

# Archived Information

## MIGRANT EDUCATION

<p><b>Goal:</b> To assist all migrant students in meeting challenging academic standards and achieving graduation from high school (or a GED program) with an education that prepares them for responsible citizenship, further learning, and productive employment.</p> <p><b>Legislation:</b> Title I, Part C of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) of 1965, as amended by the Improving America’s Schools Act of 1994 (20 U.S.C. 6391 et. seq. and 6362).</p>	<b>Funding History</b> (\$ in millions)			
	<b>Fiscal Year</b>	<b>Appropriation</b>	<b>Fiscal Year</b>	<b>Appropriation</b>
	1985	\$265	2000	\$355
	1990	\$282	2001	\$380
	1995	\$305	2002 (Requested)	\$380

### Program Description

The Migrant Education program (MEP) provides financial assistance to state educational agencies (SEAs) to establish or improve programs of supplemental education and support services for the children of migratory agricultural and fishing industry workers.

SEAs receive funding to: (1) support high-quality and comprehensive educational programs for migratory children that help reduce educational disruptions and other problems that result from repeated moves; (2) ensure that migratory children are provided with appropriate educational services (including support services) that address their special needs in a coordinated and efficient manner; (3) ensure that migratory children have the opportunity to meet the same challenging state content and challenging state student performance standards that all children are expected to meet; (4) 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; and (5) ensure that migratory children benefit from state and local systemic reforms.

The MEP provides formula grants to state educational agencies (SEAs) to be used for supplemental education and support services for migrant children. Funds are allocated through a statutory formula based on each state’s per-pupil expenditure for education and counts of migratory children, (ages 3 through 21) residing within the state. Migratory children eligible to be counted and served by the program are those who have moved within the last three years. The statute, as amended, also authorizes a set-aside fund of up to eight and one-half million dollars from the annual appropriation for contracts and grants to improve inter- and intrastate migrant coordination activities, including academic credit accrual and exchange for migrant students. Coordination moneys currently fund a toll-free telephone number that migrant families can call to reach the nearest migrant education program, a program support center to facilitate interstate coordination, and discretionary grants for applied technology and learning for migrant families.

## Program Performance

OBJECTIVE 1: ALONG WITH OTHER FEDERAL PROGRAMS AND STATE AND LOCAL REFORM EFFORTS, THE MIGRANT EDUCATION PROGRAM (MEP) WILL CONTRIBUTE TO IMPROVED SCHOOL PERFORMANCE OF MIGRANT CHILDREN.

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>	<b>Status:</b> Unable to judge. No FY 2000 data.  <b>Explanation:</b> Data not yet available for baseline year.	<b>Source:</b> Consolidated State Performance Report. <i>Frequency:</i> Annually. <i>Next collection update:</i> February 2, 2001. <i>Date to be reported:</i> Spring 2001.  <b>Validation Procedure:</b> Data and tabulations are validated by internal review procedures of the Council of Chief State School Officers.  <b>Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:</b> <i>Limitations:</i> Initially, the percentage of migrant students tested will have to be calculated using the total number of migrant students who “participated” in the MEP during the regular term at the appropriate grade level rather than the total number of migrant children in residence in a State during the regular term in the appropriate grade level. <i>Planned Improvements:</i> Data on the total number of “resident” migrant students will be requested for inclusion in the next revised version of the Consolidated State Performance Report.
	Number of States	Percent of students tested		
FY 1999:	Spring 2001	Baseline		
<b>FY 2000:</b>	<b>Spring 2002</b>	<b>Increase from the Baseline</b>		
FY 2001:		Continuing Increase		
FY 2002:		Continuing Increase		
<b>Indicator 1.2 Meeting or Exceeding State Performance Standards: In an increasing number of states, an increasing percentage of migrant students will meet or exceed the proficient level on state assessments.</b>				
Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Reading elementary</i>			<b>Status:</b> Unable to judge. No FY 2000 data.  <b>Explanation:</b> This indicator shows that, over two years, there has been (1) an increase in both the number of states including migrant students in reading and mathematics assessments and (2) in the number of states reporting that 50% or more of those migrant students tested scored at or above the proficient level on those tests.	<b>Source:</b> Consolidated State Performance Report <i>Frequency:</i> Annually. <i>Next collection update:</i> February 2, 2001. <i>Date to be reported:</i> Spring 2001.  <b>Validation Procedure:</b> Data and tabulations are validated by internal review procedures of the Council of Chief State School Officers.
<b>Year</b>	<b>Actual Performance</b>	<b>Performance Targets</b>		
	Number of States Meeting the Performance Target (of the States Reporting Migrant Students Tested)	Percent of Migrant Students in a State Who Test at or above Proficient		
FY 1996:	4 (of 10)	50%		
FY 1997:	4 (of 15)	50%		
FY 1998:	7 (of 18)	50%		
FY 1999:	Spring 2001	50%		
<b>FY 2000:</b>	<b>Spring 2002</b>	<b>50%</b>		
FY 2001:		55%		
FY 2002:		60%		

