

MEMORANDUM

January 8, 2016

TO: Board Members

FROM: Terry B. Grier, Ed.D.
Superintendent of Schools

SUBJECT: **MIGRANT EDUCATION PROGRAM, 2014–2015**

CONTACT: Carla Stevens, 713-556-6700


The Migrant Education Program (MEP) is authorized under Title I of the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB). In an effort to comply with Title I, the HISD MEP works to assist migrant students overcome the challenges of mobility, cultural and language barriers, social isolation, and other difficulties associated with a migratory lifestyle. The goal of the program is to ensure migrant students succeed in school, and to successfully transition to postsecondary education or employment.

The attached report includes demographic characteristics of migrant students served by the program in 2014–2015, a summary of services provided by and activities of MEP staff over the past year. In addition, findings from assessments of academic achievement and English language proficiency of migrant students are included.

Key findings include:

- There were 373 migrant students in 2014–2015 compared to 421 in 2013–2014.
- Students in the HISD Migrant Education Program tend to perform below the district passing rate on most assessments.
- Fewer migrant ELL students gained at least one proficiency level on the TELPAS, measuring English acquisition, than ELL students in the district.
- The gap between migrant students' longitudinal graduation rate and the districts' longitudinal graduation rate has narrowed— the two groups have comparable graduation rates.

Should you have any further questions, please contact Carla Stevens in Research and Accountability at 713-556-6700.



TBG

Attachment

cc: Superintendent's Direct Reports
Magda Galindo



RESEARCH

Educational Program Report

**MIGRANT EDUCATION PROGRAM (MEP)
2014 - 2015**



2015 BOARD OF EDUCATION

Rhonda Skillern-Jones

President

Manuel Rodriguez, Jr.

First Vice President

Wanda Adams

Second Vice President

Paula Harris

Secretary

Juliet Stipeche

Assistant Secretary

Anna Eastman

Michael L. Lunceford

Greg Meyers

Harvin C. Moore

Terry B. Grier, Ed.D.

Superintendent of Schools

Carla Stevens

Assistant Superintendent

Department of Research and Accountability

Aysha Foster, Ph.D.

Research Specialist

Venita Holmes, Dr. P.H.

Research Manager

Houston Independent School District

Hattie Mae White Educational Support Center
4400 West 18th Street Houston, Texas 77092-8501

www.HoustonISD.org

It is the policy of the Houston Independent School District not to discriminate on the basis of age, color, handicap or disability, ancestry, national origin, marital status, race, religion, sex, veteran status, political affiliation, sexual orientation, gender identity and/or gender expression in its educational or employment programs and activities.

MIGRANT EDUCATION PROGRAM (MEP), 2014–2015

Executive Summary

Program Description

The Migrant Education Program (MEP) is authorized under Title I of the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB). Title I states that the purpose of the MEP is to assist states in their efforts to meet the special needs of migrant students. In general, the MEP attempts to “support high-quality and comprehensive educational programs for migrant children to help reduce the educational disruptions and other problems that result from repeated moves” (U.S. Department of Education, 2002). A migrant student refers to any child under the age of 22 years who works in the fishing or agricultural industry, or whose parent/guardian/spouse works in one of the aforementioned industries, and has crossed school district lines within the previous 36 months for the purpose of temporary or seasonal employment in the agricultural or fishing industries.

In an effort to comply with Title I, the Texas Education Agency (TEA) Division of Migrant Education works with local education agencies (LEAs) to design programs that help migrant students “overcome the challenges of mobility, cultural and language barriers, social isolation, and other difficulties associated with a migratory lifestyle, in order to succeed in school, and to successfully transition to postsecondary education or employment” (Texas Education Agency, Division of Migrant Education, 2006). Additionally, TEA works with LEAs to meet state and federal goals for servicing migrant students.

Highlights

- There were 373 migrant students in 2014–2015 compared to 421 in 2013–2014 and 554 in 2012–2013.
- Migrant students obtained lower mean Normal Curve Equivalent (NCE) scores than the district on the 2014–2015 Iowa Assessments reading total for all grades. The mean NCE score differences between district and migrant students ranged from 5.8 NCEs (7th grade) to 28.3 NCEs (kindergarten).
- Migrant students obtained lower mean NCE scores than the district on the 2014–2015 Iowa Assessments mathematics subtest in kindergarten through 7th grade, with an exception in 3rd grade. The greatest difference in mean NCE scores between migrant and district students was 13.9 NCEs (kindergarten). The smallest NCE difference was 0.9 NCEs (7th grade).
- The migrant students in 1st grade through 4th grade obtained lower mean NCE scores compared to the district on the 2014–2015 Logramos reading subtest. The largest difference between migrant students and the district was 4.4 NCEs in 1st grade.
- The kindergarten migrant students had a slightly higher mean NCE than the district on the Logramos reading subtest, 60.7 versus 59.7 in 2014–2015.
- The migrant students scored lower than the district on the Logramos mathematics subtest in all grades in 2014–2015. The mean NCE score differences between district and migrant students in kindergarten to 4th grade ranged from 0.2 NCEs (kindergarten) to 11.8 NCEs (3rd grade).

