team meeting.

The statements of concern are compiled and combined, when they correspond or relate to each other. A plan was made for gathering further data, which included updates of test scores, survey data, and focus group information. Based on this compilation, two online meetings were held to discuss the information gathered and refine the needs statements.

Make Decisions

Based on the discussion, the team was given time to reflect upon the needs statements, data, and proposed solutions. The following components were included in the summary grid, based on the CNA team’s analysis:

- Goal Area/subpopulation
- Area of Concern
- Needs Statements
- Data Used
- Possible Solutions
- Resources

In the next step, the team recommends priority solutions. Their recommendation is based on a set of criteria they develop, based on feasibility, local program evaluations, and other experience. The team also develops a list of suggested next steps to create a transition to the Service Delivery Plan and its dissemination/training.
Introduction

Every year, the NCMEP develops a statewide student profile to be used in the development of the Comprehensive Needs Assessment and Service Delivery Plan and for informing other agencies about our students. It is also used by Local Education Agencies as they develop their Comprehensive Continuous Improvement Plans.

This document explores agricultural changes, migrant student demographic characteristics, and academic achievement not only for the most recent program year, but over a period of six years. It is hoped that this longitudinal data will offer new insights into the needs and the accomplishments of migratory students.

General Agricultural and Labor Conditions

North Carolina has become an increasingly urban state during the last 20 years. However, it still ranks high in agricultural production, being first or second in the nation in tobacco, sweet potatoes, pigs, Christmas trees, commercial trout production, and turkeys. In 2011, agricultural receipts in NC totaled more than $10.5 billion. North Carolina’s agriculture industry, including food, fiber, flowers and forestry, contributes over $74 billion annually to the state’s economy, accounting for 19 percent of the State’s income and 20 percent of the State’s workforce. Nationally, North Carolina ranks tenth in total value of agricultural receipts and sixth in the number of seasonal and migratory agricultural workers.

While there has been a recent increase in the acreage and sales of crops that are mechanically harvested, such as corn and soybeans, North Carolina farms still produce many crops that require hand labor, including sweet potatoes, tobacco, Christmas trees, cucumbers, apples, tomatoes, blueberries, and many other fruits and vegetables. In addition, the raising of livestock requires human labor at various stages.

Data Source: 2012 NC Agricultural Statistics
While some crops have seen decreases in receipts over the last six years, others have seen increases or maintained their production and sales. Nursery crops bring in the highest cash receipts for farmers. Tobacco, a crop needing extensive manual labor, has shown an overall decrease since 2006. Vegetable receipts have increased by 42 percent over the last six years. Fruit and nut crops, which also need hand labor, have had increased receipts, and Christmas trees have shown a decline in receipts.

During the last six years, the number of farms in North Carolina has declined by three percent, and the acreage of land in farms has decreased by 5.5 percent. In 2007, a new method was established that would allow for a more accurate count of small farms, so that numbers now appear to be declining somewhat.

![Number of North Carolina Farms, thousands](Data from 2012 NC Agricultural Statistics, NC Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services)

During this same time, the average size of farms has decreased from more than 180 acres to 164 acres, and again has appeared to increase slightly since 2007.

![Size of North Carolina Farms, in Acres](Data from 2012 NC Agricultural Statistics, NC Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services)
Although receipts from some major crops have increased, the number of migratory farmworkers estimated by the North Carolina Employment Security Commission has decreased by over 20 percent from 2004 to 2011, and the number of seasonal farmworkers has decreased by over 33 percent. The estimated number of migratory farmworkers by county in North Carolina ranges from none in Clay and Graham Counties in the western mountains to over 3,300 in Sampson County, 2,600 in Wayne County and 2,400 in Duplin County in the east.


H-2A workers are contracted and receive special visas to come from their home countries for limited times to work in agricultural jobs. North Carolina hosted 9,295 H-2A workers in 2012, a slight increase from 2011. Most H-2A workers in North Carolina are contracted through the North Carolina Growers Association and work in the eastern part of the state. The majority work in tobacco, although workers are also contracted for vegetable crops and Christmas trees. H-2A workers under 22 years of age can be recruited by the MEP.

The actual number of H-2A workers recruited for the MEP in North Carolina 2012 was 150, since most H-2A workers are too old for eligibility.

In 2011-2012, H-2A workers eligible for the MEP worked in 32 North Carolina counties, with a majority in the eastern part of the state, as seen below.

Over the last several years, the age of MEP-eligible H-2A workers has been increasing, with the highest number of workers, at 21 years old, in their last year of eligibility for MEPs. This reflects a preference by farmers for slightly older workers.
North Carolina Migrant Education Program Locations

There are migratory students in the majority of counties in North Carolina, with local MEPs operated in 29 counties by 30 local education agencies (LEAs). A few of the LEA-based programs work in neighboring counties through agreements with those counties (Lenoir and Greene; Rockingham and Guilford). In 2010-2011, there were two service providers through a contract with North Carolina Cooperative Extension in the Wayne/Wilson area and the Rowan-Salisbury/Cabarrus area, where there are concentrations of migratory students. Five Regional Recruiters serve non-program counties with advocacy and supportive services, and summer interns have assisted with instruction of Out of School Youth (OSY) in non-program counties. Beginning in 2012, two AmeriCorps VISTA staff members are working to develop services in Wayne and Pitt Counties.

The greatest program concentration occurs in the eastern part of the state, with only seven programs operating in the mountain counties. In 2011-2012, the largest program was in Bladen County, with 616 students. However, in 2010-2011, the largest program in the state was in the mountains, in Henderson County, with 607 students.
Recently, the North Carolina Center for Afterschool Programs (NCCAP) analyzed North Carolina counties for ten indicators of wellness, ranging from cohort graduation rates to household income to number of children without health insurance. There are striking similarities between the neediest counties, represented in dark red, and the counties where NC Migrant Education has found significant numbers of migrant children, shown on the above map. These counties are designated as focus areas for supplementary programs.

*Data Source: A Roadmap to Need, NC Center for Afterschool Programs, 2010*

**Population Characteristics**

With an overall count of 6,169 students (5,769 from 3 to 21 years old), 2011-2012 showed an 8.2 percent increase over the previous year. The overall increase since 2007-2008 is 21.7 percent and is on par with 2006-2007 numbers. While most of the increase can be attributed to regional recruitment in non-program counties, some LEA-based programs have seen a rise in numbers of eligible students. This may be due, in some part, to the economic downturn in the United States. Many workers have returned to agricultural work as other job opportunities have decreased.

*Data Source: NCMEP MIS2000 database*
The number of NCMEP eligible migrant students by age shows a bimodal distribution, with a peak in the early elementary years and a peak in late adolescence.

![NC MEP Students by age, 2011-2012](image)

*Data Source: NCMEP MIS2000 database*

When we look at students by grade levels Pre-K to Grade 12, a fairly consistent decline in numbers after first grade is apparent. Pre-K age children are the largest single category of students. Numbers of students in high school dip far more dramatically than the numbers of migrant students by age. 2011-2012 has had increases in every single school-age group, with perhaps the most dramatic increase among high school students. This is a 44 percent increase over 2006-2007, the last year with a similar total number of students. This is an indication that MEP secondary students are choosing to stay in school. It also reflects the service delivery focus on high school that has existed since the 2009 Service Delivery Plan.

![Numbers of NC MEP Pre-K Age to Grade 12, 2006-2012](image)

*Data Source: NCMEP MIS2000 database*
Including Out of School Youth (OSY) as a category in the students by grade, it is noteworthy that OSY make up the largest single category of NCMEP students and consequently helps explain the second, higher peak in the students by age. Many of the adolescent students in our overall count are OSY, either having left school in their countries of origin or dropped out of school in the United States. Since 2006, the migrant population has seen a decrease in the number of OSY students, with a nearly 30 percent decline by 2012. OSY interviewed cite that worries about immigration create fear of interacting with schools and other government agencies. In addition, farmers contracting H-2A workers have a preference for older, experienced workers, resulting in a decrease in the number of young H-2A workers, and as mentioned earlier in this report, North Carolina has the highest number of H-2A workers of any state. It is important to mention, however, that the OSY currently in the NCMEP are receiving far more services than were received by OSY in 2006.

Over 95 percent of the Out-of-School Youth (OSY) have work as their primary focus and have limited time to pursue educational opportunities, according to the OSY Surveys conducted in 2011 and 2012. However, 86 percent of the OSY interviewed have indicated that learning English is their first educational priority, and 28 percent have indicated a desire to obtain a high school diploma at some point. Given that 59 percent have attended as far as the middle grades and 42 percent have attended some high school, NCMEP needs to focus efforts to recover these “here-to-work” students, and set them on the path to a high school diploma or its equivalent.

Surveys of OSY conducted by the NCMEP in eleven counties examined the students’ perceptions of their greatest needs. 86 percent ranked English classes as their number one need. The participants then indicated their second or third priorities beyond English classes as follows:

- 20 percent indicated vocational or job skills training as one of their top three priorities.
- 72 percent indicated transportation as a need.
- 14 percent indicated medical/dental access or health/safety education.
- 14 percent of the respondents reported the need for interpretation/translation.

Over the last several years, NCMEP has increased the variety of services available to OSY, and has seen a five percent increase in the number of OSY served (from 60 to 65 percent). There is a clear need to create...
services tailored to students’ limited time availability and distinct goals, as well as varying levels of prior education, in both LEA-based programs and in areas where there is no LEA-based program. To this end, NCMEP needs to implement OSY Surveys and Needs Assessments consistently and design appropriate services accordingly.

While there has not been the increase in services hoped for in 2011-2012, there have been some notable exceptions; several LEAs that have increased their services to Out of School Youth. Lenoir County (including students that reside in Wayne and Greene), Johnston County, Edgecombe County, and Henderson County have actively increased their offerings to OSY during the last year, with Henderson County creating a position of OSY Specialist. The NCMEP Regional Recruitment staff has also been active in delivering services to OSY, and AmeriCorps VISTA workers have recruited and trained 15 volunteers to deliver ESL classes to 30 OSY students. In addition, three LEAs have been actively involved in late 2012 with enrolling and supporting students in the High School Equivalency (HEP) program. To date, six NCMEP-referred students have enrolled or received their General Education Development (GED) certificates through Wake Technical Community College HEP since June, 2012. This is a dramatic increase over past years, in which few or no MEP students enrolled in HEP.

Another group of students served by MEP are those who are 5 years of age and younger and not yet in school.

![Graph showing Pre-K Age Students in NC Migrant Education](image)

*Does not include 5 year olds in enrolled in Kindergarten.  
Data Source: NCMEP MIS2000 database

The graph that follows shows the NCMEP age distribution of children from birth to five years old during five school years from 2006-2011. The five-year trend shows that the number of three and four year olds in the program is increasing dramatically; it has more than doubled since 2006. The trend reflects increased recruitment effort for preschool (Pre-K) students across all age groups, except infants. While the birth to two-year-old cohort is not eligible for funding, this group is important to count in order to get a prospective view of children who may enter eligibility.
Among the preschool-age students, around 13 percent of 3-5 year olds attend Pre-K programs. What appears as a sudden drop in Pre-K attendance in 2009 may be attributed to NCMEP requiring a minimum of 18 hours of attendance in a Pre-K program as a requirement for listing the child as having attended a Pre-K program.

Among 4-5 year olds, approximately 15 percent attend a Pre-K program, as shown below. There was almost twofold increase from 2008 to 2010 in the percentage of four and five year old MEP students attending Pre-K programs.
Kids Count, a project of the Annie E. Casey Foundation, indicates in its 2012 State Trends in Child Well-Being, that only 44 percent of North Carolina children attended preschool during 2008-2010. The National Institute for Early Education Research indicates that North Carolina had approximately 33 percent of all three and four-year-olds enrolled in State-funded pre-school (More at Four) or Head Start in 2009-2010. The data indicate that NC migratory students have less than half the participation rate as the general population. The low rate of participation in Pre-K programs must be addressed, since readiness for school is a key indicator of later academic achievement.

As part of the last Comprehensive Needs Assessment, NCMEP conducted several surveys among migrant students and their families in order to learn more about the educational environment and needs of migrant students.

In the area of School Readiness, migrant students were compared with non-migrant Hispanic students, and with non-Hispanic, non-migrant students in three areas: attendance at a Pre-K program, reading in the home, and the presence of books in the home. Both reading and the availability of books in the home were higher in migrant than non-migrant students’ families. A possible explanation is the focus by NCMEP on family literacy and the provision of learning resources to families.
Gender, Ethnicity and States of Origin

Male students outnumber female students by close to 20 percent, and this ratio has remained relatively stable over the last six years, although the percentage of female students is slowly increasing. A large majority of OSY are male, so the high proportion of OSY in the program skews the gender ratio.

Historical data from the MIS2000 Database indicate that in North Carolina, the majority of eligible migrant students are of Hispanic ethnicity, as shown below. During 2009-2010, collection of ethnicity and race data changed, resulting in a change in categories. Now, data is gathered for race (American Indian, Asian, Black, Hawaiian-Pacific Islander, or White) and ethnicity (Hispanic or non-Hispanic). In 2011-2012, 98.9 percent of NCMEP students were of Hispanic ethnicity. In 2010-2011, 98.5 percent self-identified as being of Hispanic ethnicity, so this number appears relatively stable.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.03%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.04%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0.23%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.04%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>1.77%</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>1.46%</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>11413</td>
<td>97.32%</td>
<td>8007</td>
<td>97.96%</td>
<td>5655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.20%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.16%</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>0.45%</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0.35%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>11727</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>8174</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>5741</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data Source: NCMEP MIS2000 Database
According to the Migrant Student Information Exchange (MSIX) database, the majority of MEP students, 1978 students came to North Carolina from Florida. Other major states of origin are Michigan, Ohio, Texas, New Jersey, South Carolina, and Georgia. With an increase in blueberry production in North Carolina, we can see an increase in numbers of students leaving for and coming from Michigan and New Jersey, both blueberry production states. There is also high mobility within North Carolina, with families moving from one location in North Carolina to another. Families have also reported that they are choosing to stay in North Carolina because of travel difficulties and agricultural problems (droughts, floods, cool weather) in other states.

