

EVALUATION REPORT

Migrant Education Program 2011-2012

**Illinois State Board of
Education**



**Prepared by:
META Associates
518 Old Santa Fe Trail, Suite #1-208
Santa Fe, NM 87505
duro1@aol.com**

January 2013

LIST OF ACRONYMS USED IN THE REPORT

ACCESS	Assessing Comprehension and Communication in English State-to-State
ALRC	Adult Learning Resource Center
CGI	Cognitive-Guided Instruction
CHP	Community Health Partnership of Illinois
CIG	Consortium Incentive Grant
CNA	Comprehensive Needs Assessment
CSPR	Consolidated State Performance Report
ECE	Early Childhood Education
EL	English Learner (also ELL for English Language Learner)
ESEA	Elementary and Secondary Education Act
ESL	English as a Second Language
FLAP	Farmworker and Landscaper Advocacy Project
H.S.	High School
ID&R	Identification and Recruitment
IEP	Individual Education Plan
IL	Illinois
IDES	Illinois Department of Employment Security
IMC	Illinois Migrant Council
IMERP	Illinois Migrant Education Resource Project
IMLAP	Illinois Migrant Legal Assistance Project
ISAT	Illinois Standards Achievement Test
ISBE	Illinois State Board of Education
LEA	Local Education Agency
MALDEF	Mexican-American Legal Defense and Education Fund
MASTERS	<u>M</u> athematics <u>A</u> chievement and <u>S</u> uccess <u>T</u> hrough <u>E</u> ngagement in <u>R</u> esources for Migrant <u>S</u> tudents
MSHS	Migrant and Seasonal Head Start
MEP	Migrant Education Program
MPO	Measureable Program Outcome
MSIX	Migrant Student Information Exchange
NASDME	National Association of State Directors of Migrant Education
NCLB	No Child Left Behind Act

NGS	New Generation System
NRG	Non-regulatory Guidance
OME	Office of Migrant Education
OSY	Out-of-School Youth
PD	Professional Development
PASS	Portable Assisted Study Sequence
PFS	Priority for Services
PSAE	Prairie State Achievement Examination
RIF	Reading is Fundamental
SDP	Service Delivery Plan
SEA	State Education Agency
SOSY	Solutions for Out-of-school Youth
STAAR	State of Texas Assessments of Academic Readiness
TAKS	Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills
TEA	Texas Education Agency
TEKS	Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills
TMIP	Texas Migrant Interstate Program
UT	University of Texas at Austin
WIC	Women, Infants, and Children Program

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Introduction	1
Evaluation Methodology	3
Evaluation Context	6
Program Description.....	6
Priority For Services	7
Program Implementation and Support Services	10
Student Services – Instruction	10
Suggestions for Improvement to Instructional Services	15
Student Services – Support.....	16
Parent Involvement.....	16
Interstate Coordination Activities	19
Staff Development.....	21
Results	32
Reading Results	32
Mathematics Results	36
School Readiness Results.....	39
High School Graduation	42
Recommendations	48
Program Outcomes	48
Program Implementation	50

Appendix A: Evaluation Forms
Appendix B: CPDU Survey Comments

Table of Exhibits

Exhibit 1	Number of Eligible Migrant Students 2008-09 to 2010-11	6
Exhibit 2	Number and Percent of PFS and LEP Students by Grade Level	8
Exhibit 3	Number of Students Served in the Regular and Summer Terms and Number and Percent of Served Students Who Were PFS	8
Exhibit 4	Staff Observations of Instructional Services	10
Exhibit 5	Parent Ratings of the Illinois MEP Services.....	12
Exhibit 6	Parent Observations of Growth in Student Skills	12
Exhibit 7	Instructional Focus for Secondary Students	13
Exhibit 8	Student Ratings of Secondary Workshop Goals.....	13
Exhibit 9	Overall Student Ratings of Secondary Workshop.....	14
Exhibit 10	Staff Ratings of Support Services.....	16
Exhibit 11	Statewide Parent Meetings and Trainings	17
Exhibit 12	Parent Ratings of MEP Activities for Parents.....	17
Exhibit 13	Parent Ratings of Parent Involvement Activities	18
Exhibit 14	Overall Parent Workshop Ratings	18
Exhibit 15	Staff Observations of Parental Involvement.....	19
Exhibit 16	MASTERS and SOSY Meetings and Conference Calls	20
Exhibit 17	Illinois MEP Professional Development Opportunities	21
Exhibit 18	Staff Ratings of Statewide MEP Workshop.....	22
Exhibit 19	Overall Ratings of the Statewide MEP Workshop.....	22
Exhibit 20	CPDU Ratings of Statewide Workshop.....	23
Exhibit 21	Staff Ratings of MASTERS Pre-Service Training	24
Exhibit 22	Knowledge Gained during Math Pre-service Training.....	24
Exhibit 23	Staff Ratings of Balanced Literacy Pre-Service Training	26
Exhibit 24	CPDU Ratings of Pre-service Training Overall	28
Exhibit 25	Ratings of Statewide Identification and Recruitment Training for New Recruiters...29	
Exhibit 26	Ratings of Statewide Identification and Recruitment Training for All Recruiters.....29	
Exhibit 27	Progress of Emerging Readers on the <i>Concepts about Print</i>	32
Exhibit 28	Students Gaining at Least One Level on the <i>Rigby or Fountas and Pinnel</i> Assessment	33
Exhibit 29	Sixth to Eighth Grade Student Gains on the Fluency Snapshot	33
Exhibit 30	Percent of Instructional Staff Reporting that Professional Development Supports Reading Instruction	34
Exhibit 31	Instructional Staff Ratings of Professional Development in Reading.....	34
Exhibit 32	Parents Reporting Growth in their Ability to Support their Child's Reading Success	34
Exhibit 33	Parent Ratings of Growth in Ability to Help Children with Reading	35
Exhibit 34	Reading Achievement Gap Between Migrant and All Students on the ISAT and PSAE.....	35

Exhibit 35	Student Results on MASTERS Math Assessments by Grade.....	36
Exhibit 36	Instructional Staff Reporting that Professional Development Supports Math Instruction.....	37
Exhibit 37	Instructional Staff Ratings of Professional Development in Mathematics.....	37
Exhibit 38	Mathematics Achievement Gap Between Migrant and All Students on the ISAT and PSAE.....	37
Exhibit 39	Parents Reporting Growth in their Ability to Support their Child's Math Success	38
Exhibit 40	Parent Ratings of Growth in Ability to Help Children with Mathematics	38
Exhibit 41	Parent Ratings of Growth in Ability to Help Children with Mathematics by Service .	39
Exhibit 42	Students Gaining on the MEP Early Childhood Assessment Reading Skills by Age	39
Exhibit 43	Student Results on the MEP Early Childhood Assessment by Reading Skill	40
Exhibit 44	Student Results on the MEP Early Childhood Assessment by Other Skill	40
Exhibit 45	Students Gaining on the MEP Early Childhood Assessment Math Skills by Age	40
Exhibit 46	Student Results on the MEP Early Childhood Assessment by Math Skill	41
Exhibit 47	ECE Instructional Staff Reporting Professional Development Supports Young Children's Learning	41
Exhibit 48	ECE Instructional Staff Ratings of Professional Development	41
Exhibit 49	Parents Reporting Growth in their Ability to Support Young Children's Learning	42
Exhibit 50	Parent Ratings of Growth in Ability to Support Young Children's Learning	42
Exhibit 51	Overall Change in Percent of Courses Completed for High School Graduation.....	43
Exhibit 52	Change in Percent of Courses Completed for High School Graduation from 2010 to 2012	43
Exhibit 53	Illinois Migrant Student High School Graduation Rates	44
Exhibit 54	Instructional Staff Reporting Professional Development Helped Them Support High School Students	44
Exhibit 55	Instructional Staff Ratings of Professional Development for Supporting H.S. Students.....	45
Exhibit 56	Change in the Percent of OSY Participating in Instructional Services.....	45
Exhibit 57	Students Making Progress toward their Instructional/Learning Goals	46
Exhibit 58	Student Participation in Secondary Services (N=58)	46
Exhibit 59	Parents Reporting Growth in their Ability to Support their Child's Learning and Post-Secondary Objectives	46
Exhibit 60	Distribution of Growth in Parents' Ability to Support their Child's Learning and Post-Secondary Objectives	47
Exhibit 61	Distribution of Growth in Parents' Ability to Support their Child's Learning and Post-Secondary Objectives by Service.....	47

1

Introduction

This report presents findings related to the delivery of Migrant Education Program (MEP) services for the 2011-12 school year including the summer months. Administered by the Illinois State Board of Education (ISBE), the MEP assists schools in helping migrant learners meet State expectations for achievement that may be negatively impacted by students' frequent migration and interrupted schooling.

The educational and supportive services needs of migrant children and youth in Illinois were identified through the comprehensive needs assessment (CNA). Further, the Illinois MEP designed a service delivery plan (SDP) outlining how the program would meet the needs identified. The evaluation of the extent to which goals were met is defined through 20 measureable program outcomes (MPOs) in four categories: reading achievement, mathematics achievement, school readiness, and high school graduation. In addition to a results evaluation, the implementation of program services was evaluated through staff, parent, and student surveys.

A total of 1,709 migrant children **ages 3-21** were identified in 2011-12, with a duplicated count of 634 participating in the regular term and 800 participating in the summer. (Note: These figures will be used in tables throughout the report as the number of students identified, although the grand total of 1,835 eligible migrant students includes children from birth to 2 years old). Because the funds provided to migrant programs may not be sufficient to provide services to all students, the MEP identifies those who have a priority for services according to the Federal definition. A total of 362 students (24%) in grades K-12 and out-of-school youth (OSY) were identified as having the highest priority.

The MEP implements a variety of instructional and support programs designed to meet the needs of migrant students including supplemental instructional services during the regular school year, summer school programs, secondary credit accrual opportunities, parent involvement activities and meetings, and professional development for staff designed to increase teachers' abilities to provide high quality instruction.

As displayed in the summary chart below, the Illinois MEP met 14 of its 19 MPOs for which progress was measured in 2011-12. Baseline was established for MPO 4(e). Recommendations for improvement are provided in Section 6 of this report and are based on student achievement results, surveys, site observations, and interviews.

MPO	Target met?	Evidence
1a: 75% of students participating in a summer program for at least 3 weeks who are identified as Emerging Readers on the Concepts About Print will demonstrate a gain of at least four points.	No	56% of students assessed gained 4+ points
1b: 75% of students participating in a summer program for at least 3 weeks who are identified as Beginning Readers through 5th Grade Readers on the Rigby will demonstrate a gain of at least one level.	Yes	79% of students gained 1+ levels

MPO	Target met?	Evidence
1c: 75% of students participating in a summer program for at least 3 weeks who are identified as Readers in grades 6-8 assessed with the Fluency Snapshot will demonstrate a gain of at least five words per minute.	Yes	82% of students assessed gain 5+ words per minute
1d: 85% of migrant instructional teachers and aides, administrators, and instructional coaches will report on a PD survey that MEP-sponsored PD in reading has helped them to more effectively support high quality reading instruction.	Yes	99% reported support
1e: 90% of migrant parents surveyed will report growth in their ability to support their child's reading success.	Yes	91% reported growth
1f: The reading achievement gap between migrant students attending school in an Illinois school district with a migrant program and all students in the same districts on the IL State reading assessment will be reduced by at least 1%.	Yes	Gap was reduced by 1%
2a: 80% of the students who attend migrant summer school for at least 3 weeks will show improvement in math assessments for their grade level.	Yes	80% made gains
2b: 85% of migrant instructional teachers and aides, administrators, and instructional coaches will report on a PD survey that MEP-sponsored PD in math has helped them to more effectively support high quality mathematics instruction.	Yes	96% reported support
2c: The math achievement gap between migrant students attending school in an Illinois school district with a migrant program and all students in the same districts on the IL State math assessment will be reduced by at least 1%.	No	Gap increased by 3%
2d: 90% of migrant parents surveyed will report growth in their ability to support their child's learning in mathematics.	No	83% reported growth
3a: 80% of all preschool migrant students participating for at least 3 weeks in summer school programs will show gains in language/literacy as measured by an appropriate language/literacy assessment.	Yes	93% made gains
3b: 80% of all preschool migrant students participating for at least 3 weeks in summer school programs will show statistically significant gains in mathematics as measured by an appropriate mathematics assessment.	Yes	97% made gains
3c: 85% of migrant ECE teachers and aides, administrators, and instructional coaches will report on a PD survey that MEP-sponsored PD has helped them to more effectively support young children's learning.	Yes	98% reported support
3d: 90% of migrant parents surveyed will report growth in their ability to support their young child's learning at home.	Yes	90% reported growth
4a: The percentage of high school migrant students enrolled in summer migrant credit-bearing programs who successfully complete course(s) required for high school graduation will increase by at least 1%.	Yes	Completion rate increased by 7%
4b: The percentage of IL migrant students who graduate from high school in districts with migrant programs will increase by at least 1%.	No	Graduation rate decreased by 7%
4c: 90% of migrant secondary teachers and aides, administrators, and instructional coaches working with secondary-aged students will report on a PD survey that MEP-sponsored PD has helped them to more effectively provide services to HS-aged students	Yes	94% reported support
4d: The percentage of identified OSY who participate in instructional services will increase by 5%.	Yes	Participation increased by 13%
4e: The percentage of secondary students (both those attending a home-based program and those in a center-based program for at least 3 weeks) who make progress toward their instructional/learning goals will increase by 5%	N/A	Baseline set
4f: 90% of migrant parents surveyed will report growth in the ability to support their secondary-aged child's pursuit of learning and post-secondary objectives.	No	75% reported growth

In addition to this brief introduction, the evaluation report contains five sections: (1) evaluation methodology, outlining the purpose and design of the evaluation; (2) evaluation context, describing the processes in place through which the State developed service strategies to ensure that funds were allocated and used appropriately; (3) program implementation and support services, examining the extent to which services were implemented as planned and with which groups of students; (4) results, analyzing the results of State assessments and other data to address the State's measureable program outcomes; and (5) recommendations, providing suggestions for improvement strategies that will help the State meet all MPOs.

2

Evaluation Methodology

In 1966, Congress included language in the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) to help the children of migrant farmworkers and establish the Office of Migrant Education (OME). Currently, programs provide supplemental instruction and support services to children of migratory workers and fishers in nearly all of the States. These programs must comply with Federal mandates as specified in Title I, Part C of the ESEA.

The ESEA governs all Federally-funded educational programs. The reauthorization language of this law was built on more than 40 years of experience in implementing and evaluating programs designed to improve educational achievement for economically disadvantaged, migratory, English learners (ELs) and other students in at-risk situations. The ESEA requires districts to provide comprehensive services through the coordination of and collaboration with locally- and federally-funded programs.

Supplementary MEP funds must be used to meet the identified needs of migrant children as well as meet the intent and purpose of the MEP. These migrant funds must supplement and not supplant other local and State funding.

The State of Illinois has established high academic standards for all students and holds the Illinois public education system accountable for providing all students with a high quality education that enables them to achieve their full potential. The Illinois standards support Title I, Part C, section 1301 of the ESEA for the Education of Migratory Children to ensure that migrant students have the opportunity to meet the same challenging State content standards and challenging State student performance standards that all children are expected to meet.

Section 1001 of ESEA further states, “The Congress declares it to be the policy of the United States that a high-quality education for all individuals and a fair and equal opportunity to obtain that education are societal good, are a moral imperative, and improve the life of every individual, because the quality of our lives ultimately depends on the quality of the lives of others.”

States are required to evaluate the effectiveness of the MEP and to provide guidance to their local projects on how to conduct local evaluations. In its most recent *Non-Regulatory Guidance* (October 2010), OME indicates that evaluations allow SEAs and local operating agencies to:

1. determine whether the program is effective and document its impact on migrant children;
2. improve program planning by comparing the effectiveness of different types of interventions;
3. determine the degree to which projects are implemented as planned and identify problems that are encountered in program implementation; and
4. identify areas in which children may need different MEP services.

To achieve these results, OME requires that State education agencies (SEA) conduct an evaluation that examines both program implementation and program results. In evaluating program *implementation*, the State should answer questions such as:

- Was the project implemented as described in the approved project application? If not, what changes were made?
- What worked in the implementation of the MEP?
- What problems did the project encounter?
- What improvements should be made?

In looking at program *results*, OME requires that a program's actual performance be compared to "*measurable outcomes established by the MEP and State's performance targets, particularly for those students who have priority for service.*"

To investigate the effectiveness of its efforts to serve migrant children and improve services based on comprehensive and objective results, the Illinois MEP conducted an implementation and outcome evaluation of its MEP.