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>Reading middle</i>				<p><b>Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:</b> <i>Limitations:</i> The reported performance levels are not standardized across the states and the number of children tested may be small, likely unrepresentative, and thus imprecise. In particular, states are probably not testing all of their migrant children because under Title I, children who have not attended the schools of the same LEA for a full academic year can be excluded from the assessment process.</p> <p><i>Planned Improvements:</i> N/A.</p>
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
	Number of States Meeting the Performance Target (of the States Reporting Migrant Students Tested)	Percent of Migrant Students in a State Who Test at or above Proficient		
FY 1996:	2 (of 10)	50%		
FY 1997:	3 (of 15)	50%		
FY 1998:	6 (of 18)	50%		
FY 1999:	Spring 2001	50%		
<b>FY 2000:</b>	<b>Spring 2002</b>	<b>50%</b>		
FY 2001:		55%		
FY 2002:		60%		
<i>Math elementary</i>				
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
	Number of States Meeting the Performance Target (of the States Reporting Migrant Students Tested)	Percent of Migrant Students in a State Who Test at or above Proficient		
FY 1996:	4 (of 10)	50%		
FY 1997:	5 (of 15)	50%		
FY 1998:	9 (of 18)	50%		
FY 1999:	Spring 2001	50%		
<b>FY 2000:</b>	<b>Spring 2002</b>	<b>50%</b>		
FY 2001:		55%		
FY 2002:		60%		
<i>Math middle</i>				
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		
	Number of States Meeting the Performance Target (of the States Reporting Migrant Students Tested)	Percent of Migrant Students in a State Who Test at or above Proficient		
FY 1996:	3 (of 10)	50%		
FY 1997:	5 (of 15)	50%		
FY 1998:	7 (of 18)	50%		
FY 1999:	Spring 2001	50%		
<b>FY 2000:</b>	<b>Spring 2002</b>	<b>50%</b>		
FY 2001:		55%		
FY 2002:		60%		

**Indicator 1.3 Targeting of “Priority for Service” Students: An increasing number of “priority for service” migrant students will receive MEP services in both the regular and summer-terms.**

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	Actual Performance		Performance Targets	
	Regular-Term	Summer-Term		
FY 1998:	242,138	172,247	Baseline	<p><b>Status:</b> No FY 2000 data, but progress toward target is likely.</p> <p><b>Explanation:</b> Under section 1304(d), migrant students who are failing, or most at risk of failing to meet the States’ challenging State content and State student performance standards, <u>and</u> whose education has been interrupted during the regular school year (rather than during the summer) have a priority for services under the MEP. The indicator will examine whether there is an increase over time in the numbers of such “priority for services” students receiving either regular-term or summer-term, MEP services.</p> <p><b>Validation Procedure:</b> Data and tabulations are validated by internal review procedures of Westat, Inc.</p> <p><b>Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:</b> <i>Limitations:</i> The percentage of priority students served (by type of service and by the intensity of such services) would provide a much better indication of how effective MEPs are targeting services. <i>Planned Improvements:</i> In order to calculate the percentage of “priority for service” migrant students who receive services, data on the total number of “priority for service” migrant students will be requested for inclusion in the next revised version of the Consolidated State Performance Report.</p>
FY 1999:	Spring 2001		Increase from the Baseline	
<b>FY 2000:</b>	<b>Spring 2002</b>		<b>Continuing Increase</b>	
FY 2001:			Continuing Increase	
FY 2002:				

**Indicator 1.4 Coordination with Title 1, Part A, Programs: In an increasing number of states, an increasing percentage of migrant students will receive services in Schoolwide or Targeted Assistance Programs funded in part or wholly by Title 1, Part A.**

Targets and Performance Data			Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	<p><b>Status:</b> Unable to judge.</p> <p><b>Explanation:</b> This indicator examines the degree to which migrant students receive Title 1 Part A services. The indicator suggests that, at the baseline, very few states provide Title 1 services to 50 percent or more of their migrant children.</p>	<p><b>Source:</b> Consolidated State Performance Report  <i>Frequency:</i> Annually.  <i>Next collection update:</i> February 2, 2001.  <i>Date to be reported:</i> Spring 2001.</p> <p><b>Validation Procedure:</b> Data are validated by internal review procedures of Westat, Inc. Tabulations verified by ED attestation process and ED.</p> <p><b>Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements:</b>  <i>Limitations:</i> Data on migrant student participation in Title 1 Part A programs is collected from local districts and aggregated at the state level. In some cases, the data reported does not agree student counts collected by the State MEPs. <i>Planned Improvements:</i> Next year, ED will ask Westat to ensure that the staff working on Title 1 Part A, participation data and those working on Title 1, Part C data coordinate their edit checking and compare migrant student data collected by the two programs.</p>
	Number of States	Percent of Students Served		
FY 1997:	5 (of 48)	50%		
FY 1998:	5 (of 46)	50%		
FY 1999:	12 (of 56)	50%		
<b>FY 2000:</b>	<b>Spring 2002</b>	<b>55%</b>		
FY 2001:		60%		
FY 2002:				

**INDICATOR CHANGES**

**From Annual Plan (FY 2001)**

Adjusted

- ❖ Indicator 1.1 (inclusion in state assessments) State and local assessments changed to state assessments only
- ❖ Indicator 1.2 “Improved attention to assessment of migrant students and assessments linked to high standards will increase, reaching all states that receive Migrant Education Program (MEP) funds in 2001” replaced by “Meeting or Exceeding State Performance Standards: In an increasing number of states, an increasing percentage of migrant students will meet or exceed the proficient level on state assessments”

Dropped

- ❖ Objectives 2, 3, 4
- ❖ Indicators 2.1, 2.2, 3.1, 4.1

New

- ❖ Indicator 1.3 (Targeting of “Priority for Service” Students)
- ❖ Indicator 1.4 (Coordination with Title 1, Part A, Programs)