Overview of the 2016-2017 Louisiana Migrant Education Program (MEP) Evaluation
Acronyms

CIC  Continuous Improvement Cycle
CNA  Comprehensive Needs Assessment
ECE  Early Childhood Education
FSI  Fidelity of Strategy Implementation
MPO  Measurable Program Outcome
OME  Office of Migrant Education
OSY  Out-of-School Youth
PFS  Priority for Services
SDP  Service Delivery Plan
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Objectives for this Session

- Understand the data used to evaluate the Louisiana MEP by reviewing results
- Review the results of the 2016-17 implementation and results evaluation
- Review MEP recommendations and incorporate into planning for 2017-18
Program Evaluation is Part of OME’s Continuous Improvement Cycle Required of all State MEPs
OME Evaluation Requirements for State MEPs

- Evaluate the effectiveness of the MEP and provide guidance to local MEPs on how to conduct local evaluations.
- Perform an **annual performance results evaluation** to inform SEA decision-making.
- Provide a **full evaluation report every 2-3 years** (performance and implementation results, implications/recommendations).
- Report performance results data on **State performance targets** related to Performance Goals 1 (Reading and Math) and 5 (Graduation), and additional State performance targets for school readiness and other needs, disaggregated for PFS, non-PFS, and non-migrant.
OME Evaluation Requirements for State MEPs (cont.)

- Report performance results data on MPOs established in the SDP disaggregated for PFS and non-PFS migrant students
- Report performance results data on Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA) measures
- Report implementation results that demonstrate the level of fidelity in implementation of activities and services contained in the SDP
- Describe specific changes to the SDP and services that were made using implementation and performance results included in the full evaluation
- Provide implications and recommendations for improvement of services, based upon implementation and performance results
**Evaluation Methodology**

- The 2016-17 LA MEP includes both implementation and results data
- **META Associates** was contracted to conduct the evaluation to help ensure objectivity in evaluating the LA MEP
- META Associates collected formative and summative data to determine
  - level of implementation of the strategies contained in the SDP
  - extent to which progress was made toward the State Performance Goals in reading, math, graduation and dropout rates
  - Extent to which progress was made toward the 10 **MPOs** – see Handout
2016-17 Evaluation Results
Implementation Evaluation Results
The Implementation Evaluation section addresses:

1) Migrant Student Services (results taken from the 2015-16 Consolidated State Performance Report [CSPR] – the most recent results available)
2) Parent Involvement
3) Professional Development
4) Fidelity of Strategy Implementation (FSI)
Number of Eligible Migrant Students Over the Years

- 2011-12: 2909
- 2012-13: 2658
- 2013-14: 2629
- 2014-15: 2436
- 2015-16: 2067

# Eligible Migrant Students
15-16 Eligible Migrant Students by Age/Grade

- Age 3-5: 170
- GR 2: 166
- GR 1: 166
- GR 3: 156
- GR 5: 140
- GR 4: 139
- GR 7: 137
- GR 9: 132
- GR K: 125
- GR 8: 119
- GR 6: 119
- OSY: 115
- GR 10: 114
- Age 0-2: 105
- GR 11: 102
- GR 12: 101
- UG: 8

# Eligible Migrant Students
Migrant Students Served in 2015-16

• **73%** of eligible migrant students (1,505 students) were served during the performance period
  -- **63%** of eligible served during the **regular school year**
  -- **5%** of eligible served during the **summer**

• **84%** of the 303 PFS students were served during the performance period
  -- **83%** of PFS served during the **regular school year**
  -- **1%** of PFS served during the **summer**
Instructional Services

- **26%** of eligible migrant students (36% of students served) received instructional services during the performance period.

![Bar chart showing the number of # Students/Youth in different categories of instructional services.](chart)

- Computer/Tech Instruction: 372
- Reading Instruction: 255
- Math Instruction: 230
- Other Content Area Instr: 223
- Instructional Technology: 106
- Social Studies Instruction: 38
- Science Instruction: 36
- State Assessment Prep: 27
Support Services

- **59%** of eligible migrant students (81% of students served) received support services during the performance period.

![Bar chart showing the number of students receiving support services in different categories.](chart.png)
2016-17 Parent Activities

- Local projects hosted 82 parent activities from 2/25/15 to 4/3/17
- An average of 17 parents/family members participated in each activity
- Activities included Parent Advisory Council (PAC) meetings, parent training, family nights
- Topics included school/career readiness, attendance, technology, parent involvement, reading, community resources, etc.
2016-17 Professional Development

• The State and local projects hosted **164** professional development (PD) activities from 1/11/15 to 6/9/17.

• An average of **5 MEP staff** attended each PD.

• PD included **statewide training** (ID&R, data/MERIL), **state/national conferences**, **local project/district training**, and **staff meetings**.

• **PD topics** included ID&R, English learners, ethics, iReady, collaboration with other programs, writing, data/reporting, summer programming, parent involvement.
Fidelity of Strategy Implementation (FSI)

- Mean ratings assigned by LA MEP staff on the FSI for the level of implementation of the 14 service delivery strategies in the Louisiana SDP
- Ratings are based on a 5-point rubric:
  - 1=not aware, 2=aware, 3=developing, 4=succeeding, 5=exceeding
- A rating of succeeding (4) is considered “proficient”

GOAL AREA 1: LITERACY
2016-17 FSI Results

Mean ratings ranged from 3.0 to 3.8

MEP staff across the State did **not** rate themselves proficient on **any** of the 14 strategies.