- In 2014–2015, a lower percentage of migrant ELL students scored at the Advanced level compared to the district for kindergarten to 2nd grade (10 percent versus 17 percent), while a higher percentage of migrant ELL students scored at the Advanced level compared to the district at 3rd to 12th grades (44 percent versus 38 percent). This trend was the same for the Advanced High level for kindergarten through 2nd grade students. However, Migrant ELL students in 3rd through 12th grades scored lower compared to the district at the Advanced High level.
- The percentage of migrant ELL students in kindergarten to 2nd grade who gained at least one level was 36 percent, compared to 56 percent for the district on the TELPAS. Similarly, migrant ELL students in 3rd through 12th grades, made less progress in English proficiency than did the district (36 percent versus 52 percent).
- The 3rd grade migrant students had a higher percentage of students who met the STAAR Level II: Satisfactory (Phase-In 1) standard compared to the district on the 2014–2015 English version of the STAAR reading test, however, a lower percentage of migrant students in 4th through 8th grades met the 2014 STAAR Level II: Satisfactory (Phase-In 1) standard compared to the district.
- A lower percentage of 5th, 6th, and 8th grade migrant students met the STAAR Level II: Satisfactory (Phase-In 1) standard compared to the district on the 2014–2015 English version of the STAAR mathematics test, while a higher percentage of 3rd, 4th, and 7th grade migrant students met the Level II: Satisfactory (Phase-In 1) standard on the 2014–2015 English version of the STAAR math test compared to the district.
- Migrant students passed the 2014–2015 EOC exams at a lower rate than the district on all subjects, except English II.
- The migrant student annual graduation rate was 82.6 percent for 2013–2014, the most recent year for which data were available. This was an increase from the previous year (81.8 percent).
- The longitudinal graduation rate for migrant students in the Class of 2014 was 78.3 percent compared to 78.6 percent for the district. The gap between migrant students and the district longitudinal graduation rates has decreased over time.

Recommendations

- The HISD Migrant program should build relationships with parents early in the academic school year through outreach, communication, and community programs.
- Focus on STAAR performance is important, including paying close attention to the student tutoring services. The performance of migrant students' who received tutoring services had substantial decreases from 2013–2014 to 2014–2015.
- The HISD Migrant program should continue the support they are providing ELL students as they have progressed in their proficiency levels at lower rates compared to the district.

Administrative Response

At the beginning of each school year, the Migrant Education Program (MEP) will host parent meetings to distribute uniform vouchers and/or school supplies. During the meetings we will provide training to parents that build skills and disposition to negotiate the school and school district bureaucracy. This will give parents knowledge and confidence to effectively advocate for their children. We will identify and appoint a contact in each school servicing migrant students to advocate for migrant students and families. School contacts will monitor academic performance and attendance of each migrant student and coordinate assistance as needed. The MEP district staff will solicit community partners to provide support for migrant students to participate in extended learning opportunities such as summer leadership programs in university campuses.

To develop students' English language proficiency in language arts, math, science, and social studies, the MEP will implement ESL Reading Smart, an online tutorial program that provides content-based reading instruction. The program has weekly progress reports that allow instructors to monitor and track their students' growth in English language proficiency. MEP will also implement English language progress monitoring checks and online coaching support for teachers of ELL migrant students. To do this, teachers will receive online professional development in using the English Language Proficiency Standards (ELPS) to differentiate instruction for ELL migrant students. Teachers will also learn how to closely monitor and evaluate their students' progress in developing increased proficiency levels in English.

Introduction

Texas is amongst six states in the United States that have the highest number of agricultural workers under the age of 18, which is directly correlated with number of adult farmworkers found in the same states (National Center for Farmworker Health, Inc., 2012). Migrant students face several challenges that are associated with the high geographic mobility that is a primary characteristic of migrant families. They often have difficulty overcoming poverty, language barriers, and cultural differences caused by frequent relocations (Green, 2003). In addition to the cultural disadvantages that migrant students often face, they also encounter educational problems associated with their migrant lifestyle. Specifically, they struggle with school attendance which in turn leads to issues with staying on grade-level and meeting graduation requirements (Green, 2003; Kindler, 1994; Salerno, 1991). There are also substantial impacts on students being able to develop a social network and/or a peer support group (Green, 2003; Salerno, 1991). DiCerbo (2001) makes several suggestions about best practices that should be used when working with migrant students (e.g. “implement appropriate assessment of language proficiency and academic needs,” conduct outreach and communication in the parent’ home language,” “build on migrant student’ strengths by incorporating students’ culture and language into the curriculum.”)

The Migrant Education Program (MEP) is authorized under Title I of the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB). Section 1301, Part C of Title I states that the purpose of the MEP is to assist states in their efforts to meet the special needs of migrant students. In general, the MEP attempts to ensure that children of migrant workers have access to the same free, appropriate public education as all children. A migrant student is a [person] who is, or whose parent or spouse is, a migratory agricultural worker, including a migratory dairy worker, or a migratory fisher, and who, in the preceding 36 months, in order to obtain, or accompany such parent or spouse, in order to obtain, temporary or seasonal employment in agricultural or fishing work. After 36 months, the migrant student loses his or her migrant status, unless the family makes a “qualifying move” to obtain migratory work. After a qualifying move, they can regain migrant status for the student by applying for a Certificate of Eligibility (COE).