The following map illustrates the destination states for NCMEP students when they leave North Carolina, according to MSIX. Florida emerges as the most frequent destination. This serves to demonstrate the critical need for interstate communication with Florida Migrant Education Programs and Florida schools.
Over 700 of North Carolina’s migrant students have come to North Carolina directly from Mexico. Over 125 of these are H-2A contract workers from Mexico. Among all MEP students coming from Mexico, the major states of origin are clustered in the eastern and southern part of the country. The three major “feeder states” are Michoacán, Guerrero, and Nayarit. It is also important to note that some of the other major states of origin of migrant students coming from Mexico are Hidalgo, Puebla, Veracruz, Guanajuato, Oaxaca, and San Luis Potosí. Hidalgo and Puebla have large populations who speak Otomi, and Oaxaca has a large Mixteco-speaking population.

Data Source: NCMEP MIS2000 Database

Overall, there are at least 15 indigenous languages represented among North Carolina’s MEP families. During 2011, the NCMEP enrolled over 20 students from Burma (Myanmar). While these students did not come directly to North Carolina from Burma, they have only been in the US for a short time. They have added to the rich diversity of the NCMEP.

| Indigenous Languages Spoken by Migratory Families in NC Migrant Education |
|-----------------------------|-----------------|----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Otomi                       | Mixteco         | Nahuatl       | Tzotzil         | Tzeltal         |
| Kanjobal (Guatemala)        | Chuj (Guatemala)| Quiché (Guatemala) | Kaqchikel       | Popti           |
| Zapoteco                    | Tarascan        | Huastec       | Mam             | Karenni (Burma) |

Mobility

By definition, the MEP student population is highly mobile. In North Carolina, we see that the largest single group of students has consistently been those with qualifying moves within the last 0-12 months. Furthermore, this number appears to be increasing.
The blue bars in the graph below illustrate the percentage of each group of students that has made a qualifying move within the last 12 months. OSY are the most mobile groups of students, with 90 percent having made a move during the last 24 months, and close to 60 within the last twelve months. Close to 70 percent of pre-K age and school aged children have made moves within the last 24 months. During parent focus groups, parents indicated that they try to avoid moving so frequently after their children begin school. Among school-age migratory children, close to 40 percent have moved within the last twelve months. This indicates a strong need for NCMEP to emphasize programs that assist with school engagement, educational disruption, and loss of instructional time, all areas that are heavily affected by frequent moves.

Data Source: NCMEP MIS2000 database

Around 60 percent of migratory children at all grade levels have moved during their three years of eligibility. Although a move during a three year period may not be as disruptive as a move made yearly, it is important to note that several moves taking place during the school year over the course of a child’s academic career can have a strong impact. As can be seen below, there is a slight increase in the number of NCMEP students with
school-year moves. Instructional time is lost, school engagement suffers, and any delays in records transfer have a direct, immediate effect on students’ ability to keep up with academic work.

**Data Source: NCMEP MIS2000 database**

**English Language Proficiency, Exceptional Children, and Priority for Services**

In North Carolina, English proficiency among children in PK-12 is measured by the WIDA W-APT or the WIDA ACCESS assessment. If students are OSY, then their designation as Limited English Proficient (LEP) is based on an “OSY ELP Screener” that measures Oral English Proficiency. In the case of PK-12 students, LEP data is reported to the NCMEP by the ESL staff at DPI. For OSY, the screener results are reported by the LEA MEPs and entered into the MIS2000 database by MEP Data Specialists. There has been some variability in the number of migratory students who are English Language Learners (Limited English Proficient), but the general tendency from 2006 to 2010 is a decline in students who are LEP, dropping from 44.3 percent in 2006 to around 33 percent in 2012.

**Data Source: NC Department of Public Instruction**
When the most recent year’s totals are broken down by grade, the curve tends to mimic the overall population in the program, by grade, as seen below. Since OSY are only counted as “LEP” if they have taken a screening assessment, the numbers of OSY who are designated as English Learners (ELs) is an underestimate.

![Graph of English Language Learners by Grade 2012]

Data Source: NC Department of Public Instruction

Looking at this same data over the last six years, it may be noted that the 2010-2011 year shows an increase of ELs in almost all grades. This speaks to a continued need to provide high quality supplementary instruction in English language for students in grades K-12. In addition, OSY have consistently indicated their desire for English language instruction.

![Graph of English Language Learners by Grade 2006-2012]

Data Source: NCDPI Accountability Services and MIS2000 Database
Exceptional Children

In 2011, there were 144 migrant children and youth identified for special education services including preschool-aged children to grade 12 students. The total represents approximately 3.75 percent of the total migrant population. The percentage is lower than the national average for all children, and it may point to a difficulty in the identification process, which is certainly a consequence of mobility. Students may begin the identification process in one state and move before it is completed. If they are referred in another state, they may have to start the entire process from the beginning. The numbers in North Carolina may have declined since 2006 as a result of the data collection process moving from self-reporting within MEP to a statewide system of authoritative source data. The numbers are slowly increasing, perhaps due in some part to the use of MSIX to gather data on mobile children and facilitate screening processes in a timely manner.

Priority for Service Students

“Priority for Service” (PFS) students are those students who have educational disruption and who are also at risk of not meeting state standards. In North Carolina, we define “educational disruption” as having made a move during the last school year, or (until 2008-09) as having missed 10 or more days of school due to the migratory lifestyle. Beginning with the 2010-2011 school year, new criteria have been implemented in North Carolina MEP for determining Priority for Services. These criteria widen the range of factors considered for “at-risk” status and consider moves made both into and out of a program during the regular school year. See NCMEP Quality Assurance Manual for details. The increase in 2011-2012 can be attributed to a more accurate and comprehensive determination of PFS by local subgrantee programs.
North Carolina MEP has not historically evaluated Out of School Youth for Priority for Services. With the addition of “dropped out of a US school” as a criterion for “at-risk” status, it was anticipated that we would begin to see some OSY students as PFS, which indeed happened in 2010-2011.

![Priority for Services Students in NCMEP by Grade](chart)

Data Source: NCMEP MIS200 Database

**Academic Indicators and Assessment Results for Migrant Education Students**

This student academic profile looks at standardized testing information, credit accrual for Algebra and English (both requirements for high school graduation), and scores on English proficiency tests. Unless otherwise indicated, all data is from NCDPI Accountability Services. As of this writing, accountability data from 2011-2012 has not yet been made available for MEP students, so the data reflects 2010-2011 as the most recent year. When 2011-2012 accountability data is made available, it will be incorporated and analyzed as part of an update to this document.

The End of Grade tests are state standardized tests given to children in grades 3-8 across North Carolina. The content areas of the tests are Reading, Mathematics, and Science. The chart below compares the Reading proficiency levels of migrant and the “All Students” subgroup with the target levels for the year. From 2006-2010, the targets were Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP). 2010-2011 was the baseline years for the new Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), which are broken down by subgroups. Since 2006, the average for “All Students” surpassed the target for reading, but there existed a gap of over fifteen percent between migrant students and the target. In 2007-08, the gap increased. However, in 2008-09, the gap decreased dramatically, with migrant students closing in on the target, with approximately a six percent gap remaining. By 2009-2010, the gap between migrant students and the state target levels had closed. Beginning with the 2010-2011 year, and the new AMOs, MEP students are compared not only to “All Students,” but to three subgroups that encompass virtually all MEP students in grades k-8. Migrant students have continued to show a steady increase in percent proficient, and its baseline year’s proficiency is above that of LEP students and the current rate of annual increase outpaces the “All Students” subgroup.
In Math, an even greater rate of increase in proficiency is shown. Migrant students’ baseline proficiency level is already above or nearly equal to students in the LEP and ED subgroups. The current rate of growth in proficiency is higher than the AMO target rates for all subgroups. If MEP students keep improving proficiency at the current rate, they will be at the “all students” target by 2014. The continued focus on MEP tutoring in both reading and mathematics has perhaps had some effect on this dramatic increase.
The graphics below show a breakdown by grade spans 3-5 and 6-8. The gap between migrant and non-migrant students is closing (taking into account the renorming of the test in 2007-2008), with all students improving by 14.1 percentage points and migratory students by 26.1 points for reading.

Data Source: NC DPI Accountability Services

In math, the gap is closing even faster, with a 10.7 point increase for all students and a 25.1 point increase for migratory students.

Data Source: NC DPI Accountability Services

At the middle school level, the gains are far less dramatic, with the gap appearing to persist in reading, while closing slightly in math. This points to a strong need to work with migrant students on the critical comprehension skills needed to negotiate middle and high school reading.
Beginning in spring 2008, North Carolina administered an End-of-Grade assessment in Science at grade levels five and eight. Data from the administrations in 2010-2011 and 2011-2012 are shown below.

**Data Source: NC DPI Accountability Services**
The gap of over 20 percent between migratory and non-migratory eighth graders echoes the nearly 30 point gap in reading. Science content is specialized and academic, and MEP students need support to do well in science courses in middle school and beyond. It should be noted that the non-LEP migratory students had higher percent proficient than the “All Students” group in fifth grade and were close to the “All Students” group in eighth grade, indicating that the issue of English Language Proficiency is important in mastering science content.

Beginning with the year 2011-2012, North Carolina high school students must take the following End of Course Exams: Algebra I, English I, and Biology. In addition, all North Carolina eleventh grade students are given the ACT assessment free of charge in March. In addition, 10th graders will be administered the PLAN assessment during December, and twelfth graders completing a four year Career and Technical Education sequence will take the Work Keys during their senior year.

In previous years, students in high school took End of Course (EOC) tests in English 1, Algebra1, Algebra 2, Geometry, Civics and Economics, US History, Biology, and Physical Science.

The two courses most critical in determining whether a student is on track to graduate are English 1 and Algebra 1, since they must be taken before higher level courses. Data for these courses for the years 2006-2011 is shown below. While non-migrant students have shown slight overall improvement (from 72 to 75.6 percent), migrant student proficiency has increased from 36 percent in 2006-2007 to 53.1 percent in 2010-2011. Migratory non-LEP students continue to show higher proficiency percentages than the total population, although this number is variable due to smaller sample sizes; only 39 students in that group took the assessment. Beginning in 2009, an emphasis was placed on serving MEP high school students in the key gateway courses of Algebra 1 and English 1. The most recent year’s increase in percent proficient in English 1 may be a reflection of that emphasis. However, it is important to note that migratory LEP students’ proficiency has declined during the last two years, from 41.1 percent to 37.3 percent. This speaks to a need to provide further English Language Development support for migratory high school students, especially in the specialized academic language required in high school courses.

![Graph: English I EOC Proficiency, 2006-2012](image)

*Data Source: NCDPI Accountability Services*

Algebra 1 is the other “gateway” course, and it is particularly important in determining whether a student is on track to graduate, since it is a prerequisite for Geometry, Algebra 2, Tech Math, Pre-calculus and Calculus.
Algebra 1 proficiency rates for migratory students show a decline from 53 percent in 2006-07 down to 32.9 percent in 2010-11, but a dramatic increase in 2011-2012. It is important to determine the reasons for the increase and keep building upon this momentum.

Data Source: NC DPI Accountability Services

The gap between migrant and non-migrant students continues to be close to 25 percent in English I and over 10 percent in Algebra 1. Migrant LEP students are consistently the group with the lowest proficiency rates. This again suggests a need for increased instructional support for migrant LEP students in these courses.

Migrant student performance in Biology had declined from 2008 to 2011, but showed an upswing in 2011-2012. Again, it is important to determine the reasons for the increase, and build upon last year’s results.

Data Source: NCDPI Accountability Services

Since proficiency rates may be skewed by low enrollments of MEP students in EOC courses, it is critical to examine whether migrant students are enrolling at the same rate as non-migrant students. The chart below compares the percent of total 9th graders enrolled in English 1 and Algebra I and taking the EOC assessments, for both migratory and non-migratory students. Given that the percentage of enrolled students who take the test is around 95 percent for both groups, it is clear that only half of MEP 9th graders are
enrolled in these courses necessary for graduation. A concentrated effort needs to be made to enroll and support migrant students in required courses.

Historic Data on EOCs No Long Administered

Social Studies courses are often difficult for ELL and migrant students, due to the large amount of required reading and difficult vocabulary. There are no longer required EOC tests for Civics/Economics and US History, but the courses are still required for graduation. Data regarding past performance of migratory students on the retired EOCs may still be useful for assessing their needs. While migrant students showed strong gains in Civics proficiency for three years, with the percent proficient increasing by over 20 percent, the 2009-2010 year showed a drop of close to 6 percent. Further, only 13 percent of migrant students who are also LEP were proficient.
Migrant students seemed to fare a bit better in US History, with migrant non-LEP students having a percent proficiency almost that of all students, and even migrant LEP students comparable with non-migrant LEP students. This may be attributed to more state-specific information in the Civics and Economics curriculum, which could put highly mobile students coming from other states at a disadvantage.

