Florida
Migrant Education Program

Service Delivery Plan

Implementation Period
July 2006 – June 2010

Revised September 2008

Table of Contents

Executive Summary

This Service Delivery Plan (SDP) summarizes the key findings from Florida's Comprehensive Needs Assessment (CNA) and maps out the direction for aligning Florida's Migrant Education Program (MEP) services with those data-driven results. The SDP also provides a framework of measurable outcomes and progress indicators to determine effectiveness. The CNA and SDP reflect the input from a broad-based constituency including educators, administrators, migrant parents and the Migrant Parent Advisory Council, and MEP staff.

The measurable program outcomes that form the basis for this SDP are based on the four goal areas of reading, mathematics, school readiness, and graduation. They reflect the established needs of Florida's migrant students and families and align with the Office of Migrant Education's Seven Areas of Concern[1]. They are based on a gap analysis between migrant and non-migrant student achievement.   These outcome measures include the following:

- The percentage of migrant students who meet the annual proficiency target in **reading** (65%) will increase and the achievement gap between migrant and non-migrant students will decrease.

- The percentage of migrant students who meet the annual proficiency target in **mathematics** (68%) will increase and the achievement gap between migrant and non-migrant students will decrease.

- The percentage of migrant students who graduate from high school with a regular diploma or GED will increase and the gap in **graduation** rates between migrant and non-migrant students will decrease.

- The percentage of migrant preschool children who demonstrate **school readiness** as measured by the state's assessment will increase.

The SDP provides for the integration across all components of Florida's MEP and as such includes goals and outcomes for: parent involvement, identification and recruitment (ID&R), and priority for services (PFS) students. Performance indicators include the following:

- **Parent involvement** needs to increase by 12 percentage points for parents of students in grades K-5 and 23 percentage points for parents of middle and high schoolers.

- In terms of **ID&R** quality assurance: a) The percentage of students found to be ineligible after re-interviewing will decrease; and b) The percentage of districts conducting re-interviews annually will increase.

- The extent to which programs are targeting **PFS students** will be measured by the percentage of PFS students receiving services matched with their needs.

The state articulates findings and recommendations from the CNA process in this SDP to strongly encourage district MEPs to utilize the evidence-based strategies recommended by the

---

[1] The seven areas of concern include: educational continuity, instructional time, school engagement, English language development, educational support in the home, health, and access to services. From the "Seven Areas of Concern" Handout available on the Comprehensive Needs Assessment for Migrant Education resource website available at: http://www.cesdp.nmhu.edu/migrant/meet1.htm. [Accessed September 1, 2008.]

Expert Work Groups and Needs Assessment Committee. Local MEPs will maintain autonomy in implementing strategies and services that meet their district needs and resources in achieving these outcomes. To support implementation, the state MEP provides suggested progress indicators[2] that are designed to guide local MEPs in monitoring the extent to which they are successfully implementing services/strategies that will help them achieve the intended goals.

The district MEPs, therefore, have flexibility in designing their services to address the established goals in ways that function optimally for their districts. Ultimately, however, the districts will be held accountable to the outcome measures that focus on the end goal of raising student achievement no matter how and what they choose to deliver in terms of service strategies. An evaluation framework will guide the state in evaluating the MEP's effectiveness in closing the achievement gap between migrant students and their non-migrant peers.   That framework focuses on two main evaluation questions:

> 1.) To what extent are programs being implemented?
>
> 2.) To what extent are programs for MEP students impacting student outcomes? And are MEP students meeting state AYP targets?

The overall goal for evaluation is to implement effective strategies that will provide essential information regarding the best use of MEP funds to achieve the performance goals, indicators, and targets, as well as, the measurable outcomes detailed in this state SDP.

---

[2] Refer to tables on pages 12-15 of the Service Delivery Plan for the progress indicators for reading, mathematics, graduation, and school readiness.

Introduction and Legislative Mandate

Beginning in 2003, Florida began the development of its Migrant Education Program (MEP) Comprehensive Needs Assessment (CNA) and Service Delivery Plan with the involvement of a broad-based constituency. The systemic process involved the following: data gathering; review of relevant research and determination of best practices and strategies; and consensus building on the best direction to take to move forward in the action planning cycle. This Service Delivery Plan (SDP) summarizes the key findings from the CNA and maps out the direction for aligning MEP services with those data-driven results and with measurable outcomes and progress indicators to determine effectiveness.

Specifically, the SDP, as required by the Office of Migrant Education (OME) of the U.S. Department of Education[3], addresses the following:

- Ensures that the state and its local operating agencies identify and address the special educational needs of migratory children;
- Provides migratory children with opportunities to meet the same challenging state academic content standards and challenging state 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 for migratory children from appropriate local, state, and federal educational programs;
- Reflects joint planning among local, state, and federal programs; and
- Provides for the integration of services with those of other programs.

The CNA and SDP process included key staff from the FL MEP along with educators, administrators, parents, and migrant recruiters and other key stakeholders from 14 Florida counties with migrant education programs representing a significant number of families in the state (Collier, Dade, Escambia, Hillsborough, Indian River, Lake, Manatee, Orange, Palm Beach, Pasco, Putnam, St. Lucie, Wakulla, and Walton). The following description highlights the various constituencies and roles of the groups involved in developing this SDP.

The Florida MEP Director and her **Management Team** served to provide oversight and managed logistics in guiding the development of the MEP's SDP. This team decided on committee members and took the lead preparing meeting agendas, meeting summaries, and reports. In addition to the director, the Management Team consisted of key decision makers from local MEPs and ESCORT consultants. The SDP will be reviewed periodically by this group and revised by the Florida Department of Education (FLDOE), as necessary, to reflect changes in Florida's strategies, programs, and assessments.

A **Needs Assessment Committee** of about 40 people first reviewed the CNA process, examined assessment and other data, and then was responsible for identifying core areas of concern that

---

[3] A Migrant Education Program Service Delivery Plan is required by the Office of Migrant Education of the U.S. Department of Education under Section 1306 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, reauthorized as the *No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, Title I Part C, Sec. 1306(1) and (2).*

exemplified the areas in which MEP students needed instructional strategies and supplemental support.

The **Implementation Committee** took the work of the Needs Assessment Committee and drafted solutions to address each of the core areas of concern. The work of this committee of 25 migrant educators, administrators, and other stakeholders resulted in the development of the goals.

MEP content area specialists in four areas (Reading, Mathematics, School Readiness, and Graduation) met to write need indicators and identify data sources to measure evidence in each of the core area concerns. A smaller group of Core Area Specialists that included experts in each of the four concern areas (e.g., state agency staff, university professors, MEP specialists) finalized the strategies, discussed action plans for success, and worked to align these solutions with the state's general education goals and standards.

Finally, a smaller **Service Delivery Plan Team** was formed to take the concerns, solutions, and goal strategies, and craft the measurable program outcomes. The team included evaluation specialists from the Allegheny Intermediate Unit in Pennsylvania. The SDP Team was responsible for preparing a draft for review and reaction by the Management Team.

Throughout the process, technical assistance and consultation was provided by the lead consultants at ESCORT. A detailed description of the CNA process can be found in the *Final Report: Florida Comprehensive Needs Assessment* prepared by ESCORT (T. Hanley and L. Ackley, August 2005). The next section provides a summary of the initial concerns that guided the CNA process, and the highest priority need indicators that were borne out by the data.

Needs Identified Through the
Statewide Comprehensive Needs Assessment (CNA)

Florida's concern statements (as shown below in Table 1) were summarized around the seven areas of concern identified by OME to reflect the unique educational needs of migrant children. Data elements that were available at the time of the CNA are also summarized.

