The mission of the Office of Migrant Education is to provide excellent leadership, technical assistance, and financial support to improve the educational opportunities and academic success of migratory children, youth, agricultural workers, fishers, and their families.
AGENDA

• Guidance on MEP-funded services and other allowable activities
• States’ approaches to implementing the Department’s guidance
• Breakout discussion
• Guidance on allowable uses of MEP funds
• Small group activity
• Debrief/closing
GUIDANCE ON MEP-FUNDED SERVICES AND OTHER ALLOWABLE ACTIVITIES
MEP-FUNDED SERVICES DEFINED

Services are a subset of MEP activities. Services are educational or educationally related activities that:

1. Directly benefit a migratory child;
2. Address needs of a migratory child consistent with the State’s comprehensive needs assessment (CNA) and service delivery plan (SDP);
3. Are grounded in scientifically based [evidence-based] research, or in the case of support services, are a generally accepted practice; and
4. Are designed to enable the program to meet its measurable outcomes and to contribute to the achievement of the State’s performance targets.

(MEP Non-Regulatory Guidance (NRG), Chapter V, A1)
TYPES OF MEP-FUNDED SERVICES

• Instructional services (e.g., educational activities for preschool-age children and instruction in elementary and secondary schools, such as tutoring before and after school)

• Support services (e.g., educationally related activities, such as advocacy for migratory children; health, nutrition, and social services for migratory families; necessary educational supplies; transportation).

(MEP NRG Chapter V, A3)
MEP-FUNDED SERVICES: MODES OF DELIVERY

Some examples include:
• Extended day programs;
• Before/after school programs;
• In-class programs;
• Saturday or vacation programs;
• In-home instruction (e.g., the MEP provides family literacy services to the child at home);
• Summer or intersession programs;
• Distance learning programs (e.g., Web-based or portable courses of instruction); and
• Title I Schoolwide programs

(MEP NRG Chapter V, A7)
INTENSITY AND DURATION OF MEP-FUNDED SERVICES

• It is important to design services that are of sufficient intensity to provide reasonable promise of the project’s ability to meet its measurable outcomes.

(MEP NRG Chapter V, A5)

• Children must participate in the program for at least one day in order to be counted in Category 2 (children served in MEP-funded summer/intersession programs).

• SEAs are responsible for determining whether summer and intersession services are of sufficient duration and intensity to enable the program to meet its measurable outcomes and to contribute to the achievement of the State’s performance targets.

(MEP NRG Chapter IX, B25-26)
COORDINATION WITH OTHER PROGRAMS

SEAs are required to identify and address the unique educational needs of migratory children by providing them a full range of services from appropriate local, State, and Federal educational programs. In providing these services, SEAs must plan jointly with local, State, and Federal programs and must integrate the MEP with services provided by other programs.

(ESEA sections 1304(b) and 1306(a))
OTHER ALLOWABLE MEP-FUNDED ACTIVITIES

Examples of allowable activities that are not considered services include:

• Identification and recruitment (ID&R) activities;
• Parental involvement;
• Program evaluation;
• Professional development;
• Administration of the program

(MEP NRG Chapter V, A4)
STATES’ PERSPECTIVES ON MEP-FUNDED SERVICES:

Ms. Susan Brigman, *North Carolina Department of Public Instruction*

Ms. Sylvia Reyna, *Washington Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction*
HIGHLIGHTS FROM NORTH CAROLINA’S MIGRANT EDUCATION PROGRAM

SUSAN BRIGMAN, SECTION CHIEF ~ SPECIALTY PROGRAMS
FEDERAL PROGRAM MONITORING & SUPPORT DIVISION
NC DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION
SUCCESSFUL COORDINATION OF MEP-FUNDED SERVICES WITH OTHER PROGRAMS

• Wake Technical Community College – HEP program
• East Coast Migrant Head Start
INCREASED NUMBER OF STUDENTS SERVED IN SUMMER