**Data Source: NCDPI Accountability Services**

Physical Science is also no longer tested on the EOC, although the course is an important prerequisite for both Physics and Chemistry coursework. MEP students (green bars, below) showed an overall increase in proficiency. Migrant non-LEP students actually have a proficiency rate higher than that of all students.

**Data Source: NCDPI Accountability Services**
Retention, Graduation, Dropouts, and “Attrition”

Migrant students have a retention rate of 8.2 percent, much higher than the total rate for North Carolina, which was 4.5 percent (in 2005-06, according to the NC Schools Statistical Profile 2007). The early years of elementary school, fifth grade, and ninth grade seem to be the most critical years for migrant children, given the strong effect retentions have on dropout rates and graduation rates.

Dropout rates have decreased during the last five years, from 3.51 to 2.97 percent. It is difficult to calculate these rates for students who are as highly mobile as our MEP population, but it has been calculated by dividing the number of dropouts by the total number of MEP students in grades 9-12, and is shown below.

Across the years, it can be observed that a vast majority of students drop out in the 9th and 10th grades, a trend echoed in many subpopulations of high school students. NCMEP must make a concerted effort to intervene on behalf of students in these grades to help them stay in school.
In 2011, nineteen NCNEP students graduated from high school in the state. While there were 92 students who were seniors, the rate is somewhat deceptive, because many students left the North Carolina to continue school in another state.

An interesting approach to dropout/graduation rates is to compare the percent of students who are freshmen to the percent of seniors. One would expect to see only a slight downward trend in the population, as shown by the general population (red and orange dotted lines). However, the decline in student numbers has been much steeper for migrant students, with only about 9 percent making it to senior year in 2006-2007. In 2010-2011, more migrant students remained in school until their senior year, and the percentage of MEP high school students who are seniors is approaching the percentage for the general population.
English Language Proficiency Assessment

The last year the Idea Proficiency Test (IPT) was used as the assessment of English language proficiency among ELs was 2007-2008. Since North Carolina joined the WIDA Consortium, the IPT has been replaced by the WIDA ACCESS Placement Test (W-APT) and ACCESS for ELs (Assessing Comprehension and Communication in English State-to-State for English Language Learners). The results below indicate the English proficiency levels of migrant students for 2010-2011 on the ACCESS for ELs.

The proficiency levels shown for migrant and non-migrant students in grades 3-5 and 6-8 show a larger number of students in both groups in the middle proficiency levels of Developing and Expanding, with far fewer students in both groups reaching the Bridging or Reaching levels.
High school proficiency shows a similar distribution. One noticeable difference is the much higher proportion of “Entering” and “Beginning” students. These are students who are at the very beginning stages of learning English, and for whom academic English will be a major challenge. With over 20 percent of high school migratory ELs at this level, the need for strong intervention in the area of academic language development will be necessary if they are to be successful in high school coursework.

Data Source: NCDPI Accountability Services
Conclusions

Examining the North Carolina Migrant Student Profile as a whole, there is much work to do with every identified group of students.

- We know that School Readiness is an important factor in increasing student achievement. There needs to be an increase in pre-school attendance and services, since the number of MEP students enrolled in Pre-K programs is still not equivalent to the general population. Stronger links need to be formed between Pre-K programs and NCMEP.
- We need to maintain a strong focus on closing the gap between grades 3-5 LEP migrant students and Non-LEP Migrant students, although we are currently meeting the NCMEP Service Delivery goals in this area. The gap between migrant students in grades 3-5 and targets is currently decreasing, but the gap between migrant and non-migrant students remains.
- For middle school students (grades 6-8), proficiency levels are increasing, but gaps persist in both English Language Arts and Math, and growth is much slower than at the elementary level.
- In the area of science, we see a decline between proficiency levels at the fifth grade level and at eighth grade among migratory students. This decline is not seen among the general population. High mobility and lost instructional time become critical when students are expected to learn specific science concepts, and scientific language proficiency becomes increasingly important.
- A most critical need is at the high school level, where we must concentrate on improving not only scores, but access to courses and continuing support for high school students. A strong effort to increase student engagement through support for extracurricular activities, college access workshops, and leadership development is needed to continue to decrease the dropout rate.
- Finally, with around 26 percent of our students identified as highly mobile Out of School Youth, a focus needs to be put on instructional and support services for them. Ideally, these services will correlate with similar services provided by MEPs other states. While the majority of these students have work as a first priority, most have indicated a desire to learn English and over a quarter have indicated a desire to obtain a diploma someday. Given that 48 percent of those surveyed had attended at least to the middle school level, a high school diploma can be within their reach, if they can find the time, and MEP helps provide access to appropriate programs.
Service Delivery Planning Tool

After assessing students’ needs and determining goals for serving them, the next step is to develop strategies that can be used by MEP staff to help them meet those measurable program objectives (MPOs).

The table that follows presents the information gleaned from the Comprehensive Needs Assessment and applies it by linking strategies to the MPOs. The parts of the table are:

**Age/Grade Group of Students** - There are five groups of students delineated: Pre-Kindergarten-age children (School Readiness), Elementary School students, Middle School students, High School students, and Out-of-School Youth. Each of these groups has its own characteristics, needs, and areas of concern.

**Area of Concern** - While there are seven areas of concern described by the Office of Migrant Education, some of the concern areas are more important in particular age/grade groups. These areas of concern have been decided for each group through the CNA process by discussions, surveys, and committee meetings with MEP staff, parents, students, and other stakeholders.

**Concern Statements** - For each Area of Concern and student age/grade group, a statement expressing the dimensions of that concern is made.

**Indicators** - This column presents the information needed to study and address the Concern Statement. The data may be qualitative or quantitative.

**Data Sources and Evidence** - This column presents a digest of the most pertinent information gathered during the CNA regarding a particular concern. This is where the statistical indicators are presented, and where the qualitative data interpretations are shown. It is important to refer to this column when deciding whether sufficient data has been gathered.

**Measurable Program Objectives (MPOs)** - These are the actual goal statements for the NCMEP. They represent measurable goals, have timelines, and are clear regarding the population of students they cover. In some cases, they are implementation goals, and in other cases, they are outcomes. They were derived through the course of five webinar meetings in 2012 with CNA/SDP Committee members and through referral to the Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs) of the North Carolina Department of Public Instruction. The MPOs represent goals for the program at the state level, and they serve as a guide for local MEPs, who must work together to help achieve the statewide goals for migratory children.

**Strategies** - This column represents an assortment of promising practices and research-based approaches to assist local MEPs in meeting the Measurable Program Objectives. This column is dynamic during any given Service Delivery Plan cycle, since new strategies always come to light.
Using the Service Delivery Plan

Local MEP sub-grantees should use this plan in designing their own service delivery. Of course, each LEA sub-grantee is unique. Some may have high populations of Pre-K students; others may have high and growing populations of OSY. Their priority areas may be slightly different, but they should be constantly striving to meet the Measurable Program Objectives for the North Carolina Migrant Education Program. Each LEA sub-grantee should review the MPOs and analyze them as they relate to the population of students in that LEA. If, for example, the elementary school students are all achieving at a high level and meeting standards in an LEA, then the service focus should change to a group of students with greater needs. After reviewing the Service Delivery Plan, MEP staff should use it as a guide to completing the Migrant Education section of the Comprehensive Continuous Improvement Plan (CCIP) process, especially in creating their planning documents and determining their grant details. Monitoring processes, either through Consolidated Federal Program Monitoring or through Program Quality Reviews (PQRs), evaluate the fidelity of programs with the goals of the Service Delivery Plan. Finally, since the evaluation process (Local MEP annual Program Evaluation) derives from the Service Delivery Plan, meeting SDP goals can be evaluated by each sub-grantee in order to improve their program in subsequent years.
## Service Delivery Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of Concern</th>
<th>Concern Statements</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Data Sources and Evidence</th>
<th>Measurable Program Objectives for MEP</th>
<th>Strategies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Access to Services</td>
<td>We are concerned that Pre-K students and families do not have access to pre-K or other school readiness programs, due to time of arrival, transportation, and lack of information.</td>
<td>Percentage of Migratory Pre-school aged children who are able to enroll in Pre-K programs. Percentage of Migratory families of pre-K-age children with access to transportation to pre-K programs. Qualitative data on parent viewpoints regarding pre-K access.</td>
<td><strong>Parent Focus Groups:</strong> Enrollment in and transportation to Pre-K programs is difficult. <strong>MIS2000 Data:</strong> In 2011-2012, 19.4% of MEP 4-5 year olds attend a pre-K program of at least 18 contact hours. In 2011-2012, 15.6% of pre-K age students (ages 0-5, not in Kindergarten) received some instructional services.</td>
<td>By the end of the 2013-2014 school year, 30% of MEP Pre-K age children (ages 4-5) will receive a minimum of 18 hours of instructional services.</td>
<td>• Collaborate with East Coast /Telamon Migrant Head Start and other Pre-K programs to co-recruit and enroll. Collaborate on resolving transportation solutions. • Assist parents in resolving issues of transportation and enrollment in Pre-K Programs. • Train MEP tutors/staff in early learning assessments and home-based early learning programs. • Develop lists of local pre-K programs and provide to families; e.g., MEP packets, MEP fall parent meetings, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Support in the Home</td>
<td>We are concerned that MEP parents need to develop skills to help their pre-K children be ready for kindergarten and to provide a home environment conducive to learning.</td>
<td>Percentage of MEP programs offering family literacy programs/ number of students served in family literacy programs. Qualitative: Parent opinion surveys/ focus groups indication of need for skills.</td>
<td><strong>MIS2000:</strong> In 2011-2012, 106 pre-K ages NCMEP students received family literacy services. This represents 16.7% of pre-K age students who were not yet in kindergarten. Fifteen of 30 MEPs in North Carolina offer family literacy services. 37.3% of 51 staff indicated a need for professional</td>
<td>1) By the end of the 2013-2014 school year, 75% of LEA-based MEP Programs will offer Family Literacy activities with a minimum of 12 hours. 2) By the end of 2013-2014, 80% of parents surveyed will report an increase in their ability to help their children be prepared for kindergarten.</td>
<td>• Provide school readiness training to parents either through MEP or collaboration with other agencies; e.g., Parents as Teachers. • Use available curricula for staff development in parental training for school readiness. • Compile resource list and disseminate to LEAs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Service Delivery Plan

### SCHOOL READINESS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of Concern</th>
<th>Concern Statements</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Data Sources and Evidence</th>
<th>Measurable Program Objectives for MEP</th>
<th>Strategies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|                 |                    |            | development in the area of  family literacy. (Survey, October 2012) | 3) By the end of 2013-2014, 90% of children participating in Family Literacy activities will show an increase in school readiness as measured by a developmental skills assessment. 4) By the end of the 2013-2014 school year, 100% of staff who work with MEP Pre-K students will have trainings in Family Literacy. | • Conduct book drives and distribute books to families and children, especially in regionally served areas. Collaborate with other non-profit ventures seeking to get books in hands of families.  
• Promote “Raising a Reader” programs.  
• Develop evaluation methods for success of family literacy programs, such as pre-post skills assessments. |
|                 |                    |            | **Parent Focus Groups:** Parents indicated a desire to learn how to help their children with school readiness, but lacked training and materials. |  | |
| Health          | We are concerned that food insecurity and health issues may lower the capacity for MEP pre-K children to be ready for school. | Percentage of MEP Pre-K age students receiving health services through Migrant Health Care.  
Percentage of MEP Pre-K age students with immunization flag in MSIX.  
**Qualitative:** Parent opinions regarding pre-K migratory students’ access to basic primary care. | In 2011-2012, only 7.1% of MEP Pre-K age students received health support services through Migrant Health Care.  
10 of 30 LEA or regionally-based programs offered any health services.  
**Parent Focus Groups:** Parents indicated a lack of knowledge about local health resources. When parents were aware, they were not able to access services due to transportation issues. | 1) By the end of the 2013-2014 school year, 100% of sub-grantees will have compiled a list of health resources for MEP parents. 2) By the end of the 2013-2014 school year, 25% of families of MEP Pre-K age students will receive Health Services or Referred Services relating to health. | • Develop collaborations with local Community Health Centers, Migrant Health Centers, and private providers to provide screenings, immunizations, and basic preventive care.  
• List and describe promising practices in health services.  
• Make sure parents have health information in a language they understand. |
| English Language Development | We are concerned that Pre-K MEP children have not developed basic English language | Percentage of Pre-K students receiving literacy/pre-literate/school | 16.7% of pre-K-age children in NCMEP in 2011-2012 received literacy/family literacy services. About 15% received ESOL | 1) By the end of the 2013-2014 school year, 75% of LEA-based MEP Programs will offer Family Literacy | • Conduct statewide trainings on family literacy using models that address second language learning. |
## Service Delivery Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of Concern</th>
<th>Concern Statements</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Data Sources and Evidence</th>
<th>Measurable Program Objectives for MEP</th>
<th>Strategies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCHOOL READINESS</td>
<td>skills and pre-literacy skills.</td>
<td>readiness, ESOL, or family literacy services.</td>
<td>Attendance at MEP-sponsored family literacy activities.</td>
<td><strong>Parent Focus Groups:</strong> Parents stated a desire to help their children with reading in the home. They worried that their children did not have the English or literacy skills to begin school.</td>
<td>• Deliver family literacy curriculum to parents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>LEA Data:</strong> Family literacy activities are well attended in the LEAs.</td>
<td>2) By the end of 2013-2014, 80% of parents surveyed will report an increase in their ability to help their children be prepared for kindergarten.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Qualitative:</strong> Parent focus group opinions and suggestions about family literacy.</td>
<td>3) By the end of 2013-2014, 90% of children participating in Family Literacy activities will show an increase in school readiness as measured by a developmental skills assessment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Activities:</strong></td>
<td>4) By the end of the 2013-2014 school year, 100% of staff who work with MEP Pre-K students will have trainings in Family Literacy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Use bilingual books to enhance language learning among both parents and preschool children.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Facilitate enrollment of children into Head Start and other Pre-K programs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Educational Continuity

We are concerned that high mobility leads to gaps in education due to difficulties in registration and placement and timely provision of supplemental instruction. We are also concerned that students lose skills over the summer months, especially with the demise of many other summer programs.