Sources of data for this evaluation report include observations by MEP staff; mobility, participation, and demographic data from the New Generation System (NGS); a summary participation and outcomes data from reporting forms completed by State MEP staff; surveys completed by MEP staff, migrant parents, and migrant students; and student assessment results. The goals of the evaluation are to:

- review services to ensure that they were implemented as intended;
- document the success of services for program validation;
- analyze information to identify the strengths of services and the areas targeted for improvement; and
- report the results of the evaluation to the Illinois State Board of Education staff to disseminate to policy makers and decision makers.

This evaluation report provides summary information on the accomplishments made by students and MEP staff in Illinois. These accomplishments were reviewed in light of the MPOs outlined by the State MEP in its Service Delivery Plan and carried through to local program applications and services.

The evaluation of services to migrant students looks at both formative and summative data. The *formative* phase of the evaluation examines the planning and implementation of services based on the progress that has been made toward meeting performance objectives. The *summative* evaluation phase examines the demographics of the Illinois MEP; the dimensions of migrant student, parent, and staff participation; and student achievement, program accomplishments, and other outcomes attained through delivering services through the Illinois MEP.

An external evaluation firm, META Associates, was contracted to help ensure objectivity in evaluating the Illinois MEP, to examine the effectiveness of services, and to make recommendations to help the State improve the quality of the services provided to Illinois migrant students. To evaluate the services, the external evaluators and/or project staff were responsible for:

- maintaining and reviewing interview records, logs, attendance sign-in sheets, meeting notes, and other anecdotal evaluation tools;
- reviewing student achievement data and other outcomes; and
- preparing an evaluation report to provide information about the extent to which program processes such as migrant student ID&R, the comprehensive needs assessment, professional development, and the activities described in the Illinois SDP were implemented as planned. Student outcomes and achievement related to content and performance standards are also included in the annual report.

Data analysis includes descriptive statistics using means and frequencies; trend analysis identifying substantial trends in the data summarized according to notable themes; and analyses of representative self-reported anecdotes about successful program features and aspects of the program needing improvement.

3

Evaluation Context

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Students were served in regular and summer term programs that emphasize reading and literacy skills, math skills, English language development, technology skills, and credit accrual for high school students. In addition, the MEP provides services to seek parent input on the design, implementation, and effectiveness of programs and provides activities designed to help parents become more involved in their children’s education.

There are four sites that operate both regular and summer term programs; two operate in the regular term only; and six sites operate in the summer only. In addition, an MEP health project serves migrant students statewide during the summer. The Illinois Migrant Council (IMC) runs a number of sites both during the regular and summer terms in Springfield, Spring Valley, Lawrenceville, Keenes, Normal, and Family Literacy in Cobden and Kankakee. IMC sites are a combination of site-based and home-based instructional and support services. One of the summer projects, Parkland Community College, is a mobile project that brings teachers to work with students in their homes, old motels, and other places in rural areas that are close to where migrant families reside during their seasonal agricultural work. In total, there are 14 sites with summer and/or regular term migrant programs across the State.

According to the IMC website, there are an estimated 3,223 farms, orchards or nurseries that employ seasonal agricultural workers whose children may qualify for the program. They estimate that 20,800 farmworkers will seek agricultural jobs in the State in the coming year, down from 32,000 in previous years (www.illinoismigrant.org accessed 12/20/11). Types of agricultural work include seasonal activities related to the harvest/cultivation of apples, peaches, cabbage, cantaloupes, bell peppers, pumpkins, corn, tomatoes, soybeans, asparagus, leaf lettuce, onions, beans, spinach, squash, berries, chives, radishes, and others.

A total of 634 students participated in regular term programs and 800 participated in summer programs (note that children may participate both terms or just one or the other). A total of 1,709 students **ages 3-21** were identified and determined eligible for services. According to summer and regular term participation records, most services were provided in the summer months to highly mobile migrant students who are in the state for agricultural activities that occur between June and October. Exhibit 1 provides a breakdown by grade of the number and percent of students identified by year. The number of children identified has decreased each year which aligns with the decrease in the number of farmworkers seeking agricultural work in Illinois.

Exhibit 1
Number of Eligible Migrant Students 2008-09 to 2010-11

Grade	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12
PK 3-5	274	248	228	217
K	132	104	85	91
1	137	133	100	111
2	112	122	113	81

Grade	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12
3	127	106	90	95
4	99	115	89	76
5	101	93	89	87
6	101	102	99	99
7	113	109	90	90
8	117	101	87	104
9	134	144	116	122
10	107	107	112	107
11	97	83	98	93
12	41	54	29	50
OSY	302	298	310	286
Total	1,994	1,919	1,735	1,709

PRIORITY FOR SERVICES

The Illinois MEP collects information during the identification and recruitment process and the needs assessment process to determine students who have the highest priority for services. In accordance with ESEA, Section 1304(d), MEPs in Illinois must give **Priority for Service (PFS)** to migrant children:

- Who are failing, or most at risk of failing, to meet the State's content and performance standards; and
- Whose education has been interrupted during the regular school year.

Students are considered to be failing or at risk of failing if they meet one or more of the following criteria:

- Failed to meet State standards on State reading and/or math assessments (including students who were enrolled during the test window but were absent, exempt, not tested, or not scored);
- Limited English proficient;
- Over-age for grade (i.e., student is older--2+ years--than a typical student in that grade);
- Retained in grade;
- Failed one or more core high school courses;
- Out-of-school youth; and
- Special education student.

Failure to meet State standards may come from assessment results in mathematics and reading on the Illinois State assessments: Illinois Standards Achievement Test (ISAT), Prairie State Achievement Examination (PSAE), or Assessing Comprehension and Communication in English State-to-State for English learners (ACCESS for ELLs). Standardized assessment results from another state (i.e., TAKS and STAAR scores in NGS) may be used as well; however, State assessment results from other states must be verified through an online records transfer system such as NGS.

The PFS criteria have to occur during the current school year or within the previous school year. Two key factors that determine interruption of education during the regular school year are:

- The interruption has to occur within the preceding 12 months. Moves occurring during the summer are not considered an interruption of services.
- The interruption has to relate to the migrant lifestyle.

A total of 362 (24%) of the students in Kindergarten through 12th grade and OSY were identified as PFS. Percentages by grade level ranged from 16% for OSY and in ninth grade to 40% in the twelfth grade. The percent of students identified as LEP ranged from 13% of OSY to 45% of kindergarteners. (Note that the percent of OSY considered LEP is likely an under count due to the challenges inherent in assessing this population. See the Recommendations Section for ways in which this could be addressed.) Exhibit 2 displays the break down by grade level of the number and percent of PFS students and LEP students.

**Exhibit 2
Number and Percent of PFS and LEP Students by Grade Level**

Grade	Total	# PFS	% PFS	LEP	% LEP
K	91	17	19%	41	45%
1	111	37	33%	39	35%
2	81	27	33%	34	42%
3	95	33	35%	33	35%
4	76	25	33%	28	37%
5	87	24	28%	29	33%
6	99	18	18%	27	27%
7	90	30	33%	28	31%
8	104	19	18%	14	13%
9	122	19	16%	12	10%
10	107	29	27%	12	11%
11	93	19	20%	14	15%
12	50	20	40%	8	16%
OSY	286	45	16%	36	13%
Total	1,492	362	24%	355	24%

Overall, 634 students participated in the regular term and 800 students participated in the summer. The larger number of students served in the summer is due to the fact that many migrant students travel to Illinois in the summer months for agricultural work and leave when work is finished in September or October. A total of 195 PFS students in grades K-12 and OSY participated in the regular term and 158 PFS students participated in summer term services.

Of the students served in the regular term, 31% were PFS, and 20% were PFS in the summer term. (Note that preschool students are not considered PFS in Illinois because they do not have interrupted schooling as they have not yet entered school. Of the students served who were age-eligible for school, 36% were PFS in the regular term and 23% were PFS in the summer.)

Exhibit 3 shows participation in supportive or instructional services by grade level for all students and the number and percent of those served who were PFS.

**Exhibit 3
Number of Students Served in the Regular and Summer Terms
and Number and Percent of Served Students Who Were PFS**

Grade	Participating Regular Term	PFS Participating Regular Term		Participating Summer	PFS Participating Summer	
		N	%		N	%
Ages 0-2	19	--	--	7	--	--
Ages 3-5	80	--	--	98	--	--
K	42	18	43%	60	19	32%
1	49	17	35%	49	15	31%

Grade	Participating Regular Term	PFS Participating Regular Term		Participating Summer	PFS Participating Summer	
		N	%		N	%
2	37	15	41%	40	9	23%
3	41	18	44%	49	12	24%
4	39	17	44%	48	11	23%
5	36	14	39%	50	11	22%
6	33	13	39%	41	11	27%
7	35	14	40%	42	11	26%
8	30	8	27%	43	10	23%
9	27	10	37%	47	11	23%
10	34	9	26%	50	10	20%
11	24	10	42%	41	9	22%
12	18	10	56%	4	2	50%
OSY	90	22	24%	131	17	13%
Total	634	195	31%	800	158	20%

*PFS percent participating excludes children ages 3-5 because preschool children, by definition, cannot have interrupted schooling.

4

Program Implementation and Support Services

This section provides a description of the instructional and support services provided by MEPs across Illinois as well as staff, parent, and student perceptions of their effectiveness. The implementation of the services was examined for effectiveness through open-ended questions on surveys, survey ratings, and an examination of data available on students served and types of activities provided. Results of services provided as they pertain to the MPOs are found in Section 5: Results. Recommendations for improvement based on this analysis are included in Section 6: Recommendations.

STUDENT SERVICES – INSTRUCTION

Student services include instructional services provided by teachers and paraprofessionals in various settings such as in-class tutoring, after school programs, and summer school. Summer services were generally delivered via site-based programs, but home-based services also were offered to reach children/youth in more isolated locations or where numbers were too few to warrant a site-based program. High school graduation services include credit accrual, test preparation, English language development, and post-secondary preparation and planning.

MEP staff rated reading instruction, math instruction, ESL instruction, and the overall effectiveness of services in meeting students' academic needs on a four-point scale (with "4" being high). All items received high ratings with more than 89% to 96% of respondents agreeing by checking "a lot" or "very much." Mean ratings ranged from 3.4 on improvements in English proficiency to 3.6 on improvements in math skills. Exhibit 4 displays the breakdown by item and response for each of the areas surveyed.

Exhibit 4
Staff Observations of Instructional Services

Item	N	Not at All	Somewhat	A lot	Very much	Mean
Instruction provided by the MEP helped students improve their reading skills .	87	0 (0%)	4 (5%)	37 (43%)	46 (53%)	3.5
Instruction provided by the MEP helped students improve their math skills .	86	0 (0%)	4 (5%)	26 (30%)	56 (65%)	3.6
Migrant English language learners (ELLs) improved their English proficiency .	82	0 (0%)	9 (11%)	29 (35%)	44 (54%)	3.4
The Illinois MEP was effective in meeting the academic needs of migrant students.	92	1 (1%)	6 (7%)	30 (33%)	55 (60%)	3.5

Staff responded to an open ended question on the Staff Survey of Project Effectiveness: "In what way was the Illinois MEP most beneficial to migrant students?" Most often mentioned as beneficial was the use of individualized and small group instruction to improve reading and math skills. Staff also commented that summer programs helped students maintain skills for the regular term that are typically forgotten over the summer. Some staff commented that

secondary students gained a better understanding of post-secondary options. Representative comments follow.

- The program afforded migrant students an opportunity to work in smaller groups and receive individualized instruction.
- The program helped them make connections and not lose information gained during their regular school year.
- It gave migrant students a chance to feel special and receive individualized attention to help each child specifically in the area needed for improvement academically.
- The program provided the skills in math and literacy needed in and outside school. In addition it helped them socialize with their peers on a daily basis.
- It provides many opportunities to involve students and parents in math and learning through games.
- OSY were able to get some basic English courses and continue to work at the same time.
- The curriculum is very comprehensive. Reading and math skills and strategies have been taught and students have been given the opportunity to apply these skills through the unit lessons.
- Our curriculum provided the students with rich learning opportunities in both math and literacy and helped incorporate various uses of technology in the classroom which made students' experience very enjoyable.
- Their reading skills improved from beginning to end.
- The program helped build a bridge between teachers, students, and parents. It helped improve students' literacy and math skills.
- The item analysis helped to target individuals' needs. The follow-up games were a fun way to work with the math skills.
- Secondary students were encouraged to attend college with the visit to ISU.
- They have made available every resource to facilitate instruction for high school students and have helped them with credit accrual.
- The program assisted students with classwork they may have missed during the regular school year.
- TV lessons reviewed a lot and continued to add on from week to week.
- The math program (DVD) was very beneficial to the migrant students. Also, they enjoyed snack fractions very much.
- The home-based instruction and consistent meeting times with the elementary teacher were most beneficial. The accompanying educational trips to the library for literacy-based academic support were not only popular but helped to augment the program/MASTERS curriculum goals.

Seventy-six percent of the parents responding to the Parent Survey rated the overall services ("How would you rate the services provided by the IL MEP summer program?") as very good (see Exhibit 5) with a mean of 3.7 on the four-point scale.

Exhibit 5
Parent Ratings of the Illinois MEP Services

Item	N	Poor	Fair	Good	Very Good	Mean
How would you rate the services provided by the Illinois migrant education summer program?	111	0 (0%)	2 (2%)	25 (23%)	84 (76%)	3.7

Parents rated their perception of the extent to which their children improved their reading skills as a result of the summer program. This item was rated high (3.3) on the four-point scale. Exhibit 6 displays the distribution of parent ratings of growth in student reading skills.

Exhibit 6
Parent Observations of Growth in Student Skills

Item	N	Not at all	Very little	Some	Very Much	Mean
Has your child improved his/her reading skills as a result of the summer program?	111	5 (5%)	11 (10%)	42 (38%)	53 (48%)	3.3

Parents responded to an open ended question on the Parent Survey: “How did the IL MEP help your child succeed in school?” The most common response was appreciation for the program through comments such as “It is very good” and “Thank you.” In addition, many parents commented that they saw improvements in their children’s reading, math, and English skills. Several parents noted that they saw changes not only in skills but also in children’s affect toward education and used phrases such as “increased confidence” and “more motivated.” Representative comments follow.

- The program is very good. Thank you for the help and support.
- Children have gained confidence and they learn a lot and improve at the school.
- They have gained math and reading skills.
- My child is more motivated to learn math.
- They have learned more English and grown a lot.
- My child learned to write his name, numbers, and colors. I am very satisfied with the program. I have seen a lot of growth in his learning in just one month.
- The program helped with math in a lot of ways, especially in solving the math problems during the lessons.
- I’ve seen an increase in their knowledge and participation.
- The program has helped with getting high school credits.
- The program has helped them stay in school.
- It’s helped prepare them for the State test.
- I am so proud of what my children have accomplished and very happy with the program.
- The program is good because they spend more time with learning and less time watching TV.
- He saw that learning was easy and fun and that made him want to learn more.
- They learn more and are better prepared for the coming school year.

Site directors in Beardstown, Hoopston, Kankakee, Mendota, ROE 47, Princeville, and Urbana completed a Secondary Services Plan with secondary students participating in summer programs. Staff recorded the instructional focus for each student and the materials used.

A total of 58 plans were completed and instructional foci most used were high school credit accrual (in 60% of the plans), career awareness (57%), and post-secondary preparation (48%). Included under other instructional focus were preparation for science assessments, and basic reading, writing, and math instruction. Exhibit 7 displays the number and percent of plans that included each instructional focus.

**Exhibit 7
Instructional Focus for Secondary Students**

Instructional Focus	Count	Percent (unique count=58)
High School Credit Accrual	35	60%
Career Awareness	33	57%
Post-secondary Preparation	28	48%
ESL	19	33%
Other	17	29%
TAKS/STAAR Preparation and Testing	3	5%
Middle School Course	2	3%
Life Skills	1	2%
Total (duplicated count)	138	

Secondary Student Workshop

A Migrant Secondary Student Workshop was held at Heartland Community College in Normal, IL on July 14, 2012 in conjunction with a statewide parent workshop. The workshop was designed to help participating students build connections with their peers, make plans for the future, learn about applying to college, and learn about financial aid for post-secondary education. Sessions for students included “Achieving College Success” and campus tours. Twenty students completed a workshop evaluation where they indicated the extent to which they learned about the major topics during the workshop. As displayed in Exhibit 8, mean ratings ranged from 2.4 to 2.7 on the three-point scale.

