

**MEP Section of the SY 2016-17  
Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR), Part II  
Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs)**

**General Questions**

**QUESTION #1: Is it possible to receive a copy of our previous submission's "MEP Child Count Rating Instrument" with the reviewer's feedback?**

**OME Response:** Yes, contact the Office of Migrant Education's Data-Evaluation Team (Ed Monaghan or Preeti Choudhary), and they will provide you with your State's 2.3 MEP Rating Instrument from any previous year.

**QUESTION #2: What age/grade category on the CSPR should be reported for students who have dropped out of school? For example: A student enrolled in the 10th grade in September 2016. This student dropped out of school in January 2017. On the State's database, the student is identified as a "drop out" keeping 10 as his grade level. Come September 2017, the family still resides in the same school district. Grade 10 is kept as his grade level and the student is still coded as a drop out. The student continues to reside in the same school district until his 36-month eligibility ends. The student's grade level will always remain at grade 10 in the State's database. (File Specifications C032, C054, C121, C122)**

**OME Response:** For performance reporting purposes, in terms of tables in section 2.3, such a child would be reported at the age/grade category in which s/he spent the majority of his/her time while residing in the State. Therefore, the above child should be counted either as a 10th grader or an Out-of-School Youth (OSY) for the SY 2016-17 performance period, depending upon the amount of time s/he spent as a 10<sup>th</sup> grade student. This child should be included as an *Out-of-School Youth* (OSY) for future performance periods. Note that the *Glossary for the MEP* defines OSY as including "students who have dropped out of school."

In the table in section 2.3.2.8.1, the child in question would be counted and reported as having dropped out of school in grade 10. Section 2.3.2.8.1 is designed to count just the number of students who have dropped out of school during the current performance reporting period. It is not meant to count the total number of migratory students who are school dropouts (i.e., the number of migratory students who dropped out of school in the current and previous reporting periods).

For all applicable tables in section 2.3, assuming the child in question (who dropped out in January 2017) received a MEP-funded service sometime between September 2016 and August 2017 the child should be reported as being in the same age/grade category for the performance period.

**QUESTION #3: How does the SEA provide an unduplicated count of migratory students, when students transfer between LEAs? (File Specification C121)**

**OME Response:** Report each student only once, regardless of the number of schools s/he has attended.

**QUESTION #4: What students are included in File Specification C145?**

**OME Response:** Children who are included in C145 are those that received instructional or supportive services funded in whole or part by the MEP who were eligible, and those that received services during the term their eligibility ended. Those students who should NOT be reported include those children who were served through a Title I SWP where MEP funds were combined with those of other programs.

**QUESTION #5: Why do we report race/ethnicity (File Specification C052)?**

**OME Response:** Under the Final Regulations of 34 CFR 76.720, revised on January 22, 2007, States are required to report ethnicity/race data through the ED*Facts* reporting system, for migratory students. However, beginning with SY 2016-17, States will no longer be required to submit race/ethnicity data for three age/grade categories: B-2, 3-5 (not K), and OSY.

**QUESTION #6: Are children who receive a one-time instructional or informational packet considered served by the MEP? Should these children be included in tables in sections 2.3.1.2 (Category 2 Child Count), and 2.3.5 (Served During the Performance Period)? (File Specifications C122 and C054)**

**OME Response:** The one-time act of providing instructional or informational packets to a child or family does not constitute a service; therefore, children who receive instructional or informational packets as a one-time act of a State or local MEP summer or intersession project are not participants in those programs within the meaning of the MEP statute. States should not include these children in the tables in sections 2.3.1.2 and 2.3.5.

**QUESTION #7: In reference to tables in sections 2.3.2.1, 2.3.3.2, 2.3.4.2, and 2.3.5.1: would a child in the 3-5 age range ever be considered to have priority for services? (File Specifications C054, C121, and C192)**

**OME Response:** Yes. A State Education Agency (SEA) may choose to identify preschool migratory children (i.e., age 3-5) as a Priority for Services (PFS) to the extent that they can demonstrate that these children meet the PFS criteria (i.e., they are failing or most at risk of failing to meet State standards and they have had their education interrupted during the regular school year). *Note: this definition will change for the SY 2017-18 CSPR.*

**QUESTION #8: In reference to tables in sections 2.3.2.1., 2.3.3.2, 2.3.4.2, and 2.3.5.1: would a child who is out-of-school ever be considered to have priority for services? (File Specifications C054, C121, and C192)**

**OME Response:** Yes. An SEA may choose to identify out-of-school youth (i.e., here to work youth and recent drop outs of U.S. schools) as having PFS. These children experience an interruption of their education and are at risk of failing to meet State academic standards because they do not attend school and have not graduated from high school.