#### Concern Statements
- Percentage of Staff members who indicate that they have issues with records.
- Percentage of staff actively using MSIX.
- Percentage of K-5 students receiving instructional services.
- Percentage of K-5 students receiving advocacy services/pupil services.
- Parent opinions about needs for summer instruction.
- Percentage of K-5 MEP students receiving instructional services during the school year and summer in 2011-2012.
- Percentage of K-5 MEP students who have a qualifying move within the last 12 months.

#### Data Sources and Evidence
- Staff Survey: 23% of staff indicated that records from out of state do not arrive in a timely fashion.
- MSIX Reports: 88 MEP staff have been trained as primary users of MSIX as of August 2011. Nearly half of those users have not accessed the system within the last 3 months.
- MIS 2000: 46.9% of MEP and 45.2% of K-5 MEP students had a qualifying move within the last 12 months.
- 184 (70.5%) PFS students in grades K-5 received instructional services during the school year and summer in 2011-2012.
- 46 of 261 PFS students in grades K-5 received instructional Services during the school year only, 27 (10%) students received only summer instruction.

#### Measurable Program Objectives for MEP

1. By the end of the 2013-2014 school year, 100% of PFS students in grades 3-5 will receive instructional services.
2. By the end of the 2013-2014 school year, 100% of PFS students will have a Personal Education Plan (PEP) for Migrant Education.
3. By the end of the 2013-2014 school year, 100% of MEP summer program staff will have received professional development on summer program design, implementation, and evaluation.
4. By the end of the 2013-2014 school year, at least 50% of MEP students in NC during the summer will participate in summer instructional services for at least 15 hours; e.g., 5 days of 3 hours, 15 days of one hour.
5. By the end of the 2013-2014 school year, 80% of those students receiving summer instructional services will show growth, based on pre/post assessments.

#### Strategies
- Increase number of staff using MSIX, especially MSIX notification information.
- Conduct parent-educator meetings to discuss student progress as a requirement for all PFS students; use of PEP form for all PFS students.
- Distribute template for needs assessments to all subgrant programs in order to enable quick assessment of students.
- Assist parents in obtaining the affidavits and other documentation needed to enroll students in school.
- Increase instructional services to all PFS students.
- Investigate teacher exchanges as a means of fostering both educational continuity and language development.
- Develop models for different summer programs, ranging from state programs to local summer schools to home-based visitation programs.
- Deliver summer services in all LEAs either through a structured summer programs.
## ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of Concern</th>
<th>Concern Statements</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Data Sources and Evidence</th>
<th>Measurable Program Objectives for MEP</th>
<th>Strategies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Time</td>
<td>We are concerned that high mobility leads to lost instructional time and results in difficulties meeting academic standards.</td>
<td>MIS2000: Percentage of children who have a qualifying move within the last 12 months. Percentage of K-5 students receiving instructional services. Percentage of K-5 students receiving advocacy services/pupil services.</td>
<td>Received summer instruction in 2011-2012. This is a decrease from 2010-2011. 37.3% of MEP staff indicated a need for professional development on summer program design.</td>
<td>1) By the end of the 2013-2014 school year, MEP students in grades 3-5 will show a 9% increase in proficiency in reading. 2) By the end of the 2013-2014 school year, MEP students in grades 3-5 will show a 6% increase in proficiency in math.</td>
<td>- Deliver professional development on how to design and evaluate summer programs.  - Investigate ways to measure what is lost during summer and address it through summer programs.  - Continue home-based tutoring and reading programs.  - Facilitate reading groups and tech-based programs to foster reading skills—not test prep programs.  - Design and implement a consistent teacher checklist and intake survey to determine reading and math needs for extended programs.  - Utilize MSIX to assist in early intervention.  - Create innovative math/science activities to stimulate interest and progress in math/science.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area of Concern</td>
<td>Concern Statements</td>
<td>Indicators</td>
<td>Data Sources and Evidence</td>
<td>Measurable Program Objectives for MEP</td>
<td>Strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Continue NASA/other summer program and expand offerings to school year. Investigate teaming with local university science departments to offer STEM summer opportunities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area of Concern</td>
<td>Concern Statements</td>
<td>Indicators</td>
<td>Data Sources and Evidence</td>
<td>Measurable Program Objectives for MEP</td>
<td>Strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Instructional Time for English Language Development                          | We are concerned that Middle School MEP students still lag behind their peers in Reading. | Accountability Information: Percentage of MEP students meeting or exceeding State standards for their grade in reading. | Student Profile: Reading—The gap between MEP 6-8th graders and all students is around 24 points. Only 47% of MEP students in grades 6-8 met or exceeded standards. Only 27.1% of Migratory LEP students met or exceeded standards. The gap between MEP students and AMOs for Economically Disadvantaged students is 14%. Only around 7% of MEP middle school students are in the higher levels of English Proficiency, as measured by the ACCESS for ELIs. | 1) By the end of the 2013-2014 school year, MEP students in grades 6-8 will show an increase of 14% in reading proficiency, as measured by the EOG assessment in reading for their grade. 2) By the end of the 2013-2014 school year, all MEP PFS students in grades 6-8 will receive supplementary instructional services in reading. | • Provide LEAs some creative supplemental curriculum choices, preferably a few choices using internet resources.  
• Differentiation is so important to the language development and grades of our middle school students. This is where they often become frustrated if they are left behind.  
• Load reading activities onto MP3 or other equipment.  
• Use materials from the Migrant Consortia to enhance learning in reading.  
• Continue to support English Language Development among ELls, especially focusing on content area English and SIOP methodologies. |
| We are concerned that Middle School MEP students lag behind their peers in Math and Science. | Accountability Information: Percentage of MEP students meeting or exceeding State standards for their grade in reading. | Student Profile--Math: The gap between MEP and “all students” meeting state standards has dropped to less than 12% in 2011-2012. 70.8% of MEP students met or exceeded state standards in | | 1) By the end of the 2013-2014 school year, MEP students in grades 6-8 will show an increase of 7% in math proficiency, as measured by the mathematics EOG for their grade. | • Utilize interactive Math games and technology/internet math resources are a  
• Continue math-science enrichment during summer and school year to increase interest. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of Concern</th>
<th>Concern Statements</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Data Sources and Evidence</th>
<th>Measurable Program Objectives for MEP</th>
<th>Strategies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Middle School   | Comparison of MEP with ED, LEP, and Hispanic subgroups.  
Student Surveys:  
Percent of students who attend afterschool programs.  
Perception of students regarding their achievement and mastery of content.  
Student Surveys: 52% of MEP students stated that they were receiving an A or B in Math in 2010. Students’ perceptions of their own math achievement are aligned to actual test results. | 2011-2012. The gap between MEP students and the AMO for Economically Disadvantaged students is now below 1%.  
Science: The gap is over 17% between MEP grade 6-8 students and all students.  
60.9% met or exceeded state standards.  
Student Surveys: 60.9% met or exceeded state standards. | 2) By the end of the 2013-2014 school year, MEP PFS students in grade 8 will show an increase of 9% in proficiency in science, as measured by the Science EOG for 8th grade. | Develop models for LEA-based programs to use.  
• Use SIOP and other methodologies to help students develop English for science content.  
• Provide training in math tutoring techniques and resources for MEP staff. |

| Educational Continuity | We are concerned that Middle School students fall behind during the summer months  
MIS 2000: Percentage of 6th – 8th graders participating in summer instruction.  
Student surveys:  
Percent of students who would like to attend summer program.  
Percent of Students who are aware of summer programs.  
MIS 2000 Data: 33% of 6th – 8th graders attended a summer program or received summer instruction in 2011-2012. (A 5% increase since 2010-2011.) Student Survey: 28.6% indicated that there was no program or they didn’t know about a program. 14% indicated that they had to work, so they couldn’t attend summer programs. 21% indicated that they were not present in the summer to attend a program. | 1) By the end of the 2013-2014 school year, 50% of MEP students in grades 6-8 will receive summer instruction.  
2) By the end of the 2013-2014 school year, 80% of those MEP students receiving summer instructional services will show gains on pre/post assessments. | 1) By the end of the 2013-2014 school year, 50% of MEP students in grades 6-8 will receive summer instruction.  
2) By the end of the 2013-2014 school year, 80% of those MEP students receiving summer instructional services will show gains on pre/post assessments. | Locate and implement web-based instruction that can be delivered in a variety of sites.  
• Utilize donated hardware (MP3s, tablets, laptops), run a 2 week Virtual Camp.  
• Create short term summer experiences (weekends, 2-3 day sessions) for students who may be working in the summer.  
• Develop summer programs early and inform students and parents of the programs. |
## MIDDLE SCHOOL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of Concern</th>
<th>Concern Statements</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Data Sources and Evidence</th>
<th>Measurable Program Objectives for MEP</th>
<th>Strategies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Access to Services</strong></td>
<td>We are concerned that middle school students lack access to digital resources.</td>
<td>Percent of students who cannot attend summer programs because of work.</td>
<td><strong>Staff Survey:</strong> 78% of staff indicated that providing Internet access was “somewhat” to “very important” for their students.</td>
<td>1) By the end of the 2013-2014 school year, 100% of MEPs will have a plan to provide internet and technology access to their students.</td>
<td>- Build relationships with local internet providers, such as the public library.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Parent Focus Groups:</strong> Parents cited a lack of access to digital resources, such as computers in the home or internet service.</td>
<td>2) By the end of the 2013-2014 school year, 35% of MEP students in grades 6-8 will receive Technology Instruction.</td>
<td>- Develop short term computer literacy courses for students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>MIS2000:</strong> 17.3% of MEP students in grades 6-8 received technology or computer instruction in 2011-2012. 4.6% received internet access services or assistance.</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Add resources/activities for MEP staff to use with participants/technology related.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Student Survey:</strong> Percentage of students who indicate that they don’t have regular access to the internet or to digital resources.</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Develop means of taking internet resources to camps; e.g., internet modems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Instructional Time for English Language Development

**Concern Statements:** We are concerned that high school students lag behind their peers in gateway courses, Algebra I and English I.

**Indicators:**

**Accountability Data:** Gap between MEP and all students in achievement in Algebra I and English I. Note that English II will become the EOC course. However, English I remains a gateway.

Examine gaps between MEP students and AMO for Economically Disadvantaged students.

Percent of high school students receiving Pupil Services and are not on track to graduate.

**Student Survey:** Percentage of students who indicate that they are taking or have taken Algebra I and English I.

**Data Sources and Evidence:**

**Student Profile:** There is a 27% gap between Migrant and “all students” in English I. The gap for LEP Migrant students and “all students” is nearly 43%. The gap between MEP students and the AMO for Economically Disadvantaged (ED) students is around 23%.

There is a 9.5% gap between Migrant and “all students” in Algebra I, and a 13% gap between LEP Migrant and “all students.” The gap between MEP students and the AMO for ED students in Algebra I is around 7%.

In 2011-12, 41 high school students received pupil services because they were not on track to graduate.

**Student Surveys:** Only 32% and 39% of MEP students surveyed indicated that they were currently taking either a Math or English class.

**Measurable Program Objectives for MEP:**

1) By the end of the 2013-2014 school year, MEP high school student proficiency percent will have increased by 12% in English I (or English II) EOC exams.

2) By the end of the 2013-2014 school year, MEP high school student proficiency percent will have increased by 5% in Algebra I EOC exams.

3) By the end of 2013-2014 school year, NCMEP will facilitate training in MSIX for 15 high school counselors.