**Exhibit 8
Student Ratings of Secondary Workshop Goals**

Item	N	Not at all	Somewhat	Very Much	Mean
I met other migrant students from across the State.	19	1 (5%)	10 (53%)	8 (42%)	2.4
I learned about planning for the future.	17	1 (6%)	3 (18%)	13 (76%)	2.7
I learned about applying to college.	18	0 (0%)	7 (39%)	11 (61%)	2.6
I learned about applying for financial aid and scholarships.	18	1 (6%)	6 (33%)	11 (61%)	2.6
I would like to attend another workshop like this one.	18	2 (11%)	5 (28%)	11 (61%)	2.5

As displayed in Exhibit 9, students rated the overall workshop on a five-point scale and assigned a mean rating of 4.1.

Exhibit 9 Overall Student Ratings of Secondary Workshop

Item	N	Just OK (3)	Very Good (4)	Excellent (5)	Mean
Overall, the workshop was...	20	6 (30%)	7 (35%)	7 (35%)	4.1

Students were asked to list the things they liked most about the workshop with most indicating they appreciated the information about post-secondary options. Representative comments follow.

- The tour
- The talk about scholarships
- How to apply for scholarships
- I liked the school, the programs, and everything about it
- Applying for college, financial aid
- The sessions and the exploration
- When he explained how much money the college and university cost. And what we need about everything
- Being with youth from other states
- The line game
- I liked everything
- The opportunities
- That I was taught how many years you have to work in college
- Planning for the college
- I like when we play the game

It's good that parents and children are oriented and that they learn that education is very important in life.

- Student at the
Secondary Workshop

Students were asked what aspects of the workshop they liked the least. Comments varied but a suggestion of note is that one student said “It was too short and I would like there to be more information for OSY.” With OSY in attendance, this comment emphasizes that differentiating for participant needs is important.

To gain a better sense of the needs of students and the topics they would like to see addressed, participants were surveyed regarding additional topics they would like to see covered in future workshops. Representative comments follow.

- Science careers
- Medical careers
- Law school
- Technical careers
- Business degrees
- Immigration
- College prices, paying for college, financial aid

SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT TO INSTRUCTIONAL SERVICES

Staff, parents, and students were asked to provide suggestions for making improvements to the Illinois MEP services. A trend for surveys completed in 2012 was instructional staff requesting renewed focus on identification and recruitment, including providing all migrant staff with information about eligibility. Other common suggestions dealt with specific instructional strategies and needs that may be particular to some sites. Below are specific suggestions made by **staff**.

- We need to continue to focus on finding all qualified students. (5)
- An RV for outreach programs would decrease time needed for travel. (2)
- Everyone in the migrant program needs to understand something about eligibility so that we can refer recruiters to families we meet.
- Our students are not very engaged in the math videos.
- Extend the program two more weeks at least [from a four-week summer program].
- It would be good to emphasize to the parents the importance of keeping the child coming to class on a daily basis so the gains can be better or more beneficial to them.
- Parents should be more involved in the program.
- Add cultural enrichment as well as academic enrichment.
- Resources should be available for OSY as they are needed.
- I would like to see fewer tests and more time dedicated to the students.
- There should be more than two family math activities. There were just the ones during and at the end of the program.
- More games and hands-on activities for the older grades.
- Focus the writing activities more. It felt rushed to put six different styles in the curriculum.
- Hire bilingual teachers who can help the recent arrivals more effectively.
- Offer more literacy skills in the students' native languages
- Be realistic on time frame to cover the curriculum or precut a pre-K curriculum. Curriculum could be copied and sorted so teachers and aides don't waste time.
- The MEP needs to design a personal instruction program based on the pretest and the longitudinal information gathered for each student.
- Consider allowing students to be placed at ability levels for reading and math as opposed to grade specific.
- I appreciate the fact that our specialists who present at the statewide trainings are available to help with overall program needs while at the same time willing and able to direct and provide workshops, trainings, and/or educational materials for small groups or even for a specific student's needs. I hope that the services will continue to have the opportunity to stay abreast of current and useful practices so that the professionals and continue to pass on the invaluable information to use as we work with the families.

When **parents** were asked to provide suggestions for improving the program, most indicated that no changes were needed. Of those parents who had suggestions, the common thread was increased communication between the schools and parents through progress reports for their children and personal communication. Representative comments follow.

- Nothing—it is a good program. (40 responses)
- I hope the program will always continue.
- Provide a place where parents can volunteer. I wanted to volunteer and I never received a response.
- Parents should be more involved in the projects with the children.
- More communication between parents and program staff.
- It would be good for parents to observe some of the classes to see how our children behave.
- I believe the staff is doing a good job and always finding new ways to improve.
- The program could find more migrants with more communication with other agencies.
- I would like to see them work a little more on reading.
- I would like to know more about how they did during the summer school, like with a grade or an explanation of how they did.
- Maybe have an hour during parent night to inform parents how well each of their children did during school.

STUDENT SERVICES – SUPPORT

The Illinois MEP, in conjunction with local service agencies and community programs, provides services to families to facilitate the learning of migrant children. Services include medical and dental screenings, nutrition, referrals, transportation, and other services that are directed at meeting the identified needs of migrant children.

MEP staff responded to a survey about support services indicating the extent to which they believed supportive services contributed to the academic success of migrant children. Over 90% of respondents indicated that the supportive and supplemental services contributed to the academic success of migrant students by assigning a rating of “a lot” or “very much.” The mean rating on a four-point scale was 3.5. Exhibit 10 displays the breakdown of staff ratings.

Exhibit 10
Staff Ratings of Support Services

Item	N	Not at all	Somewhat	A lot	Very much	Mean
Supportive and supplemental services contributed to the academic success of migrant students.	92	0 (0%)	5 (5%)	32 (35%)	55 (60%)	3.5

PARENT INVOLVEMENT

Parent involvement and training opportunities at the State level include the Statewide Bilingual Parent Summit, State Parent Advisory Group, local Parent Advisory Group meetings for year-round project sites, and the State Migrant Parent Workshop. At the local level, each funded MEP agrees to provide two local parent workshops (one of which may include sending parents to the State Migrant Parent Workshop). In addition MEPs are working with partners to provide parent involvement opportunities.

In Cobden and Kankakee, family literacy is operated by the IL Migrant Council and focuses on interactive literacy activities with parents and children as well as parent education. In the case of

Cobden, joint parent workshops are routinely planned and conducted during the season by the local MEP (ROE #2), Migrant and Seasonal Head Start, and IMC Family Literacy. Activities offered at several sites across the State include those listed below.

- Parent/teacher conferences to review students' learning activities and outcomes;
- Family math nights that include curriculum-related activities and games for parents and children;
- State Parent and Secondary Student Workshop designed to strengthen parents' involvement in their children's education covering topics such as understanding the U.S. school system, online safety, communicating with the school, and secondary records exchange; and
- End-of-the-summer parent activities that provide opportunities for parents to visit with school staff and see the projects students have completed over the course of summer programs.

Migrant parents participated in the Statewide Bilingual Summit and one Statewide Parent Workshop during the 2011-12 school year. Topics discussed included an orientation to the IL MEP, parent involvement, activities to solicit advice from parents, and information about secondary options for students. Exhibit 11 displays the parent meetings.

Exhibit 11 Statewide Parent Meetings and Trainings

Date	Location	Number Attending
May 12, 2012	Oak Brook, IL	5
July 14, 2012	Normal, IL	11

On the statewide end-of-project parent survey, parents rated the extent to which they received information about and participated in parent involvement activities. Mean ratings ranged from 3.0 (out of 4.0) on having the opportunity to attend a parent event to 3.7 for feeling welcome at the school. Exhibit 12 provides the breakdown of ratings by survey item.

Exhibit 12 Parent Ratings of MEP Activities for Parents

Item	N	Not at all	Very little	Some	Very Much	Mean
Did the migrant education summer math program staff communicate with you about your child's participation?	107	3 (3%)	9 (8%)	40 (37%)	55 (51%)	3.4
Did you have the opportunity to attend a parent event ? (examples: family night, parent-teacher conference, parent committee meeting)	108	14 (13%)	13 (12%)	37 (34%)	44 (41%)	3.0
If your child attended the migrant education summer program at a school , did you feel welcomed at the school?	122	2 (2%)	4 (3%)	23 (19%)	93 (76%)	3.7
If an instructor visited your home , did you feel welcome to participate in the lessons?	104	6 (6%)	7 (7%)	21 (20%)	70 (67%)	3.5
Does your child have a good attitude about learning math in the migrant education summer program?	120	0 (0%)	18 (15%)	30 (25%)	72 (60%)	3.5

The Illinois MEP held its State Migrant Parent Workshop on Saturday, July 14, 2012 at Heartland Community College in conjunction with the secondary student workshop. Presenters included representatives from cooperating programs, MEP staff, and State representatives. Parent participants attended some keynote sessions and had the opportunity to choose from among breakout sessions that were of interest to them. Sessions were presented in English, Spanish, and French to maximize full participation by all parents. French speakers were new to the parent group in 2011-12, and logistics for translation into two languages were a challenge for translation as evidenced by some comments on surveys. Breakout and keynote sessions geared toward parents included:

- Their Tomorrow Depends on Your Words Today
- Communicating with Your Child’s School
- MISX to the Rescue!
- An Introduction to Online Safety
- An Introduction to the U.S. School System (provided specifically for French speakers who indicated a need for greater knowledge of school procedures new to them)
- Dare to Dream
- Campus tour

During the statewide parent workshop, parents completed a survey about their learning experience. Mean ratings were high for all items and ranged from 2.6 to 3.0 on the three-point scale. Exhibit 13 displays the distribution of ratings by survey item.

Exhibit 13
Parent Ratings of Parent Involvement Activities

Extent to which...	N	Not at All	Somewhat	A lot	Mean
I learned about supporting my child’s learning.	10	0 (0%)	2 (20%)	8 (80%)	2.8
I learned about the process of preparing for college and careers.	11	0 (0%)	2 (18%)	9 (82%)	2.8
I was able to meet and work with other parents during the workshop.	10	1 (10%)	2 (20%)	7 (70%)	2.6
The presenters were good at explaining the topics.	11	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	11 (100%)	3.0
I can use the information that I received.	10	0 (0%)	2 (20%)	8 (80%)	2.8
I would like to attend another workshop like this one.	11	0 (0%)	2 (18%)	9 (82%)	2.8

In addition to rating aspects of the workshops, 91% of parent respondents rated the overall quality as either “very good” or “excellent” with a mean rating of 4.2 on the five-point scale. Exhibit 14 displays the distribution of parent responses.

Exhibit 14
Overall Parent Workshop Ratings

N	Very Poor	Poor	Just OK	Very Good	Excellent	Mean
11	0 (0%)	0 (0)	1 (9%)	7 (64%)	3 (27%)	4.2

On the workshop survey, **parents** indicated the aspects of the sessions that they liked the most. They mentioned liking the topics and presenters, meeting and speaking to other parents, and learning effective ways to communicate with the school. Representative comments follow:

- Very interesting and informative

- The college information that was given
- The presenters had a lot of knowledge about what they were teaching.
- Mr. Chávez’s presentations
- I enjoyed the online safety workshop
- To be able to share ideas with other professionals
- It was awesome! I loved the interactions at the first session, with all three languages.
- Getting to know the university and all its functions
- Luis was very knowledgeable and gave us great information about colleges.
- High school students learning about their options

Parents also indicated what they liked least about the workshop. Most said they had no comments, but when comments were provided, some parents mentioned that the translations were difficult to hear, especially when multiple interpreters were speaking at once. Follow-up conversations with staff indicate that there were technical difficulties with the translation equipment that are being addressed for subsequent meetings in 2012-13.

Parents suggested subjects they would like to learn more about. Suggested topics varied but the most common suggestions pertained to increasing parent knowledge of things they can do in the home to support their children’s education. Representative comments follow:

- How to help children establish goals so that they have success in school and in life
- Reading at home, math at home, educational websites
- How to know which career suits you based on your thoughts and likes
- Social skills and bullying
- Preparing for college
- How to prepare nutritious food or eat healthy

Staff rated the extent to which they believed parents were involved in the local programs on the Staff Survey on Project Effectiveness. Over half of the staff responding (56%) indicated that parents were involved “a lot” or “very much” with a mean rating of 2.7 on the four-point scale. Exhibit 15 displays the breakdown of **staff** ratings for parent involvement.

**Exhibit 15
Staff Observations of Parental Involvement**

Item	N	Not at all	Somewhat	A lot	Very much	Mean
Parents were involved in your program. (Staff Survey)	90	8 (9%)	31 (34%)	29 (32%)	22 (24%)	2.7

INTERSTATE COORDINATION ACTIVITIES

Many migrant students who attend summer school in Illinois attend schools in other states for at least part of the regular school term. In order to ensure that these students receive instruction that will help them achieve high standards in the schools inside and outside of Illinois, interstate coordination is a critical component of the Illinois MEP. National opportunities for interstate coordination in which Illinois has participated include:

- National Association of State Directors of Migrant Education (NASDME) Conference
- Texas Migrant Interstate Program Workshop

- Office of Migrant Education Conference
- OME State Directors' Meeting

In addition, Illinois is a part of two consortium incentive grants: MASTERS (Mathematics Achievement and Success Through Engagement in Resources for Migrant Students) and SOSY (Solutions for Out-of-School Youth). MASTERS is a consortium of nine states led by Texas. The goal of MASTERS is to provide services designed (based on review of evidence-based research) to improve the mathematics proficiency of migratory children whose education is interrupted. A key strand for MASTERS is the integration of Balanced Literacy, which provides teachers with strategies for increasing student reading skills. SOSY is a consortium of 21 states led by Kansas. The goal of SOSY is to design services (based on a review of scientifically-based research) to improve the educational attainment of out-of-school migratory youth whose education is interrupted.

Illinois is an active member of both consortia and uses the products developed and the coordination opportunities to improve MEP services in the State. One component of participation in the consortium incentive grants is attendance at steering and leadership team meetings where critical decisions about the direction of services are made. During the curriculum advisory team and technical support team meetings, products are reviewed and developed. Exhibit 16 displays the meetings and conference calls in which a representative from Illinois participated for the consortium incentive grants.

Exhibit 16
MASTERS and SOSY Meetings and Conference Calls in which
Illinois Participated

Meeting	Date
SOSY Monthly Communication	9/21/11
MASTERS Steering Team Meeting in Austin, TX	10/4-5/11
SOSY Monthly Communication	10/10/11
SOSY Meeting in Nashville, TN	11/15/11
MASTERS Curriculum Advisory Team Conference Call	11/21/11
SOSY Monthly Communication	12/16/11
MASTERS Curriculum Advisory Team Meeting in San Antonio, TX	1/19-20/12
SOSY Monthly Communication	2/15/12
MASTERS Steering Team Meeting in Santa Fe, NM	2/9-10/12
SOSY Monthly Communication	3/15/12
MASTERS Training of Trainers in San Antonio, TX	4/12-13/12
SOSY Monthly Communication	4/15/12
SOSY Monthly Communication	5/15/12
SOSY Monthly Communication	6/15/12
SOSY Monthly Communication	7/15/12
SOSY Monthly Communication	8/15/12
SOSY Dissemination Event in Clearwater, FL	9/13/12

In addition to interstate coordination, a key component of many migrant programs is coordination with other service providers in their area. During interviews and meetings, MEP staff provided lists of local partners that had helped deliver services to migrant families and students:

- Women, Infants and Children (WIC)
- Head Start
- K-C Casa (counseling services)

- One-stop services coordinated with various community agencies
- Community colleges and adult education programs (ESL and GED classes)
- ISBE State Title I-A (Basic Program); Title I-B (Even Start Program and Migrant Even Start); Title I-D (Homeless Program); Title II-D, Title III, Title V
- State Transitional Bilingual Education Program
- Illinois institutions of higher education (campus visitations for secondary students and professional development opportunities)
- Regional Offices of Education
- Illinois State Board of Education Division of English Language Learning (Chicago)
- Illinois Migrant Education Resource Project (IMERP through the Illinois Migrant Council)
- Illinois Department of Commerce and Economic Opportunity's *Eliminate the Digital Divide Program* (through the Illinois Migrant Council Technology Learning Center)
- Illinois Migrant Legal Assistance Project (IMLAP)
- Illinois Department of Employment Security (IDES)
- Illinois Migrant and Seasonal Head Start (MSHS)
- Farmworker and Landscape Advocacy Project (FLAP)
- Community Health Partnership of Illinois (CHP)
- Mexican-American Legal Defense and Education Fund (MALDEF)
- Adult Learning Resource Center (ALRC) at: www.thecenterweb.org/alrc/
- The Illinois Resource Center at: www.thecenterweb.org/irc/
- Child Nutrition Programs including the National School Lunch and School Breakfast Programs
- Community Health Partnership of Illinois: Migrant Primary and Oral Health Care Network
- Illinois Arts Council (through IMERP)

STAFF DEVELOPMENT

The Illinois MEP provides extensive professional development to prepare teachers and paraprofessionals to adapt instruction to address the unique educational needs of migrant students. During the 2011-12 school year and summer programs, local and national trainings were provided to help teachers learn the strategies needed to implement the SDP, with an emphasis on math and literacy strategies. Exhibit 17 displays the training offered at the State level. Results of participant surveys follow.