In order to comply with Title I, Part C of NCLB, the Texas Education Agency (TEA) Division of Migrant Education has stated that its primary goal is to “support high-quality and comprehensive educational programs for migratory children to help reduce the educational disruptions and other problems that result from repeated moves” (Texas Education Agency, Division of Migrant Education, 2006). Additionally, TEA works with local education agencies (LEAs) including the Houston Independent School District (HISD) to address methods to meet state and federal goals for servicing migrant students.

HISD addresses the unique educational needs of migratory children by focusing on five areas: identification and recruitment; interstate/intrastate coordination and transfer of records (via the New Generation System, NGS); encouraging parental involvement; delivery of program services; and finally, program monitoring and evaluation (see **Appendix A** for further details, p. 23). The purpose of this evaluation was to examine the impact of the migrant education program on students’ performance on the Iowa Assessment, Logramos, STAAR, and TELPAS as well as migrant students’ dropout rate and graduation rate.

Methods

Data Collection and Analysis

Measure

- Iowa Assessment measures students’ academic achievement in various academic subjects across nine grade levels (kindergarten through grade 8). Kindergarten students take the Iowa Assessments at the

end of the fall semester, and grade 1 through grade 8 students take the exam in May of the academic year. The report includes results of the Iowa Assessments calculated Reading Total and Mathematics Total. The Reading Total is calculated using scores from the Reading Comprehension and Vocabulary subtests; the Mathematics Total is calculated using scores from the Mathematics and Computation subtests. Only current year data/results are presented in this report, as this was the first year the district administered the Iowa Assessments.

- Logramos is a norm-referenced, standardized achievement test in Spanish, and is used to assess the level of content mastery for students who receive instruction in Spanish. The Logramos assesses students' academic achievement in the same content areas as the Iowa Assessment (i.e., reading and math); however, the Logramos is not a translation of the Iowa Assessment. Only current year data/results are presented in this report, as this was the first year the district administered the Logramos.
- State of Texas Assessments of Academic Readiness (STAAR) is the state of Texas criterion-referenced assessment program. It replaced the Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills (TAKS) program in spring 2012. The Texas Education Agency (TEA), in collaboration with the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board (THECB) and Texas educators, developed this new assessment system in response to requirements set by the 80th, 81st, and 83rd Texas legislatures. This new system focuses on increasing postsecondary readiness of graduating high school students, and helps to ensure that Texas students are competitive both nationally and internationally. The key outcome measures in this evaluation were the percentage of students who met the 2015 STAAR Level II: Satisfactory (Phase-in I) performance standard in reading and mathematics. In addition, STAAR End-of-Course (EOC) assessments for Algebra I, Biology, English I, English II, and U.S. History were used as outcome measures of the HISD migrant program effect on student academic performance. Results are reported for the English and Spanish versions of the regular STAAR. This excludes versions used for students receiving special education services and/or linguistic accommodations (STAAR L, STAAR A, and STAAR Alternate 2).
- Texas English Language Proficiency Assessment System (TELPAS) is an assessment program for students in Texas public schools who are learning the English language. This English language proficiency assessment is administered to all English Language Learner (ELL) students in kindergarten through twelfth grade annually until their language proficiency assessment committee (LPAC) concludes that they have excelled to a level of proficiency. The assessment was developed by the Texas Education Agency (TEA) in response to federal testing requirements (U.S. Department of Education, 2002). Proficiency scores in the domains of listening, speaking, reading, and writing are used to calculate a composite score. Composite scores are in turn used to indicate where ELL students are on a continuum of English language development. This continuum, based on the stages of language development for second language learners, is divided into four proficiency levels: Beginning, Intermediate, Advanced, and Advanced High.
- Additional data (2013 annual migrant graduation rate and demographic information) were collected from the Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS). Longitudinal graduation rates, annual and longitudinal dropout rates were attained from the annual Performance-Based Monitoring Analysis System (PBMA) report. A parent survey was administered to gather parents' opinion on the program's instructional and support services in the 2014–2015 academic year.

Data Analysis

- Comparisons were made between migrant students and students district wide on the STAAR, STAAR EOC, Iowa Assessment, Logramos, and TELPAS. District-level data were retrieved from district-level summary reports. Migrant students' results were calculated using datasets from the Cognos, Chancery Ad Hoc package (TELPAS report used for migrant ELL students' results). For STAAR and STAAR EOC, the percentage of students who met Level II: Satisfactory (Phase-in 1) standard is shown. STAAR results were reported and analyzed for the reading and mathematics subtests by grade level. STAAR EOC results include the percentage of students who met standard for Algebra I, Biology, English I and II, and U.S. History. Iowa Assessment and Logramos results were reported using Normal Curve Equivalents (NCEs) for reading and mathematics subtests.
- TELPAS results are reported for two indicators. One of these reflects attainment, for example, the overall level of English language proficiency exhibited by ELL students. For this indicator, the percent of students at each proficiency level is presented. The second indicator reflects progress, i.e., whether students gained one or more levels of English language proficiency between testing in 2014 and 2015. For this second TELPAS indicator, the percent gaining one or more proficiency levels from the previous year, is reported.
- The 2015 migrant students' graduation and dropout rates were compared with the district's. The course grades the students receive in each grading cycle were reported. While parent surveys were distributed, results were not able to be provided due to the lack of response.