**QUESTION #9:** There are several data quality checks that compare the previous year’s CSPR data for an increase/decrease of 25%, and others compare the previous year’s CSPR data for an increase/decrease of 10%. How do I know which one of these two data quality checks applies to individual CSPR questions?

**OME Response:** Several data quality checks in the SY 2016-17 CSPR require MEP directors to provide a comment, explaining a difference of 25% or more from the previous year. The CSPR questions that require a comment, based upon a 25% or more difference include the following:

Migrant CSPR Section Number	Migrant CSPR Questions
2.3.2 Eligible Migratory Children	2.3.2.1, 2.3.2.2, 2.3.2.3, 2.3.2.4, 2.3.2.5, 2.3.2.8.1, 2.3.2.8.2
2.3.3 Services for Eligible Migratory Children	2.3.3.2, 2.3.4.2
2.3.5 MEP Services – During the Performance Period	2.3.5, 2.3.5.1, 2.3.5.2, 2.3.5.3, 2.3.5.3.1, 2.3.5.3.2
2.3.6 School Data During the Regular School Year	2.3.6.1
2.3.7 MEP Project Data	2.3.7.1

There are two data quality checks in the SY 2016-17 CSPR that require MEP directors to provide a comment, explaining a difference of 10% or more from the previous year. The CSPR questions that require a comment, based upon a 10% or more difference include the following questions that represent the Category 1 and Category 2 Counts:

Migrant CSPR Section Number	Migrant CSPR Questions
2.3.1 Migrant Child Counts	2.3.1.1, 2.3.1.2

**QUESTION #10:** When must I submit a request to increase child counts to the OME director, Dr. Lisa Ramirez? When must I inform OME director, Dr. Lisa Ramirez, of a significant decrease in child counts?

**OME Response:** If an SEA determines that an upward change to its Category 1 or Category 2 Child Count is necessary, it must submit a request to the U.S. Department of Education, Director of the Office of Migrant Education, Dr. Lisa Ramirez for pre-approval to modify the child count. The request must include an explanation of the child count data that need to be changed and why the change needs to be made. The request should be sent prior to the SY 2016-17 CSPR Part II resubmission period. Resubmissions of SEA child count data in ED*Facts* files C121 and/or C122 with upward revisions without prior approval will not be accepted by the Department.

If an SEA determines that a significant downward change to its Category 1 or Category 2 Child Count is necessary, it must inform the U.S. Department of Education, Director of the Office of

Migrant Education, Dr. Lisa Ramirez. A significant downward change would be any resubmission that decreases the child count by 25% from the last *EDFacts* submission of files C121 and/or C122 before the SY 2016-17 CSPR Part II submission period closes. The SEA must explain how the error happened and what the SEA is doing to prevent the error in the future.

### **2.3.1 Migrant Child Counts Questions**

**QUESTION #11: For SY 2016-17, when we record students in the grade that they attended the majority of the time, will that affect the assessment reports on CSPR? Currently we count a student in the grade level s/he attended during the regular school year. I want to make sure that our migratory students are counted at the same grade level in both the MEP 2.3 section and the CSPR Part I section 1.3.**

**OME Response:** For SY 2016-17, States will report migratory children in the grade that they attended the majority of the time. This *EDFacts* Guidance ensures that most students will be counted in the grade in which they were tested during SY 2016-17. There also may be some cases of students who will not be counted at the correct grade level, e.g., when a student enrolls in school and participates in a statewide assessment late in an academic year, and then the student re-enrolls in July/August of the subsequent school year, with the majority of the student's time in the performance period occurring in the subsequent school year.

**QUESTION #12: In CSPR question 2.3.1.3.3, should I include language that describes methods our State uses to count all eligible children, 3-21, during the performance period? Should language include how my State counts seniors who graduated later in the year?**

**OME Response:** States should provide a description of procedures and processes at the State level that show that the SEA has provided an unduplicated count of eligible migratory children, ages 3-21. Additionally, OME does require States to provide language that describes how high school graduates are NOT included in the subsequent year's child count.