Exhibit 17 Illinois MEP Professional Development Opportunities

Training	Date	Location
MASTERS Teacher Pre-service	May 11, 2012	Bloomington, IL
Balanced Literacy Teacher Pre-Service	May 12, 2012	Bloomington, IL
Illinois Statewide Workshop	June 11-13, 2012	Alsip, IL

Statewide Workshop

Participants rated the sessions, format, and accommodations for the Statewide MEP Workshop. On a four-point scale, mean ratings ranged from 3.4 to 3.7. Ratings for each of the components are displayed in Exhibit 18.

Exhibit 18
Staff Ratings of Statewide MEP Workshop

Item	N	Developing	Average	Good	Exemplary	Mean
Breakout Sessions	126	1 (1%)	4 (3%)	48 (38%)	73 (58%)	3.5
General Sessions	125	2 (2%)	6 (5%)	57 (46%)	60 (48%)	3.4
Format/Organization of the Workshop	126	0 (0%)	4 (3%)	37 (29%)	85 (67%)	3.7
Hotel Accommodations	123	0 (0%)	9 (7%)	36 (29%)	78 (63%)	3.6

Participants also rated the workshop in its entirety. Overall, the workshop was rated 3.5 on the four-point scale with 98% indicating it was “Good” or “Exemplary.” Of note is that no attendee rated the workshop as “poor.”

Exhibit 19
Overall Ratings of the Statewide MEP Workshop

	N	Poor	Average	Good	Exemplary	Mean
How would you rate this workshop?	120	0 (0%)	3 (3%)	49 (41%)	68 (57%)	3.5

On the Illinois Statewide MEP Workshop summary, participants were asked to justify their overall rating of the workshop. The most common word used to describe the workshop was “organized.” Representative justifications for the overall ratings follow:

- The conference was a great experience and very beneficial.
- This was the BEST workshop—from beginning to end—I’ve attended! Every presenter and every session were well organized and meaningful!
- Good combination of education but time for social interaction during breaks and lunches.
- Everyone is so dedicated, pleasant, excited, genuine, enthusiastic, ran smoothly. Solid Team! Very fun!
- The variety of workshops was very useful and informative.
- I think this was one of the best Statewide workshops ever – and they’re always stellar! I loved the opening keynote address. Those key points are crucial to success in migrant. I wish all who work with migrant kids could remember that.
- Well organized, quality session topics!
- The breakout sessions I went to were very engaging. I loved the session “Engaging Latino Youth through Art.”
- Still falls short for mobile teachers.
- Organization was stellar.

Loved this conference. Overall, one of the best I have attended in years. The sessions & content surpassed even the National Conference.

--Conference participant

- I now feel more confident about beginning the program after the breakout sessions.
- Many new workshops which had helpful and relevant information for many of us new teachers. Some workshops were repetitive from last year.
- The workshop was good because I got to meet other people from different programs.
- Many of the workshops were very repetitive but overall very enjoyable.
- Well-organized, friendly, good information, not overwhelming.
- Appreciated the home based sessions. Enjoyed the interactive nature of many breakout sessions
- Needs to be shorter and at a more convenient location. It's a long time to be gone and there's a lot of down time. Also, there's a discrepancy in paid hours. Different sites get paid for more hours than others. Is this at site's decision or based on a program decision? All groups should get the same amount.
- I really enjoyed Liliana Barro Zecker – great ideas and Julie Alexander. They're amazing!
- If possible more doubling of sessions. More clearly specific sessions available at more than one time.
- I obtained lots of useful information. All the sessions, I attended, in addition to the director's session, have all prepared and excited me for the summer!

Participants in the Statewide Workshop completed a survey that accompanies the provision of Continuing Professional Development Units (CPDU). Mean ratings of all items were high on the five-point scale, ranging from 4.5 to 4.9. Exhibit 20 displays the distribution of staff ratings for each item.

Exhibit 20
CPDU Ratings of Statewide Workshop

Item	N	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Mean
This activity increased my knowledge and skills in my areas of certification, endorsements or teaching assignment.	56	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (2%)	17 (30%)	38 (68%)	4.7
The relevance of this activity to ISBE teaching standards was clear.	56	0 (0%)	2 (4%)	2 (4%)	16 (29%)	36 (64%)	4.5
It was clear that the activity was presented by persons with education and experience in the subject matter.	57	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	8 (14%)	49 (86%)	4.9
The material was presented in an organized, easily understood manner.	57	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	13 (23%)	44 (77%)	4.8
This activity included discussion, critique, or application of what was presented, observed, learned, or demonstrated.	57	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	16 (28%)	41 (72%)	4.7

Staff provided narrative comments about the best features of the activity. Many staff commented that the skills and knowledge of the presenters were particularly effective with many commenters mentioning presenters by name. Suggestions for improvement were varied. Two comments that appeared several times were to have sessions specifically for teachers new to the program and to repeat sessions that are popular or necessary. All CPDU comments are included in Appendix B.

MASTERS Teacher Pre-service

Evaluations were completed at each of the pre-service trainings for math and balanced literacy where teachers rated the effectiveness of the workshops and the extent of their own learning. Exhibit 21 shows the staff ratings of the MASTERS pre-service training. Critical components of the workshop were rated on a three-point scale. Each aspect of the training was rated very high with mean ratings ranging from 2.5 to 2.8 on the three-point scale. The exhibit below displays the distribution of ratings on each aspect of the training.

**Exhibit 21
Staff Ratings of MASTERS Pre-Service Training**

Item	N	Developing	Good	Exemplary	Mean
Training	42	2 (5%)	7 (17%)	33 (79%)	2.7
Applicability	41	1 (2%)	11 (27%)	29 (71%)	2.7
Involvement	42	0 (0%)	19 (45%)	23 (55%)	2.5
Materials	42	0 (0%)	9 (21%)	33 (79%)	2.8
Trainer Skill	40	0 (0%)	12 (30%)	28 (70%)	2.7

At the MASTERS training, teachers also rated the growth in their own knowledge of the specific strategies addressed. Mean gains in knowledge were similar and ranged from 2.9 to 3.1 on changes in the MASTERS curriculum, State of Texas Assessment of Academic Readiness (STAAR) performance, and centers. Exhibit 22 displays mean ratings on the knowledge and strategies assessed.

**Exhibit 22
Knowledge Gained during Math Pre-service Training**

Item	N	No knowledge	Some knowledge	Much knowledge	Extensive knowledge	Mean
Changes to the MASTERS Curriculum	35	1 (3%)	6 (17%)	17 (49%)	11 (31%)	3.1
STAAR Performance	38	2 (5%)	12 (32%)	12 (32%)	12 (32%)	2.9
Centers	38	1 (3%)	10 (26%)	10 (26%)	17 (45%)	3.1

Respondents also provided narrative comments on the MASTERS Staff Training Survey indicating how they believed the sessions would impact their teaching in the summer. The two most common responses were that staff felt that they came away from the training with a better understanding of the curriculum and that they feel that they better understand how to teach problem-solving strategies. Representative comments follow:

- The new teaching strategies will be very useful.
- This training highlighted the changes to the curriculum for the summer.

- STAAR training was excellent! PD looks great. This will help us to record students' thinking!
- It gives me ideas I can apply to my high school students.
- Eases the anxiety to have some training before the workshop or summer session begins. Nice to have handouts and materials ahead of time.
- Every training enriches me more as a teacher. I learn more about the learning process and how kids process information. It is easier for them to have manipulatives and many hands-on activities. Thanks for the trainings.
- Wow! I'm not waiting until summer to start some of the visuals for multiplying and word problems – Monday will be a start for letting children show their ideas. Holding all accountable for strategies, not just a few.
- I really appreciate all of the scripting that has been implemented into the curriculum. Informing us of these changes and showing us how to incorporate centers and other activities into program this summer will be essential for a successful program.
- This training will greatly increase my teaching expertise because the new problem solving strategies (step by step) are good innovation for our ELLs whose language proficiency is at the developmental stage. I also loved the 10 base block demo for equations.
- Wasn't directed towards 6-8. Couldn't imagine doing centers at this age
- Love the MAS Space segment.

Suggestions for improving the MASTERS training were varied. The most common suggestions were about allowing ample time for doing the activities and discussing strategies with the other educators. Representative comments follow:

- This was a nice workshop. I liked the hands-on activities.
- It is really hard to stay engaged when we come after school... It would be great to not sit so long and to discuss more as groups – talk about ideas presented.
- I loved the format of using Norma and alternating “live” technology, with live face-to-face person/facilitator! Awesome!
- None, you do a very good job.
- My recommendation would be to allow ample time for these kinds of workshops. I greatly enjoyed the math demo by Norma.
- More time should be provided for hands-on activities. We should be able to try the activities and be able to ask questions. There should also be a question and answer for the activities.
- Only new members should be required to attend.
- Less videos and more hands-on materials and time to do the activities.
- I loved the changes that have been made to the MASTERS curriculum. Follow-up and more time to delve into the curriculum.

Balanced Literacy Teacher Pre-Service

Participants at the Balanced Literacy Pre-Service Training on May 12, 2012, rated all aspects high with ratings ranging from 4.3 to 4.6 on the five-point scale. The distribution of staff responses by survey item is displayed in Exhibit 23.

**Exhibit 23
Staff Ratings of Balanced Literacy Pre-Service Training**

Item	N	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Mean
The workshop raised my level of knowledge about reading and writing within an integrated curriculum.	45	0 (0%)	1 (2%)	4 (9%)	12 (27%)	28 (62%)	4.5
The workshop raised my level of comfort about facilitating reading and writing within an integrated curriculum.	45	0 (0%)	1 (2%)	2 (4%)	16 (36%)	26 (58%)	4.5
The workshop raised my level of knowledge about integrated reading/writing strategies in a balanced approach to literacy.	45	0 (0%)	1 (2%)	2 (4%)	18 (40%)	24 (53%)	4.4
The workshop raised my level of comfort about using integrated reading/writing strategies in a balanced approach to literacy.	45	0 (0%)	1 (2%)	4 (9%)	19 (42%)	21 (47%)	4.3
The workshop raised my level of knowledge about integrated reading/writing strategies in the classroom.	45	0 (0%)	2 (4%)	0 (0%)	16 (36%)	27 (60%)	4.5
The workshop raised my level of comfort about using integrated reading/writing strategies in the classroom.	44	0 (0%)	1 (2%)	2 (5%)	22 (50%)	19 (43%)	4.3
The workshop affirmed what I already knew about integrated reading/writing strategies.	45	0 (0%)	2 (4%)	4 (9%)	19 (42%)	20 (44%)	4.3
The workshop presenter was effective.	45	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	3 (7%)	13 (29%)	29 (64%)	4.6

In addition to the ratings found in the exhibit above, staff provided narrative responding to the question, “What did you learn about conferring with readers and writers within an integrated curriculum at this session?” The most common statements were related to how the strategy would be implemented in the classroom. Comments representative of many respondents follow:

- How to ask questions that do not require a yes/no answer, how to be patient and wait for an answer and not lead the student.
- I learned how to get students talking about their reading and writing.
- The students need to learn to talk about what they are reading about as well as writing and why they are doing it.
- How to begin a conference, let student lead the conference, do not criticize student work, and always point out the positive in student’s writing
- It’s truly individual instruction; the goal is to get the students to talk about their reading and writing.

- How to set up and effectively implement conferences with individual students and have them lead the discussion
- How to use writing conferences to help students improve their writing.
- Frame and focus in a certain area that is meaningful for the students learning.
- There is a very specific process for making conferences successful. Conferencing with readers and writers can improve their thinking and your understanding of them as readers and writers.
- The videos were very instructive for me to learn how it is recommended to conference
- This content was something I was already familiar with. It was a good view from a different perspective and a good refresher though.
- Ways to elicit language, how to combine children's experiences and your teaching.
- I learned how to help a student think about their thinking. I learned a large amount of activities to use in the classroom and as daily routines.
- I learned that as teachers, we must not attempt to change the thought process of our readers or writers; rather, we must scaffold our writers' ideas on paper, and assist them in elaborating their thought processes and making minimum changes to what they wrote.

In addition, participants provided suggestions responding to the questions, "What questions would you like to have addressed at future professional development sessions (including the June Statewide Workshop in Alsip)?" The most common suggestion was to provide more information about classroom management during conferencing activities. Several staff commented that they would like more information in general about differentiating for students with special needs and who are limited in language proficiency. Of special note for migrant summer programs were comments that teachers needed strategies for teaching in a migrant environment where new students arrive every day. Representative comments follow.

- It would be helpful to see/have examples of note-taking/record keeping forms and methods.
- Time management in terms of testing for 2 weeks and having new students every day.
- Looking at the curriculum and how to read it and what is necessary to teach over the short time
- Working with ELL students with special needs
- What is the rest of the class doing while you're conferencing? What happens when they finish their task early?
- More focus on 6-8 population (more focused on K-5 and not as relevant/realistic to 6-8 population);
- Managing multi-grade classrooms
- Books of poetry – bilingual/language using short stories in class –short plays in class – titles – short stories to plays
- Loved the videos to demonstrate conferencing. Loved the extra lit resources/list of books and the raffle. Loved the walk-around-the-tables exercise; this put the training into live practice.
- How to help a student who reads books that are lower than his/her zone of proximal development?

- How to use these fabulous ideas/teaching strategies within our summer program with students arriving and leaving at many different times.
- My questions are: What could be possible writing ideas that can stream through the kids' thought process while writing especially ELLs? How can a classroom teacher keep a smooth conference with his/her students all year round?

Overall Pre-Service Evaluation

Participants in the MASTERS and Balanced Literacy pre-service sessions completed a survey that accompanies the provision of Continuing Professional Development Units (CPDU). Mean ratings of all items were high on the five-point scale, ranging from 4.6 to 4.9. Exhibit 24 displays the distribution of staff ratings for each item.

Exhibit 24
CPDU Ratings of Pre-service Training Overall

Item	N	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Mean
This activity increased my knowledge and skills in my areas of certification, endorsements or teaching assignment.	46	0 (0%)	1 (2%)	0 (0%)	13 (28%)	32 (70%)	4.7
The relevance of this activity to ISBE teaching standards was clear.	46	1 (2%)	1 (2%)	2 (4%)	9 (20%)	33 (72%)	4.6
It was clear that the activity was presented by persons with education and experience in the subject matter.	45	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	6 (13%)	39 (87%)	4.9
The material was presented in an organized, easily understood manner.	46	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (2%)	7 (15%)	38 (83%)	4.8
This activity included discussion, critique, or application of what was presented, observed, learned, or demonstrated.	46	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	9 (20%)	37 (80%)	4.8

Staff provided narrative comments about the best features of the activity. Many staff commented that the strategies employed during the session were effective in communicating the information and helping participants learn new skills. Suggestions for improvement somewhat contradicted the “best features” with some commenters saying there was too much lecture. However, the overarching theme of the comments was that participants felt the activities and content presented were useful for the classroom. All CPDU comments are included in the Appendix.

Identification and Recruitment

Recruiters participated in the Statewide ID&R Training on May 14-16, 2012 in Bloomington. The first two days of the training were for new recruiters, and the third day brought all the recruiters (new and veteran) and reviewers together for updates and refreshers. Recruiters new to the program rated all components of the training high with most mean ratings at 2.9 or 3.0 on the three-point scale. The one rating that was slightly lower than the others was “opportunities for group and individual learning.” However, direct instruction may be the most appropriate method

for delivering new information about identification and recruitment. Exhibit 25 displays the distribution of participant responses for the ID&R training for new recruiters.

Exhibit 25
Ratings of Statewide Identification and Recruitment Training for
New Recruiters (Days 1 and 2)

	N	Developing	Good	Exemplary	Mean
Overall training	9	0 (0%)	1 (11%)	8 (89%)	2.9
Applicable to job responsibilities	9	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	9 (100%)	3.0
Opportunities for group and individual learning	8	0 (0%)	3 (38%)	5 (63%)	2.6
Opportunity for questions and answers	8	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	8 (100%)	3.0
Handouts and materials	9	0 (0%)	1 (11%)	8 (89%)	2.9
Knowledge of the presenters	9	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	9 (100%)	3.0
Content of the training	9	0 (0%)	1 (11%)	8 (89%)	2.9
Pace of the training	9	0 (0%)	1 (11%)	8 (89%)	2.9

Overall, all participants rated the training as “good” or “exemplary.” Mean ratings of the individual aspects of the training for all recruiters were all high on the three-point scale and ranged from 2.8 to 3.0. Exhibit 26 displays the distribution of participant responses for each item on the ID&R Training survey.