**Strategies Resources Needed/Next Steps:**

- Work with counselors to help them use MSIX in order to properly assign student to courses.
- Develop “bridge” supplemental summer programs for 8th grade students who need a boost to enroll in English I or Algebra I.
- Develop a “master list” of methods for credit recovery.
- Require a Personal Education Plan (PEP) for every migratory high school student.
- Train MEP tutors to work with Algebra and English I students.
- Work with students studying for English II exams.
- Create expectation that high school MEP students will receive tutoring.
## HIGH SCHOOL AND OUT-OF SCHOOL YOUTH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of Concern</th>
<th>Concern Statements</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Data Sources and Evidence</th>
<th>Measurable Program Objectives for MEP</th>
<th>Strategies Resources Needed/Next Steps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Educational Continuity</strong></td>
<td>We are concerned that high school students are not on track to graduate, due to retentions and scheduling issues.</td>
<td><strong>MIS 2000:</strong> Percentage of students who are taking or have completed Algebra 1 and English 1 by 10th grade.</td>
<td><strong>Student Surveys:</strong> 29% of MEP students surveyed indicated that they had never met with their counselor. <strong>Student Profile:</strong> MEP dropout rate has decreased by nearly half since 2008. Over 8% of MEP students have been retained at least once, while fewer than 5% of other students have been retained.</td>
<td>1) By the end of the 2013-2014 school year, 100% of high school PFS students will receive instructional services. 2) By the end of 2013-2014 school year, NCMEP will facilitate training in MSIX for 15 high school counselors.</td>
<td>• Train MEP and other staff to use MSIX to find students who have begun courses and not finished them; it will help locate students who need to take courses. • Focus tutorial programs on the gateway courses and other requirements for graduation. • Implement PASS program in NC, at least for Algebra I and English I. • Ensure that each high school student is evaluated for PFS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>School Engagement</strong></td>
<td>We are concerned that high school students are not involved in extracurricular or supplemental activities.</td>
<td><strong>Student Survey:</strong> Percentage of students who indicate that they participate in extracurricular activities.</td>
<td><strong>Student Survey:</strong> 70% of students surveyed indicated that they did NOT participate in extracurricular activities. Of the 30% who participated in extracurricular activities or received services, 40% stated that they go help from a supplemental program available to all students, while 90% indicated that they got help from the MEP, although</td>
<td>1) By the end of 2013-2014 school year, increase the participation of high school MEP students in extracurricular activities to 50%.</td>
<td>• Develop an MEP Service Learning Program. • Ensure that MEP students can receive transportation to and from extracurricular activities. • Continue or start AIM programs, involve students in 4H or other groups. • Develop project-based</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## HIGH SCHOOL AND OUT-OF SCHOOL YOUTH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of Concern</th>
<th>Concern Statements</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Data Sources and Evidence</th>
<th>Measurable Program Objectives for MEP</th>
<th>Strategies Resources Needed/Next Steps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>School Engagement</strong></td>
<td>We are concerned that high school MEP students lack the skills to set personal and academic goals.</td>
<td>Student Survey: Percentage of students who participate in leadership/goal setting/ life planning activities.</td>
<td>Student Survey: 74% of MEP high school students surveyed stated that they had <strong>not</strong> participated in any leadership development programs, such as 4-H, Adelante, AIM, or others.</td>
<td>1) By the end of 2013-2014 school year, increase the participation of high school MEP students in leadership development, college and career access activities to 50%.</td>
<td>• Develop and implement statewide initiatives in higher education access.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>that help may have been supportive services. Youth may have to care for other siblings, so they cannot stay for help.</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Utilize new service code 064 for college access.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Investigate other services and include in data collection system as appropriate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Encourage cross-district initiatives that may involve other students who are not in MEP; e.g., AIM, CloseUp, Levante, Juntos.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Access to Services</strong></td>
<td>We are concerned that high school MEP students do not have access to digital resources necessary for completion of high school work.</td>
<td>Staff Survey: Percentage of staff indicating a need for access to digital resources.</td>
<td>Staff Survey: 78% of staff indicated that providing Internet Access was “somewhat” to “very important” for their students.</td>
<td>1) By the end of the 2013-2014 school year, 38% of MEP high school students will receive Technology Instruction services or Technology Access services.</td>
<td>• Ensure internet access for all high school MEP students through innovative means such as mobile hotspots, internet modems, or transportation to access sites.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Parent Focus Groups: Opinion of parents regarding need for access to digital resources.</td>
<td>Parent Focus Groups: Parents cited a lack of access to digital resources, such as computers in the home or internet service, contributing to their children’s difficulty in completing courses and</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Increase services in technology literacy instruction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Student Survey: Percentage of students who indicate that they don’t have regular access to the internet or to digital resources.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area of Concern</td>
<td>Concern Statements</td>
<td>Indicators</td>
<td>Data Sources and Evidence</td>
<td>Measurable Program Objectives for MEP</td>
<td>Strategies Resources Needed/Next Steps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Language Development</td>
<td>We are concerned that Out of School Youth (OSY) have difficulty participating in ESL classes due to their work schedules.</td>
<td>MIS2000: Percentage of MEP grades 9-12 students who are receiving technology instruction/computer instruction/assistance with internet access.</td>
<td>MIS2000: 18.4% of MEP students in grades 6-12 received technology/computer instructional services in 2011-2012.</td>
<td>OSY Survey: OSY data indicates that 47% of students would like an ESL class, but 100% indicated that their only availability was evenings or weekends. MIS2000 Data: In 2011-2012, only 15% of OSY received instructional services. This is no change since 2010.</td>
<td>1) By the end of 2013-2014, 50% of OSY will receive ESL or other instruction of at least 6 hours. 2) By the end of 2013-2014, 50% of OSY will have received instruction in goal setting and life planning. 3) By the end of 2013-2014, 75% of OSY will receive instructional or supportive services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OSY Survey: Percentage of students who would like ESL classes.</td>
<td>Percentage of students available days, nights, weekends.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Provide classes and services in evenings and on weekends, with expectation of a minimum number of 6 class hours. • Increase technology involvement in ESL and other instruction. Develop a promising practices report. • Offer professional development on short term ESL courses. • Seek appropriate venues for classes: e.g., worksites, Laundromats, camps. • Survey specific vocational interests of OSY in order to have content based ESL that will increase interest . • Utilize OSY trainer model to provide statewide training and coordination for working with OSY.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Area of Concern | Concern Statements | Indicators | Data Sources and Evidence | Measurable Program Objectives for MEP | Strategies | Resources Needed/Next Steps
--- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | ---
### Educational Continuity
We are concerned that there are not sufficient programs geared to the needs of “recovery” youth, especially those who are working full time. | **OSY Survey:** Percentage of students available days, nights, weekends. Percentage of OSY students who would like to get their GED or H.S. Diploma. Percentage of students who have completed 6th grade. Percentage of students who have transportation to classes. | **OSY Survey:** Of 202 students surveyed, 100% indicated that they are available only nights and weekends. Of 202 students surveyed, 22 indicated that they would like to get their GED. 86% of OSY surveyed had a 6-12th grade education. Only 13% indicated that they had transportation to classes (sometimes by bike). | 1) By the end of the 2013-2014 school year, increase participation in HEP to 15 MEP students per year. 2) By the end of 2013-2014, at least 10 OSY will be enrolled in Pre-GED services. | • Collaborate with HEP. • Connect with the portal for Plazas Comunitarias in Vance County. • Collect and distribute resources from Mexican Consulate. • Offer Pre-GED classes, and promote GED online assistance. • Create and distribute resource list for potential GED students. |
### Educational Continuity
We are concerned about the role of food insecurity and health issues in the capacity for out of school youth to participate in educational activities. | **OSY Survey:** Percentage of OSY indicating a health concern. **MIS 2000:** Percentage of NCMEP OSY receiving Health Support **External Research in Farmworker Health:** Measures of health of farmworker youth. | **OSY Survey:** 25 out of 202 OSY students indicated that they had health concern. **MIS2000:** In 2011-2012, 11.5% of OSY received Health Support Services NCMEP. **External Research:** North Carolina ranks #1 in the United States for heat related illnesses and death among farmworkers. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep.* 2008;57(24):649-643 | 1) By the end of 2013-2014, 45% of OSY will receive a basic health orientation from MEP or in collaboration with a local health provider/migrant clinic. 2) By the end of 2013-2014, 25% of OSY will receive health/safety education focusing on agricultural safety, heat stress reduction, and other health issues of interest to them. | • Develop stronger connections with health clinics and health providers. • Facilitate transportation to clinics, mobile sites, and health care providers. • Provide health/agriculture work safety education for all OSY, through collaboration with Ag. Extension, Institute of Agromedicine, Toxic Free NC, Wake Forest University.
Monitoring Plan

The goal of the Federal Program Monitoring Section is to help LEAs develop and implement programs that are compliant with statute and regulations, responsive to students’ needs, and exemplary of best practices. This is accomplished by providing various opportunities for training, conducting multi-tiered monitoring, and offering quality assurance guidance.

In North Carolina, the Migrant Education Program (MEP) is administered by Local Education Agencies (LEAs) through sub-grants from the North Carolina Department of Public Instruction (NCDPI), with oversight and compliance monitoring also conducted by the State Education Agency (SEA). In addition, the NCMEP conducts regional programming through Regional Recruiters, Regional Data Specialists, Regional Service Providers, and other initiatives such as the AmeriCorps VISTA Regional Approach to Migrant Programs and Services (RAMPS) project.

Monitoring, which has traditionally been conducted by staff of each Federal program, is conducted in a multi-tiered approach, with each of the following types of monitoring/evaluation:

- On-site Program Quality Reviews
- MEP Sub-grantee Self-evaluations
- Consolidated On-site Monitoring
- The application process, as part of the Comprehensive Continuous Improvement Plan

Program Quality Reviews (PQRs) are MEP-specific visits that may focus on particular issues and often include “just-in-time” technical assistance. Self-evaluations of the MEP are conducted yearly by each LEA with a Migrant Education Sub-grant as part of their grant application process. Consolidated monitoring provides a “snapshot” of program performance and compliance in various Federal programs, including the MEP. PQR schedules are developed and sent out each year to each LEA that will receive a visit. As of 2013, half of the sub-grant programs will be visited each year.

MEP Statute and Guidance set specific requirements that are not detailed in the North Carolina Federal Program Monitoring Section's Consolidated Monitoring Instrument. To develop and foster programs that are constantly improving their services to migrant children, the NCMEP has introduced a system of quality checking and support for LEAs. The Quality Assurance process requires LEAs to maintain documents on file to chart the procedures, processes, and progress of their local MEPs. Each year, half of the LEA programs will be selected for a site visit Program Quality Review (PQR) by DPI staff to review required documentation and discuss program practices. The goal of the on-site review is to view best practices in action and help programs make adjustments where needed.

In addition, LEAs will be asked to submit some documentation as part of the Comprehensive Continuous Improvement Planning (CCIP) online process. That documentation (uploaded to an online document library) is part of each program’s requirements for application and acts as another control on sub-grant program compliance and quality.

Finally, regionally-based Data Specialists, Recruiters, and Service Providers will be monitored through the use of the same or similar instruments as LEA-based programs.
The following diagram helps differentiate between the Consolidated Monitoring process and the Quality Assurance process:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>On-site Monitoring</th>
<th>Quality Assurance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Snapshot in time</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ongoing (at least once/2years)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Consolidated</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Program-Specific PQRs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Statutory compliance</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Guidance and Best Practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Observations and Follow-up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Actions needed</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Professional Development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Linked to Program Planning
North Carolina Migrant Education Site Visit Instrument

Representatives of the North Carolina Migrant Education Program at the Department of Public Instruction will visit approximately twelve program sites each year to evaluate program quality and needs. The visits will last one day, and will be combined with prospective re-interviews when possible.

The visit will use a modification of the following instrument to help assess and evaluate each program. The instrument is based on six program integrity areas identified by the Office of Migrant Education: student eligibility, needs assessment (for program design and student service), educational reform, funding and fiscal issues, quality control (quality assurance), and record transfer. Since many aspects of this instrument are included in the Quality Assurance process, the instrument is used to identify challenges faced in implementing and improving their programs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEA/LOA</th>
<th>Reviewers</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

RATING SCALE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leading</td>
<td>The program has complied with all requirements of the Migrant Education Program, and is exemplary. The program has a clear and evident record of accomplishing its goals for migrant students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing</td>
<td>The program complies with all requirements of the Migrant Education Program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emerging</td>
<td>The program has met most of the requirements of the Migrant Education Program. The program needs some assistance in developing plans to meet all requirements within one program year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lacking</td>
<td>The program has not complied with elements of three or more areas. A program of technical assistance must be implemented to ensure that all requirements are met within one program year.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Questions in italics (in the Considerations column) are designed to gather information to answer the major program area objective.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Considerations</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>I. Identification and Recruitment (ID&amp;R) and Eligibility</strong> (Sec. 1301(e), 1303(a)(1), 1303(e), 1304 (b)(1)(B), 1308 (b)(1))</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 1. The LEA has used the State ID and R Plan to guide its ID and R activities. | • **Interview Recruiter, Director, and any other staff involved with ID&R. Ask:**  
  o What are the most common qualifying activities in your area? Where do most families move from/to?  
  o How do you find new MEP students/youth that have moved to the area?  
  o What outside sources do you use to identify new MEP students/youth to the area?  
  o Is the number of identified migrant students increasing or decreasing? Why? What changes have you seen in agricultural labor patterns in your area?  
  o What do you feel is the greatest challenge in Identification and Recruitment in your program?  
  o Can you mention one of your most successful recruitment activities? The least successful? Is there any other new recruitment activity you are considering?  
  o How do you use MSIX and the MIS2000 online tool as part of your recruiting efforts?  
  o How do you review and improve your overall recruitment efforts? | | |
| 2. Recruiters observe seasonal migration patterns and local crops timeline in order to maximize ID&R opportunities. In addition, Recruiters’ schedules are flexible in order to allow for increased ability to recruit. | • **Interview Recruiter, Director, and any other staff involved with ID&R. Ask:**  
  o What are the best times of the year to recruit, and how to those times relate to qualifying activities?  
  o How do the Recruiter(s) schedule and activities relate to the qualifying activities’ peak season(s)? Are there issues with time and scheduling in your district? Explain. | | |
| 3. The state (National) COE is used to identify every MEP child. Information used to establish eligibility | • **Interview Recruiter, Director, and any other staff involved with ID&R. Ask:**  
  o Are eligibility interviews conducted face to face?  
  o Is the current COE used in determining eligibility? | | |
is based on a personal interview with a parent, guardian or other responsible adult.

4. Recruiter(s) and any other authorized ID&R staff demonstrate knowledge of the eligibility criteria for MEP and make adequate eligibility determinations.
   - **Interview Recruiter, Director, and any other staff involved with ID&R. Ask:**
     - What are the eligibility criteria, and how do you determine and document whether students are eligible for the MEP? Are any of the criteria especially difficult to assess?