Table 1: Initial Concern Statements from Florida's CNA Aligned with OME's Seven Areas of Concern

Concern Area	Initial Concerns We are concerned that:	Relevant Data Points
Educational continuity Instructional time	Migrant students miss too many days of school due to mobility and economic demands, which puts the students in danger of failure and ultimately dropping out of school.	36% of migrant students in Florida enroll late or withdraw early from school compared to 20% of non-migrant students. Source: 2002-2003 FLDOE K-12 Database
School engagement (behavioral, emotional, cognitive)	Migrant students do not participate in extracurricular activities. Migrant students are not connected to a school staff member who provides educational and personal support and guidance. Migrant students enter kindergarten with fewer cognitive skills and concepts than non-migrant students (knowledge of colors and shapes; emergent literacy skills).	43% of migrant students surveyed reported that they do not participate in any kind of extracurricular activities. Only 49% of migrant students surveyed indicated that they receive encouragement from teachers. Specifically, teachers provided encouragement in academic areas including promoting attendance in college and improvement of grades. 54% of migrant preschoolers entering kindergarten were "ready" for school (as measured by SRUSS) compared to 74% of non-migrant preschoolers. Source: 2004 CNA Migrant Student Survey
English language development	Migrant students' reading development is impeded by their lack of proficiency in English and lack of continuity of instruction.	Migrant students scored about 25% lower than non-migrant students in both reading and math on the Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT). Source: 2003 Demographic Report of Student Performance Results, Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test Note: One initial data indicator requested was percentage of LEP migrant students with less than a 2.0 GPA and less than 300 on FCAT reading and math, as compared to LEP non-migrant and non-LEP migrant and entire student body. Data on levels of proficiency in reading and math by LEP status were unavailable from FLDOE at the time of the CNA.

Concern Area	Initial Concerns We are concerned that:	Relevant Data Points
Educational support in the home	Migrant parents feel unwelcome in schools due to cultural, social, and linguistic barriers; migrant parents do not have adequate literacy in their native language; and migrant families do not promote reading in the home.	Only about 57% of migrant parents surveyed said that they attended parent-teacher conferences and open houses at their children's schools. In terms of parent involvement in school activities, 68% of migrant parents (with students in K-5) attended activities as compared to 81% for non-migrant parents; the percentages for grades 6-8 were 28% for migrant parents and 36% for non-migrants and for grades 9-12, 33% of migrant parents and 36% for non-migrants. 31% of migrant parents surveyed never read to their child(ren); 40% read to their child(ren) one to three times per week. 53% of migrant parents surveyed have one to ten books and other print material in the home; 13% indicated they have no books etc. in the home. Source: 2004 CNA Migrant Parent Survey
Health	Unique characteristics of migrant farm workers' lifestyle place their children at high risk of developing medical and dental problems that interfere with learning; and migrant students are not receiving immunizations in a timely manner.	Health data were unavailable. Data team contacted the Coordinated School Health Programs at FLDOE, the FL Association of Community Health Centers, and one large school district. Health records are not disaggregated by migrant and non-migrant; they are reported by level of school.
Access to services	Migrant children do not have consistent access to programs for children from birth to age five due to their entering school late after programs already have a waiting list.	22% of migrant kindergarten students participated in a migrant Title I funded preschool program. Source: Office of Early Learning Kindergarten Profile 2005-2006.

In addition, the CNA data included items related to academic expectations and performance based on state assessment scores in mathematics and reading. FCAT scores indicated substantial gaps between migrant and non-migrant students in reading and mathematics. Other assessment data also revealed gaps in school readiness and graduation rates between migrant students and their non-migrant peers. Appendix A provides highlights of the student profile data that were examined during the CNA to provide a snapshot of the migrant student population in Florida at the time (2005-2006).

Based on the analysis of qualitative and quantitative data from the CNA, a final set of need indicators was generated:

Graduation
- The number of migrant students in grades 9-12 who were retained needs to decrease by 5%.
- The number of migrant students in grades 9-12 with a GPA of 1.9 or lower needs to decrease by 9%.

- The number of migrant students in grades 9-12 with a GPA of 2.0 or higher needs to increase by 16%.

School Readiness
- The percentage of migrant students "ready" for school needs to increase by 17%.

English Language Development/Reading
- The percentage of grade 4 migrant students scoring a level 3 or higher on the FCAT reading needs to increase by 29%.
- The percentage of grade 8 migrant students scoring a level 3 or higher on the FCAT reading needs to increase by 30%.
- The percentage of grade 10 migrant students scoring a level 3 or higher on the FCAT reading needs to increase by 27%.

Mathematics
- The percentage of grade 4 migrant students scoring a level 3 or higher on the FCAT math needs to increase by 23%.
- The percentage of grade 8 migrant students scoring a level 3 or higher on the FCAT math needs to increase by 26%.
- The percentage of grade 10 migrant students scoring a level 3 or higher on the FCAT math needs to increase by 24%.

School Engagement
- Migrant student (grades 7-12) participation in extra-curricular activities needs to increase by 20%.
- The percentage of migrant students in grades 7-12 who receive encouragement (graduation from high school, going to college) from their teachers needs to increase by 15%.

Educational Support in the Home
- Migrant parental involvement at grades K-5 needs to increase by 12%.
- Parental involvement at the middle and high school level needs to increase by 23%.

This SDP is designed to address the specific, unique challenges that Florida's migrant students face in each of these areas. The next section describes the goals and strategies identified through the CNA process and then refined with stakeholder input through the development of the SDP.

Measurable Program Outcomes and Strategies

The Florida MEP developed measurable program outcomes around the four goal areas of reading, mathematics, school readiness, and graduation based on the findings of the CNA. These measures were included in the Request for Application (RFA) for the 2008-2009 performance period and each local district MEP will be evaluated by them accordingly. Local MEPs maintain autonomy in implementing strategies and services that meet their district needs and resources in achieving these outcomes. However, the state MEP provides guidance in identifying the evidence-based solutions that were recommended by the expert Work Groups and ultimately the Needs Assessment Committee during the CNA. The state MEP also provides progress indicators that are designed to enable local MEPs to monitor implementation of their strategies to gauge whether programs are on target to meet the outcome goals or whether mid-course corrections are needed.

In literacy, for example, the CNA revealed gaps in reading achievement between migrant and non-migrant students. The overarching performance goal, aligned with the state's as per NCLB, is that by 2013-2014, all students will reach high standards, at a minimum attaining proficiency or better in reading/language arts. In order to raise migrant student achievement to a level playing field, the MEP offers supplemental programming to close the gap. The percentage of migrant students in fourth grade scoring a level 3 (proficiency) or higher on FCAT reading needs to increase by 29% points, 30% for eighth graders and 27% for tenth graders. The local MEPs are required to implement or facilitate literacy programming that addresses the unique educational needs of migrant students, i.e., addresses the factors that impede academic success in reading (e.g., a summer school literacy program that supplements instruction lost during the regular school year). The CNA Work Group in Reading examined the research and evidence base in reading in the context of the seven areas of concern for migrant students. Their recommendation, articulated in the RFA language found in Column 1 of Table 2 below, was for district MEPs to focus on vocabulary and fluency development as the most effective components of literacy development to target with highly mobile students. That is, supplemental vocabulary and fluency instruction can be designed for short-term service provision and for portability so that when students move they can continue to build on this academic foundation.

In order to provide effective literacy programming, the CNA experts (Work Group and NAC) also recommended that a reading advocate be utilized by districts—a certified reading teacher with experience in second language acquisition and well-versed in the latest reading research and principles of adult education—to help shape literacy programming and to provide technical assistance to MEP staff. A number of strategies were also suggested to help districts think through their literacy programming, e.g., family outreach, sustained professional development for MEP staff, etc. (see Table 2). The state articulates these findings and recommendations from the CNA process in this SDP and in the RFA to strongly encourage MEPs to utilize these strategies. Ultimately, the districts will be held accountable to the outcome measure focused on the end goal of raising student achievement, stated as the percentage of migrant students who meet the annual proficiency target in reading (65%) will increase and the achievement gap between migrant and non-migrant students will decrease (column 2 of Table 2).