Exhibit 26
Ratings of Statewide Identification and Recruitment Training for
All Recruiters and Reviewers (Day 3)

	N	Developing	Good	Exemplary	Mean
Overall training	22	0 (0%)	1 (5%)	21 (95%)	3.0
Applicable to job responsibilities	28	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	28 (100%)	3.0
Opportunities for group and individual learning	24	0 (0%)	6 (25%)	18 (75%)	2.8
Opportunity for questions and answers	27	0 (0%)	1 (4%)	26 (96%)	3.0
Handouts and materials	28	0 (0%)	2 (7%)	26 (93%)	2.9
Knowledge of the presenters	28	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	28 (100%)	3.0
Content of the training	28	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	28 (100%)	3.0
Pace of the training	23	0 (0%)	1 (4%)	22 (96%)	3.0

Participants in the statewide training were asked to indicate what they liked best about it. Several commented that the videos of the recruiters in action were particularly effective. Representative comments from both sessions follow.

- The discussion/separation of suggestions/questions for old/new recruiters. The video of Eva (State recruiter) in action – inspiring.
- That we got to work with the experienced recruiters and get tips from them.
- Learning advice from experienced recruiters.
- The simple way to establish eligibility requirements.
- That we were able to ask questions to experienced recruiters and got great answers.
- Presenters are very knowledgeable about the topics discussed.
- I liked the hands on activities and the introduction at the beginning.
- I liked the group activities such as:
 - Suggestions
 - Questions (groups)

- MSIX referral presentation
- Chances to practice, to collaborate, to help others, pacing, Scott's humor!
- The "one-on-one" feel of the training. Everyone was involved.
- Specific and to the point. Informative and covered all aspects pertinent to ID&R.
- I liked the different approach for presenting the information. Very creative.
- The specific examples that were used to answer questions.
- SOSY and MEP introductions.
- The MSIX skit.
- Being able to work in a small group and look at and talk about the form I will be reviewing.
- The presentation was helpful, and it was practical, especially learning from experienced recruiters.
- I enjoyed how we were asked to see the presentation through the eyes of different people. All the handouts are very useful and helpful.
- The opportunity to introduce ourselves to others and the numerous opportunities to ask questions.
- I appreciate the relaxed atmosphere and knowledgeable presenters.
- What I most like was the involvement of recruiters to get a chance in recruiting in the real world by acting it out in class.
- I enjoyed the handouts given, they are useful. I also like that we had practice interviews and tried to play on how to approach different areas and people.

In the interest of continuous improvement, participants also were asked for suggestions to improve the training. Many commenters noted that no changes were needed, but a few indicated wanting to practice doing an interview in different scenarios. Representative comments follow.

- Nothing at all. I believe you guys did an awesome job the way it was.
- Practice interviews with different scenarios would be helpful and make us think of issues that we might see out in the field. Also create a website where we can log on and contribute and ask for help or opinions on issues.
- More details about my unique area.
- Have more practice with interviews, and make more time to learn more about other resources we can use.
- More practice with interviews, to learn how to treat each situation.
- The training seemed well prepared and appropriate. From my point of view, it did not lack.
- Great to have 3 days for new people.
- I think you divided it up very appropriately, i.e., vets and newbies in a session together.
- Talk more about OSY and ways to maintain contact with them to give them services.
- What I most loved was the acting of the real world out there – role plays.
- Explain the significance of culture when working with migrant farmworkers.

Recruiters were asked to provide suggestions for future training, responding to the question, “Are there any topics you would like to recommend for discussion and/or review at the 2012 MEP Statewide Workshop?” Suggestions varied with many participants saying they had no suggestions. Others noted that they would like to continue the videos of recruiters doing interviews. Another suggestion from some respondents was a session about connecting families with support service providers. Representative comments follow.

- How to find good literature for bilingual learners/educators.
- How different regions can work together along with partner agencies.
- More practice.
- Maybe a closer look at MSIX.
- More training on what to offer OSY.
- I would just say to show more clips instead of the written examples, but examples offered were good enough – just add more clips involving the scenarios.
- Other resources or services we can provide to the migrant families, also how we can help them in other ways.
- I would like to recommend to have more video presentations for future meetings, but all of my questions were answered.
- Healthcare and dental for migrant farmworkers.
- I would like to hear more of the “scope” and numbers of migrant workers entering Illinois from May to October.
- Maybe a website for all recruiters to share information.
- Would like to have fill out more than one COE.

5

Results

This section provides a summary of program results related to the MPOs. Sources of data include student assessment results, demographic data from the State MEP database, and director, staff, and parent surveys.

READING RESULTS

MPO 1a: 75% of students participating in a summer program for at least 3 weeks who are identified as *Emerging Readers* on the Concepts About Print will demonstrate a gain of at least four points.

The *Concepts About Print* assessment developed by Marie Clay (2002) was designed to help teachers assess young children's understanding about print and how it works such as directionality, concepts of letters and words, and punctuation. The test can be given either in Spanish or English as it covers pre-reading skills. There are 22 points possible on the test.

As displayed in Exhibit 27, 56% of the kindergarten students made a four-point or greater gain on the Concepts about Print. Though this does not meet the MPO, it does show progress. During the summer of 2011, 45% of students met the target gain, so there was an 11% increase during the summer of 2012. In addition, 89% of the students tested made a gain. The number and percent gaining are presented in Exhibit 27.

Exhibit 27
Progress of Emerging Readers on the *Concepts about Print*

Grade	Number Assessed	# (%) with Any Gain	# (%) with a Gain \geq 4 Points	MPO Met?
K	17	15 (88%)	9 (53%)	No
1	1	1 (100%)	1 (100%)	Yes
Total	18	16 (89%)	10 (56%)	No

Additional information relating to the attainment of reading skills is found in the Implementation (Section 4) part of this report in the Student Services—Instruction sub-section.

MPO 1b: 75% of students participating in a summer program for at least 3 weeks who are identified as *Beginning Readers* through *5th Grade Readers* on the Rigby will demonstrate a gain of at least one level.

The *Rigby Benchmark Assessment* assesses and monitors reading progress in the areas of accuracy, comprehension and fluency for students in grades K-5. Through the use of the assessment, teachers can track what students know at the beginning of the program and what they have learned by the end.

Of the 190 students assessed on either the *Rigby* or *Fountas and Pinnel* Assessment, 151 (79%) demonstrated a gain, meeting the MPO. Further analysis shows that the percent gaining in grades K-4 met the MPO, though the percent gaining in grade 5 was 19% below the target. Percentages of students gaining ranged from 56% in the fifth grade to 93% in the second grade. Exhibit 28 shows the breakdown by grade level of the number of students assessed and the number and percent gaining at least one level.

Exhibit 28
Students Gaining at Least One Level on the *Rigby* or *Fountas and Pinnel* Assessment

Grade	N	# Gaining	% Gaining	MPO Met?
K	22	18	82%	Yes
1	33	29	88%	Yes
2	28	26	93%	Yes
3	38	32	84%	Yes
4	30	24	80%	Yes
5	39	22	56%	No
Total	190	151	79%	Yes

MPO 1c: 75% of students participating in a summer program for at least 3 weeks who are identified as *Readers* in grades 6-8 assessed with the Fluency Snapshot will demonstrate a gain of at least five words per minute.

The *Fluency Snapshot* (Barr, Blachowicz, & Wogman-Sadow, 1995) allows teachers to gather information about a child's use of reading strategies by analyzing the self-corrections s/he makes during a 1-minute oral reading of grade- and age-appropriate text.

Of the 57 sixth through eighth graders with assessment data, 47 (82%) made the target gain of at least five words per minute, meeting and surpassing the MPO. Furthermore, when broken down by grade level, students in the sixth and seventh grades met the target for gains while eighth graders did not. However, due to low numbers of students assessed in the eighth grade, these results should be interpreted with caution. Results by grade level, number and percent making any gain, and the target gain are displayed in Exhibit 29.

Exhibit 29
Sixth to Eighth Grade Student Gains on the Fluency Snapshot

Grade	N	#(%) with Any Gain	# (%) with an Increase ≥ 5 Words Per Minute	MPO Met?
6	27	24 (89%)	24 (89%)	Yes
7	21	17 (81%)	17 (81%)	Yes
8	9	6 (67%)	6 (67%)	No
Total	57	47 (82%)	47 (82%)	Yes

MPO 1d: 85% of migrant instructional teachers and aides, administrators, and instructional coaches will report on a PD survey that MEP-sponsored PD in reading has helped them to more effectively support high quality reading instruction.

On a year-end staff survey, teachers, paraprofessionals, and administrators were asked to rate the extent to which training sponsored by the MEP in reading helped them to more effectively

support high quality reading instruction. Additional comments on and ratings of MEP professional development efforts can be found in Section 4 of this report.

As displayed in Exhibit 30, 99% of staff responding to the survey indicated that training helped them provide high quality reading instruction, meeting and exceeding the MPO.

Exhibit 30
Percent of Instructional Staff Reporting that Professional Development Supports Reading Instruction

Extent to which...	N	Percent Reporting Support	Percent Reporting no Support	MPO Met?
Training sponsored by the MEP helped you more effectively support high quality reading instruction.	81	99%	1%	Yes

Further analysis of staff responses shows that 80% of staff responding felt that training helped them “a lot” or “very much.” Only one staff member indicated that the training helped “not at all.” The distribution of staff responses are displayed in Exhibit 31.

Exhibit 31
Instructional Staff Ratings of Professional Development in Reading

Extent to which...	N	Not at All	Some-what	A lot	Very Much	Mean
Training sponsored by the MEP helped you more effectively support high quality reading instruction.	81	1 (1%)	15 (19%)	22 (27%)	43 (53%)	3.3

MPO 1e: 90% of migrant parents surveyed will report growth in their ability to support their child’s reading success.

Parent perceptions of their own growth in their ability to support their child’s reading success were collected on the Parent Survey. Additional information about the impact of MEP parent involvement activities from parent and staff surveys and interviews can be found in the Parent Involvement sub-section of Section 4 in this report.

As displayed in Exhibit 32, 91% of parents surveyed reported that they learned ways to help their child improve reading skills, meeting the MPO.

Exhibit 32
Parents Reporting Growth in their Ability to Support their Child’s Reading Success

Extent to which...	N	Percent Reporting Growth	Percent Reporting little or no Growth	MPO Met?
Did you learn new ways to help your child improve his/her reading skills?	115	91%	9%	Yes

Further analysis shows that over half (57%) of parents responding felt they learned “a lot.” The mean rating on the four-point scale was high at 3.5. The distribution of responses provided by parents is displayed in Exhibit 33.

Exhibit 33
Parent Ratings of Growth in Ability to Help Children with Reading

N	Not at All	Very little	Some	A lot	Mean
115	1 (1%)	9 (8%)	39 (34%)	66 (57%)	3.5

MPO 1f: The reading achievement gap between migrant students attending school in an Illinois school district with a migrant program and all students in the same districts on the IL State reading assessment will be reduced by at least 1%.

The *Illinois Standards Achievement Test* (ISAT) measures student achievement relative to the Illinois Learning Standards and is given to students in grades 3-8. Students in grade 11 take the *Prairie State Achievement Examination* (PSAE). Data were collected at the State level for districts in which there are migrant programs and the proficiency rates of non-migrant students and migrant students in those districts are compared by grade level. Data are disaggregated for migrant students, and percentages of migrant and all students who met or exceeded standards were used to arrive at the proficiency rates.

Overall, the gap in the proficiency rates decrease by one point from 25 in 2010-11 to 24 in 2011-12, which **meets the MPO**. By grade level, the gap in proficiency decreased in grades 3, 5, and 7 and increased in all other grades. Exhibit 34 displays the proficiency rates for all students and migrant students, and the gap between the groups.

Exhibit 34
Reading Achievement Gap Between Migrant and All Students on the ISAT and PSAE

Grade	2010-11			2011-12			Gap Change (+/-)	MPO Met?
	% Prof/Adv		Gap	% Prof/Adv		Gap		
	All	Migrant		All	Migrant			
3	871 (70%)	15 (38%)	32	786 (66%)	15 (47%)	19	-13	Yes
4	843 (68%)	19 (51%)	17	864 (70%)	14 (52%)	18	+1	No
5	788 (68%)	12 (32%)	36	853 (70%)	15 (52%)	18	-18	Yes
6	923 (80%)	18 (58%)	22	841 (74%)	18 (49%)	25	+3	No
7	769 (65%)	9 (39%)	26	801 (71%)	17 (47%)	24	-2	Yes
8	827 (76%)	7 (47%)	29	893 (76%)	9 (39%)	37	+8	No
11	452 (41%)	5 (26%)	15	421 (40%)	0 (0%)	40	+25	No
Total	5,473 (67%)	85 (42%)	25	5,459 (67%)	88 (43%)	24	-1	Yes

In making comparisons between migrant students and all students, it is important to note that the *all students* group and the *migrant students* group contain widely disparate numbers. For migrant students, the small “n” affects the stability of the results with a few student scores affecting the overall average and the results fluctuating from year-to-year. In addition, the students tested on the ISAT and PSAE represent a fraction of the students who received services in Illinois because not all grade levels are assessed and not all students are in the State during the testing window.

MATHEMATICS RESULTS

MPO 2a: 80% of the students who attend migrant summer school for at least 3 weeks will show improvement in math assessments for their grade level.

The MASTERS (Mathematics Achievement and Success Through Engagement in Resources for Migrant Students) curriculum contains embedded pre- and post-assessments for migrant students attending summer school. Assessment items are tied to national standards as well as aligned to the Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills (TEKS). Many students attending summer school in Illinois are home-based in Texas, and Illinois participation in MASTERS is a component of the plan for interstate collaboration and continuity of instruction with Texas.

Of the 267 students with pre- and post-test scores, 214 (80%) showed gains from pre-test to post-test, **meeting the MPO target**. Further analysis shows that five of the nine grade levels met or exceeded the MPO target. The percentage of students showing gains varied ranging from 62% of seventh and eighth graders to 97% of third graders. Exhibit 35 shows mean scores and the percent and number gaining on the MASTERS assessments by grade.

Exhibit 35
Student Results on MASTERS Math Assessments by Grade

Grade	N	Mean Pretest	Mean Posttest	Mean Gain	# (%) Gaining	MPO Met?
K	41	5.6	8.7	3.1	35 (85%)	Yes
1	31	5.1	8.4	3.3	26 (84%)	Yes
2	26	4.8	7.5	2.7	23 (88%)	Yes
3	37	4.1	8.5	4.4	36 (97%)	Yes
4	30	2.9	4.7	1.8	21 (70%)	No
5	41	3.6	6.9	3.3	35 (85%)	Yes
6	29	2.1	4.3	2.2	18 (62%)	No
7	21	2.1	3.9	1.8	13 (62%)	No
8	11	1.2	2.9	1.7	7 (64%)	No
Total	267	3.8	6.7	2.9	214 (80%)	Yes

Additional information about math achievement and perceptions about growth in abilities for parents and instructional staff can be found in Section 4-Implementation.

MPO 2b: 85% of migrant instructional teachers and aides, administrators, and instructional coaches will report on a PD survey that MEP-sponsored PD in math has helped them to more effectively support high quality mathematics instruction.

On a year-end staff survey, teachers, aides, and administrators were asked to rate the extent to which training in mathematics sponsored by the MEP helped them more effectively support high quality math instruction. Additional comments on—and ratings of—MEP professional development efforts can be found in Section 4 of this report.

As displayed in Exhibit 36, 96% of staff responding to the survey indicated that training helped them provide high quality math instruction; **exceeding the MPO target of 85% by 10%**.

Exhibit 36
Instructional Staff Reporting that Professional Development Supports Math Instruction

Extent to which...	N	Percent Reporting Support	Percent Reporting no Support	MPO Met?
Training sponsored by the MEP helped you more effectively support high quality math instruction.	78	96%	4%	Yes

Further analysis of staff responses shows that most staff responding (86%) felt that MEP-sponsored training helped them support math instruction by a lot or very much. Ten percent indicated that the training helped somewhat and 4% indicated that the training was not at all helpful. Exhibit 37 displays the distribution of staff responses.

Exhibit 37
Instructional Staff Ratings of Professional Development in Mathematics

Extent to which...	N	Not at All	Some-what	A lot	Very Much	Mean
Training sponsored by the MEP helped you more effectively support high quality math instruction.	78	3 (4%)	8 (10%)	22 (28%)	45 (58%)	3.4

MPO 2c: The math achievement gap between migrant students attending school in an Illinois school district with a migrant program and all students in the same districts on the IL State math assessment will be reduced by at least 1%.