5. The LEA trains Recruiters on ID&R, including eligibility criteria and how to develop an ID&R plan.
   - Has the Recruiter or any other assigned person been trained and authorized by the State Education Agency (SEA) or by the LEA to conduct eligibility interviews and make eligibility determinations?
   - **Interview Recruiter, Director, and any other staff involved with ID&R. Ask**
     - What training have you received on ID&R?
     - Have you received one-one training? Who provided it?
     - Have you or other MEP staff members attended all SEA regional and statewide trainings and webinars? What kinds of ongoing training has your Recruiter/team had during the last year?
     - Do you know how to use the MIS2000 Online Tool and MSIX?
     - What are your training needs?
### II. Student Data and Records Transfer (Sec. 1304(c)(1)(B), Sec.1304(b)(3))

The Data Specialist will be contacted by telephone to complete this section.

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6. Student data is up-to-date and accurate on the MIS 2000 system.</td>
<td>• Review MIS 2000 records (COE and Student Data views) to determine if students’ data is currently up-to-date and accurate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• <strong>Interview program coordinator/Director. Ask:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Who is your COE Reviewer and have they been trained and certified (beginning spring 2013)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• <strong>Interview Data Specialist and Recruiter. Ask:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Data Specialist and Recruiter: How do you keep each student’s data updated? Explain the process, starting with how data is collected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Recruiter: Explain the process you use for sending COEs to the Regional Data Specialist.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Data Specialist: Are there any specific issues involving data uploads?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Data Specialist and Recruiter: What is the process for correcting data entry errors?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Data Specialist: How frequently do you “upload changes” and “check for upgrades”?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Data Specialist and Recruiter: Do you do “enrollment verification”? When? How?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. COEs are entered into the MIS 2000 database within two weeks (14 calendar days) of the interview date.</td>
<td>• Run, review, and compare the COE Review Up to Date report for the year being monitored and current and previous year. Discuss any delays in entering COEs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• <strong>Interview Data Specialist and Recruiter. Ask:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o How do you ensure that COEs are entered on time into MIS2000? If the COE Up-to-Date Report indicates an error rate in timeliness of entry, what is your plan to be in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 8. | Instructional staff is aware of migrant student information, which is accessible for their use. | • Review forms used to convey information about migrant students to other LEA staff members.  
• **Interview MEP staff. Ask:**  
  o How is data on MEP students made available to instructional and support staff? On what timeline? |
| 9. | Educational continuity is promoted by the timely transfer of student records, use of MSIX, and development and use of intrastate and interstate communication systems. | • Is there evidence of a records transfer process? Has the **Transfer of Migrant Student Records Evaluation Report** been completed and submitted for the most recent year? Is a staff member trained and using MSIX?  
• **Interview MEP Staff. Ask:**  
  o How does the LEA request and transmit student records to other LEAs in North Carolina and to other states?  
  o How do you verify the accuracy and completeness of the information sent?  
  o Please describe how your program has used MSIX to promote educational continuity. Which staff members in your program have been trained in MSIX?  
  o How many records have been requested and sent in the past year? How many have been requested and received? How many times have you requested or given information/assistance from another LEA or state? How many times have you used MSIX to inform locations that MEP students are moving to their area?  
  o Are there ways you could improve this process? |
| 10. | The LEA has developed a system of communication with their Regional Data Specialist. | • MEP staff knows about MIS2000 data collection and reporting requirements.  
• **Interview LEA Migrant Education staff and Regional Data Specialist. Ask:**  
  o How do you ensure that the following reports are sent to the Data Specialist in a timely fashion? |
| o | Supplemental Services Report (monthly) |
| o | Enrollment Verification information (complete by September deadline) |
| o | Describe how your program uses digital resources to enhance communication. |
| o | What are your training needs? |
### III. Program Services/ Provision of services  
(Sec. 1304(d), 1306 (1)(a)-1306(1)(g)

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **11. Services provided to students** | **- Is the program being implemented as described in the application? Does the program reflect the goals of the State Service Delivery Plan?**  
**- How does the district identify the educational and support needs of migrant children?**  
**- Does the LEA conduct its own needs assessment? How are the results communicated? How frequently is a needs assessment conducted? How current is the data? To what degree is updated data used for program planning?**  
**- What type of data is collected? (e.g., State and local assessment data, attendance data, dropout rates, graduation rates, college admission exam scores)**  
**- **Interview Director and MEP staff. Ask:**  
  o Tell how program design connects with data (especially your student profile and student records), needs assessment (surveys and questionnaires) and your annual program evaluation. What is the process of completing your local needs assessment and program evaluation? Who is involved?  
  o How does the LEA promote continuity in the provision of instruction and related supportive services for migrant children as they move across school districts and States, including the transfer of credits for high school students? Give examples of this.  
  o How are services matched to student needs?  
  o How do you know individual components of the MEP are successful? How do you evaluate your program?** |
| **12. The MEP needs assessment identifies the students who have a priority for service (those whose education has been interrupted within the** | **- Interview Director and any MEP staff. Ask:**  
  o Do you know what “Priority for Services” (PFS) means? Do you know how the SEA has defined “at risk of failing to meet the State’s standards” AND “an educational interruption during the regular school year?”** |
school year and are failing or at-risk of failing state standards). Teachers and other staff are instructed to serve students according to the service priorities.

| 13. Migrant students are provided quality, rigorous summer/intersession programs/activities, either through the MEP alone or in collaboration with other programs. | **Interview Director. Ask:**
|  | ○ How are summer programs determined and designed?
|  | ○ Describe your summer programs.
|  | ○ What evaluation designs are used to evaluate the (1) implementation and (2) results of the summer program? What data is collected? How do you communicate the results? |

| 14. Services available to MEP students are enhanced by coordinating activities with other programs and agencies. | **Interview Director. Ask:**
|  | ○ Give some examples of how your program coordinates with other agencies and programs, including:
|  | - McKinney-Vento Homeless Education Program
|  | - Child Nutrition Program |

| 15. Supplementary staff development activities that improve staff skills in teaching migrant students are provided. Staff development activities provided by the MEP are supplementary to those offered by the LEA, and address the special needs of Migrant students. | **Interview Director and MEP staff. Ask:**
|  | ○ How are staff development activities determined at your LEA for MEP staff?
|  | ○ How do you ensure that MEP staff and non-migrant staff participate in the staff development activities provided by both MEP and the local district? How is information disseminated to all stakeholders?
|  | ○ Have you or other staff members attended ALL NCDPI Professional Development Assistance Meetings and Webinars?
|  | ○ Describe something new that you can apply to your work with migratory students as a result of professional development activities in which you have participated.
<p>|  | ○ Have you offered professional development regarding migrant students to other staff in your LEA? |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 16. Classroom teachers and tutors can cite specific examples of services provided to migrant students. | • **Interview Teacher/Tutor. Ask:**  
  - What special assistance do you provide to migrant students? How has the MEP helped your students? How do you receive information about migrant students? How do you design your instructional activities? |   |   |
| 17. There is a clear understanding of the Continuation of Services Provisions of the Migrant Education Program. | • **Interview Director and MEP staff. Ask**  
  - What are the number of COS students in the LEA-based MEP? What provision are they served under? What documentation is used to ensure that the program is compliant with the statute? |   |   |
### IV. Parent, Student, and Community Involvement (Sec. 1118, Sec. 1304(c)(3))

#### 18. The LEA has a clearly articulated overall parental involvement plan that describes ways parents can support student learning. The plan incorporates efforts supported by federal, local, state and/or private funding. Funds are targeted to meet the specific needs of Migrant families.

- **Interview Director and MEP staff. Ask:**
  - What steps has your program taken to involve parents in the planning and implementation of the MEP?
  - What assistance do parents receive in understanding content standards, student performance standards and other printed materials in languages other than English?
  - How much MEP funding is used for parent involvement? (This funding is noted in the BUD or BAAS system by Purpose Codes.)

#### 19. Parents can cite specific examples of their involvement with Migrant education program matters. MEP parents are involved in the planning and implementation of MEP activities.

- **Interview MEP parents. Ask:**
  - Did the MEP staff explain the information they asked you at the first interview? Are you aware that this information is confidential?
  - Have you been notified that your child/ren qualify for the MEP? Did staff explain the duration of eligibility?
  - What are the services that your local MEP offers? Do your children participate?
  - How are you involved in the consultation and planning of the MEP in your county? Can you provide specific examples of how you been involved and consulted?
  - Do you receive information in a language that you understand? What type of information do you receive? Do you feel comfortable visiting your child’s school?
  - Do you know the local MEP staff members and how to contact them?
  - What type of assistance do you need in order to help your child to be successful at school?
<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Students can cite specific examples of the services provided to them by the LEA MEP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Has staff told you about MSIX?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Interview MEP students. Ask:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- What kind of programs does your MEP have? Have you participated in them? What has been your favorite MEP activity, and why?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- What would you like the MEP to offer?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

V. Funding (Section 1120A)

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>The MEP financial plans and practices meet legal requirements and are supplemental to the LEA's base program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Do financial records accurately account for MEP fund expenditures?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Do Migrant students receive the base program at the LEA with Migrant Education service providing supplemental services?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Interview Director. Ask:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Do you understand how the SEA allocates MEP funds?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Describe how the MEP supplements other programs. If teachers who teach during regular school hours are paid from MEP funds, how is their work supplemental?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>The MEP equipment inventory is up-to-date.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Is the equipment inventory up-to-date according to NC state standards? (This is currently being monitored by NCDPI Fiscal Monitors.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>Expenditures reflect approved budget; if there are changes, appropriate amendment forms and BUD/BAAS amendments have been submitted and approved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Is there no more than a 10% discrepancy between approved budget and expenditures?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Have amendments been submitted and approved in BUD or BAAS?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- In the case of a program change, have Program Amendments been submitted to the MEP Consultant at DPI?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>VI. Quality Assurance</strong>  (Sec, 1304 (c)(7), Sec.1309 (2))</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interview Director. Ask:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- If you have budget lines for Contracted Services, please describe the services. Please have contracts or proposed contracts available for review.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interview Director, Recruiter, Data Specialist, and Tutors/Advocates/Service Providers. Ask:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Does the LEA MEP have a process for resolving eligibility questions? Describe.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- What is the procedure for reviewing completed COEs to verify that the information included support a proper determination of eligibility? Has the LEA assigned a COE reviewer? What does the COE reviewer check? Explain.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Have you ever enrolled a child/youth that was later found ineligible? How was this discovered? How was it resolved? Is there a formal process for correcting eligibility errors?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- What procedures are implemented to detect and correct student data errors?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- What are the most common errors found? What process do you follow to correct them?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- How are you documenting service delivery? How do you tie Service Delivery to the data in your student profile?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Have you completed documentation for each PFS student and each student receiving Continuation of Services?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All required Quality Assurance reports have been completed and submitted for the most recent program year.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Priority for Services Plan

Legal Basis

Section 1304(d) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act details the Priority for Services requirements for Migrant Education Programs. MEPs must give Priority for Services (PFS) to those migrant children and youth who are failing, or at risk of failing, to meet state standards, and whose education has been interrupted during the regular school year.

Students who have been designated as PFS are more likely than others to deal with the following concerns:

- Lost instructional time
- Educational Continuity
- School Engagement
- Educational Support in the Home
- Access to Services (due to high mobility)
- Health (due to high mobility and knowledge of local health resources)

Migrant Education Programs need to do the following to assist students designated as PFS: minimize disruption caused by moving during the school year; provide increased levels of academic and supportive services; proactively seek out parents/guardians in order to help them minimize the stress of moving on their children.

Minimizing Disruption

MEPs should facilitate the timely transfer of student records and assist school staff in obtaining records through communication with MEPs in other areas and the use of MSIX. In the absence of records, MEPs should work to assess children’s needs as quickly as possible upon enrollment, so that appropriate services begin immediately.

PFS students should be assigned buddies and integrated into school activities to help them become oriented quickly to their new school and community. Items such as backpacks and school uniforms should be obtained at the earliest possible time so that students do not have to wait to begin school.

Increased Levels of Services

Assess PFS students’ progress frequently to make sure that they are receiving the services they need. If there is a lag in assessment, highly mobile students may be gone before services are delivered. PFS students should receive increased levels of service. They should have first access to afterschool programs, increased home visits, or priority for summer programs.

Family Support

It is important to remember that PFS students’ families may have missed all of the orientation meetings that have been held earlier in the year. MEPs should make early contact and have frequent communication with parents/guardians of children who are PFS. MEP staff can support families by referring them to community resources in a timely fashion, so that the families are aware of a resource before a need arises. Parents of
highly mobile children need extra help in understanding the requirements of the local school system and in communicating with teachers and school staff. If there are “veteran,” experienced parents, MEPs can tap them as a resource for newly arrived families. MEPs can assist highly mobile families in obtaining important documentation, such as birth certificates, IDs, passports.

In 2011-2012, NCMEP had 423 Priority for Services students in 18 counties. This represents about 7.35% of the A1 Count of students, and is a low number. For the past two years, the number has been increasing slightly, due to increased professional development and a wider range of risk factors used to determine PFS status. However, some districts are still not evaluating all new students for PFS upon enrollment, so that potentially needy students can be missed.

The majority of PFS students are in the elementary grades, although numbers are increasing for high school students and even for OSY.

**Policies and Procedures for PFS Designation**

Newly arrived students are evaluated using the PFS criteria list, which is part of the PFS Record Form that follows. If a student has moved into or out of a school district during the regular school year, they are considered to have met Criterion 1. Criterion 2 has a list of risk factors, any of which can be used to meet the requirements.