See Handout
Questions/comments/feedback about the implementation evaluation?
2016-17 Evaluation Results

Outcome/Results Evaluation Results
2016 LEAP Scores

Percent Scoring Proficient or Above

- **ELA**:
  - PFS: 64%
  - Non-PFS: 77%
  - Migrant: 71%
  - Non-Migrant: 71%
  - Target: 100%

- **Math**:
  - PFS: 58%
  - Non-PFS: 71%
  - Migrant: 65%
  - Non-Migrant: 65%
  - Target: 100%

472 migrant students assessed in English Language Arts (ELA)

462 migrant students assessed in math
MPO 1a - Literacy

MPO 1a: By the end of the program year, 50% of migrant students in grades 3-8 who had a “D” or “F” in a language arts class will improve their grade as a result of participating in a migrant-funded literacy intervention.

MPO Met?  YES

58% improved their grade in language arts (56% PFS students)
MPO 1b - Literacy

MPO 1b: By the end of the program year, 80% of migrant parents responding to surveys who participated in a migrant-sponsored or co-sponsored parent activity addressing literacy will report being better prepared to help their child with reading and literacy at home.

MPO Met? **YES**

91% of parents responding reported being better prepared
MPO 2a - Mathematics

MPO 2a: By the end of the program year, 50% of migrant students in grades 3-8 who had a “D” or “F” in a mathematics class will improve their grade as a result of participating in a migrant-funded mathematics intervention.

MPO Met?  YES
53% improved their grade in math (51% PFS students)
MPO 2b - Mathematics

MPO 2b: By the end of the program year, 80% of migrant parents responding to surveys who participated in a migrant-sponsored or co-sponsored parent activity addressing mathematics will report being better prepared to help their child with math at home.

MPO Met?  YES
91% of the parents responding reported being better prepared
MPO 3a – School Readiness

MPO 3a: By the end of the program year, 80% of 3-5-year-old migrant children (not in kindergarten) will be enrolled in early childhood programs and/or receive MEP-sponsored services.

MPO Met?  **YES**
95% were enrolled in an early childhood program and/or received MEP services (71% PFS children)
MPO 3b – School Readiness

MPO 3b: By the end of the program year, 80% of migrant parents responding to surveys who participated in a migrant-sponsored or co-sponsored parent activity addressing school readiness will report being better prepared to help their child with school readiness skills at home.

MPO Met?  **YES**

88% of parents responding reported being better prepared
MPO 4a
Graduation/Career Readiness

MPO 4a: By the end of the program year, 50% of migrant students in grades 9-12 who had a “D” or “F” in a core class will improve their grade as a result of participating in a migrant-funded intervention.

MPO Met?  YES
68% improved their grade in a core class (55% PFS students)
MPO 4b: By the end of the program year, 30% of migrant students in grades 7-12 who participated in a migrant-funded summer intervention program will obtain credits leading toward high school graduation.

MPO Met?  NO

11% obtained credits (1 of the 9 students working on credit-bearing coursework)
MPO 4c
Graduation/Career Readiness

**MPO 4c**: By the end of the program year, 80% of migrant parents responding to surveys who participated in a migrant-sponsored or co-sponsored parent activity addressing graduation and career readiness will report being more knowledgeable about graduation requirements and college and career readiness.

**MPO Met?**  **YES**
82% of parents responding reported being more knowledgeable
MPO 4d: By the end of the program year, 50% of OSY responding to surveys who received information and assistance from MEP staff will report being more knowledgeable about educational services and career options.

MPO Met?  **YES**

92% of OSY reported being more knowledgeable
In Summary...

- There was a 15% decrease in the number of eligible migrant students/youth in 2015-16.
- Nearly three-fourths of the eligible migrant students were served during 2015-16.
- The same percentage of migrant and non-migrant students scored proficient or above on LEAP ELA and Math assessments.
- 9 of the 10 MPOs (90%) were met by the LA MEP.
- MPO 4b was not met (11% of secondary-aged students obtained high school credit during the summer program).
Evaluator Recommendations for Program Implementation

• Work with local projects to determine reasons for low ratings on the FSI of strategies related to the provision of and collaboration of preschool and school readiness services (3-2, 3-3, 3-4) and provide technical assistance and/or training to ensure that services for preschool students is needs-based, of high quality, and implemented with fidelity to the intended strategy.

• Encourage local projects to provide more postsecondary and career informational events to migrant students and parents. This strategy (4-4) was rated low, indicating that more work needs to be done by projects to implement these needed services.
Evaluator Recommendations for Program Implementation (cont.)

• Consider the suggestions made by parents including more one-on-one time for students during tutoring time, English instruction/classes, school uniforms, child care, support for high school graduates who need help with college admissions, music classes, a reading program for the entire year, and sports for the students to help them acquire discipline.

• Facilitate opportunities for MEP staff to share effective and promising practices during training sponsored by the MEP so they can learn from each other.

• Consider recommendations made by OSY including providing English classes, offering classes for OSY, and providing more supplies.
Evaluation Recommendations for Program Results

- MPO 4b was not met during 2016-17 with 11% of the migrant students in grades 7-12 who participated in a migrant-funded summer intervention program obtaining credits leading toward high school graduation. It is recommended that PD/TA be provided to local migrant projects to increase this percentage in 2017-18 to ensure that migrant students are receiving needed high school credits.

- Continue to assist projects to support student during the regular school year to ensure that more students improve their grades in the core content areas. Focus on collaborating and communicating with instructional staff so MEP staff are providing enrichment that is needs-based, and builds on the instruction provided during the school day.

- Review the targets set in each of the MPOs to ensure that they are appropriate based on evaluation results.
Questions/comments/feedback about the evaluation?
Thank you for all your efforts to implement the evaluation of the Louisiana MEP!!!