The ISAT measures student achievement relative to Illinois Learning Standards for students in grades 3-8 and the PSAE measures the achievement in reading, mathematics, and science of students in grade 11. Data were collected at the State level for districts with migrant programs allowing the proficiency rates of all students and migrant students in those districts to be compared by grade level. Data were disaggregated for migrant students, and percentages of migrant and all students who met or exceeded standards were used to arrive at the proficiency rates.

For all grades combined, the gap in proficiency rates between all students and migrant students increased by two points from 16 points in 2010-11 to 18 points in 2011-12, which **does not meet the MPO**. By grade level, the gap in proficiency decreased in grades 3, 5, 7, and 8 but increased in the other grades. Exhibit 38 displays the math proficiency rates for all students and migrant students and the gap between the groups for 2009-10 compared to 2010-11.

Exhibit 38
Mathematics Achievement Gap Between Migrant and All Students on the ISAT and PSAE

Grade	2010-11			2011-12			Gap Change (+/-)	MPO Met?
	# (%) Prof/Adv		Gap	# (%) Prof/Adv		Gap		
	All	Migrant		All	Migrant			
3	1,043 (83%)	24 (60%)	23	964 (81%)	21 (66%)	16	-7	Yes
4	1,040 (83%)	32 (84%)	-1	1,018 (82%)	21 (72%)	10	+11	No
5	883 (76%)	20 (53%)	23	921 (75%)	22 (65%)	10	-13	Yes

Grade	2010-11			2011-12			Gap Change (+/-)	MPO Met?
	# (%) Prof/Adv		Gap	# (%) Prof/Adv		Gap		
	All	Migrant		All	Migrant			
6	922 (80%)	20 (65%)	15	906 (80%)	19 (51%)	28	+13	No
7	896 (76%)	12 (52%)	24	908 (80%)	24 (65%)	15	-9	Yes
8	859 (79%)	7 (47%)	32	892 (76%)	12 (52%)	24	-8	Yes
11	430 (39%)	4 (20%)	19	382 (37%)	0 (0%)	37	+18	No
Total	6,073 (74%)	119 (58%)	16	5,991 (74%)	119 (55%)	19	+3	No

In making comparisons between migrant students and all students, it is important to note that the *all students* group and the *migrant students* group contain widely disparate numbers. In the case of the migrant students, the small “n” affects the stability of the results with a few student scores affecting the overall average and the results fluctuating from year-to-year. In order to meet the MPO, eight more students would have needed meet or exceed standards for their grade level.

MPO 2d: 90% of migrant parents surveyed will report growth in their ability to support their child’s learning in mathematics.

Parent perceptions of their own growth in ability to support their child’s learning in mathematics were collected on the Parent Survey. Additional information about the impact of MEP parent involvement activities from parent and staff surveys and interviews can be found in the Parent Involvement sub-section of Section 4.

As displayed in Exhibit 39, 83% of parents surveyed reported that they learned ways to support their child’s learning in math, which **does not meet** the MPO target.

Exhibit 39
Parents Reporting Growth in their Ability to Support their Child’s Math Success

	N	Percent Reporting Growth	Percent Reporting Little or No Growth	MPO Met?
Did you learn ways to help support your child’s math learning at home ?	113	83%	17%	No

Further analysis shows that 47% of parents indicated that they learned some and 36% indicated learning “very much” to about ways to support their child’s math learning at home. Exhibit 40 displays the distribution of parent responses.

Exhibit 40
Parent Ratings of Growth in Ability to Help Children with Mathematics

Item	N	Not at all	Very little	Some	Very Much	Mean
Did you learn ways to help support your child’s math learning at home ?	113	5 (4%)	14 (12%)	53 (47%)	41 (36%)	3.2

Because the MPO was not met, further analysis was done to examine the particular services that parents participated in and which, if any, had an impact on whether or not parents felt they learned ways to support their child’s math learning. For those parents who indicated utilizing the summer math games, 93% said that they learned ways to support their child’s math learning at

home by some or a lot. Those taking advantage of other services were higher than the overall average but did not meet the 90% MPO target. (Note that 29 parents did not indicate participating in any of the parent involvement activities listed on the survey and 84 indicated utilizing one or more services.) The parent ratings by service are displayed in Exhibit 41.

Exhibit 41
Parent Ratings of Growth in Ability to Help Children with Mathematics by Service

Service	N	Not at all	Very little	Some	Very Much	% Some or Very Much
Math games in the home	45	0 (0%)	3 (7%)	24 (53%)	18 (40%)	93%
Parent night at the school	21	1 (5%)	2 (10%)	10 (48%)	8 (38%)	86%
Math videos for parents	7	0 (0%)	1 (14%)	2 (29%)	4 (57%)	86%
Reading to a child at home	50	2 (4%)	4 (8%)	26 (52%)	18 (36%)	88%

SCHOOL READINESS RESULTS

MPO 3a: 80% of all preschool migrant students participating for at least 3 weeks in summer school programs will show gains in language/literacy as measured by an appropriate language/literacy assessment.

For the purpose of addressing this MPO, the ISBE has adapted the New York *MEP Early Childhood Education (ECE) Assessment* and aligned it with the Illinois Early Learning Standards for use in a short-term summer program. The language/literacy portion of the *Illinois MEP ECE Assessment* measures students' skills in the areas that follow:

- Initial Book Behaviors
- Emergent Literacy Skills
- Emergent Writing Skills
- Prepositions
- Alphabet

Of the 60 students assessed, 56 (93%) made gains from pre- to post-test, surpassing the MPO target of 80%. The **MPO was met** at all age levels as well. Exhibit 42 shows the number of students assessed and number and percent gaining by age.

Exhibit 42
Students Gaining on the MEP Early Childhood Assessment Reading Skills by Age

Age	N	# Gaining	% Gaining	MPO Met?
3	12	11	92%	Yes
4	22	22	100%	Yes
5	26	23	88%	Yes
Total	60	56	93%	Yes

The two exhibits that follow display mean pre-test and post-test scores by skill and the number and percent of students gaining.

Exhibit 43
Student Results on the MEP Early Childhood Assessment by Reading Skill

Skill	Number of items	Pre	Post	Mean Gain	N	# (%) Gaining
Initial Book Behaviors	3	2.8	3.0	0.2	52	8 (15%)
Emergent Literacy Skills	15	10.1	12.3	2.2	52	28 (54%)
Emergent Writing Skills	5	3.0	3.6	0.6	60	22 (37%)
Prepositions	8	5.2	6.4	1.2	52	33 (63%)
Alphabet	60	14.3	19.1	4.8	60	56 (93%)

Exhibit 44
Student Results on the MEP Early Childhood Assessment by Other Skill

Skill	Number of items	Pre	Post	Mean Gain
Personal Data	3	2.5	2.8	0.3
Colors	33	27.7	30.1	2.4
Body Parts	10	8.3	9.1	0.8
Scissor Skills	3	2.2	2.8	0.6
Following Directions	3	2.4	2.8	0.4

MPO 3b: 80% of all preschool migrant students participating for at least 3 weeks in summer school programs will show statistically significant gains in mathematics as measured by an appropriate mathematics assessment.

The *Illinois MEP ECE Assessment* also measures students' skills in math on pre- and post-tests. Skills assessed include:

- Rote counting
- One-to-one correspondence
- Number identification
- Matching, identifying, and naming geometric shapes

Of the 60 students with a pre and a post score, 58 (97%) made gains, **meeting the MPO** target of 80%. Exhibit 45 displays the number of students assessed and number and percent gaining, by age.

Exhibit 45
Students Gaining on the MEP Early Childhood Assessment Math Skills by Age

Age	N	# Gaining	% Gaining	MPO Met?
3	12	12	100%	Yes
4	22	22	100%	Yes
5	26	24	92%	Yes
Total	60	58	97%	Yes

Exhibit 46 displays mean pre-test and post-test scores by math skill and the number and percent of students gaining.

Exhibit 46
Student Results on the MEP Early Childhood Assessment by Math Skill

Skill	Number of items	Pre	Post	Mean Gain	N	# (%) Gaining
Counting	60	28.0	34.5	6.5	60	54 (90%)
Shapes	36	17.8	21.7	3.9	60	53 (88%)

MPO 3c: 85% of migrant ECE teachers and aides, administrators, and instructional coaches will report on a PD survey that MEP-sponsored PD has helped them to more effectively support young children’s learning.

On a year-end staff survey, early childhood teachers, aides, and administrators were asked to rate the extent to which training sponsored by the MEP helped them support young children’s learning. Additional comments on—and ratings of—MEP professional development efforts can be found in Section 4 of this report.

As displayed in Exhibit 47, 98% of staff responding to the survey indicated that training helped them support young children’s learning, **surpassing the target** of 85% in the MPO.

Exhibit 47
ECE Instructional Staff Reporting Professional Development Supports Young Children’s Learning

Extent to which...	N	Percent Reporting Support	Percent Reporting no Support	MPO Met?
Training sponsored by the MEP helped you more effectively support young children’s learning.	46	98%	2%	Yes

Further analysis of staff responses shows that 89% of respondents felt that training helped them support young children’s learning by “a lot” or “very much.” Nine percent of staff members surveyed indicated the training helped “somewhat” and one respondent indicated that it helped “not at all.” Exhibit 48 displays the breakdown of staff responses.

Exhibit 48
ECE Instructional Staff Ratings of Professional Development

Extent to which...	N	Not at All	Some-what	A lot	Very Much	Mean
Training sponsored by the MEP helped you more effectively support young children’s learning.	46	1 (2%)	4 (9%)	10 (22%)	31 (67%)	3.5

MPO 3d: 90% of migrant parents surveyed will report growth in their ability to support their young child’s learning at home.

Parent perceptions of their own growth in ability to support their young child’s learning at home were collected on the Parent Survey. Additional information about the impact of MEP parent

involvement activities coming from parent and staff surveys and interviews can be found in the Parent Involvement sub-section of Section 4.

As displayed in Exhibit 49, 90% of parents surveyed reported that they learned ways to support their child’s learning in math. This **meets the MPO** target of 90%.

Exhibit 49
Parents Reporting Growth in their Ability to Support Young Children’s Learning

Item	N	Percent Reporting Growth	Percent Reporting no Growth	MPO Met?
Did you learn new ways to help your preschooler or young child learn new things at home?	66	90%	10%	Yes

On the aggregate, parents felt that they learned very much (49%) or some (41%) to help their young children learn at home. Exhibit 50 displays the distribution of parent responses.

Exhibit 50
Parent Ratings of Growth in Ability to Support Young Children’s Learning

Item	N	Not at all	Very little	Some	Very Much	Mean
Did you learn new ways to help your preschooler or young child learn new things at home?	66	1 (1%)	6 (9%)	27 (41%)	32 (49%)	3.3

HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATION

MPO 4a: The percentage of high school migrant students enrolled in summer migrant credit-bearing programs who successfully complete course(s) required for high school graduation will increase by at least 1%.

Summer programs offer credit for migrant students who intend to graduate in either Illinois or their home state. The curriculum typically used is the Portable Assisted Study Sequence (PASS) or the University of Texas (UT) Migrant Program coursework that is accepted for credit at school districts in both states. PASS and UT distance learning courses are designed to be completed semi-independently and are conducive to use with students who are highly mobile and do not have enough time in one location to complete an entire course.

Courses attempted by students each year may vary depending on the credit needs of individual students. Completing a course in a short-term summer program is very difficult and represents great diligence on the part of the students and MEP summer school staff.

In the summer of 2011 81.5% of courses attempted were completed and in the summer of 2012 88.5% of courses were completed, a 7% increase that **meets the MPO**. Exhibit 51 displays the number and percent of courses attempted and completed in 2011 and 2012.

Exhibit 51
Overall Change in Percent of Courses Completed for High School Graduation

Summer 2011		Summer 2012		Change in completion rate	MPO met?
# Attempted	# Completed	# Attempted	# Completed		
27	22 (81.5%)	26	23 (88.5%)	+7	Yes

To provide a longitudinal perspective, Exhibit 52 displays the courses attempted and completed in summer programs during 2010, 2011, and 2012. Twelve of the 26 courses attempted (46%) in 2012 were UT Credit by Exam Spanish courses and seven (27%) were English courses. All Spanish and English courses were completed. Four (15%) social studies courses were attempted and one was completed.

Exhibit 52
Change in Percent of Courses Completed for High School Graduation from 2010 to 2012

Course	Summer 2010		Summer 2011		Summer 2012	
	# Attempted	# Completed	# Attempted	# Completed	# Attempted	# Completed
Algebra IA	2	0				
Algebra IB	1	1	1	1		
Algebra IIA	1	0				
Algebra IIB			1	0		
Economics			1	1		
English IA	1	0			2	1
English IB			1	0	1	1
English IIA					1	1
English IIB			1	0	2	2
English IIIA	1	1				
English IIIB	1	1			1	1
Environmental Science A	1	1				
Geometry A			1	1		
Health	2	2	3	3	3	3
Personal Finance	2	2	5	4		
Spanish 1 A	1	1	3	3	3	3
Spanish 1B	1	1	3	3	4	4
Spanish 2A	1	1	1	1		
Spanish 2B	1	1	1	1		
Spanish 3A	1	1	2	2	3	3
Spanish 3B	1	1	2	2	2	2
US Government	1	1	1	0	1	0
US History B					1	1
World Geography	1	1			1	0
World History A					1	0
Total	20	16 (80.0%)	27	22 (81.5%)	26	23 (88.5%)

MPO 4b: The percentage of IL migrant students who graduate from high school in districts with migrant programs will increase by at least 1%.

Graduation rates were calculated for migrant students enrolled in the 12th grade in districts where there was a migrant program. Graduation rates for migrant students were obtained from the State database by dividing the number of migrant 12th graders graduating by the total number of migrant 12th graders enrolled.

The graduation rate for migrant students in the 2010-11 school year was 71%. The graduation rate for 2011-12 was 64%, a 7 point decrease, which **does not meet MPO**. To meet the MPO, two more students would have needed to graduate. The total number of migrant twelfth graders enrolled was the same for both academic years. Exhibit 53 displays the number of migrant students enrolled and the number graduating for 2010-11 and 2011-12.

**Exhibit 53
Illinois Migrant Student High School Graduation Rates**

2010-11		2011-12		Change in Rate (+/-)	MPO Met?
# 12 th Grade Migrant Students	# (%) Graduating	# 12 th Grade Migrant Students	# (%) Graduating		
14	10 (71%)	14	9 (64%)	-7	No

MPO 4c: 90% of migrant secondary teachers and aides, administrators, and instructional coaches working with secondary-aged students will report on a PD survey that MEP-sponsored PD has helped them to more effectively provide services to HS-aged students.

On a year-end staff survey, secondary teachers, aides, and administrators were asked to rate the extent to which training sponsored by the MEP helped them to more effectively provide services to high-school aged students. Additional comments on—and ratings of—MEP professional development efforts can be found in Section 4 of this report.

As displayed in Exhibit 54, 94% of staff responding to the survey indicated that training helped them more effectively provide services to high school students, **meeting the MPO** target of 80%.

**Exhibit 54
Instructional Staff Reporting Professional Development Helped Them Support High School Students**

Extent to which...	N	Percent Reporting Support	Percent Reporting no Support	MPO Met?
Training sponsored by the MEP helped you more effectively provide services to high school aged students.	34	94%	6%	Yes

Further analysis shows that 89% staff members indicated that training helped them provide high school student services by “a lot” (18%) or “very much” (71%). Two staff members indicated that training helped “not at all.” Exhibit 55 displays the distribution of staff responses.

Exhibit 55
Instructional Staff Ratings of Professional Development for Supporting H.S. Students

Extent to which...	N	Not at All	Some-what	A lot	Very Much	Mean
Training sponsored by the MEP helped you more effectively provide services to high school aged students.	34	2 (6%)	2 (6%)	6 (18%)	24 (71%)	3.5

MPO 4d: The percentage of identified OSY who participate in instructional services will increase by 5%.

The number and percent of OSY identified and participating in instructional services is obtained from the SOSY Coordinator Survey for both 2010-11 and 2011-12. Instructional services for OSY include those that promote graduation, provide life skills lessons, and help students pursue educational and/or career goals. In the 2010-11 school year, 24% of the 310 OSY identified participated in instructional services. In 2011-12, the percent participating increased to 37%, a 13 point increase, **which meets the MPO** target of a 5% increase.

Exhibit 56 displays the number of OSY identified and the number and percent participating in instructional services in 2010-11 and 2011-12.