MEP staff should complete the PFS Record Form for each student, describing the nature of the interventions or services that student will receive as a PFS student. The forms should be maintained on site, and will be reviewed during the Program Quality Review or Consolidated Monitoring Process. If the local staff has a question or concern about a student, a call should be made to the MEP Consultant at the Department of Public Instruction.

When a student is designated as PFS, their status should be communicated to the Regional Data Specialist as an identification code (034) on the monthly Service Records sent to data specialists. The database system will not designate a student as PFS, so it MUST be done by the local MEP and entered into the database by data specialists by the procedure above.

**PFS in the Service Delivery Plan**

PFS students in elementary, middle, and high school have specific Measurable Program Objectives in the Service Delivery Plan. While there are currently fewer than 30 Pre-K age children and Out of School Youth designated as PFS, it will become important to develop Measurable Program Objectives for them, also. Since they are the most highly mobile populations in NCMEP, further research must be conducted on how to serve them best, given their frequent moves and the lack of formal programs that can serve extremely short-term participants in many areas. Increased collaboration at the state level with Head Start Programs and with the distance HEP at Wake Tech provides one tool we can begin to make sure that are accessible to the most mobile families of Pre-K age children and OSY.
### North Carolina Migrant Education
#### Priority for Services Student Record

**LEA/LOA/Service Provider**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Name ____________________________</th>
<th>COE ID ___________________</th>
<th>UID ____________________________</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Both **Criterion 1** and **Criterion 2** must be marked, below.

**Criterion 1:** Mobility—Student moved into or out of a school district within the regular school year. The “moved out of” criterion applies to children who may leave our district during the school year and return during the summer. They have still made a move during the school year and suffered a disruption. They may also leave another district during the school year, and not be enrolled in your district until after the end of the Regular School Year, thereby suffering another type of disruption.

- [ ] Moved into your district
- [ ] Moved out of a school district

**Criterion 2:** At-Risk of failing to meet state standards—Check one or more of the criteria below, if they apply. If data is not obtained from MIS2000 or NCWISE, please note source of data (e.g., MSIX; district discipline records). Data sources must be available for review during Performance Quality Reviews.

- [ ] Student is at Entering, Beginning, Developing, or Expanding levels of WAPT or ACCESS test;
- [ ] Student has a NOT PROFICIENT (1 or 2) Score on EOG/EOC;
- [ ] Student is NOT ON TRACK TO GRADUATE, as defined in NCMEP (no credit for Algebra I or English 1 by end of 10th grade);
- [ ] Student has been retained at least once;
- [ ] Student has failed a grade in grades K-8 during the last three years, but was not retained;
- [ ] Student is not in appropriate grade for age (at least 2 years behind, e.g., an 8 year old in 1st grade);
- [ ] Elementary or middle school student with at least 5 consecutive days of Out-of-School Suspension during a school year;
- [ ] For Out of School Youth (OSY), student has dropped out of high school.

**Description of Services to PFS Student:** e.g., extra home visits, extra tutoring, first in line for summer program, material support…..

- [ ] Check if PFS indicator has been self-reported to MIS2000.

**Date of PFS designation ____________**

**Form Prepared by__________________________**

**Date___________________**

Initial if additional information is added or form is changed. **Update** if a student re-qualifies due to a new move.
Migrant Student Information Exchange (MSIX) Plan

The timely and accurate access to educational information about migratory students is at the heart of effective service delivery. To that end, North Carolina Migrant Education has participated in a site visit from the Records Exchange Advice, Communication, and Technical Support (REACTS) team, and has developed an implementation plan and a set of policies for student records transfer and coordination under the Migrant Student Information Exchange (MSIX) initiative. These procedures and plans build on the current data management policies outlined in our Quality Assurance Manual. The following table summarizes the MSIX plan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Measurable Goals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-MEP staff have limited to no access or awareness about MSIX</td>
<td>• Present at Title I Meetings&lt;br&gt;• Use counselor “champions” to discuss MSIX with others&lt;br&gt;• Present at Student Services Meetings&lt;br&gt;• Work with Student Services Directors in counties</td>
<td>• Train a counselor or social worker in each program LEA by end of 2013-2014 school year.&lt;br&gt;• Train 15 non-program county school counselors by end of 2014 school year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEP staff do not make consistent or frequent use of MSIX</td>
<td>• Monitor MSIX use through reports feature.&lt;br&gt;• Conduct 2-3 MSIX webinars or training opportunities each year.&lt;br&gt;• Frequent users will present on MSIX at regional and statewide meetings.</td>
<td>• Each local MEP will have at least one trained and active MSIX user by the end of the 2012-2013 school year.&lt;br&gt;• Each local MEP will have verified attendance in at least one professional development activity on MSIX each year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most NCMEP parents are not aware of MSIX</td>
<td>• Train recruiters to introduce parents to MSIX.&lt;br&gt;• Use MSIX brochures/scenarios at local Parent Advisory Council meetings.&lt;br&gt;• Discuss MSIX at state PAC meeting.&lt;br&gt;• Ask parents about MSIX during parent interviews at PQRs or consolidated monitoring visits.</td>
<td>• Beginning in 2012-2013, all new recruiters will receive MSIX information during their one-on-one training, including tips on how to talk to parents about MSIX.&lt;br&gt;• By the end of 2013-2014, at least 50% of parents interviewed during monitoring visits will report knowledge of MSIX.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most NCMEP Out of School Youth (OSY) are not aware of MSIX</td>
<td>• Train recruiters to introduce OSY to MSIX.&lt;br&gt;• Ask OSY about MSIX during interviews at PQRs or consolidated monitoring visits.</td>
<td>• Beginning in 2012-2013, all new recruiters will receive MSIX information during their one-on-one training, including tips on how to talk to OSY about MSIX.&lt;br&gt;• By the end of 2013-2014, at least 50% of OSY interviewed during monitoring visits or re-interviews will report knowledge of MSIX.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Records Transfer Procedures

Section 1304(b)(3) of the statute requires SEAs to promote interstate and intrastate coordination by providing for educational continuity through the timely transfer of pertinent school records (including health information) when children move from one school to another, whether or not the move occurs during the regular school year.

To comply with this requirement, North Carolina Migrant Education Program (NCMEP) has developed a procedure to promote and ensure the correct and timely transfer of migrant student records (including health information). This is done to coordinate services when a student moves on an intrastate or interstate basis. In North Carolina, schools and school districts are responsible for transferring school records. NCMEP does not have the authority to request school records. However, in an effort to ensure this action is being done, each LEA MEP will contact the school Student Information Management System (SIMS) or North Carolina Window of Information on Student Education (NC WISE) operator to follow up on the request of records. Each LEA MEP is required to implement the following procedure in its district beginning with the 2007-2008 school year:

1. When a student comes to a NC LEA from another state or another NC LEA, the local MEP will contact the school NC WISE (state student data system) operator to confirm if the student’s record was received or when it was requested. If the record has not been requested, the recruiter will inform their MEP director. The director will then contact the school principal to follow up on the transfer of record. Each LEA MEP will develop a process for the NC WISE operator to inform the LEA MEP when records have been received. If the student is coming from another state, the LEA MEP will also contact the sending state MEP to request the migrant student’s record to get health information and information on the services the student received from MEP in the sending state.

In addition, every time a student moves to a NC LEA, the new LEA MEP must verify in its local records, state database and in MSIX whether the student already has a record in MIS2000 before creating a new student record. If the record is found, it will be downloaded to the local database following the steps outlined on the attached sheet. If the student’s record was not found in MIS2000, the new LEA must contact the prior school district MEP to request as soon as possible copy of the student’s migrant record, including migrant history, services provided, health information, etc.

2. Each LEA-based or regional recruiter should use monthly NCWISE consumption reports to identify students who have moved within the state and who have not been identified by MEP in their receiving LEAs or regions.

3. When a student leaves for another state, if the MEP knows that the student is leaving, it will give to the student’s family a folder with the student’s information, such as student’s name, LEA, school, school contact information, last grade attended, MEP local and state contact information, etc. Upon immediate request, the LEA MEP will fax or mail the student’s COE, health information and services provided to the next local or state MEP.

In addition, the staff of the LEA-based MEP should use the notification feature of MSIX to alert a receiving state to expect the student.
Through a report submitted to the SEA annually in September (through the CCIP process) and during monitoring and site visits, NCMEP will periodically follow-up and monitor to ensure that local staff request and transfer migrant student records in a timely manner. The report submitted by the LEA will inform the number of records requested, received and sent from and to other school districts in state and out of state. The form is attached. The LEA MEP will keep documentation for 7 years regarding student records transfer. This will be part of document for reviewing during monitoring visit.
Parent Engagement Plan

The North Carolina Migrant Education Program views parents as the best advocates for their children. We depend on the advice of parents to complete our needs assessment, design our program components, and evaluate how well our program has served their families. PAC meetings are designed to develop leadership among migrant parents, to educate parents about topics of interest and to solicit parent feedback on state MEP initiatives.

Parental Involvement

Statewide
The state Parent Advisory Council (PAC) meets face-to-face at least once per year, usually in the spring. Other meetings may be held by webinar, and frequently parents attend our regional and statewide staff meetings. In addition, we administer surveys to parents at various times. The annual PAC meeting includes several key components:

- A state of NCMEP report, based on the State Student Profile.
- A discussion of the current service delivery plan, with parent feedback.
- A discussion of current program activities and an evaluation through focus group discussions by parents.
- A leadership development component, during which a facilitator works with parents to develop their own leadership skills. Spring 2013 will focus on educational rights and advocacy.

A team of staff and parents are responsible for the planning of the annual parent meeting. Due to the high mobility of our families, parents decide whether or not to have terms of service. At present, parents self-nominate, and there is no limit on the number of parents on the council.

Local
Each local sub-grantee is expected to have a Parent Advisory Council. In areas with few MEP students, that council can be part of another parent council’s meeting (such as Title I or Title III), but MUST have a breakout session dedicated to MEPs. The meetings should have formal agendas and sign-in lists. In addition, the meetings should focus on MEP improvement and actively seek parental advice, rather than just being informational sessions for parents. Local sub-grantees can contact NCMEP for assistance in planning parent workshop sessions on the following topics:

- Being a leader in your community
- Parents as Teachers
- Family literacy
- Helping your child with homework
- Building resilience and self-esteem
- College access
- Educational rights and responsibilities
- Health and safety issues
- Anti-bullying
- Obtaining and protecting important documents (e.g., transcripts, immunization records, etc.)
Youth Involvement

The NCMEP includes Out-of-School Youth in the annual parent meetings for two reasons: some of them are parents of children in the program; and most of them act as their own “parents,” making adult life decisions. They, too, should have a voice in the direction of migrant education in North Carolina. At present, only a few youth attend these meetings, but as numbers increase, we hope to establish a Youth Advisory Council under the advisement of participating migrant youth.
Professional Development Plan

NCMEP will provide opportunities for training in all aspects of program quality. Training is provided by the SEA for all MEP staff members throughout the state. This includes Recruiters, Data Specialists, Directors, Tutors, and other advocates.

The first level of training is one-on-one training offered at DPI for Data Collection and Reporting, and on-site for ID&R and Service Provision. A one-on-one training session is required for all new MEP Recruiters, Data Specialists, and Service Providers. In addition, each new local program Director will be given a one-on-one session to cover basic aspects of managing a MEP. For experienced staff, we still offer MSIX refreshers and onsite trainings upon request.

Next, we have two Regional Meetings per year, one in October, and one in February. The sessions focus on updates, new procedures, and specific professional development topics. The February meeting is focused on the NCMEP student profile, networking, and on new information from the Office of Migrant Education Conference (from the previous November). Every subgrant program should send at least one staff member to their respective session.

Beginning in 2013, NCMEP will hold a statewide meeting in May. This meeting, following shortly on the heels of the Migrant Education Conference, will give opportunity for those who have attended that conference to share information with colleagues. In addition, it features a summary of the sub-grant application process. Finally, collaborating organizations are invited to send speakers to address issues such as law, health, and educational access.

In addition to these professional development opportunities, NCMEP will frequently schedule training sessions and webinars based on the Professional Development Needs Assessment results and on the needs of various working groups. We conduct surveys at our regional meetings or through online survey providers in order to determine topics for webinars and trainings. In addition, webinars are conducted to introduce local staff members to changes in guidance and regulations or changes in state procedure.

NCMEP often holds sessions as part of the North Carolina Association of Compensatory Educators (NCACE) Conference in the fall of each year and participates in other statewide conferences. These sessions are open to anyone attending the conference. In addition, MEP staff is encouraged to attend the NCDPI Comprehensive Conference on Student Achievement, the Synergy Conference, the Eastern Stream Forum, and the NC Farmworker Institute.

Focused “Promising Practices” days will be held on specific topics throughout the year, sponsored by NCMEP or through collaborative efforts with other agencies. Currently, we have an annual Promising Practices for Out of School Youth mini-conference held in partnership with the Wake Technical Community College HEP Program.