The state MEP also recommends monitoring progress in implementing the district-derived literacy programming through the indicators articulated in Column 3 of Table 2. In some cases, documentation is required for state reporting, e.g., description and purpose of program, number of students served, frequency and duration, etc. in order to provide evidence that literacy programming has been made operational. Additional indicators are strongly recommended to measure on-going effectiveness, e.g., curriculum or standards-based assessments in reading that provide more immediate feedback from student scores. Table 2 summarizes the state's goals and intended service delivery for migrant students in the goal area of reading, implemented through a system of district control to determine their own best strategies, but accountable to the statewide measure of closing the achievement gap. The state MEP will then aggregate district-derived data to analyze increases in the percentages of migrant students meeting annual proficiency targets by grade level (i.e., 29% points in fourth grade).

Tables 2-5 below summarize the local application language used to modify the requirements for Local Education Agency (LEA) grants in order to align with the CNA/SDP goals, the measurable outcomes, progress indicators, and suggested strategies for each of the four goal areas.

Table 2: Reading		
Local Application Language	**Measurable Program Outcome**	**Progress Indicators**
Migrant Education will implement **literacy** *programming or facilitate access to existing literacy programming that addresses the special and unique needs of migrant students. It is recommended that the focus be on vocabulary and fluency development. Particular emphasis should be given to hiring or consulting with a reading advocate (e.g., a certified teacher with experience in second language acquisition, who is well-versed in recent literacy research, can implement differentiated instruction, and is able to work with adult learners).*	The percentage of migrant students who meet the annual proficiency target in reading (65%) will increase and the achievement gap between migrant and non-migrant students will decrease.	▪ Documentation on district activities intended to influence migrant student achievement in reading: description (including whether a scientific/research-based model is used); purpose; target population; frequency; total duration; and total number of students participating. ▪ Reading assessment data to monitor student progress (e.g., standards-based): name of assessment; type of analysis conducted (e.g., pre/post, spring to spring); type of score used; number of students completing assessment; and number and percentage of students performing at proficient or above. ▪ Documentation on MEP staff development and training: frequency, duration, purpose and expected outcomes, and participant numbers.

Suggested Strategies

- Provide training to MEP staff on instructional strategies and assessments for reading
- Train reading coaches/advocates to support MEP staff skills development
- Provide information and materials to instructional staff on scientifically-based reading strategies
- Offer family literacy opportunities to parents, including home-based tutoring and basic English for adults
- Provide high quality curriculum that is aligned with tools for assessment and progress monitoring
- Provide strategic, content-based tutoring in reading to students identified as Priority for Services
- Observe migrant instructional advocates and other instructors to identify effective practices and areas needing further development
- Utilize technology and other tools for literacy
- Emphasize language-based content instruction
- Explore the use of coaching models (academic advocates with content expertise in reading)
- Provide sustained and intensive professional development
- Hire or consult with a reading advocate (e.g., a certified teacher with experience in second language acquisition who is well-versed in recent literacy research, can implement differentiated instruction, and is able to work with adult learners)

Table 3: Mathematics

Local Application Language	Measurable Program Outcome	Progress Indicators
Migrant education will implement mathematics programming that addresses the special and unique needs of migrant students, with a recommended focus on rigor and cultural relevance, and the use of manipulatives in instruction. Particular emphasis should be given to hiring or consulting with a math coach (e.g., a certified math teacher with experience in second language acquisition, who is well-versed in recent research, can implement differentiated instruction, and is able to work with adult learners). Extra points will be given to programming that includes collaboration with local universities, junior colleges, and/or industries.	The percentage of migrant students who meet the annual proficiency target in mathematics (68%) will increase and the achievement gap between migrant and non-migrant students will decrease.	▪ Documentation on district activities intended to influence migrant student achievement in mathematics: description (including whether a scientific/research-based model is used); purpose; target population; frequency; total duration; and total number of students participating. ▪ Mathematics assessment data to monitor student progress (e.g., standards-based): name of assessment; type of analysis conducted (e.g., pre/post, spring to spring); type of score used; number of students completing assessment; and number and percentage of students performing at proficient or above. ▪ Documentation on MEP staff development and training: frequency, duration, purpose and expected outcomes, and participant numbers.

Suggested Strategies

- Provide training to MEP staff on instructional strategies and assessments for mathematics
- Train math coaches/advocates to support MEP staff skills development
- Hire or consult with a math advocate (e.g., a certified teacher)
- Provide information and materials to instructional staff on scientifically-based mathematics strategies
- Offer mathematics literacy opportunities to parents (e.g., math-related field trips such as shopping, board games, etc.)
- Provide high quality curriculum that is aligned with tools for assessment and progress monitoring
- Provide strategic, content-based tutoring in math to students identified as Priority for Services
- Observe migrant instructional advocates and other instructors to identify effective practices and areas needing further development
- Use concrete approaches (e.g., manipulatives) to build mental models of mathematical concepts
- Instruct parents on using mathematics resources in the home (e.g., create simulations for parents to experience learning activities)
- Utilize technology and other tools to promote mathematical skills development

Table 4: Graduation		
Local Application Language	**Measurable Program Outcome**	**Progress Indicators**
*The project will develop or enhance efforts to raise **graduation** rates by addressing the unique needs of migrant secondary students due to their mobility and migrant lifestyle. Particular emphasis should be given to the hiring of a secondary advocate who addresses factors related to educational discontinuity, credit accrual, and school engagement.*	The percentage of migrant students who graduate from high school with a regular diploma or GED will increase and the gap in graduation rates between migrant and non-migrant students will decrease.	▪ Data on retention rates, especially for 7th, 8th and 9th grade students who are failing courses and recommended for retention or mandatory summer school. ▪ Documentation on FCAT pass rates for 10th grade migrant students participating in MEP-funded FCAT preparation (or those referred to existing FCAT preparation courses) for at least nine months. ▪ Participation rates in PASS and Mini-PASS.

Suggested Strategies

▪ Hire qualified secondary-level advocates (grades 6-12) to assist migrant students to access services and programs
▪ Provide training to MEP staff on resources and strategies for secondary-aged migrant students
▪ Provide information and materials to migrant and general education staff on advocacy, credit accrual, FCAT preparation, and graduation enhancement for migrant secondary students
▪ Offer information on graduation enhancement to parents (e.g., reading report cards, differences between diplomas and certificates of completion, etc.)
▪ Provide PASS and Mini-PASS curricula to migrant students who are behind and need to accrue additional credits toward graduation
▪ Provide strategic, content-based tutoring to secondary students
▪ Provide transition support for migrant students moving from elementary to middle school and from middle school to 9th grade
▪ Provide FCAT preparation tutoring
▪ Create mentoring opportunities for migrant students (e.g., peer-to-peer, adult volunteers, etc.) and parents (e.g., shadowing migrant parents actively involved in the MEP)
▪ Utilize strategies and programs in place for dropout prevention and/or recovery (e.g., CROP, HEP, Career Academies, entrepreneurship programs, etc.)