• North Carolina increased the number of migratory children served during the 2020-21 summer/intersession by approx. 36% compared to the prior year.
• Several key actions led to this increase
KEY ACTIONS

• Professional Development on proper data collection and submission
• Increased emphasis on well-planned summer programming during regional and State MEP meetings
• Increased communication about State expectations and federal guidance related to summer programming and the MEP
• Professional development and presentations that focused on the importance and impact that summer enrichment programming has for migratory children
• Opportunities for other subgrantees to share best practices on summer programming during regional, State, and national meetings
• Scheduled visits by State MEP Administrators to provide feedback on summer programs
GROWING NEEDS OF MEP

• Virtual Learning Support/Reliable Internet
• Social Emotional Support
• Access to Pre-K Services
ADVICE FOR NEW DIRECTORS

• Learn and Understand How to Collect and Submit Data to OME
• Ensure an Effective ID&R Plan is Implemented
• Provide Continuous Professional Development
• Ensure Academic Services and Support Services are Provided Consistently
• Ensure MEP Staff are Building Community Partnerships
QUESTIONS?

Susan Brigman, Section Chief ~ Specialty Programs
susan.brigman@dpi.nc.gov
We would like to acknowledge the Indigenous people who have stewarded this land since time immemorial and who still inhabit the area today, the Steh-Chass Band of Indigenous people of the Squaxin Island Tribe.
Title I Part C Migrant Education Program
35,793 farms (2017)

Nearly 900 organic farms (2017)

67% of farms are less than 50 acres (2017)

Nearly 27,000 female farmers

Food processing generated more than $21.8 billion in revenues (2019 WA Dept. of Revenue)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number 1 U.S. Producer of:</th>
<th>Number 2 U.S. Producer of:</th>
<th>Number 3 U.S. Producer of:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>APPLES</td>
<td>APRICOTS</td>
<td>DRIED PEAS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLUEBERRIES</td>
<td>ASPARAGUS</td>
<td>LENTILS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOPS</td>
<td>GRAPES</td>
<td>ONIONS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEARS</td>
<td>POTATOES</td>
<td>PEPPERMINT OIL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPEARMINT OIL</td>
<td>ALL RASPBERRIES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWEET CHERRIES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Crop

(temporary or seasonal)
Migratory Student Enrollment Trends

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WA</td>
<td>30,306</td>
<td>30,798</td>
<td>31,744</td>
<td>30,542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OR</td>
<td>20,707</td>
<td>21,625</td>
<td>21,833</td>
<td>19,541</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TX</td>
<td>32,593</td>
<td>30,602</td>
<td>28,068</td>
<td>25,405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FL</td>
<td>25,792</td>
<td>24,454</td>
<td>24,834</td>
<td>23,112</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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WA MEP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Student Count</th>
<th>Fed Award</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016-2017</td>
<td>32,000</td>
<td>40,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017-2018</td>
<td>33,758,151</td>
<td>35,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018-2019</td>
<td>31,000</td>
<td>30,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019-2020</td>
<td>29,500</td>
<td>15,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-2021</td>
<td>29,000</td>
<td>10,000,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Washington State Migrant Education Program
School Year 2021-2022

SCHOOL DISTRICT
KENNEWICK 3870
YAKIMA 2740
WAHLUKE 2194
PASCO 2152
SUNNYSIDE 2147
WENATCHEE 1719
MOUNT VERNON 1673
OTHHELLO 1166
WAPATO 1094
EASTMONT 1092
TOPPENISH 865
PROSSER 861
NORTH FRANKLIN 713
GRANDVIEW 607
QUINCY 550
BURLINGTON-EDISON 536
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## Washington State Migratory Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Graduation Rate</th>
<th>Special Education</th>
<th>State Bilingual Education</th>
<th>Title I Part A Targeted Assistance and Learning Assistance Programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>75.4% (13.6% dropout)</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2/2/2022</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Examples of Activities to Support 9th Graders On-Track