**QUESTION #13: What is a Category 2 child? (File Specification C122)**

**OME Response:** The Category 2 child count is the unduplicated statewide total summer/intersession count of eligible migratory children, age 3-21, who were served for one or more days in MEP-funded summer or intersession programs in the State during the September 1 – August 31 performance period.

### **2.3.2 Eligible Migrant Children Questions**

**QUESTION #14: In reference to the table in section 2.3.2.1 (Priority for Services): If a student's "priority for service" status expires during the reporting period, should that student be included in the priority for services count? (File Specification C121)**

**OME Response:** If a student is determined to have “priority for services” for one day during the reporting period, that student should be included in the eligible count for the table in section 2.3.2.1. However, be aware that only those students who received services during the regular school year, summer/intersession, and/or performance period and held PFS status at the time the services were rendered should be included as PFS children who received services in tables of sections 2.3.3.2, 2.3.4.2, and 2.3.5.1.

**QUESTION #15: What should a State do in terms of not having data to report on the numbers of Limited-English-Proficient (LEP) 3-5 year-olds in the table in section 2.3.2.2 of the MEP-specific section of the SY 2016-17 CSPR, Part II? (File Specification C121)**

**OME Response:** If a State does not have LEP data for these 3-5 year olds, a State should note in the report that the LEP data for those age ranges are not available, and provide an explanation as to why.

**QUESTION #16: For sections 2.3.2.8.1 and 2.3.2.8.2, please clarify whether the *actual number or rate* of children that dropped out or obtained their HSED should be entered? (File Specification C032)**

**OME Response:** In the instructions for sections 2.3.2.1 and 2.3.2.2, OME indicates that SEAs are to report the number of children.

**QUESTION #17: Does the term “educationally related service,” as used in the Referred Service table of the SY 2016-17 CSPR, Part II, include services such as getting clothing, food, or eye glasses for migratory children from other programs/organizations due to referral or advocacy efforts of Migrant Education Program (MEP) personnel? (File Specification C145)**

**OME Response:** In general, the term “educationally related service” includes such things as health services, nutrition services, counseling services, transportation services, which support the education of migratory children. This said, please note that in section 2.3.2.6 in the SY 2016-17 CSPR, Part II, an SEA is to report the number of migratory children that received services, whether educational or educationally related, that were provided and funded by another program or organization due to the advocacy or referral efforts of MEP personnel. The educational or educationally related services provided to migratory children under these circumstances are considered “referred services.” Please keep in mind that any such “referred service” must meet the definition of a “service” as defined in the MEP Policy Guidance (2017), p. 53, question A1.

Please also note that the counts to be reported in section 2.3.2.6 are the number of migratory children that actually received the referred service from the other program or organization (not simply the number of services, nor the number of referrals made, nor the number of children given a referral). Furthermore, the number of migratory children that received a referred service should not be included in tables in section 2.3, except in the table in section 2.3.2.6.

**QUESTION #18: Do I understand correctly that for CSPR question 2.3.2.5, I should use the actual school year (in my State’s case - August through May) instead of the school year that falls within the performance period (September 1 through August 31)? Additionally, how do I count students when school districts start on different dates?**

**OME Response:** Migrant child counts collected in CSPR Question 2.3.2.5 are not considered a subset of Category 1 child counts, and they serve a limited purpose by assisting States in determining an interruption in education during the regular school year. To that end, States provide the unduplicated number of eligible migratory children whose QAD occurred during the SY 2016-17 regular school year, even though the regular school year may have begun prior to September 1, 2016. For the SY 2016-17 CSPR, State Education Agencies (SEAs) should use the most accurate method of counting students when school districts have different starting dates prior to September 1, 2016.

**QUESTION #19: Will we need to capture the exact date a student dropped out of school on the CSPR?**

**OME Response:** CSPR Question 2.3.2.8.1 requires States to report the number of eligible migratory students who dropped out of school. The CSPR does not require States to report an exact date for each student who dropped out of school, but States should have a method for tracking this information in order to ensure that the children reported in 2.3.2.8.1 dropped out of school sometime between September 1, 2016 – August 31, 2017 (i.e., during the 2016-17 CSPR performance period).