Exhibit 56
Change in the Percent of OSY Participating in Instructional Services

2010-11 School Year (Baseline)		2011-12 School Year		% Increase	MPO met?
# OSY Identified	# (%) Participating in Instructional Services	# OSY Identified	# (%) Participating in Instructional Services		
310	73 (24%)	282	104 (37%)	+13	Yes

MPO 4e: The percentage of secondary students (both those attending a home-based program and those in a center-based program for at least 3 weeks) who make progress toward their instructional/learning goals will increase by 5%

The Illinois summer migrant education programs help students consider options for postsecondary education and careers through services such as high school coursework, test preparation, ESL, post-secondary preparation, career awareness, life skills, and other services meeting student needs. Sites track services provided and the number of students meeting the learning objectives outlined in their services delivery plan.

Exhibit 57 displays the number of secondary students with a services plan and the number and percent of those who met their learning objectives. Sixty-six percent (66%) met their learning objectives. This is the first year Illinois has collected data in this way and the first year with this revised MPO. Therefore, progress will be measured beginning in the 2011-12 school year.

Exhibit 57
Secondary Students Making Progress toward their Instructional/Learning Goals

Number with Services Plan	# (%) Making Progress	MPO Met?
58	57 (98%)	Baseline set

In addition to tracking the number of students meeting learning objectives, sites tracked the goals students had (note that a single student may have worked on one or more goals during the summer). The number of students with each educational goal varied and ranged from one working on life skills lessons to 35 working toward high school credit accrual. The number and percentage of secondary students participating in each type of service are displaying in Exhibit 58.

Exhibit 58
Student Participation in Secondary Services (N=58)

Instructional Goal	# (%)
High school credit accrual	35 (60%)
Career goal plan	33 (57%)
Post-secondary planning	28 (48%)
ESL	19 (33%)
Other	17 (29%)
TAKS/STAAR prep	3 (5%)
Middle school course	2 (3%)
Life skills lessons	1 (2%)

MPO 4f: 90% of migrant parents surveyed will report growth in the ability to support their secondary-aged child’s pursuit of learning and post-secondary objectives.

Parent perceptions of their own growth in ability to support their secondary-aged child’s pursuit of learning and post-secondary objectives were collected on the Parent Survey. Additional information about the impact of MEP parent involvement activities coming from parent and staff surveys and Parent Advisory Group meetings can be found in the Parent Involvement sub-section of Section 4 and in Appendix B.

As displayed in Exhibit 59, 74% of parents surveyed reported that they learned ways to support their child prepare for college and/or a career. This does not meet the MPO target of 90%.

Exhibit 59
Parents Reporting Growth in their Ability to Support their Child’s Learning and Post-Secondary Objectives

Extent to which...	N	Percent Reporting Growth	Percent Reporting no Growth	MPO Met?
Did you learn new ways to help your high school student prepare for college and/or a career?	55	75%	25%	No

Seventy-four percent of parents felt that they learned very much (38%) or some (36%) about preparing their high school student for college and/or a career. Exhibit 60 displays the distribution of parent responses.

Exhibit 60
Distribution of Growth in Parents' Ability to Support their
Child's Learning and Post-Secondary Objectives

N	Not at All	Very little	Some	Very Much	Mean
55	5 (9%)	9 (16%)	20 (36%)	21 (38%)	3.0

Because the MPO was not met, further analysis was done to examine the particular services that parents participated in and which, if any, had an impact on whether or not parents felt they learned ways to help their high school student prepare for graduation.

For those parents who indicated attending a parent night at a school, 90% said that they learned ways to prepare their child for school. Those taking advantage of other services did not meet the 90% MPO target. (Note that 17 parents did not indicate participating in any of the parent involvement activities listed on the survey and 38 indicated utilizing one or more services.) The parent ratings by service are displayed in Exhibit 61.

Exhibit 61
Distribution of Growth in Parents' Ability to Support their
Child's Learning and Post-Secondary Objectives by Service

Service	N	Not at all	Very little	Some	Very Much	% Some or Very Much
Math games in the home	19	4 (21%)	1 (5%)	8 (42%)	6 (32%)	74%
Parent night at the school	10	1 (10%)	0 (0%)	5 (50%)	4 (40%)	90%
Math videos for parents	6	1 (17%)	0 (0%)	3 (50%)	2 (33%)	83%
Reading to a child at home	28	5 (18%)	4 (14%)	13 (46%)	6 (21%)	67%

6

Recommendations

This section of the report provides recommendations for action based on the data reported for the evaluation of the Illinois MEP. Recommendations are summarized based on observations, staff, parent, and student surveys, results of student assessments, and tracking records prepared by site administrators. Recommendations are provided for implementation as well as for addressing the progress made to reach the MPOs.

The State is commended for meeting 15 of the 19 MPOs for which progress was measured in 2010-11. In addition, the State MEP developed a new additional MPO (4e) and established a baseline measure. The implementation evaluation data show that the Illinois MEP implemented recommendations from previous evaluations, and the services provided by the MEP consistently received high ratings from staff, parents, and students.

PROGRAM OUTCOMES

There were five MPOs that the State did not meet during the 2011-12 academic year. The reasons these measures were not met are varied and will be discussed separately as they each have their own implications for program planning and evaluation.

1. MPO 1a indicated that students who receive reading instruction for at least three weeks (during the summer months) and are identified as Emerging Readers will demonstrate a gain of at least four points on the Concepts About Print. Fifty-six percent of students made at least a four-point gain. This is the third year that this measure has been in place in Illinois and the third year that the target of 75% gaining four or more points was not met (though in 2009 the target was even higher at 5 points gained). However, 89% of students assessed made some gain indicating that learning is taking place. It is difficult to determine the precise reason the target was not met. It could be that three weeks is not enough time to make the target gain. It could be that inconsistent attendance typical during summer migrant programs played a role. It could be that some instructional practices need to be improved. The assessment may not have been given to all who are “emergent readers” and more training is necessary for teachers in selecting students appropriately for this assessment. This may be the case for the summer of 2012 because the number of students assessed decreased by 11 from the previous summer while the number participating at this grade level actually increased by 10. It is recommended that additional training be provided to teachers in the proper selection of students for the *Concepts about Print* assessment. In addition, the State may want to consider whether or not a different assessment may be more appropriate due to student reading ability, such as the *Early Childhood Education Assessment* which measures growth in students’ pre-literacy skills.
2. MPO 1f: The State is commended for reaching the MPO relating to the reduction in the achievement gap on the State reading assessment between migrant and non-migrant students. However, the gap between non-migrant and migrant students on the State assessment in math increased by three points, which does not meet the MPO. The

problem with the small number of migrant students assessed for this type of measure again comes into play. Small numbers of students will contribute to volatility in proficiency rates as individual differences and factors outside of MEP involvement likely affect the overall percent proficient. In this case consolidating the MPO is not an option. Therefore, it is recommended that extra assistance be provided to students who are close to proficient, and monitor students who are just at the proficiency mark, providing extra assistance as needed to ensure that they do not fall below the proficient level.

3. MPO 2d: Although 83% of migrant parents surveyed indicated that they learned ways to help support their child's math learning at home, this does not meet the MPO target of 90%. The target of 90% may be too high for this performance measure. In addition, further analysis shows that 93% of parents who utilized the math games provided as part of the Math MASTERS program indicated that they learned ways to support their children's math learning at home. Therefore, it is recommended that the State continue to emphasize the importance of using the in-home math activities during the summer programs through parent involvement activities, implementation of local strategies for parent involvement, trainings, and professional development.
4. MPO 4b: The percent of migrant secondary students graduating from high school decreased by 7% from 2010-11 to 2011-12. The rates were calculated by looking at the number of migrant students enrolled in the 12th grade and the number graduating. The same number of students were enrolled in each academic year but one fewer student graduated in 2012 compared to 2011. Migrant student achievement in high school is of particular concern as no student assessed on the PSAE in math or reading was proficient. The relevant strategy for this MPO is "Establish a collaboration among the school guidance counselor, MEP staff, and the migrant student to develop and monitor a graduation plan that is revisited at least annually to provide support and ensure that students participating during the regular school year are on track for graduation." It is unclear if these graduation plans are being revised annually as stated or if counselors are aware of migrant services available to migrant secondary students and recommending students at risk for not graduating to these services. It is recommended that the State place renewed emphasis on high school student achievement through monitoring of the completion of graduation plans and providing supplemental services to students at risk for not graduating.
5. MPO 4e states "The percentage of secondary students (both those attending a home-based program and those in a center-based program for at least 3 weeks) who make progress toward their instructional/learning goals will increase by 5%." The way this MPO is tracked was changed in 2012 from a student-reported form to a site-reported form that indicates student's goals and the progress students made on those goals. The report indicates that 98% of students with goals for the summer programs made appropriate progress on those goals. The State is commended for the hard work in helping students identify and work toward their individual education and career goals. However, a ceiling has been reached and further increases in the percent of students making progress can be made. Therefore, it is recommended that the MPO be changed to read "90% of secondary students (both those attending a home-based program and those in a center-based program for at least 3 weeks who have established summer learning goals) will make progress toward their instructional/learning goals as measured by a staff rating of three or higher on a four-point rubric of student progress."

6. **MPO 4f:** Although 75% of migrant parents surveyed indicated that they learned ways to help their high school student prepare for college and/or a career, this does not meet the MPO target of 90%. Further analysis shows that 90% parents who attended a parent night did learn ways to help their high school student. While only 10 parents with high school student attended a parent night, it is likely that this venue would be the best option for helping parents learn about college and career options. Therefore, it is recommended that the State continue to emphasize through parent involvement activities, trainings, and professional development the importance of involving parents in site-based activities designed increase knowledge and awareness surrounding post-secondary and career options.

PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION

There is evidence of consistent and ongoing efforts to **involve parents** in education and in the MEP. Parents are invited to State workshops, the State Bilingual Summer, and the secondary student workshop; further, local MEPs provide at least two opportunities for local parent workshops. Parent feedback is solicited through surveys, parent groups, and focus groups as appropriate. The Illinois MEP is commended for taking into account parent feedback and implementing suggestions.

7. Parent suggestions on the Parent Survey of Project Effectiveness included increased communication between the schools and parents through progress reports for their children and personal communication. Though most parents said that no changes were needed to the services, the suggestion requesting additional information from the school reflects interest in the schooling of their children, a commendable result of parent involvement efforts. It is recommended that the State work with sites and teachers to outline ways in which sites can report student academic progress. For example, sites may wish to send home results of the summer math program pre-assessments and indicate the math skills that teachers will be working on with children. During the development of reports for parents, it should be recognized that teachers have very limited time during summer programs and limited information about student's prior knowledge. Also, the reports need to provide information that is relevant accessible to parents.

Parents suggested subjects they would like more information about during parent involvement activities. Although most had no comments, some parents indicated wanting sessions designed to increase parent knowledge of what they can do in the home to support their children's education. The MEP should continue to address these subjects at parent activities and/or add to existing activities as needed and continue to encourage sites to send parents to statewide events.

While the MEP provided many opportunities for parent involvement, training, and feedback, the Parent Advisory Group was not formally convened during the 2011-12 academic year. Staff indicated that this was due to a miscommunication during the State Bilingual Summit and low migrant parent attendance at the summit. Staff also indicated that the PAG will be convened via webinar in 2013.

The Illinois MEP has met all MPOs related to training and **professional development**. Staff had very positive comments about the effectiveness of the training provided by the MEP.

Furthermore, staff rated all trainings very high and indicated in comments that they will be using the information and skills gained to positively influence the learning of migrant students.

8. When asked to provide suggestions for improvement to the math MASTERS pre-service training, Balanced Literacy pre-service training, and the State Workshop, participants often indicated that they had no suggestions. When suggestions were provided, they were about scheduling, venue, and logistics rather than the overall program design. Two comments that appeared several times were to have sessions specifically for teachers new to the program and to repeat sessions that are popular or necessary so that all have the ability to attend. Other comments related to specific content-related suggestions are summarized in the body of the report in the State Development section.

The Illinois MEP has placed great emphasis on training recruiters and providing the most up-to-date information regarding regulations and best practices. Not only does the State provide a statewide ID&R training so that all recruiters and reviewers can benefit from expertise and lessons learned, but also an additional training is provided for new recruiters to get the basic information needed to accurately identify eligible migrant children.

9. Recruiters were asked to provide suggestions for improvement on a survey completed at the end of the statewide training. Most recruiters responded that they had no suggestions. However, one comment made by several individuals was that they would like to have practice doing an interview utilizing several different scenarios. According to materials from the training sessions, there were opportunities to practice interviews and interview techniques. However, participants indicated wanting a variety of scenarios to help them understand circumstances they might encounter in the field. While time may not allow for every recruiter to practice several different scenarios, trainers may want to provide variations on example interviews, changing one element that would affect how the interview is conducted and what questions would be asked. In addition, several instructional staff mentioned wanting additional information about child eligibility so that they could better aid recruiters in finding eligible families.

Overall, the Illinois MEP has established a high quality program that focuses on student achievement and establishes methods for measuring the effectiveness of all activities provided. The program has increased learning in reading and mathematics through intentional focus on the skills migrant students need as a basis for meeting State standards. Preschool children have increased the number of skills mastered to prepare them for school. High school students are completing courses for graduation in summer programs. All of these achievements indicate a solid program focused on improving education for all Illinois migrant students.

APPENDIX A

Evaluation Forms

Illinois Migrant Education Workshop Evaluation
DoubleTree Hotel—Alsip, Illinois
June 11-13, 2012

Directions: Complete the form by placing an "X" in the box that best describes your reaction to the criterion.

	Exemplary	Good	Average	Developing
Breakout Sessions	<input type="checkbox"/> Highly interesting & informative	<input type="checkbox"/> Interesting & informative	<input type="checkbox"/> Somewhat interesting & informative	<input type="checkbox"/> Uninteresting & uninformative
General Sessions	<input type="checkbox"/> Highly interesting & informative	<input type="checkbox"/> Interesting & informative	<input type="checkbox"/> Somewhat interesting & informative	<input type="checkbox"/> Uninteresting & uninformative
Format/Organization of the Workshop	<input type="checkbox"/> Very organized and structured in a way that learning was optimal	<input type="checkbox"/> Organized and structured in a way that learning was optimal	<input type="checkbox"/> Somewhat organized and structured in a way that some learning was accomplished	<input type="checkbox"/> Disorganized/little learning was accomplished
Hotel Accommodations	<input type="checkbox"/> Highly convenient/comfortable	<input type="checkbox"/> Convenient/comfortable	<input type="checkbox"/> Somewhat convenient/comfortable	<input type="checkbox"/> Inconvenient/uncomfortable

How would you rate this workshop? Justify your rating below.

Exemplary Good Average Poor

Indicate your **primary** position:

Teachers/Aides	Other Personnel	
<input type="checkbox"/> PK	<input type="checkbox"/> Administrator	<input type="checkbox"/> Parent Liaison
<input type="checkbox"/> Grades K-5	<input type="checkbox"/> Data Specialist	<input type="checkbox"/> Recruiter and/or Advocate
<input type="checkbox"/> Grades 6-8	<input type="checkbox"/> Family Educator	<input type="checkbox"/> Other (specify):
<input type="checkbox"/> H.S. 9-12		
<input type="checkbox"/> OSY		

*Rate how your skills increased as a result of participating in this training by circling a number to the right of each statement below. Please rate **ONLY** those items that relate to your position.*

4 = Very Much 3 = A Lot 2 = Somewhat 1 = Not At All N/A = Not Applicable

Position	Extent to which the workshop helped you learn to...	Rating
All teachers and aides	a) Apply various reading strategies in working with migrant students	4 3 2 1 N/A
	b) Apply various math strategies in working with migrant students	4 3 2 1 N/A
Preschool teachers and aides	c) Apply various early learning strategies in working with migrant students <u>ages 3-5</u> .	4 3 2 1 N/A
Secondary/OSY teachers and aides	d) Apply various learning strategies in working with <u>secondary-aged</u> migrant students	4 3 2 1 N/A
Recruiters/Advocates	e) Apply various strategies for identification and recruitment/advocacy of migrant students	4 3 2 1 N/A
Data Entry Specialists	f) Apply tools for data entry and/or the management of information related to migrant students and programs	4 3 2 1 N/A
Parent Liaisons/ Family Educators	g) Apply strategies for the involvement of migrant parents in the education of their children	4 3 2 1 N/A
Administrators	h) Apply strategies for the effective management of summer migrant education programs.	4 3 2 1 N/A

Other Comments: _____

Illinois Migrant Education Program Parent Survey

Location _____

1. My child participating in the Migrant Education Program is in (check all that apply):

Preschool/Kindergarten Elementary Middle School High School

2. What parent activities did you participate in? (check all that apply)

Math home games Math parent video Parent workshop Reading with my child

Directions: Please circle the number in the box below which best describes your experiences with migrant services. Then write your responses to the questions presented below. Thank you.