The table below provides examples of how federal and state program funds may be coordinated to support 9th graders. There may be specific requirements under each of the state and federal programs to consider before implementing. To meet these requirements, consult with your district’s program directors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEA Level Activities</th>
<th>Title I, Part A</th>
<th>Title I, Part C, Migrant Ed</th>
<th>Title II, Part A</th>
<th>Title II, Part C</th>
<th>LEA, Part A</th>
<th>LEA, Part C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provide transition opportunities to students accessing high school from middle/junior high to high school</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide opportunities to parents to learn how to use online databases to monitor grades, attendance, and other indicators of student progress.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase parents’ understanding of coursework requirements and the importance of attendance.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Examples of Activities to Support Regular Attendance**

The table below provides examples of how federal and state program funds may be coordinated to support regular attendance. There may be specific requirements under each of the state and federal programs to consider before implementing. To meet these requirements, consult with your district’s program directors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEA Level Activities</th>
<th>Title I, Part A</th>
<th>Title I, Part C, Migrant Ed</th>
<th>Title II, Part A</th>
<th>Title II, Part C</th>
<th>LEA, Part A</th>
<th>LEA, Part C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hire an Advocate to assist teachers and administrators in recognizing and responding to the unique needs of the diverse student population as well as understanding cultural nuances that affect their learning.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hire a position such as a Community Outreach Coordinator that supports the Community Transition Board (CTB) process</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide professional learning focused on how to effectively engage parents, families, and community partners and how to coordinate services between school and community to address student attendance.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Currently Tracking

- Drought condition forecasts for parts of state
- Increase in forest fires affecting air quality and crops
- Affordable housing declining in many areas
- Increase in H2A guest worker requests
- Snowpacks declining; rain increasing - flooding
- Continued guidance and assistance to COVID-19
Program Highlight

Academic (Math, Science, Biology)

High School Planning for migratory students grades 8-12 (not yet graduated)

- UW (CAMP)
- WSU – Pullman (CAMP)
- EWU (CAMP)
- CWU (CAMP)
- WWU (College of Education)
- WSU – Spokane (Health Sciences)
- Association of Washington School Principals (program development and credit issuance)

2012
BREAKOUT DISCUSSION
BREAKOUT DISCUSSION INSTRUCTIONS

• You will be assigned to small groups for approximately 20 minutes.

• Please use the discussion prompts to guide your conversation on MEP-funded services.

• We ask that one volunteer from each group take notes on any key takeaways. These notes will be accessible to all participants.
DISCUSSION PROMPTS

1. What are specific practices your State has found to be effective in jointly planning with other (Federal, State, local) programs and integrating MEP services with those other programs?

2. How does your State ensure MEP-funded services are of sufficient intensity and/or duration to meet the program’s objectives and outcomes?

3. How has your State modified services in response to the pandemic?

4. Are there any modifications your State implemented as a result of the pandemic that will be implemented in the long term?
ALLOWABLE USES OF MEP FUNDS
BLENDING VS. BRAIDING

Blending

- Funds from multiple sources are combined for a common activity. The identity of the original sources is no longer tracked.
- Must be authorized under statute.

Braiding

- Funds from multiple sources are joined to contribute to a common activity. The original funding sources are still tracked and are easily extracted if necessary.
EXAMPLES OF BLENDING VS. BRAIDING MEP FUNDS

**Blending**

- Consolidation of State administration funds from Title I, parts A, C, and D (ESEA section 1004)

- Consolidation of MEP funds in a Title I Schoolwide Program, after meeting specific criteria (ESEA sections 1306(c)(2) and 1114, 34 C.F.R. 200.29(c)(1))

**Braiding**

- MEP funds pay for the costs of an additional teacher to increase the number of migratory students served in a district’s summer school.