Sample


The U.S. Department of Education (2002) defines migrant students as "...a child who is, or whose parent or spouse is, a migratory agricultural worker, including a migratory dairy worker, or a migratory fisher, and who, in the preceding 36 months, in order to obtain, or accompany such parent or spouse, in order to obtain, temporary or seasonal employment in agricultural or fishing work" (p. 1580). The sample in this evaluation included students who attended HISD schools in 2014–2015, were identified as migrant students, and who had an Average Daily Attendance (ADA) eligibility classification other than '0'—enrolled, no membership. A total of 373 migrant students met these criteria. These students were matched with the HISD student assessment databases to obtain migrant students' test data for STAAR, STAAR End-of-Course (EOC), Iowa Assessments, Logramos, and TELPAS. (Note. A small population of migrant students was compared to a large population tested district wide. Results for migrant students may be affected by a small number of students while the larger population will regress toward the mean and remain more stable.)

Results

What was the HISD migrant education program enrollment trend in the last seventeen years?

- **Figure 1** presents the migrant student enrollment trends for HISD and Texas from 1998 to 2015.
- Migrant students typically account for less than one percent of the district's student population. The number of migrant students decreased in 2013–2014 from the previous year, from 554 to 421, a decline of 24.0 percent. In 2014–2015, the number of migrant students continued to decrease, with a 24.3 percent decline, reflected by an enrollment of 373.
- The HISD migrant enrollment has similar trends to state enrollment across time.

Figure 1. Migrant student enrollment in HISD and Statewide, 1998 to 2015




Sources: PEIMS database, Enrollment in Texas Public Schools (http://tea.texas.gov/acctres/enroll_index.html)
 Note. 2015 Migrant student enrollment data for Texas was not available at the time of the report.

What were the demographic characteristics of migrant students enrolled in HISD schools in 2014–2015?

- **Figure 2** presents the demographic characteristics of migrant students who attended HISD schools in 2014–2015. Student characteristics in 2013–2014 compared to 2014–2015 were similar with respect to ethnicity, special education placement, economically-disadvantaged, and LEP status (**Appendix B-Table 1, p. 24**). In 2014–2015, about 98 percent of migrant students were Hispanic, about 98 percent were economically-disadvantaged, 54 percent were LEP, and about seven percent received services from special education programs.

- Migrant students classified as gifted-talented accounted for approximately 13 percent in both 2012–2013 and 2013–2014; however, this percentage decreased to about nine percent in 2014–2015.
- The proportion of at-risk Migrant students increased from 79 percent in 2013–2014 to 85 percent in 2014–2015.

Figure 2. Migrant student demographic characteristics, 2014–2015



Source: Fall 2014 PEIMS database

What methods were used by district MEP staff members to identify and recruit migrant students and verify the eligibility of migrant students and their families?

- Migrant recruitment activities for the 2014–2015 school year are shown in **Appendix B-Table 2, p. 24**. The total number of families contacted via phone calls or visits increased by 66.5 percent from 260 in 2013–2014 to 433 in 2014–2015.
- The total number of newly-recruited migrant students (122), was higher than the previous year (65) (Appendix B-Table 2).
- **Appendix B-Table 3, p. 25** shows the number and percentage of migrant students who benefited from MEP’s instructional and support services in 2014–2015. Among the ten categories of instructional services offered, the Study Island program and Personal Grad Plan services were most frequently used. The number of secondary migrant students receiving tutorial services during the school year was almost double the amount of elementary students who were tutored. This trend was reversed during the summer, with double the number of migrant elementary students being tutored compared to secondary migrant students.
- Appendix B-Table 3 also shows the number of migrant students receiving support services. Among the seven categories of support services offered, clothing and school supplies were the two most popular services with 420 counts of clothing/uniform vouchers and 432 for school supplies.


What were parents' responses on the MEP's instructional and support services parent survey?

- Parent surveys were sent out to all parents of migrant students during the 2014–2015 school year. The surveys included return envelopes and postage. There was a 3 percent return rate for parent surveys. While parent surveys were distributed, results were not able to be provided due to the lack of response.

What were the academic outcomes for MEP students who received tutoring support?

- **Figure 3** depicts the passing rate of elementary migrant students, who received tutoring courses provided by MEP, on the four cycle grades (quarterly) in 2013–2014 compared to students who received tutoring courses in 2014–2015 (different cohorts of students). The cycle grades in 2014–2015 improved from the previous year during each cycle, with an exception in Cycle II, where the passing rate was two percentage-point lower. Otherwise, the largest difference between the 2013–2014 cycle grades compared to the 2014–2015 cycle grades occurred during the third cycle where the passing rate was seven percentage-points higher.


Figure 3. Passing rate of elementary migrant students on the cycle grades, 2013–2015



Source: HISD Migrant Education Program Office

- **Figure 4** depicts the passing rate of secondary migrant students, who received the tutoring courses provided by MEP on the six cycle grades (6 weeks) in 2013–2014 and 2014–2015. The passing rates for all six cycles in 2014–2015 was higher than the previous year except in Cycle III and Cycle VI. The largest difference was in Cycle II which was 30 percentage-points higher in 2014–2015 than 2013–2014.