Table 5: School Readiness		
Local Application Language	**Measurable Program Outcome**	**Progress Indicators**
Describe the instructional/supportive services provided to migratory Pre-K children to ensure their readiness for school in the area of emergent literacy skills (oral communication, knowledge of print and letters, phonemic and phonological awareness, and vocabulary and comprehension development). Include program type and/or name, sites (schools, community centers, and individual homes), indicating the number of children being served at each site by age span (age 3 and age 4) and the amount of Title I, Part C funds expended.	The percentage of migrant preschool children who demonstrate school readiness as measured by the state's assessment will increase.	▪ Percentages of migrant Pre-K students demonstrating growth on developmentally appropriate skills assessments. ▪ Documentation on professional development for preschool staff, preferably regular, ongoing, and focused on readiness in the area of emergent literacy skills.
Suggested Strategies		
▪ Hire highly qualified parent educators to provide school readiness services ▪ Offer a content-based instructional sequence that features instruction, application to two or three children for 3-5 months, support visits from the advocates ▪ Sponsor a collaborative portfolio exchange among districts and a means to share assessment tool information ▪ Provide training to MEP staff on instructional strategies and assessments for young children, family involvement, research-based and other promising developmentally-appropriate practices ▪ Offer family outreach, literacy and parent involvement opportunities to parents (e.g., create simulations for parents to experience center learning activities that they can use at home, develop shadowing or mentoring programs for parents) ▪ Provide high quality early childhood education curriculum that is aligned with tools for assessment and progress monitoring ▪ Coordinate with Head Start and other community-based agencies to allow access to education and support services for migrant children and families (see resources for full service preschool classes) ▪ Explore funding and resource collaboration to support full service and preschool classes and other options for migrant children		

FLDOE will use its ongoing, extensive data collection tools to monitor the implementation of this SDP and to measure student outcomes.

Table 6: Data Collection Instruments for Monitoring Implementation

Instrument	Type	Reliability Information	Target	Area* (R,M,G,SR)
FCAT Reading Test	Statewide assessment	Highly correlated with Florida literacy curricula	Grades 3-8	R
FCAT Math Test	Statewide assessment	Highly correlated with Florida math curricula	Grades 3-8	M
PASS End-of-Course Exam	Criterion-Referenced test	Highly correlated with PASS curriculum	Grades 9-12	G
PASS Record Sheet	Records review sheet	Internally consistent	Grades 9-12	G
FLKRS ECE Assessment	Kindergarten screening tool	State tool matched to research-based age appropriate skills	Pre-K children ages 3-5	SR
MEP Parent Survey	Questionnaire	Reliability will be established through a pilot test (.80 minimum reliability)	Parents of children from Pre-K to 12	R,M,G,SR
State-developed documentation and review tools	District reporting template, monitoring tools, documentation logs	Used as a project implementation review and monitoring tool by the FLDOE	Local MEP sites	R,M,G,SR

*KEY: *R= Reading; M= Math; G=Graduation; SR=School Readiness*

The SDP takes into account other aspects of the MEP beyond the four goal areas. These include: parent involvement, identification and recruitment, and priority for services students. Each of these components are addressed in the following sections in order to demonstrate alignment of service delivery across all components of Florida's MEP.

Parent Involvement Plan

Parent involvement is of particular importance in addressing the educational outcomes identified in this SDP. Increasing educational support in the home was a key concern confirmed in the CNA process. Parent involvement outcomes were established by student grade level.

Parent involvement needs to increase by:

- o   12 percentage points for parents of students in grades K-5
- o   23 percentage points for parents of middle and high schoolers

as measured by the total (unduplicated) number of parents participating in at least one activity or event from year to year.

The MEP Parent Involvement Plan adapts FLDOE's Title I Parent Involvement Plan to migrant families and follows the framework for the statewide plan. [4] The objectives and strategies identified for reaching the broad goals of raising parent involvement follow Joyce Epstein's six levels of parent involvement: parenting, communicating, volunteering, learning at home, decision-making, and collaborating with community.

The following table describes proposed strategies aligned with this framework for MEP purposes at the state level.

Table 7: Parent Involvement Strategies

Objective	Strategies	
	SEA	**Locals**
Parenting: Assist families in setting home conditions that support children as students at each age and grade level.	▪ Disseminate information on best practices in family outreach. ▪ Share information on adult education and English as a Second Language classes available statewide.	▪ Support home visits by advocates to provide information on parent involvement, nutrition, health, and other services. ▪ Share information about developmental stages.
Communicating: Develop two-way communication between families and the MEP and between families and schools.	▪ Compile resources and best practices related to creating migrant-family friendly schools.	▪ Provide professional development for school staff on understanding the migratory lifestyle, cultural heritage, and home environment. ▪ Assist schools in delivering important home information in appropriate languages. ▪ Provide information and materials to migrant families of secondary students related to graduation requirements and post-secondary opportunities.
Volunteering: Improve recruitment and training to involve families as volunteers in programs to support students.	▪ Provide training and technical assistance to local MEPs on establishing and/or strengthening parent volunteer programs for academic support to migrant students.	▪ Disseminate information on volunteering in schools and MEP activities. ▪ Establish rewards to recognize the contributions of individuals and community organizations (e.g., ceremonies, awards, etc.).
Learning at Home: Involve migrant families in their children's learning at home.	▪ Support local MEPs in researching, developing, and implementing home learning activities that support migrant student academic success.	▪ Offer family literacy opportunities, focused on mathematics and reading. ▪ Instruct families on the use of hands-on activities for content area learning, e.g., math manipulatives. ▪ Provide information to families of preschoolers on building school readiness skills.

[4] Bureau of Family and Community Outreach, Florida Department of Education. (2006, August). *Florida's State Education Agency (SEA) Title I Parent Involvement Plan – No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act of 2001 Title I, Part A.* Tallahassee, FL: FDOE. Available on-line at: http://www.fldoe.org/family/title1/pdf/seapi-plan.pdf [Accessed May 2008.]

Objective	Strategies	
	SEA	Locals
Decision-making: Include migrant families as participants in MEP decisions and advocacy.	▪ Coordinate statewide Migrant Parent Advisory Council meetings. ▪ Conduct parent outreach in a format and language understandable to parents. ▪ Consult with migrant parents on service delivery plans. ▪ Include migrant parents on ad hoc committees, e.g., needs assessment committee.	▪ Coordinate local Migrant Parent Advisory Council meetings. ▪ Conduct parent outreach in a format and language understandable to parents.
Collaborating with Community: Utilize community resources to strengthen MEPs, schools, families, and student learning.	▪ Provide training and technical assistance on establishing effective collaboration between schools, MEPs, community organizations, and businesses.	▪ Coordinate with Head Start and other community-based agencies to allow access to education and support services for migrant children and families.

One of the main strategies for engaging families is through an advisory council. The Florida MEP consults routinely with parents of migratory students through its Migrant Parent Advisory Council (FMPAC). The goals of the FMPAC are to help families: utilize strategies to strengthen their children's FCAT skills, become more proficient with NCLB parent involvement components, and become more involved in MEP-sponsored events and school activities. Members of FMPAC include migrant parents, representatives from the state MEP, staff from district MEPs, and parent involvement technical assistance providers. Communication is in a format and language (typically Spanish, Haitian, and Southeast Asian languages) that parents understand. Interpreters and cultural mediators are used to allow meaningful discussion and feedback about all aspects of the program. The July 2008 FMPAC provided an opportunity for migrant parents to review this SDP and to provide recommendations for planned services. Parent feedback included the following:

▪ Identify barriers to parent participation MEP services and ways to overcome these challenges (e.g., providing home tutoring so parents don't have to find transportation or child care);
▪ Help parents develop practical skills for working with their children's school, including how to read a report card, understanding the difference between a diploma and a certificate of completion, developing basic English skills (e.g., using programs like Sed de Saber), and helping their children to ask questions in the classroom;
▪ Use practical, fun activities for parents and children to develop reading and math skills together (e.g., Family Math grocery shopping trip);
▪ Provide simulations of learning environments at parent meetings to demonstrate the activities that children experience during the school day (e.g., preschool learning centers);
▪ Develop family mentoring programs, e.g., new parents can shadow families that are actively involved in the MEP, encourage participating parents to bring others to the meetings or trainings, etc.