**QUESTION #20: Can you please clarify how I should count migratory students in CSPR Question 2.3.2.6, “Referrals – During the Performance Period?”**

**OME Response:** Include the unduplicated number of eligible migratory children who, during the performance period, received an educational or educationally related service funded by a non-MEP program/organization that they would not have otherwise received without efforts supported by MEP funds. Children should be reported only once regardless of the frequency with which they received a referred service. *Include children who received a referral only or who received both a referral and MEP-funded services. Do not include children who received a referral from the MEP, but did not receive services from the non-MEP program/organization to which they were referred.*

### **2.3.3 Services for Eligible Migrant Children Questions**

**QUESTION #21: Does the phrase in the directions in section 2.3.3 (Services for Eligible Migrant Children), “Do not include children who were served through a Title I SWP where MEP funds were consolidated with those of other programs” mean that migratory children who are enrolled in an SWP school and receive supplemental MEP-funded services should not be counted even if the MEP-funded program operates separately from the school’s schoolwide program? (File Specification C192)**

**OME Response:** No. Section 2.3.3 should include migratory children enrolled in an SWP school who receive supplemental MEP-funded services - as long as the MEP-funded services are provided by a MEP-funded program that operates separately from the school’s schoolwide program (i.e., MEP funds are NOT combined in the SWP campus budget).

Students who receive MEP-funded services in schools where MEP funds are combined, should NOT be reported in section 2.3.3. These students’ receipt of MEP-funded services should be reported in section 2.3.6.2 only.

### **2.3.5 MEP Services During the Performance Period Questions**

**QUESTION #22: In the SY 2016-17 CSPR, for section 2.3.5.3, does “Instructional Services” only include instruction provided by teachers? (File Specification C145)**

**OME Response:** No. Instructional services can include instruction provided by teachers and paraprofessionals as noted in the *Glossary for the MEP*. In section 2.3.5.3, States should just report the counts of children who received any type of instructional service.

However, when States count and report the number of children who received reading instruction, mathematics instruction, or high school credit accrual instruction services in section 2.3.5.1, States should count and report only those children who received instruction in reading, mathematics, or credit accrual services that were provided by a teacher.

In addition, please note, that for a child to be counted as receiving any instructional service, the instructional services must meet the overall definition of “services” as the term is defined in the *Glossary*. In this regard, “services” were defined to be “those activities that: (1) directly benefit a migratory child; (2) address a need of a migratory child consistent with the SEA’s comprehensive needs assessment and service delivery plan; (3) are grounded in scientifically 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 contribute to the achievement of the State’s performance targets.”

**QUESTION #23: Our State provides 24-hour accident insurance to all eligible migratory students ages 3-21. Are we able to count these as support services?**

**OME Response:** While paying to provide such accident insurance is an allowable activity, simply paying for the insurance does **not** meet the definition of a program service, as the term “service” is defined in the *Glossary for the MEP* or the MEP policy guidance. Thus, students who were simply covered by accident insurance should not be counted.

**QUESTION #24: How do I count credit accrual for eligible migratory children?**

**OME Response:** Question 2.3.5.3.1, Type of Instructional Service – During the Performance Period, currently collects data on counts of eligible migratory children who receive Reading Instruction, Mathematics Instruction, and High School Credit Accrual During the Performance

Period. Ensure that the high school credit accrual is MEP-funded, is instruction in courses that accrue credits needed for high school graduation, and is provided by a teacher for students on a regular or systematic basis, usually for a predetermined period of time. High school credit accrual includes correspondence courses taken by a student under the supervision of a teacher.

**QUESTION #25: For SY 2016-17 CSPR Question 2.3.5.3.1, may I include counts of eighth grade students who received MEP-funded high school credit accrual?**

**OME Response:** Yes, include counts of eighth grade students that received MEP-funded high school credit accrual.

### **2.3.6 School Data During the Regular School Year Questions**

**QUESTION #26: For section 2.3.6.1, should we include only schools in which MEP-funded services are provided? Should we include schools in which migratory children receive MEP-funded services during the summer? (File Specification C165)**

**OME Response:** For section 2.3.6.1, only count those public schools enrolling eligible migratory children that operate during the regular school year. Count such schools regardless of whether MEP-funded services are provided in the school.