Figure 4. Passing rate of secondary migrant students on the cycle grades, 2013–2015




Source: HISD Migrant Education Program Office

- **Appendix B-Table 4, p. 26**, shows that there were decreases in the percentage of elementary migrant students who received tutoring and met the STAAR Level II: Satisfactory (Phase-In 1) standard on the English and Spanish STAAR reading tests from the previous year. The percentage decrease in reading was from 74 percent to 38 percent, while the percentage decrease in writing was from 76 percent to 33 percent. There was also a substantial decrease in the number of students tested. (Note. Due to the small number of students represented in the migrant sample, percentages are more likely to have large fluctuations from year to year.)
- The percentage of secondary migrant students who received tutoring and met the STAAR Level II: Satisfactory (Phase-In 1) standard on the English version of the STAAR reading EOC English I and II decreased from 71 percent to 25 percent from the previous year (**Appendix B-Table 5, p. 26**).

How did migrant students perform on the 2014–2015 Iowa Assessments and Logramos reading and mathematics subtests compared with their grade-level peers in the district?

- **Figures 5–8** included the performance comparison between migrant and district students on the Iowa Assessments and Logramos reading and mathematics subtests.
- Migrant students obtained lower mean NCE scores than the district on the 2014–2015 Iowa Assessments reading subtest for all grades. The mean NCE score differences between district and migrant students ranged from 5.8 NCEs (7th grade) to 28.3 NCEs (kindergarten) (Figure 5).


Figure 5. Mean NCE scores on the 2014–2015 Iowa reading subtest for migrant students by grade level.



Source: 2014–2015 Riverside- Iowa Assessments data file

- Migrant students obtained lower mean NCE scores than the district on the 2014–2015 Iowa Assessments mathematics subtest in kindergarten through grade 7, with an exception in grade 3. The greatest difference in mean NCE scores between migrant and district students was seen in kindergarten (M = 13.9 NCEs). The smallest NCE difference was seen in grade 7 (M = 0.9 NCEs) (Figure 6).
- The 3rd grade migrant students (M = 56.0) obtained a higher mean NCE score than the district (M = 54.3) on the 2014–2015 Iowa Assessments mathematics subtest (Figure 6).


Figure 6. Mean NCE scores on the 2014–2015 Iowa mathematics subtest for migrant students by grade level.



Source: 2014–2015 Riverside- Iowa Assessments data file

- Migrant students (1st grade through 4th grade) obtained lower mean NCE scores compared to the district on the 2014–2015 Logramos reading subtest (Figure 7). The largest difference between migrant students and the district was 4.4 NCEs in 1st grade.
- The kindergarten migrant students had a slightly higher mean NCE than the district on the Logramos reading subtest, 60.7 versus 59.7 (Figure 7).


Figure 7. Mean NCE scores on the 2014–2015 Logramos reading subtest for migrant students by grade level.



Source: 2014–2015 Riverside- Iowa Assessments data file

- The migrant students scored lower than the district on the Logramos mathematics subtest in all grades. The mean NCE score differences between district and migrant students in kindergarten to 4th grade ranged from 0.2 NCEs (kindergarten) to 11.8 NCEs (3rd grade) (Figure 8).
- The kindergarten migrant students mean NCE score (M = 59.0) was comparable to the district mean NCE (59.2) on the Logramos mathematics subtest (Figure 8).

Figure 8. Mean NCE scores on the 2014–2015 Logramos mathematics total for migrant students by grade level




Source: 2014–2015 Riverside- Iowa Assessments data file

How did migrant students perform on the 2014–2015 TELPAS compared with their grade-level peers in the district?

- **Figures 9 and 10** represent the level and gains of English proficiency as measured by TELPAS. The 2014–2015 TELPAS report included 155 students who had the migrant student designation.
- Figure 9 shows the percentage of migrant students assessed and rated on the four proficiency levels of the 2014–2015 TELPAS. A lower percentage of migrant students scored at the Advanced High level on the TELPAS as compared to all ELL students in the district who took TELPAS, 1 percent versus 9 percent for kindergarten to 2nd grade and 18 percent versus 29 percent for 3rd to 12th grades.
- A lower percentage of migrant ELL students scored at the Advanced level compared to the district for kindergarten to 2nd grade (10 percent versus 17 percent), while a higher percentage of migrant ELL students scored at the Advanced level compared to the district for 3rd to 12th grades (44 percent versus 38 percent) (Figure 9).
- A greater proportion of migrant ELL students scored at the Intermediate level compared to the district for Kindergarten to 2nd grade (38 percent versus 30 percent). Migrant ELL students in 3rd through 12th grades scored lower compared to the district (18 percent versus 24 percent).
- A higher percentage of migrant ELL students scored at the Beginning level compared to the district for all grades (50 percent versus 45 percent for kindergarten through 2nd grade; 20 percent versus 9 percent for 3rd to 12th grades) (Figure 9).
- Figure 10 shows migrant ELL students' gains on the 2014–2015 TELPAS, demonstrating gains in English language proficiency. Of primary interest is the percent of students tested who gained at least one proficiency level between their 2014 and 2015 tests.
- The percentage of migrant ELL students in kindergarten to 2nd grade who gained at least one level was 36 percent compared to 56 percent for the district on the TELPAS. Similarly, migrant ELL students


in 3rd through 12th grades, made less progress in English proficiency than did the district (36 percent versus 52 percent).