These suggestions were incorporated into the focus area summary tables on pages 10-13 of the SDP and will addressed in future parent involvement technical assistance to the districts.

Local MEPs are also required to implement an effective parental involvement component, including the establishment of and consultation with a local MPAC. The state will monitor progress toward reaching the goals of increasing parent involvement through its evaluation plan. The next section describes Identification and Recruitment (ID&R) of eligible migrant children and youth.

Identification and Recruitment Plan

An ID&R plan defines the procedures in place to identify and recruit migrant children in a timely and proper manner. The plan addresses administration and logistics, training and staff development, and quality assurance.

The state has two performance indicators related to ID&R quality assurance:

1. The percentage of students found to be ineligible after re-interviewing will decrease.
2. The percentage of districts conducting re-interviews annually will increase.

The state's ID&R activities are conducted through its ID&R Office, led by a State Coordinator, with guidance from a Steering Committee and Technical (Policy) Workgroup. The Steering Committee meets for the purpose of discussing issues affecting ID&R and providing general input on the direction of ID&R in the state. The Technical Workgroup assists the ID&R office in reviewing new policy, interpreting regulations from OME, and providing overall feedback on new and unusual qualifying activities.

The ID&R Office is responsible for the design and implementation of the following efforts:

- Training of all staff responsible for the proper and timely identification and recruitment of migrant children and/or youth;
- Training of all staff responsible for reviewing and monitoring the staff conducting ID&R efforts in the state;
- Overseeing the strategies used by districts to actively identify and recruit migrant children and/or youth;
- Monitoring the presence of potentially eligible children in non-program districts;
- Developing tools to assist districts, both project and non-project, in identifying potentially eligible migrant children and youth (e.g., home school surveys, mapping of migrant families and qualifying activities, daily and weekly schedules for recruiters, etc.);
- Review of existing tools and methods to ensure the proper and timely identification of migrant children and/or youth (e.g., COE annual review and update, and qualifying activities by county and for the state);
- Assisting in the coordination and networking among districts and other agencies that may serve migrant children and/or youth (e.g., early childhood providers, Departments of Agriculture and Labor, health clinics, employers);

- Suggesting safe and effective strategies to deploy recruiters in program and non-program areas;
- Designing strategies and tools for effective and reliable monitoring of COE completions and eligibility determinations (e.g., COE checklists and rolling and annual re-interviews);
- Providing opportunities for the ongoing networking and information dissemination among Florida recruiters (e.g., electronic newsletter, recruiter-specific website); and
- Conducting visits to districts to review local ID&R practices and ascertain training needs of recruitment staff.

The ID&R efforts for the state include three main activities described below.

1.) Policy Guidance

The state's ID&R manual, developed by the ID&R Office, includes all of the policy interpretations related to ID&R to be followed in the state. Migrant staff responsible for the proper and timely eligibility determination of migrant children and/or youth must follow the procedures and guidelines delineated in the ID&R Manual.

2.) Training

The ID&R Office also provides ongoing training to recruitment staff in the state. Efforts are made to conduct statewide training at least twice a year: at ID&R Training Events in the spring and during the program's State Conference in the fall. The training topics include, but are not limited, to:
- New Recruiter Training
- Eligibility Basics
- Eligibility and Guidance Updates
- COE Completion
- Quality Control

The ID&R Office also provides training to districts upon request and on a case-by-case basis, depending on the availability of staff and the identified needs of districts: for instance, new coordinators, a significant number of new recruitment staff, etc.

The training needs are identified through consultation with the districts as well as from feedback obtained from the Steering Committee and/or the Technical Workgroup.

3.) Quality Assurance

The ID&R office is responsible for the design and implementation of quality control measures as well as a quality control system related to the proper and timely identification of migrant children and/or youth in the state. Florida's quality control efforts include:

- Training of recruiters to ensure the proper and timely identification of migrant students;
- Training of reviewers to properly corroborate the eligibility determinations made by recruiters (by corroborating the accuracy and completeness of the form);
- Reviewing and updating Florida's COE as an effective tool to document eligibility of Florida's migrant children and/or youth;

- Validating eligibility determinations by district and state-led re-interviews of randomly selected families; and
- Facilitating the process of resolving eligibility conflicts at the district and state level.

The next section describes Priority for Services.

Priority for Services

The state mandates, as required by NCLB, that district MEPs give priority to migratory children who are failing, or most at risk of failing, to meet the state's challenging state academic content standards and whose education has been interrupted during the regular school year.

The state definition of a Priority for Services migratory child is as follows:

      A.   scored at Level 1 or Level 2 on the FCAT; or
      B.   is an English language learner; or
      C.   has an age/grade discrepancy; or
      D.   was retained; or
      E.   is at risk of failing to meet state graduation requirements in one of the following areas:
            i.   an unweighted GPA of 2.0 or below, or
            ii.   insufficient credits for promotion or graduation.

      AND whose education has been interrupted during the regular school year.

The state MEP has included a performance indicator in its evaluation plan to measure the extent to which programs are targeting PFS students. The RFA requires districts to describe a PFS Action Plan that identifies which migratory children must receive services prior to migrant funds being used for other migrant children. The plan requires districts to detail out how MEP funds will be used to address the unique educational needs of children who meet the PFS definition and to document the services that these children receive. The state MEP will evaluate this measure—the percentage of PFS students receiving services matched with their needs—from individual student needs assessment results and student service provision/activity participation data provided by the districts. The CNA generated solution strategies in mathematics and reading address PFS students and the state MEP will be monitoring service provision in part by examining FCAT scores in these content areas by disaggregating data by PFS. The next section provides an overview of the evaluation plan for the FL MEP and its alignment with the SDP.

Evaluation Plan

For program improvement purposes and in accordance with the evaluation requirements provided in 34 CRF 200.83(a)(4), the evaluation data and demographic information described above will be collected, compiled, analyzed, and summarized each year by the FL MEP. These

activities will help the state determine the degree to which the MEP is effective in relation to its performance targets and measurable outcomes. The full evaluation framework is included in Appendix B. The framework describes the following:

- the main evaluation questions;
- objective/performance indicators related to those questions;
- the strategies, activities, or actions that relate to the performance indicator (i.e., what activities drive the change that we are intending to measure);
- the population served;
- the data source(s) or evaluation methods;
- the responsible party for data collection and reporting;
- the evaluation timeline; and
- progress notes.

There are two main evaluation questions:

1.) To what extent are programs being implemented?
2.) To what extent are programs for MEP students impacting student outcomes? And are MEP students meeting state AYP targets?

The first evaluation question targets performance indicators that measure the number of students receiving services, e.g., the percentage of MEP students participating in summer programs, the percentage of PFS students and out-of-school youth receiving services that match their needs. This question also measures staff capacity building through professional development and increased parent involvement. ID&R quality assurance indicators are also addressed.

The second evaluation question targets performance indicators that measure increases in the number of students achieving proficiency or better in reading and mathematics and school readiness. Measures of high school graduation are also addressed, e.g., dropout rates, graduation rates, retention rates, increased participation in FCAT preparation, and grade point averages.

Collectively, these evaluation measures target the program services that came from the CNA process and that are reflected in this SDP. The framework will guide the state in evaluating the MEP's effectiveness in closing the achievement gap between migrant students and their non-migrant peers.

Data Collection and Reporting Systems

Local education agencies maintain their own records which include formal and informal results on student skills checklists, rubric-based assessments, demographic data, and other student outcomes (i.e., attendance, graduation rates, drop out rates), and staff outcomes. The FL MEP is in the process of implementing a new district reporting template that will facilitate data collection and transmission to the state. Districts will receive training on the new template in the fall of the 2008-2009 school year. District deadlines for submission using the new template will be determined after sufficient training has been provided. In subsequent years, data will be due

to the state MEP three months after the end of their programming year (i.e., the end of September or the end of November depending on whether programs administer summer school programs). The FL MEP will use the data to complete state and federal reports. The FL MEP will also communicate evaluation results with districts for program improvement, as described below.