- MEP funds contribute to rent costs of a local non-profit’s after-school program to expand space for serving additional migratory students.
CONSIDERATIONS FOR USE OF MEP FUNDS: IDENTIFIED NEEDS AND STRATEGIES

1. Does the activity or service address a need identified in the MEP statewide comprehensive needs assessment (CNA)? Is the activity or service aligned to the strategies in the MEP statewide service delivery plan (SDP)?
   - ESEA section 1304(c)(1)(A) requires that funds be used in accordance with the statewide CNA and SDP required in ESEA section 1306.

2. Are the funds being used to meet the identified needs that result from the children’s migratory lifestyle and to permit the children to participate effectively in school?
   - ESEA section 1306(b)(1) requires that MEP funds must first be used to meet the identified needs of migratory children that result from their migratory lifestyle and to permit the children to participate effectively in school.
CONSIDERATIONS FOR USE OF MEP FUNDS: OTHER AVAILABLE RESOURCES

3. Does the activity or service supplement, and not supplant, non-Federal funds?
   o ESEA section 1304(c)(2) requires that MEP programs and projects be carried out in a manner consistent with the objectives of ESEA section 1118(b).

4. Is the need already addressed by services available from other programs?
   o In general, ESEA section 1306(b)(2) requires that MEP funds be used to address the needs of migratory children not addressed by services available from other Federal and non-Federal programs.
CONSIDERATIONS FOR USE OF MEP FUNDS: UNIFORM GUIDANCE COST PRINCIPLES

5. Are the costs reasonable and necessary, and allocable (i.e., chargeable) to the MEP relative to the benefit received?
   - See the Uniform Guidance (2 CFR Part 200, subpart E) for information about the cost principles.
SMALL GROUP ACTIVITY
ACTIVITY INSTRUCTIONS

• Participants will be randomly assigned to small groups.

• You will have 20 minutes to review 15 scenarios/examples of costs with your group and determine which of the following categories the cost is associated with:

  o Allowable service;
  o Allowable non-service; or
  o Unallowable use of MEP funds

• Discuss your rationale for each categorization as needed with your group.

• We will reconvene the full group and ask volunteers to share any examples that were most challenging and how their group made its determination.
ACTIVITY DE-BRIEF

Which example(s) did your group find the most challenging to classify, and how did you reach a determination?
ANSWER KEY: COSTS ASSOCIATED WITH ALLOWABLE SERVICE

• Salaries for teachers providing in-home family literacy programs to migratory parents and children

• Physical examinations and athletic fees for eligible migratory children if the school district does not provide assistance for students that cannot afford the costs associated with sports participation.

• Food for migratory students in a weekly, MEP-funded night school program if there are no other resources available.

• Supplies for migratory children required for school attendance that are not immediately available from other sources (e.g., COVID-19 rapid tests, N95 masks)

• Summer coding camp for migratory high school students when comparable opportunities are not available
ANSWER KEY: COSTS ASSOCIATED WITH ALLOWABLE NON-SERVICE

• Reasonable expenditures for refreshments or food provided during parent meetings

• Purchase of t-shirts with MEP logo to be worn by Identification and Recruitment (ID&R) staff during their field work

• Transportation for parents of migratory children to a “Know Your Rights” informational session on topics such as immigration, public education

• Necessary security upgrades to the State’s migrant-specific database

• One-time act of providing instructional or information packets to migratory children
ANSWER KEY: UNALLOWABLE USE OF MEP FUNDS

• Summer school for migratory students that operates on the same schedule as the district’s summer school and provides comparable instruction (certified teachers in core subject areas).

• $100 grocery store gift cards for every migratory child in the program, regardless of individual needs.

• Purchase of laptop computers, iPads, and other electronic devices for migratory students to keep indefinitely.

• Tickets to a water park for migratory children, when there is no connection to curriculum or other educational component.

• Construction of a small building on a high school campus to create office space for the school’s migrant counselor and academic advisor.
THANK YOU

Jessenia Guerra
Jessenia.Guerra@ed.gov

Sarah Martinez
Sarah.Martinez@ed.gov
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