Figure 9. Percentage of ELL students at each proficiency level on the 2014–2015 TELPAS by grade level



Sources: Spring 2014 and 2015 TELPAS Summary Report

Figure 10. Percentage of ELL students who made gains in proficiency on the 2014–2015 TELPAS by grade level




Sources: Spring 2014 and 2015 TELPAS Summary Report

How did migrant students perform on the 2014–2015 English and Spanish STAAR reading and mathematics tests, and the STAAR end-of-course (EOC) tests compared with their grade-level peers in the district?

- **Figures 11–14** represent the performance comparison between migrant and district students on the 2014–2015 English and Spanish version STAAR reading and mathematics tests.
- The 3rd grade migrant students had a higher percentage of students who met the STAAR Level II: Satisfactory (Phase-In 1) standard compared to the district on the 2014–2015 English version of the STAAR reading test (Figure 11).
- A lower percentage of migrant students in 4th through 8th grades met the 2014–2015 STAAR Level II: Satisfactory (Phase-In 1) standard compared to the district (Figure 11).


Figure 11. Percentage of migrant students who met the STAAR Level II: Satisfactory (Phase-In 1) standard on the 2014–2015 English version STAAR reading test by grade level



Source: PEIMS, Pearson- 2014–2015 HISD STAAR data file

- A lower percentage of 5th, 6th, and 8th grade migrant students met the STAAR Level II: Satisfactory (Phase-In 1) standard compared to the district on the 2014–2015 English version of the STAAR mathematics test (Figure 12).
- A higher percentage of 3rd, 4th, and 7th grade migrant students met the Level II: Satisfactory (Phase-In 1) standard on the 2014–2015 English version of the STAAR test compared to the district (Figure 12).

Figure 12. Percentage of migrant students who met the STAAR Level II: Satisfactory (Phase-In 1) standard on the 2014–2015 English version STAAR mathematics test by grade level




Source: PEIMS, Pearson- 2014–2015 STAAR data file

- A lower percentage of 3rd grade migrant students met the 2014–2015 STAAR Level II: Satisfactory (Phase-In 1) standard on the Spanish version of the STAAR reading test compared to the district, while

4th grade migrant students had a higher percentage of students who met standards than did the district (Figure 13).


Figure 13. Percentage of migrant students who met the STAAR Level II: Satisfactory (Phase-In 1) standard on the 2014–2015 Spanish version STAAR reading test by grade level



Source: PEIMS, Pearson- 2014–2015 STAAR data file

- A lower percentage of 3rd and 4th grade migrant students met the 2014 STAAR Level II: Satisfactory (Phase-In 1) standard on the Spanish version of the STAAR mathematics test compared to the district (Figure 14).


Figure 14. Percentage of migrant students who met the STAAR Level II: Satisfactory (Phase-In 1) standard on the 2014–2015 Spanish version STAAR mathematics test by grade level



Source: PEIMS, Pearson- 2014–2015 STAAR data file, STAAR Summary Report

- **Figure 15a** depicts results for the 2014–2015 STAAR-EOC assessments. The percentages of migrant students who met the STAAR Level II: Satisfactory (Phase-In 1) standard or above on the English I and II, Algebra I, Biology, and U.S. History EOC exams are presented. Amounts in parentheses show the number of students tested. **Appendix B, Figure 15b, p. 27** displays the 2013–2014 STAAR EOC results.
- Migrant students passed EOC exams at a lower rate than the district on all subjects, except English II (Figure 15). Detailed passing rates can be found in **Appendix B, Table 6, p. 27**.

Figure 15a. Percentage of migrant students who met the STAAR EOC standard by subject, 2014–2015




Source: PEIMS, Pearson- 2014–2015 STAAR EOC data file, STAAR EOC Summary Report

What were migrant students’ graduation and dropout rates compared with their grade-level peers in the district?

- Graduation data are presented in **Figures 16, 17, and 18**.
- Figure 16 shows annual graduation rates (i.e., number of migrant students graduating in a given school year divided by the number of migrants enrolled in 12th grade in that same year). The migrant student annual graduation rate was 82.6 percent for 2013–2014, the most recent year for which data were available. This was an increase from the previous year’s annual graduation rate (81.8 percent).


Figure 16. Migrant student annual graduation rates, 2006–2007 to 2013–2014



Source: 2012 Migrant Report (2006–2011 results); 2012 and 2013 PEIMS, 2013 and 2014 Graduates data file (2013–2014 results)

- Figure 17 shows the percentage of migrant students receiving the Recommended High School Program (RHSP) or the Distinguished Achievement Program (DAP) advanced diplomas over the same time period. This measure is defined as the number of migrant students who graduated with either the RHSP or DAP certification, divided by the total number of migrant graduates in that year. Migrant students experienced a 42.9 percentage-point decrease in the number of students graduating with RHSP/DAP diplomas.


Figure 17. Percent of migrant students graduating with RHSP/DAP diplomas, 2006–2007 to 2013–2014



Source: 2013–2014 PBMAS

- **Figure 18** presents the longitudinal graduation rates of migrant and the district students. The formula for the longitudinal graduation rate is based on the graduation rate for the cohort of students who started in grade 9 and progressed through to grade 12 within four years. The rates presented are the federal calculations without exclusions. The reported longitudinal graduation rate for migrant students in the Class of 2014 was 78.3 percent compared to 78.6 percent for the district. The gap between migrant students and the district longitudinal graduation rates has decreased over time. There was a 10 percentage-point gap for the Class of 2012 to 3.6 percentage points for the Class of 2013 and 0.3 percentage points for the Class of 2014.