Using Evaluation Results for Mid-course Corrections and Improvement

A key reason to collect data is to determine student progress and to make adjustments in the program to increase student achievement. The FLDOE will support local MEPs in their efforts to use evaluation results for making mid-course corrections and improving program services through:

- Sponsoring migrant-specific professional development and consultation on increasing the reliability of data collection and reporting, interpreting data, and monitoring student progress for improving instruction;
- Distributing materials to support migrant-specific professional development activities among Florida MEP staff during regional meetings and statewide workshops;
- Providing opportunities for local MEPs to share ideas and discuss the use of evaluation results for improvement during regional and statewide meetings;
- Reviewing local MEP action plans for the use of evaluation results during formal and informal monitoring;
- Highlighting the use of data for improvement as a technical assistance focus with Regional Comprehensive Center staff assigned to provide technical assistance to the FL MEP;
- Participating with 15 other states in a consortium arrangement and distributing consortium materials/outcomes related to assessment and evaluation statewide;
- Including language in local MEP applications asking sites to discuss how evaluation results will be utilized for program improvement purposes; and
- Providing tools to support local efforts in use of evaluation results to make mid-course corrections and improve MEP programs and services.

The overall goal is to implement effective evaluation strategies that will provide essential information regarding the best use of MEP funds to achieve the performance goals, indicators, and targets, as well as, the measurable outcomes detailed in this state Service Delivery Plan.

FOR MORE INFORMATION

Florida Department of Education
Ms. Carolyn Mathews, State Director
Migrant Education Program
325 Gaines Street, Suite 352
Tallahassee, FL 32399-0400
Phone: 850●245-0415 or 0693 (direct line)
Fax: 850●245-0683
carolyn.mathews@fldoe.org
http://www.fldoe.org/bsa/title1/doemep.asp

Appendix A
Student Profile

Florida Migrant Student Profile Data for 2005-2006

Number of Migrant Students Eligible by Grade –
(unduplicated by state)

Grade	Count of SID
01	3,290
02	2,881
03	3,010
04	2,547
05	2,553
06	2,178
07	2,473
08	2,536
09	2,623
10	2,008
11	1,934
12	1,868
KG	3,269
OS	6,870
PK	5,524
Total	**45,564**

Number of migrant students (unduplicated by state) by –

- LEP Code – 13,460

- Student Dropout – 427

- GED Completion – 10

- Migrant code / Students served

    * Regular – 32,078

    * Summer – 14,735

- QAD by –

    * 0-12 months – 13,502

    * 13-24 months – 10,476

    * 25-36 months – 10,306

Appendix B
Evaluation Framework

EVALUATION FRAMEWORK – FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION MIGRANT EDUCATION PROGRAM

Objective/Performance Indicator	Strategy, Activity, or Action Plan	Population Served	Data Source(s) or Evaluation Methods	Responsible Party	Evaluation Timeline	Progress Notes
Evaluation Question 1: To what extent are programs being implemented?						
% of students having a completed individual needs assessment AND/OR % of students having a completed individual needs assessment by within X days of identification		All students	# of students receiving individual needs assessment / # of total students = % # of students receiving individual needs assessment within X days / # of total students = %	District MEP staff responsible for conducting individual needs assessments. State will examine needs assessment completion overall.	Each student receives an individual needs assessment annually	
% of students participating in a summer program		All students	List of summer programs, services/ participation records # of students participating / # of total students = % [Can disaggregated further by program/ service type.]	Districts maintain activity/service lists and track participation data.	After summer programs conclude	
Activity/service provision AND/OR Student participation in activities		All students	Activities/services participation data in state database and/or annual district self-evaluation, State monitoring/site visits	Districts maintain activity/service lists and track participation data.	Maintained on ongoing basis, reported annually in district self-evaluation.	

Objective/Performance Indicator	Strategy, Activity, or Action Plan	Population Served	Data Source(s) or Evaluation Methods	Responsible Party	Evaluation Timeline	Progress Notes
% of students served through a school year program/service		All students	List of SY programs/services, Service/participation records **# of students participating / # of total students = % [Can disaggregate further by program/ service type.]**	Districts maintain activity/service lists and track participation data.	After school year programs/services conclude	
% of preschool-aged children receiving intervention services		3- and 4-year old children	Demographics, program or service availability, program or service provision records, student needs records **# of children receiving services / # of total children = %** **Results should be disaggregated by child age and/or program/service type.**			
Increase staff capacity through professional development.		Migrant Education staff	List of prof. development opportunities, sign-in sheets, agendas, PD evaluations, staff observations	Districts collect, maintain, and report data	Districts report results in annual, year-end self-evaluation	

Objective/Performance Indicator	Strategy, Activity, or Action Plan	Population Served	Data Source(s) or Evaluation Methods	Responsible Party	Evaluation Timeline	Progress Notes
% of Priority for Service students receiving services matched with their needs		PFS students	Individual Student Needs Assessment results, student service provision/ activity participation data # of PFS students receiving services matched with their needs / # of total PFS students = % [Could be further disaggregated to look at PFS within need category.]	Districts conduct needs assessments and document services	Quarterly examination at the district level, annual examination at the state level	
% of out-of-school youth receiving services matched with their needs		Out-of-school youth	Individual Student Needs Assessment results, service provision/activity participation data # of OSY receiving services matched with their needs / # of total OSY students = % [Could be further disaggregated to look at PFS within need category, if PFS is used with OSY.]	Districts conduct needs assessments and document services	Quarterly examination at the district level, annual examination at the state level	

Objective/Performance Indicator	Strategy, Activity, or Action Plan	Population Served	Data Source(s) or Evaluation Methods	Responsible Party	Evaluation Timeline	Progress Notes
K-5 migrant parental involvement needs to increase by 12% points. (CNA)		Parents of migrant students	Sign-in sheets, district logs, parent involvement opportunities list, parent correspondence, announcements, or promotional items for opportunities. Increase should be determined by comparing prior year's participation rate(s) (i.e. # of parents participating at least once) with the current year's participation rate(s) using consistent data sources/methods	Districts collect, maintain, and report data	Districts report results in annual, year-end self-evaluation	
Parental involvement in the middle and high schools needs to increase by 23% points. (CNA)		Parents of migrant students	(# parents participating / total # of parents) = % current year – (# parents participating / total # of parents) = % prior year = Difference (change in % points)	Districts collect, maintain, and report data	Districts report results in annual, year-end self-evaluation	

Objective/Performance Indicator	Strategy, Activity, or Action Plan	Population Served	Data Source(s) or Evaluation Methods	Responsible Party	Evaluation Timeline	Progress Notes
% of students found to be ineligible after re-interviewing will decrease.	ID & R process, re-interviewing	All migrant students	Quality control measures and/or Standard Operating Procedures (SOP), staff interviews, surveys, etc., student ID & recruitment efforts (staff time logs) Year-to-year comparison: # of students found to be in-eligible after re-interview / total # of migrant students = %	District implements re-interview process and reports results	Districts report results in annual, year-end self-evaluation	
% of districts conducting re-interviews annually will increase.		Districts enrolling migrant students	Documentation of implementation of re-interview process, i.e. interview forms, travel doc., data/findings on #s of students found eligible/in-eligible, monitoring Year-to-year comparison: # of districts conducting re-interviews / total # of districts = %	District implements re-interview process and reports results	Districts report results in annual, year-end self-evaluation	

Evaluation Question 2: **To what extent are the following programs for ME students impacting student outcomes?** AND **Are ME students meeting state AYP targets?**

Objective/Performance Indicator	Strategy, Activity, or Action Plan	Population Served	Data Source(s) or Evaluation Methods	Responsible Party	Evaluation Timeline	Progress Notes
Performance Goal 1: By 2013-2014, all students will reach high standards, at a minimum attaining proficiency or better in reading/language arts and mathematics.						
1.1 Performance indicator: The % of students, in the aggregate and for each subgroup, who are at or above the proficient level in reading/language arts on the state's assessment. [Note: These subgroups are those for which the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) requires state reporting, as identified in Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(i).]		K-12 migrant students	Student scores from FCAT (Grades 3-11), other assessments (i.e. DIBELS, 4Sight), demographics data Data should be examined as a state, by district, by grade level, by subgroup, by PFS, by ELL/non-ELL. [This holds true for each of the grades outlined below.] # of students scoring at proficient or above / total # of students assessed = %	State office will query migrant students' FCAT results. Other assessment results from district self-evaluation reports. Consider achievement in light of services provided, examining migrant activities vs. non-migrant implemented programs.	FCAT will be queried in summer according to data release/availability. Districts will report other assessment data in September each year as part of its self-evaluation report.	