1=Not at all

2=Very little

3=Some

4=Very much

N/A = Not Applicable

3. Did the migrant education summer math program staff communicate with you about your child's participation?	1	2	3	4	N/A
4. Did you learn ways to help support your child's math learning at home? (for example, with math games at home & parent videos)	1	2	3	4	N/A
5. Did you have the opportunity to attend a parent event? (examples: family night, parent-teacher conference, parent committee meeting)	1	2	3	4	N/A
6. If your child attended the migrant education summer program at a school , did you feel welcomed at the school?	1	2	3	4	N/A
7. If an instructor visited your home , did you feel welcome to participate in the lessons?	1	2	3	4	N/A
8. Do you feel like you are more involved in your child's math education because of the migrant education summer program?	1	2	3	4	N/A
9. Does your child have a good attitude about learning math in the migrant education summer program?	1	2	3	4	N/A
10. Did you learn new ways to help your child improve his/her reading skills?	1	2	3	4	N/A
11. Has your child improved his/her reading skills as a result of the summer program?	1	2	3	4	N/A
12. Did you learn new ways to help your preschooler or young child learn new things at home? (Circle N/A if you do not have a preschool-aged child.)	1	2	3	4	N/A
13. Did you learn new ways to help your high school student stay on track for graduation? (Circle N/A if you do not have a high school student.)	1	2	3	4	N/A
14. Did you learn new ways to help your high school student prepare for college and/or a career? (Circle N/A if you do not have a high school student.)	1	2	3	4	N/A
15. Did your child participate in the summer math program <u>last</u> summer?	1	2	3	4	N/A
16. If your child participated <u>last summer</u> , did you keep using the math activities?	1	2	3	4	N/A
17. How would you rate the services provided by the Illinois migrant education summer program?	Poor	Fair	Good	Very Good	N/A

18. How did the Illinois Migrant Education Program help your child succeed in school?

.....

.....

19. How would you change the Illinois Migrant Education Program to make it better?

.....

.....

Staff Survey on Project Effectiveness Illinois Migrant Education Program

Check your current position. (Choose only one position.)

Indicate your primary position:	Teacher/Aide: <input type="checkbox"/> PK/K <input type="checkbox"/> Gr. 1-5 <input type="checkbox"/> Gr. 6-8 <input type="checkbox"/> H.S. 9-12 <input type="checkbox"/> OSY
	<input type="checkbox"/> Administrator <input type="checkbox"/> Parent Liaison <input type="checkbox"/> Recruiter <input type="checkbox"/> Family Educator
	<input type="checkbox"/> Data Entry <input type="checkbox"/> Other (specify):

Please rate the effectiveness of the services provided by the Illinois MEP by circling a number to the right of each statement below. Note that question 7 applies to preschool staff, question 8 applies to high school staff, and question 9 applies to staff who work with out-of-school youth.

1 = Not At All 2 = Somewhat 3 = A Lot 4 = Very Much N/A = Not Applicable

<i>In your opinion, rate the extent to which...</i>	Rating
1. Instruction provided by the MEP helped students improve their reading skills .	1 2 3 4 N/A
2. Instruction provided by the MEP helped students improve their math skills .	1 2 3 4 N/A
3. Supportive and supplemental services contributed to the academic success of migrant students.	1 2 3 4 N/A
4. Migrant English language learners (ELLs) improved their English proficiency .	1 2 3 4 N/A
5. Training sponsored by the MEP helped you more effectively support high quality reading instruction .	1 2 3 4 N/A
6. Training sponsored by the MEP helped you more effectively support high quality math instruction .	1 2 3 4 N/A
7. Training sponsored by the MEP helped you more effectively support young children's learning (answer if you worked with preschool students).	1 2 3 4 N/A
8. Training sponsored by the MEP helped you more effectively provide services to high school students (answer if you worked with high school students).	1 2 3 4 N/A
9. Training sponsored by the MEP helped you more effectively provide services to out-of-school youth (OSY) (answer if you worked with OSY).	1 2 3 4 N/A
10. Parents were involved in your program.	1 2 3 4 N/A
11. The Illinois MEP was effective in meeting the academic needs of migrant students.	1 2 3 4 N/A

In what way was the Illinois MEP most beneficial to migrant students?

.....

.....

What suggestions do you have to improve services to migrant students in Illinois?

.....

.....

What suggestions for professional development do you have?

.....

.....

Staff Training Survey IL MEP 2012

Date(s) _____ Location _____ Training Title _____

Directions: Complete the form by placing an "X" in the box that best describes your reaction to the criterion.

	Exemplary Performance (4 points)	Good Performance (3 points)	Average Performance (2 points)	Developing Performance (1 point)
Training	<input type="checkbox"/> Highly relevant and informative	<input type="checkbox"/> Relevant and informative	<input type="checkbox"/> Somewhat relevant and informative	<input type="checkbox"/> Uninteresting and irrelevant
Applicability	<input type="checkbox"/> Very applicable	<input type="checkbox"/> Applicable	<input type="checkbox"/> Somewhat applicable	<input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable
Involvement	<input type="checkbox"/> Numerous hands-on activities and chances for involvement	<input type="checkbox"/> Sufficient hands-on activities and chances for involvement	<input type="checkbox"/> Some hands-on activities and chances for involvement	<input type="checkbox"/> All lecture with no chance for involvement
Materials	<input type="checkbox"/> Very useful	<input type="checkbox"/> Useful	<input type="checkbox"/> Somewhat useful	<input type="checkbox"/> Not useful
Trainer(s)	<input type="checkbox"/> Skilled at using various techniques to facilitate learning	<input type="checkbox"/> Used sufficient techniques to facilitate learning	<input type="checkbox"/> Used some techniques to facilitate learning	<input type="checkbox"/> Lacked skills to facilitate learning

Please rate your knowledge of the training topics/content areas/strategies on a scale from one to four.

1 = No Knowledge 2 = Some Knowledge 3 = Much Knowledge 4 = Extensive Knowledge

Topic/Content Area/Strategy	Rating				
	1	2	3	4	N/A
	1	2	3	4	N/A
	1	2	3	4	N/A

How will this training impact the training you provide to local sites to regarding Math MASTERS?

What recommendations do you have for future training?

Secondary Student Services Plan Summer MEP

Name _____ Date _____

Location _____ Grade Level _____

Student's Goal _____

Student's Interest(s) _____

Instructional Focus (Check all that apply)	Materials/Strategies (Circle or add)				
<input type="checkbox"/> Middle School Course — Make-Up for Promotion — Skill Building — Other	Middle School PASS Other: _____				
<input type="checkbox"/> High School Credit Accrual — Missed or failed course — Remediation — Acceleration	PASS UT Other: _____				
<input type="checkbox"/> TAKS Preparation and Testing	TAKS Referral Form Arrange Testing Other: _____				
<input type="checkbox"/> ESL	Oxford Picture Dictionary Living in America Other: _____				
<input type="checkbox"/> Post-Secondary Preparation	Preparing for College (PASS Unit) Campus Visit College Essay Other: _____				
<input type="checkbox"/> Career Awareness	Career Connections Course (PASS) Websites: _____ Other: _____				
<input type="checkbox"/> Life Skills	Health Mini Lessons Financial Literacy Mini Lessons Other: _____				
<input type="checkbox"/> Other	Other: _____ Other: _____				
After being enrolled for at least 3 weeks, to what extent did the student make progress on this plan? (circle one)	<table border="1" style="display: inline-table; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="padding: 5px;">Not at all</td> <td style="padding: 5px;">Very little</td> <td style="padding: 5px;">Somewhat</td> <td style="padding: 5px;">A lot</td> </tr> </table>	Not at all	Very little	Somewhat	A lot
Not at all	Very little	Somewhat	A lot		

Use the Secondary Student Record and PASS Report, if applicable, to document students' credit accrual and to aid in credit transfer. Both full and partial credits should be entered in NGS. Summer credit accrual information should also be sent to students' homebase schools or whatever they plan to enroll in the fall.

APPENDIX B

CPDU Comments

**CPDU Comments
Statewide MEP Workshop
June 11-13, 2012**

The best features of this activity were:

- I really enjoyed Tammy from the IRC. I went to two of her sessions and learned a lot from each!
- I thoroughly enjoyed Kim Gillam's MASTERS session. Having taught pre-k last year, I was unfamiliar with the curriculum so this session was highly informative.
- Strategies discussed and modeled that can be used in the classroom.
- The strategies, instructional tools to help all the students.
- Tammy King, Kim English, Doug Irwin, Christine Chávez – Great, Great, Great.
- I enjoyed the writing with Tammy King and Doug Irwin. I also picked up a lot from the tech sessions with Kelly English.
- Sandra Moran from Wauconda was very impressive in her experience and knowledge regarding parent involvement.
- Kelly English on technology
- Very relevant breakout sessions
- Preparation for summer program
- Good hands-on activities for data entry
- Variety of sessions
- Interactive sessions, great presenters
- Knowledgeable presenters
- Interactive sessions, give-aways, technology resources
- Emily Dugan: *A Safe Place to Fail* was excellent, Musical math and more math, photo booth
- I liked all the presentations. Great job!
- E-books and *Bringing Literature to Life*
- Cooking up Reading*
- I loved all the sessions. They were very helpful and I will use the strategies I learned in my classroom. Beth Knotnerus did a fantastic job in her session. She was very enthusiastic, knowledgeable, and gave lots of resources. I loved the conference.
- Julie Alexander & Liliana Barra-Zecker were enjoyable and informative. Lots of great ideas
- Tammy King and Liliana Zecker are excellent presenters.
- Well organized. Great hotel!
- Help and support with MASTERS!
- All of the little extras were great! Candy bars, trivia night (with genuine enthusiasm and participation by all levels of staff, administration), awesome photo booth, snack breaks, food & meals, Gloria Rosales' party/hosting. The hotel is beautiful & rooms are nice & comfortable. Very close to city, very well planned. Very friendly conference registration table this year! Effective presenters! ☺
- Variety of sessions offered during breakout sessions. Very well organized! Very experienced/veteran presenters.
- The workshops were led by qualified, professional, passionate individuals. Having Christine Chávez as a speaker was incredible. Thank you!
- The PBS-using the media presentation was fabulous. It's disappointing that their funding was discontinued, but I gratefully appreciate the materials provided. I can't wait to go use them! Tammy King from IRC provided worthwhile information & strategies. She's a wonderful, knowledgeable resource!
- Computer activities
- The breakout sessions were extremely valuable. I am much more competent in utilizing MAS Space and have so many new ideas for reading in math.
- The range of breakout sessions included as well as the scheduling to include multiple opportunities to see a session.
- College readiness was really good and I heard the Dream Act was too.
- Interaction
- The interactive sessions and Revolution Lucharte

- That we stayed in the hotel for everything
- Julie Alexander reading workshops, Linda Braam – cooking ideas for the classroom, Kim Gillam
- To learn new ways to help our students feel confident participants in the classroom environment that will encourage learning.
- Fun, Funky, Fresh Ideas. *Creating a Safe Place to Fail, Coaching Students to go to College*
- Having choices of workshops
- Practical ideas for reinforcing learning in the classroom.
- Hands-on activities, lists of resources for teachers, bringing in youth who personally shared their experiences
- On each workshop I visited.

Suggestions for improvement include:

- New sessions for repeat teachers. (2)
- Make the session 1 hour long.
- Some sessions could be cut down to one hour instead of hour and 15 minutes.
- Need to consider having this sooner in the year.
- More sessions for secondary students
- Make sessions one hour long instead of 1.25 hrs
- Repeat some of the sessions more
- Lunch on Wednesday (5)
- The word wall creating should explain how to reference them during lessons.
- Better food selection
- More info for pre-k and k
- Perhaps a little bit of switching around of scheduling and/or placement of sessions would benefit participants. For example, the louder sessions w/music could be placed in the conference rooms that are more removed. It seemed that presenters were struggling to concentrate when certain music or songs were heard through walls between session rooms. Maybe the more interactive sessions, such as Emily Dugan's could be held in afternoons to help participants to maintain concentration & engagement in learning. Getting up & moving around during sessions helps most in afternoon sessions. Participants are more "awake" in the mornings vs. afternoons.
- As a new teacher to the program, I would have appreciated a workshop specific to helping new teachers in the program. "A walk through MASTERS" was helpful in this regard.
- More activities for HS teachers
- I really wanted to go to certain sessions, but couldn't at particular times due to scheduling. Maybe, repeat sessions could be offered more.
- Inclusion of more math & in-depth MASTERS curriculum instruction. Also providing copies of the curriculum for the session would be helpful.
- I think the really good workshops should have been available more than once.
- Food and service could have been better.
- More instruction on successful guided reading groups.
- Is good as is.

Other comments and reactions I wish to offer:

- Love the accommodations. It would be nice to vary the location of the conference throughout the state. It would break up the drive for different people each year.
- The conference should be held down state or central every other year. The accommodations were great, but the food was lacking.
- The conference continues to contain very high quality sessions with purpose. I remember some years ago there was "fluff". Not much room for "fluff" anymore.
- State workshop should be in a central location. Chicago is not centrally located for all state projects.
- Great conference
- I especially enjoyed *Bringing Literature to Life*; Chris Fascione was wonderful (especially early on the last morning)
- Always a great experience

- The hotel rooms (bedrooms & bathrooms) smelled like cigarette smoke the whole time. Did not really like the food for this conference.
- I like that in previous years there were books available to be bought, Latin America, art craft, etc. I missed them this year.
- I really enjoyed it! ☺
- Christine Chávez! So Awesome!! ☺ Highlight of the conference. Thank you!!
- Loved this conference. Overall, one of the best I have attended in years. The sessions and content surpassed even the National Conference.
- Please allow us to have access to e-books
- Please keep the e-books
- Very helpful
- Loved the musical math and musical reading seminars.
- I like it. Ans I give you thank you for all of you.

**Balanced Literacy and Math MASTERS Pre-service Training
May 11-12, 2012**

The best features of this activity were:

- Videos were great!
- The videos
- The hands-on activities we did to show us how to present it to the children.
- Our group interactions (2)
- Learning practical strategies that can be used in my classrooms
- Practical, usable info was presented
- All the examples given to promote scaffolding while conferencing with writers.
- The videos (2)
- Well informed, very strong presenters, relevant topics, hands-on application
- The very last part where we moved around and wrote on the paper different strategies to help readers and writers.
- Hands-on activities (2)
- Presenter/teachers interactions. Samples of different strategies for reading/writing success
- Hands-on activities, video clips (all), how-tos for conferencing w/students in reading & writing.
- Teaching/using new strategies.
- Presenter Dr. Katie Van Sluys
- Lots of information on how to include writing in the classroom. Specifically, conferencing with students and their writing.
- Great ideas for presenting math, reading, and writing in the classroom.
- Hands-on and a mix of talk and video demonstration. Plenty of opportunity to ask questions and engage in activities.
- Carousel activity, TV poetry lesson, good job changing gears –lecture, video, activities
- Balanced literacy workshop on Sat. was very good. It gave me ideas to help my students during the school year.
- Seeing the actual content of the sessions put into place. Getting updated on changes to the curriculum and how our summer will be affected.
- Well organized material and presentation that involved the participation of teachers.
- The ideas that I can take back into my classroom.
- The videos of the conferences were really interesting and informative.
- The carousel activity and challenge to think of open-ended responses
- Lots of ideas
- The examples and hands-on activities
- Reading scenarios and writing conferences – to see how people do it
- The materials
- Multi-mode information dissemination
- The videos and discussion of teaching in action

Suggestions for improvement include:

- Less lecture
- Make sure everyone has some knowledge of the curriculum before the conference
- Warmer room.
- Allow more time for group interactivities
- More hands-on activities.
- More direct connections to summer and Balanced Literacy
- More interactions with audience
- Ideas for strategies to implement in the classroom – literacy
- Less lecture and videos
- Math is very confusing
- More excitement-more ideas that can be utilized
- Continue more of the same and include methods for record-keeping
- More movement
- Don't go over basic info that educators usually already know
- Math was not as engaging which is hard for a Friday night.
- More information on broader topics
- Lessen the math section. The videos are bad. Maybe we should split the time in half.

Other comments and reactions I wish to offer:

- Many strategies and ideas are easy to implement!
- I learned a lot from this speaker and feel more comfortable to use conferences
- This presenter was excellent. Thank you for providing such a quality in-service for us.
- Long time to sit
- Nothing, I really liked it!!
- Great presenters. Good accommodations.
- Excellent food & lodging. Great presenter (Saturday) and good facilitation on Friday. Loved Norma's contribution!
- Really eye opening ideas were presented on both days!
- Great work
- Great workshop
- Great presentation, come back
- The presenter did a great job!
- More time to apply skills to curriculum