Approximately ten times per year, we send out NCMEP Updates to all staff members throughout the state. The updates feature program updates, highlights from local programs and initiatives, and links to resources for serving students. In addition, the State maintains a large presence on the web providing local staff with information and links for program management and improvement.
### Professional Development Opportunities for MEP Staff Members and Service Providers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opportunity</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Attendance</th>
<th>Audience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One-on-one trainings</td>
<td>At beginning of assignment for Regional Service Providers and Interns. As needed for new Directors, Recruiters, and Regional Data Specialists.</td>
<td>DPI (Data); on-site (Data, ID &amp; R, and Services)</td>
<td>Mandatory for new recruiters; optional for experienced.</td>
<td>Directors, Recruiters, Data Specialists, Service Providers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bi-annual Regional Meeting</td>
<td>Fall and spring of each year</td>
<td>Sites across state</td>
<td>Recommended; at least one staff member from each sub-grant LEA should attend. All regional staff are expected to attend.</td>
<td>All MEP staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCMEP Webinars</td>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td>Online</td>
<td>Highly Recommended</td>
<td>All MEP staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Development Sessions, Working Groups, Promising Practices Days</td>
<td>As needed or requested</td>
<td>Sites across state</td>
<td>Recommended</td>
<td>All MEP staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directors’ Meeting</td>
<td>As requested</td>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>Recommended</td>
<td>Directors, Coordinators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Visits by DPI Staff</td>
<td>As needed</td>
<td>On-site</td>
<td>As needed</td>
<td>Program Directors, Recruiters, Service Providers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCACE Conference</td>
<td>Fall of each year</td>
<td>Greensboro</td>
<td>Optional</td>
<td>NCACE Members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Conferences</td>
<td>Varied</td>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>Optional</td>
<td>Variable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Results of 2012 Professional Development Survey

The NCMEP conducted a professional development survey to determine professional development needs for the upcoming year. Surveys were made available at the fall 2012 Service Area meetings and in an on-line format. Over 50 staff members responded resulting in a 60% response rate. Based on this information, the NCMEP will be offering more information on parent engagement, family literacy, and summer programs. We are inviting speakers on immigration and HEP to our meetings.

In which of the following areas would you like professional development?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identification and Recruitment</td>
<td>31.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Updates</td>
<td>29.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSIX</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSEDD Online Tool</td>
<td>27.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Literacy</td>
<td>37.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apps for MEP</td>
<td>35.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESL for Adults/OSY</td>
<td>35.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountability for Summer Programs</td>
<td>37.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent Education and Engagement Resources</td>
<td>45.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School Diploma Programs</td>
<td>31.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Issues for Farmworkers</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigration Issues</td>
<td>43.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Which are your preferred methods of professional development?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Webinars</td>
<td>56.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Updates/ Online information</td>
<td>41.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-person Workshops</td>
<td>70.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Visits by Facilitators</td>
<td>37.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer One-day Institutes</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentations at NCACE, Comprehensive Conference</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wikis, Moodle, Blogs, etc.</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Identification and Recruitment (ID&R) Summary and State Plan

NC ID&R Structure

The NC Migrant Education Program allocates MEP funds directly to local education agencies (LEA) upon review and approval their applications. Each LEA employs its own recruiter(s), who is (are) under the supervision of the LEA MEP director or other assigned MEP staff. The NC Department of Public Instruction (DPI) employs regional recruiters to identify and recruit migrant children in the counties that do not have a migrant program. The NC State ID&R Coordinator provides training, technical assistance, quality control, standardization, consistency, and related functions for all MEP recruiters across the state.

Recruiter Responsibilities & Practices

Recruiters must rely on best practices in order to find migrant students. Recruiters are expected to be familiar with the geographic area, research the reasons and the time of the year that migrant students move to their LEA, and identify where families are likely to reside. The recruiters should establish a network of local resources by building relationships with schools, community agencies, health programs, growers, agribusinesses, and service providers who work with and/or employ potentially qualifying families and their children (e.g., Head Start, Cooperative Extension, Telamon, etc.). Recruiters need to develop and maintain this cooperative network in order to assist them in their search for potentially eligible children.

Once a recruitment calendar and map is established, the recruiters visit potential migrant families & students in order to obtain information regarding the eligibility for the MEP. They are to accurately and clearly record information that establishes that a child is eligible for the MEP on a Certificate of Eligibility (COE). The determination of a child’s eligibility is guided by statute, regulations, and policies that the SEA implements. The decision on eligibility must be able to be confirmed by any other trained MEP staff member in compliance with the state quality assurance system.

Recruiters need to then assess student needs through an informative survey. They must also inform the families/workers what services they receive from the migrant program. Due to the diversity of program options across the state, recruiters must be knowledgeable about the services that the program provides in their LEA/Region. Recruiters must be ready to refer families with needs who do not qualify for the MEP to the appropriate person or agency.

When an eligibility question arises, the recruiter should try to resolve it by reviewing the ID&R manual and discussing it among the local MEP staff. If the question remains unresolved, the recruiter, Data Specialist, or assigned staff member will contact the SEA ID&R coordinator. The SEA ID&R coordinator is available to answer any eligibility or data collection questions as needed. If, based on the questions received, a trend of significant errors, misunderstanding, or both is identified; it will be communicated to all MEP staff by sending a memorandum or by having a training session.

Quality Assurance

The SEA ID&R Coordinator verifies worker/family eligibility and that information recorded on the Certificate of Eligibility (COE) is accurate and adequate to establish a student’s eligibility through a prospective re-interviewing procedure. A yearly random sample of all new statewide COEs is drawn from the
state data base. The families/workers to be re-interviewed will not be less than 50. The SEA/independent re-interviewer must follow the “NCMEP Re-interview Protocol” to conduct the re-interviews.

The SEA ID&R Coordinator develops a COE Summary Report for all LEAs and the recruiter regions every school year to identify any errors and problems with the required eligibility information and data collection. The report will be used as part of the Program Quality Review process for one half of the LEA-based programs each year.

The LEA must submit an “ID&R Evaluation Report” to the SEA ID&R coordinator once a year. The report must include a detailed list of ID&R activities that took place in the identified resource areas (schools, community agencies and businesses, and employment settings) and any other recruitment resource area identified by the LEA, such as door-to-door recruitment within a housing area. The report must evaluate the effectiveness of ID&R efforts and make the appropriate recommendations, such as changing the time when recruitment is taking place in a particular resource area, discontinuing recruitment activities in a specific setting, or adding a new place to conduct recruitment. Regional Recruiters will submit a monthly “Activity Log” to the SEA ID&R coordinator along with the yearly “ID&R Evaluation Report.”
North Carolina Migrant Education Program

State ID&R Plan

### Recruitment Target Audiences
- Migrant Students attending school (K-12)
- Migrant Out-of-School Preschooler’s
- Migrant Out-of-School Youth (under 21 years old)

### Resource Areas
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local K-12 School System</th>
<th>Local Service Agencies &amp; Businesses</th>
<th>Employment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Occupational Survey</td>
<td>Pre-K Programs (Head Start &amp; Partnership for Children)</td>
<td>Local Farmers/Crew Leaders/Contractor Lists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIMS/NCWISE (Reports)</td>
<td>Health Programs (Health Departments &amp; Migrant Clinics)</td>
<td>Employment Security Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Personnel (Meetings)</td>
<td>Statewide Agencies (Cooperative Extension &amp; Social Services)</td>
<td>Telamon Corporation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Annual Recruitment Calendar
- **Complete a Recruitment Calendar annually and send it to the State ID&R Coordinator**
  - Target county migrant labor concentration
  - Base it on qualifying agricultural activities and seasons
  - List primary person(s) responsible for ID&R of migrant children/youth
  - Recruitment activities (migrant labor camps, housing, social events, etc.)
  - Recruitment schedules

### Enrollment Verification Procedures
- Enrollment Verification for all migrant children enrolled from the regular school year to the summer period must be completed and reported to the SEA

### Resolving Eligibility Questions
- Discuss eligibility question within your local LEA staff
- Refer to guidance
- Contact SEA/ID&R Coordinator

### ID&R Training
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New Recruiters</th>
<th>All Recruiters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contact NCDPI for training within 10 days of employment</td>
<td>Attend State Education Agency Trainings</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Evaluation
- Complete the Identification & Recruitment Evaluation Report annually and send it to the State ID&R Coordinator
Program Evaluation

Each local MEP is required to submit an annual program evaluation as part of the Documents Library of the Continuous Comprehensive Improvement Process (CCIP), used for various federal programs in the North Carolina Department of Public Instruction. This document is submitted after August 31 of the evaluated year. It is reviewed by the NCMEP Consultant.

**Purpose:** Organize the process of evaluation of implementation and outcomes of the NCMEP based on performance targets, measurable outcomes, and qualitative data.

**Timeline:** Evaluation will be conducted within program every year. Every three years, NCMEP will contract with an external evaluator.

**Implementation Data:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Information Needed</th>
<th>Data Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Were local projects implemented as described in the approved CCIP application?</td>
<td>• Review of all CCIP applications and subsequent monitoring/PQR of at least half of all programs each year. The instrument used is either the Consolidated Monitoring Instrument for NC Federal Program Monitoring or the Program Quality Review Instrument (NCMEP). (See Appendix ____.) Further review of budget items.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Were strategies in the SDP followed with fidelity by subgrantees? (If not, why not?)</td>
<td>• Review of all CCIP applications and subsequent monitoring/pqr of at least half of all programs each year. The instrument used is either the Consolidated Monitoring Instrument for NC Federal Program Monitoring or the Program Quality Review Instrument (NCMEP). (See Appendix ____.)Further review of budget items.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Was each group of students (PK, K-5, 6-8, 9-12 and OSY) served?</td>
<td>• Review of Services Reports in NCMEP Quality Assurance Manual.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Were suggested strategies implemented?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Were Priority for Services requirements understood and followed by all MEP staff?</td>
<td>• PFS records from MIS2000.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was monitoring conducted according to the NCMEP monitoring plan?</td>
<td>• Monitoring results from LEAs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was the parent involvement plan followed?</td>
<td>• Review of annual monitoring schedules and reports.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Records of parent advisory council meetings; parent focus groups and questionnaires.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Budget allocations for parent involvement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was the professional development plan followed?</td>
<td>• Records of professional development events and webinars.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was the ID and R plan followed?</td>
<td>• Quality Assurance Manual reports from LEAs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Monitoring and PQR Reports from LEAs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Were reporting and data quality expectations understood and monitored?</td>
<td>• Monitoring and PQR reports.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Data quality checks and reports from Quality Assurance Manual.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Outcome Data:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Information Needed</th>
<th>Data Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To what extent did preschool-age children who participated in Pre-K programs through NCMEP (either directly or referred) demonstrate readiness for kindergarten?</td>
<td>• Service Reports in MIS2000;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Data on pre-K readiness collected by LEA subgrantees;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Parent surveys, focus groups, and questionnaires.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent did children in elementary grades and who received MEP services demonstrate proficiency in reading?</td>
<td>• Accountability Division reports of scores;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• CEDARS data warehouse information on grades.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Parent surveys and focus groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Student focus groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent did children in elementary grades and who received MEP services demonstrate proficiency in mathematics?</td>
<td>• Accountability Division reports of scores;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• CEDARS data warehouse information on grades.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Parent surveys and focus groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Student focus groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent did middle school students who received MEP services demonstrate proficiency in reading?</td>
<td>• Accountability Division reports of scores;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• CEDARS data warehouse information on grades.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Student surveys and focus groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent did middle school student who received MEP services demonstrate proficiency in mathematics?</td>
<td>• Accountability Division reports of scores;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• CEDARS data warehouse information on grades.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Student surveys and focus groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent were high school MEP students on track to graduate? How many students obtained a high school diploma?</td>
<td>• Accountability Division reports of scores;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• CEDARS data warehouse information on grades.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• MIS2000 reports on graduation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent did OSY in NCMEP improve their English Language or Job skills? How many NCMEP students completed their GED or returned to a program leading to high school graduation?</td>
<td>• LEA Service Reports in MIS2000;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Pre-post assessments given by LEAs;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• OSY interviews, questionnaires, and focus groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent did PFS (Priority for Services) students show academic growth in reading, mathematics, and science?</td>
<td>• Assessment reports.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do parents feel like they have played an active role in program improvement?</td>
<td>• Parent interviews and focus groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do program staff members feel that professional development opportunities have improved their ability to serve migratory students?</td>
<td>• Staff surveys.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Meeting evaluation reports.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have error rates for ID and R and data reporting remained under 5%?</td>
<td>• Annual prospective re-interview results.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Triennial external re-interview results.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Quality Assurance manual reports.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• MIS2000 Reports.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annual Evaluation Report

Each year, NCMEP will compile a summary report of the annual evaluation and present this information to program staff, parents, and other stakeholders.

Use of Evaluation Information and Annual Evaluation Report

The results of the evaluation will be used by local programs to improve their services. Each program can compare its results to statewide results and act by:

- Requesting technical assistance and/or trainings from NCMEP.
- Sponsoring workshops or trainings on areas of interest.
- Creating regional networks among local programs in order to tackle common issues.
- Presenting sessions at regional and statewide meetings.
- Incorporating changes into subsequent year plans in CCIP.
- Creating MEP Professional Learning Communities to improve communication and coordination of activities.
- Adding criteria to monitoring instruments to allow for follow-up on Consolidated Monitoring visits and Program Quality Reviews.
Links to Other Documents

NCMEP Identification and Recruitment Manual
http://www.dpi.state.nc.us/docs/mep/resources/recruitment/id-recruitment-manual.pdf

NCMEP Quality Assurance Manual

NCMEP Student Records Exchange Policies and Procedures

NCDPI Federal Program Monitoring Consolidated Monitoring Instrument
http://www.ncpublicschools.org/program-monitoring/monitoring/

CCIP
http://ccip.schools.nc.gov/documentlibrary/default.aspx?ccipSessionKey=635005115441043638

ESEA Title I, Part C
http://www2.ed.gov/policy/elsec/leg/esea02/pg8.html

Migrant Education Program Non-Regulatory Guidance and other helpful circulars and regulations

RESULTS Website—Clearinghouse for a variety of Migrant Education information
http://results.ed.gov/