Objective/Performance Indicator	Strategy, Activity, or Action Plan	Population Served	Data Source(s) or Evaluation Methods	Responsible Party	Evaluation Timeline	Progress Notes
The % of grade 4 migrant students scoring a level 3 or higher on the FCAT reading needs to increase by 29% points. (CNA)		Grade 4 migrant students	Student demographics, Prior year to current year comparison of % of Grade 4 migrant students scoring a level 3 or higher on FCAT Reading # of Grade 4 students scoring proficient or above / total # of Grade 4 students assessed = %	State office will query FCAT results for migrant students.	FCAT will be queried in summer according to data release/ availability.	
The % of grade 8 migrant students scoring a level 3 or higher on the FCAT reading needs to increase by 30% points. (CNA)		Grade 8 migrant students	Student demographics, Prior year to current year comparison of % of Grade 8 migrant students scoring a level 3 or higher on FCAT Reading # of Grade 8 students scoring proficient or above / total # of Grade 8 students assessed = %	State office will query FCAT results for migrant students.	FCAT will be queried in summer according to data release/ availability.	

Objective/Performance Indicator	Strategy, Activity, or Action Plan	Population Served	Data Source(s) or Evaluation Methods	Responsible Party	Evaluation Timeline	Progress Notes
The % of grade 10 migrant students scoring a level 3 or higher on the FCAT reading needs to increase by 27% points. (CNA)		Grade 10 migrant students	Student demographics, Prior year to current year comparison of % of Grade 10 migrant students scoring a level 3 or higher on FCAT Reading # of Grade 10 students scoring proficient or above / total # of Grade 10 students assessed = %	State office will query FCAT results for migrant students.	FCAT will be queried in summer according to data release/ availability.	
1.2 Performance indicator: The % of students, in the aggregate and in each subgroup, who are at or above the proficient level in mathematics on the state's assessment. [Note: These subgroups are those for which the ESEA requires state reporting, as identified in section 1111(h)(1)(C)(i).]		K-12 migrant students	Student scores from FCAT (Gr 3-11), other assessments (i.e. 4Sight, etc.), demographics data Data should be examined as a state, by district, by grade level, by subgroup, by PFS, by ELL vs. non-ELL. [This holds true for each of the grades outlined below.] # of students scoring proficient or above / total # of students assessed = %	State office will query FCAT results for migrant students. State should consider achievement in light of services provided. Districts will report other assessment data to the state.	FCAT will be queried in summer according to data release/ availability. Districts will report other assessment data in September each year as part of its self-evaluation report.	

Objective/Performance Indicator	Strategy, Activity, or Action Plan	Population Served	Data Source(s) or Evaluation Methods	Responsible Party	Evaluation Timeline	Progress Notes
The % of grade 4 migrant students scoring a level 3 or higher on the FCAT math needs to increase by 23% points. (CNA)		Grade 4 migrant students	Demographics, prior year to current year comparison of % of Grade 4 migrant students scoring a level 3 or higher on FCAT Math # of Grade 4 students scoring proficient or above / total # of Grade 4 students assessed = %	State office will query FCAT results for migrant students.	FCAT will be queried in summer according to data release/ availability.	
The percentage of grade 8 migrant students scoring a level 3 or higher on the FCAT math needs to increase by 26% points. (CNA)		Grade 8 migrant students	Demographics, prior year to current year comparison of % of Grade 8 migrant students scoring a level 3 or higher on FCAT Math # of Grade 8 students scoring proficient or above / total # of Grade 8 students assessed = %	State office will query FCAT results for migrant students.	FCAT will be queried in summer according to data release/ availability.	

Objective/Performance Indicator	Strategy, Activity, or Action Plan	Population Served	Data Source(s) or Evaluation Methods	Responsible Party	Evaluation Timeline	Progress Notes
The % of grade 10 migrant students scoring a level 3 or higher on the FCAT math needs to increase by 24% points. (CNA)		Grade 10 migrant students	Demographics, prior year to current year comparison of % of Grade 10 migrant students scoring a level 3 or higher on FCAT Math # of Grade 10 students scoring proficient or above / total # of Grade 10 students assessed = %	State office will query FCAT results for migrant students.	FCAT will be queried in summer according to data release/ availability.	
1.4 District-derived Performance Indicator: The percentage of migrant students who meet the annual proficiency target in reading (65%) will increase and the achievement gap between migrant and non-migrant students will decrease.		Migrant students taking FCAT (Grades 3-11)	Demographics, comparison of FCAT results for migrant/non-migrant students # of migrant students scoring proficient or above / total # of migrant students assessed = % Compared to # of non-migrant students scoring at proficient or above / total # of non-migrant students assessed = %	State office will query/analyze FCAT results for migrant/non-migrant students.	Annually in summer	

Objective/Performance Indicator	Strategy, Activity, or Action Plan	Population Served	Data Source(s) or Evaluation Methods	Responsible Party	Evaluation Timeline	Progress Notes
1.5 District-derived Performance Indicator: The percentage of migrant students who meet the annual proficiency target in mathematics (68%) will increase and the achievement gap between migrant and non-migrant students will decrease.		Migrant students taking FCAT (Grades 3-11)		State office will query/analyze FCAT results for migrant/non-migrant students.	Annually in summer	

Objective/Performance Indicator	Strategy, Activity, or Action Plan	Population Served	Data Source(s) or Evaluation Methods	Responsible Party	Evaluation Timeline	Progress Notes
1.6 Performance Indicator: The % of migrant Pre-K children who demonstrate school readiness as measured by the State's assessment will increase. OR The % of migrant students "ready" for school (as measured by FLKRS) needs to increase by 17% points. (CNA)		Pre-K migrant students	Demographics, prior year to current year comparison of cohort results on FLKRS (# students demonstrating school readiness on FLKRS / total # of students assessed using FLKRS) = % current year – (#students demonstrating school readiness on FLKRS / total # of students assessed using FLKRS) = % prior year = Difference (change in % points)	State office will query/analyze FLKRS results for migrant pre-K students.	Fall annually	

Objective/Performance Indicator	Strategy, Activity, or Action Plan	Population Served	Data Source(s) or Evaluation Methods	Responsible Party	Evaluation Timeline	Progress Notes
Performance Goal 5: All students will graduate from high school.						
5.1 Performance Indicator: The % of students who graduate from high school each year with a regular diploma 1) disaggregated by race, ethnicity, gender, disability status, migrant status, English proficiency, and status as economically disadvantaged; 2) calculated in the same manner as used in National Center for Education Statistics reports on Common Core of Data.		Grade 12 migrant students	Demographics, individual student graduation data. Current year comparison of total # Grade 12 migrant students to actual # graduated with a regular diploma also compared to prior year results. (# students graduating w/regular diploma / total # of students in Grade 12) = % current year – (# students graduating w/regular diploma / total # of students in Grade 12) = % prior year = Difference (change in % points)	State migrant office will examine student graduation results for the state and by district, disaggregated by race, ethnicity, gender, disability status, migrant status, English proficiency, and status as economically disadvantaged.	Annually in summer following the end of the school year.	