Figure 18. Migrant student longitudinal graduation rates compared with the district, Classes of 2012–2014 (without exclusions)



Source: 2013–2014 PBMAS

- Dropout rates are shown in **Figures 19** and **20**. **Figure 19** shows annual dropout rates for the migrant students and the district. Annual dropout rate is defined as the total number of migrant students in grades 9–12 dropping out in a given year divided by the total number of migrant students enrolled in grades 9–12 in that year. The annual dropout rate for migrant students was less than one percent compared to the district’s 3.9 percent dropout rate in 2013–2014.
- The annual dropout rate for migrant students has continuously decreased over the previous two academic years.

Figure 19. Migrant student annual dropout rates, 2011–2014




Source: 2013–2014 PBMAS

- **Figure 20** shows the longitudinal dropout rates from 2012–2014. The definition of longitudinal dropout rate is based on cohorts of students who began in grade nine and dropped out prior to graduation four years later. The rates presented use the federal calculations without exclusions. Results show that the longitudinal dropout rate for migrant students in the Class of 2014 (13.0) was higher than the district’s (12.5) by 0.5 percentage points.

While the longitudinal dropout rate for the district has remained about the same from 2012 to 2014, the migrant students’ longitudinal dropout rate has fluctuated with a 4.9 percentage-point decrease between the Class of 2012 and the Class of 2013 to a 2.3 percentage-point increase from the Class of 2013 to the Class of 2014.

Figure 20. Migrant student longitudinal dropout rates, Class of 2012 to Class of 2014 (without exclusions)



Source: 2013–2014 PBMAS

Discussion

The purpose of the Migrant Education Program is to design and support programs that help migrant students overcome the challenges of mobility, cultural and language barriers, social isolation, and other difficulties associated with a migratory lifestyle in order to succeed in school and to successfully transition to postsecondary education or employment. This report provides summary information on the accomplishments made by migrant students and MEP staff in HISD. Students in the HISD Migrant Education Program tend to perform below the district passing rate on most assessments. Additionally, results on the TELPAS for migrant ELL students who gained at least one proficiency level, demonstrating English acquisition, were lower than ELL students in the district. The previous evaluation of the HISD MEP program recommended that the program focus on improving the EOC results of migrant students. Migrant students passed the 2014–2015 EOC exams at a lower rate than the district on almost all subjects. Initiatives to increase EOC performance should continue to be addressed. The gap between migrant students' longitudinal graduation rate and the district's longitudinal graduation rate has narrowed; the two groups have a comparable graduation rate.

Based on the findings presented in this report, recommendations include building relationships with parents as early in the school year as possible through outreach, communication, and programs. The lack of returned surveys may be an indicator that parents do not feel connected, regardless of the benefits their children are receiving (Schofield, Alexander, Bangs, & Schauenburg, 2006). The program should harness the support of parents to increase student outcomes. Secondly, focusing on STAAR performance is important, including paying close attention to the student tutoring services. The performance of migrant students who received tutoring services had substantial decreases from 2013–2014 to 2014–2015. Finally, the program should continue to support ELL students as they have progressed in their English proficiency levels at lower rates compared to the district.

Reference

- DiCerbo, P. A. (2001). Why migrant education matters. *NCBE Issue Brief*, 8, 1-7.
- Green, P. E. (2003). The Undocumented: Educating the Children of Migrant Workers in America. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 27(1), 51–71. <http://doi.org/10.1080/15235882.2003.10162591>
- Kindler, A. L. (1994). Education of Migrant Children in the United States. *Directions in Language and Education*, 1(8). Retrieved from <http://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED394305>
- National Center for Farmworker Health; Inc. (2012). *Farmworker Health Factsheets: Child Labor in Agriculture*. Retrieved from http://www.ncfh.org/uploads/3/8/6/8/38685499/fs-child_labor.pdf
- No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, Pub. L. No. 107-110, 115 Stat. 1425 (2002). Retrieved July 20, 2015, from <http://www2.ed.gov/policy/elsec/leg/esea02/107-110.pdf>
- Salerno, A. (1991). Migrant Students Who Leave School Early: Strategies for Retrieval. ERIC Digest. Retrieved from <http://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED335179>
- Schofield, J. W., Alexander, K., Bangs, R., & Schauenburg, B. (2006). Migration Background, Minority-Group Membership and Academic Achievement Research Evidence from Social, Educational, and Developmental Psychology. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/239603301_Migration_Background_Minority_Group_Membership_and_Academic_Achievement_Research_Evidence_from_Social_Educational_and_Developmental_Psychology
- Texas Education Agency, Division of Migrant Education (2006). <http://www.tea.state.tx.us/nclb/migrant/>
- U.S. Department of Education (2002). “No Child Left Behind: A Desktop Reference.” U.S. Department of Education, Office of Elementary and Secondary Education.

Appendix A

MEP Recruitment Activities and Student Accounting Methods

Since the 1996–1997 school year, the migrant data specialist has used the New Generation System (NGS) to track migrant students and their families. Because federal funds are tied to the number of migrant students being served by a district, recruiting migrant families for participation in MEP became a top priority. The recruitment procedures included processing referral applications and verification of program eligibility. MEP recruiters issued a Certificate of Eligibility (COE) for each family who qualified for MEP services, and this certificate entitled a migrant student to three years of eligibility to participate in the program.