**QUESTION #27: What counts does CSPR 2.3.6.1 report?? (File Specification C165)**

**OME Response:** CSPR 2.3.6.1 gathers information about the number of schools that enrolled eligible migratory children and the number of eligible migratory children enrolled in those schools. Since more than one school in a State may enroll the same migratory child at some time during the year, the number of children may include duplicates. Therefore, this CSPR section gathers numbers of children at the school level, but reports this number, which may include duplicates, at the State level.

**QUESTION #28: In reference to sections 2.3.6.1 and 2.3.6.2: Are we to include counts from private schools, preschools, home-schools, Head Start, out-of-school (alternative) facilities, and/or HEP programs that are not part of a public K-12 institution? (File Specification C165)**

**OME Response:** No. Include counts from public schools that serve school age (e.g., K-12) children only. Do not include counts from private schools, alternative schools, preschools, home-schools, Head Start, or High School Equivalency (HEP) programs that are serving school-age children.

**QUESTION #29: The performance period is between September 1<sup>st</sup> and August 31<sup>st</sup>. Do we count students at schools that start before September 1<sup>st</sup>? (File Specification C165)**

**OME Response:** Yes.

**QUESTION #30: If a MEP student attends one school and receives MEP services at another school, at which school should the child be counted? (File Specification C165)**

**OME Response:** Student counts are accomplished at the school where students are enrolled. This allows the State to include all eligible children, whether or not they are served by the MEP.

### **2.3.7 MEP Project Data Questions**

**QUESTION #31: In reference to section 2.3.7.1: Does the term MEP project refer to a region or an individual school site? (Manual Entry)**

**OME Response:** A “MEP project” is the entity that receives MEP funds (by a subgrant or contract from the State) and provides services directly to the migratory child. Further definition of the term “project” is found in the *Glossary*.

**QUESTION #32: In reference to section 2.3.7.1 (Type of MEP Project): We have a school that operates during the school year, providing services to migratory students during the school day. During the summer, this school serves as one of the summer school sites for that region. Do we count the school under rows 1 and 3, or just row 4? (Manual Entry)**

**OME Response:** Because rows 1 and 3 request information on projects that operate only in the regular term or only in the summer/intersession term, you should count a project that operates during both terms only once under row 4 as a “Year round” project and not under rows 1 and 3. This said, please note that in section 2.3.7.1, we are asking for counts of “projects,” not for each school or site where project services are delivered. The terms “project” and “year round project” are defined in the *Glossary for the MEP*.

**QUESTION #33: Please clarify the meaning of row 2 of the table in section 2.3.7.1, “Regular school year—School day/extended day.” In particular, should row 2 include (1) projects that provide MEP-funded services only before/after the school day; and/or (2) projects where MEP-funded services are provided both during the regular school day as well as before/after the school day? Would row 2 include projects where extended day/week services are provided in some but not all of the school sites operated by the project? (Manual Entry)**

**OME Response:** Yes. Row 2 of the table in section 2.3.7.1 should include those projects in which some or all MEP services are provided during an extended day/week during the regular school year. This would include projects that provide MEP-funded services only before/after the school day, as well as those projects where MEP-funded services are provided both during the regular school day as well as before/after the school day. Please note that, as defined in the *Glossary*, a single “project” can provide services in multiple sites- some of which may provide extended day/week services. Such projects (where some but not all school sites provide the extended day/week services) should also be included in row 2.

**QUESTION #34: We have an elementary school that operates a regular term after school program and a summer school program. Do we count our elementary school under rows 2 and 3 of the table in section 2.3.7.1? (Manual Entry)**

**OME Response:** No. Since, in your example, the LOA subgrantee provides MEP services during both the regular term and the summer term, it should be counted as a single year-round project under row 4. As noted in a previous response, this is consistent with the definitions of “project” and “year round project” provided in the *Glossary for the MEP*.

**QUESTION #35: We have several projects that provide services during the regular school day and after school, and during the summer. Should we count these projects in rows 1, 2, and 3, or just row 4 of the table in section 2.3.7.1? (Manual Entry)**

**OME Response:** Since these projects operate in both the regular school year and in the summer, they should be counted as year round projects in row 4 only.