Objective/Performance Indicator	Strategy, Activity, or Action Plan	Population Served	Data Source(s) or Evaluation Methods	Responsible Party	Evaluation Timeline	Progress Notes
5.2 Performance Indicator: The % of students who drop out of school, 1) disaggregated by race, ethnicity, gender, disability status, migrant status, English proficiency, and status as economically disadvantaged; and 2) calculated in the same manner as used in National Center for Education Statistics reports on Common Core of Data.		Migrant students in Grades 9-12	Demographics, individual student drop-out data. Current year comparison of total # migrant students by grade to # migrant students dropping out by grade also compared to prior year results. [Consider examining migrant student dropout per NCLB and NGA (National Governors Act) Graduation Counts Compact that uses a formula to follow students over their high-school careers.] (# students dropping out / total # of students age 16 or older) = % current year – (#students dropping out / total # of students age 16 or older) = % prior year = Difference (change in % points)	State migrant office will examine drop-out for the state and by district, disaggregated by race, ethnicity, gender, disability status, migrant status, English proficiency, and status as economically disadvantaged.	Annually in summer following the end of the school year.	

Objective/Performance Indicator	Strategy, Activity, or Action Plan	Population Served	Data Source(s) or Evaluation Methods	Responsible Party	Evaluation Timeline	Progress Notes
5.3 Performance Indicator: The % of migrant students who graduate from high school with a regular diploma or GED will increase and the graduation rate between migrant and non-migrant students will decrease		Grade 12 migrant students	Demographics for migrant/non-migrant students, individual student graduation/GED data. Current year comparison of total # Grade 12 migrant students to actual # graduated with a regular diploma/ GED also compared to prior year results. Comparison of migrant and non-migrant graduation/ GED annual rates. (# students graduating w/regular diploma or GED/ total # of students in Grade 12) = % current year – (# students graduating w/regular diploma or GED / total # of students in Grade 12) = % prior year = Difference (change in % points)	State migrant office will examine student graduation/GED results for the state and by district.	Annually in summer following the end of the school year.	

Objective/Performance Indicator	Strategy, Activity, or Action Plan	Population Served	Data Source(s) or Evaluation Methods	Responsible Party	Evaluation Timeline	Progress Notes
5.4 District-derived Performance Indicator: Migrant students in grades 9-12 will reflect an increase in GPA.		Migrant students in Grades 9-12	Demographics, individual student current year and prior year GPA data. Prior year to current year comparison of % students showing an increase in GPA. Compare 2 years of GPA for each student to identify those that showed an increase. / Total number of students examined = % of students showing an increase in GPA	State migrant office will examine student GPA results for the state and by district.	Annually in summer following the end of the school year.	

Objective/Performance Indicator	Strategy, Activity, or Action Plan	Population Served	Data Source(s) or Evaluation Methods	Responsible Party	Evaluation Timeline	Progress Notes
The number of migrant students in Grades 9-12 with a GPA of 1.9 or lower needs to decrease by 9% points. (CNA)		Migrant students in Grades 9-12	Demographics, individual student GPA data. Prior year to current year comparison of % students showing an increase in GPA. # of students in Grades 9-12 with a GPA of 1.9 or lower / # of students in Grades 9-12 = % for current year - # of students in Grades 9-12 with a GPA of 1.9 or lower / # of students in Grades 9-12 = % for prior year = Difference in % points	State migrant office will examine student GPA results for the state and by district.	Annually in summer following the end of the school year.	

Objective/Performance Indicator	Strategy, Activity, or Action Plan	Population Served	Data Source(s) or Evaluation Methods	Responsible Party	Evaluation Timeline	Progress Notes
The number of migrant students in Grades 9-12 with a GPA of 2.0 of higher needs to increase by 16% points. (CNA)		Migrant students in Grades 9-12	Demographics, individual student GPA data. Prior year to current year comparison of % students showing an increase in GPA. # of students in Grades 9-12 with a GPA of 2.0 or higher / # of students in Grades 9-12 = % for current year - # of students in Grades 9-12 with a GPA of 2.0 or higher / # of students in Grades 9-12 = % for prior year = Difference in % points	State migrant office will examine student GPA results for the state and by district.	Annually in summer following the end of the school year.	

Objective/Performance Indicator	Strategy, Activity, or Action Plan	Population Served	Data Source(s) or Evaluation Methods	Responsible Party	Evaluation Timeline	Progress Notes
5.6 District-derived Performance Indicator: Increasing percentages of 10th grade migrant students who participate in Migrant Education Program funded or facilitated FCAT preparation tutorials for at least nine months will pass the FCAT.		Grade 10 migrant students	Demographics, individual student FCAT assessment data, FCAT prep. participation records, sign-in sheets, FCAT preparation content, frequency, duration Annual comparison of # of Grade 10 students participating in FCAT prep tutorials for 9+ months and passing FCAT / # of Grade 10 students participating in FCAT prep tutorials for 9+ months	State migrant office will examine student GPA results for the state and by district.	FCAT will be queried in summer according to data release/ availability.	

Objective/Performance Indicator	Strategy, Activity, or Action Plan	Population Served	Data Source(s) or Evaluation Methods	Responsible Party	Evaluation Timeline	Progress Notes
5.7 Performance Indicator: Decreasing percentages of migrant students who are retained. AND The number of migrant students in Grades 9-12 who were retained needs to decrease by 5% points. (CNA)		K-12 migrant students Grade 9-12 migrant students	Demographics, individual student grade retention data. Prior year to current year comparison of % retained by grade. # of students in retained by grade / # of students in each grade = % for current year - # of students retained by grade / # of students in each grade = % for prior year = Difference in % points	State migrant office will examine student GPA results for the state and by district.	Annually in summer following the end of the school year.	

BEFORE Using the Evaluation Framework:

1. What are the reporting requirements, if any?
2. What do you want to know?
3. Do you want an internal or external evaluation?
   a. If external, identify an evaluator.
   b. If internal, identify staff with specialized skills.
4. Establish your evaluation team. The evaluation plan should be a collaborative effort of the evaluation team.

DIRECTIONS for Using the Evaluation Framework:

1. In the gray-shaded Performance Measure fields, evaluators will create long-term goals for the project. In some cases, these areas can be used for establishing questions to be answered by the evaluation process.
2. Underneath each performance measure, evaluators will establish key objectives or performance targets to work toward. (Column 1)
3. Column 2, Strategy/Action Plan, refers to the process, strategy, or activity the program will use to accomplish the objective or target noted in Column 1.
4. The Population column notes which population (teachers, students, administrators, community members, etc.) will be affected by the strategy.
5. Data Source indicates the data instruments to be developed or used. These may include classroom observations, feedback survey, pre/post assessment, annual assessment, material examination, etc.
6. Responsible Party is the individual or team responsible for the data collection related to the particular target.
7. Timeline refers to the deadline or time period by which the objective will be completed and/or measured.
8. The final column provides space for programs and evaluators to make notes about data collection or progress toward targets.

The chart may expand to accommodate any number of evaluation questions and objectives.

AFTER Completing the Framework:

1. Locate or develop data collection instruments.
2. Establish data collection procedures and processes. This may include developing checklists, spreadsheet templates, database queries, and collection and management protocols (what happens after data collected?).
3. Conduct analysis.
4. Produce reports according reporting requirements or what you wanted to know.
5. Use evaluation findings for program planning, improvement, and sustainability.