Throughout the year, HISD migrant recruitment specialists and community liaisons made telephone calls to family homes and local schools in an effort to find students who may have been eligible for services. All referrals came from family surveys, and were from within the district. Other recruitment efforts were made by distributing migrant fliers in the following venues: health fairs, health clinics, food pantries, community centers, public libraries, and apartment complexes.

Using these sources to identify potential program participants, phone calls were made to families to establish eligibility criteria. For families found to be eligible, an appointment was scheduled to fill out the COE. Home visits were also made to families with no home phone or working phone number, and COE's were completed if the family was eligible. For families not available at home, a door knocker was left for them to contact the migrant office, and the Chancery database was periodically checked for any new contact information.

To further assist with recruitment and identification efforts, the MEP staff utilizes a report identifying the late entry of former eligible migrant students previously enrolled in HISD. This daily report ascertains whether any former or current migrant students have entered the HISD school system. When children are identified, recruiters make contact with the family to determine whether a qualifying move has been made and the reason for the late entry.

The procedures required for verification of eligibility for migrant services have become more stringent as of 2012. Potentially eligible migrant families are identified through their responses during interviews with MEP staff. However, there is now increased emphasis on follow-up efforts to verify information provided during these screening sessions, for example in determining whether the family has or has not made a qualifying move. This extra level of screening was not rigorously enforced previously, and the additional oversight may have been a contributing factor in the decreased program enrollment since 2013–2014.

Appendix B

Table 1. Migrant Student Demographics, 2012–2015

Ethnicity	2012–2013		2013–2014		2014–2015	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Asian	0	0	0	0	0	0
African American	0	0	2	<1	0	0
Hispanic	549	99.1	414	98.3	367	98.4
White	3	<1	4	<1	4	1.1
Other	0	0	1	<1	2	<1
Program						
At-Risk	414	74.7	332	79.2	318	85.3
Economically Disadvantaged	550	99.3	418	99.3	365	97.9
Gifted/Talented	70	12.6	53	12.7	35	9.4
Limited English Proficient (LEP)	303	54.7	219	53.0	202	54.2
Special Education	35	6.3	27	5.9	25	6.7
Total	554	100	421	100	373	100

Source: PEIMS 2/16/15

Table 2. Identification and Recruitment Activities of the Migrant Recruitment Specialist and Community Liaisons, 2013–2015

Activities	No. of students 2013–2014	No. of students 2014–2015
Phone calls/Visits		
Eligible for MEP	78	116
Not eligible for MEP	182	317
Students recruited		
New	65	122
Previously identified	152	175
Certificates of eligibility	78	116
Total school supplies distributed		
Steeping Stones	13	10
Elementary School	235	202
Middle School	121	109
High School	128	111
Subtotal	497	432

Table 3: Number of Migrant Students Receiving Supplemental Benefits Through MEP During the Regular and Summer School Months, 2014–2015

2014–2015

Instructional Services	Regular	Summer
Distance Learning	15	0
Other Credit Accrual (MEP Funded)	1	0
Science	10	0
Stepping Stones	13	7
Technology Instruction	10	0
Tutorial Elementary	48	43
Tutorial Secondary	80	21
Other 1: Academic Mentoring	49	0
Other 2: Personal Graduation Planning (PGP), FAFSA/TAFSA	92	0
Other 3: Study Island	117	0
Support Services		
Clothing/Uniform Vouchers	420	0
School Supplies	432	0
Tools for Homework Assistance	3	0
Transportation	17	0
Other 1: Health Fair	36	0
Other 2: College Readiness Workshop	7	0
Other 3: College Tour	24	0

Table 4: STAAR Results for Elementary Students (3rd to 5th Grades) Who Received Tutoring and Met the STAAR Level II: Satisfactory (Phase-In 1) Standard, 2013–2015

Subject	2013–2014		2014–2015	
	n	%	n	%
Reading	39	74	26	38
Writing	17	76	3	33
Mathematics	23	65	0	n/a


Table 5. STAAR Results for Secondary Students (6th to 12th Grades) Who Received Tutoring and Met the STAAR Level II: Satisfactory (Phase-In 1) Standard, 2013–2015

Subject	2013–2014		2014–2015	
	n	%	n	%
Reading/ English I/English II	38	71	52	25
Writing	1	n/a	0	n/a
Mathematics/Algebra I	19	63	3	33
Science/Biology	14	50	0	n/a
Social Studies/U.S. History	3	n/a	0	n/a

Table 6: Percentage of migrant students who met the STAAR EOC Level II: Satisfactory, (Phase-in 1) standard by subject, 2014–2015

Subject	Group (n)	Failed (%)	Passed (%)
Algebra I	Migrant (24)	25	75
	HISD (12395)	21	79
Biology	Migrant (23)	26	74
	HISD (12399)	13	87
English I	Migrant (23)	57	43
	HISD (13334)	42	58
English II	Migrant (18)	33	67
	HISD (11884)	39	61
U.S. History	Migrant (25)	20	80
	HISD (10305)	12	88

Figure 15b. Percentage of migrant students who met the STAAR EOC standard by subject, 2013–2014



Source: 2013–2014 HISD Migrant Education Report