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## Executive Summary

This profile provides a snapshot of the age and grade distributions, home languages, and academic achievement outcomes of California’s migratory children[[1]](#footnote-2) and youths.[[2]](#footnote-3) The profile also explores their unique strengths, interest in specific Migrant Education Program (MEP) services, and academic and health service needs. It is intended to provide a foundation for research and exploration regarding the priority and nonpriority needs of migratory children and youths.

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act, as reauthorized by the Every Student Succeeds Act, requires the MEP of each state’s department of education that receives Title I, Part C federal funds to identify and address the unique educational needs of migratory children through the development of a statewide Comprehensive Needs Assessment (CNA) and Service Delivery Plan (SDP). This profile provides a foundation for research and exploration that members of the California MEP CNA SDP committee—made up of staff and parents from local MEP programs across the state—will use as they develop the CNA and SDP. The profile is organized into discrete sections that highlight key findings related to

* trends in demographic characteristics of migratory children and youths;
* migratory students’ academic achievement as measured by graduation and dropout rates and performance on standardized assessments;
* health service needs for migratory children and youths based on needs assessment data; and
* school readiness service needs for migratory children aged three through five years.

In developing this profile, WestEd and the California Department of Education (CDE) relied on analyses of children’s and youths’ demographics, needs assessments, and the service and academic performance data available in the Migrant Student Information Network (MSIN). The MSIN is a central student information system for California’s migratory child and youth population. This system was used along with DataQuest, California’s public data reporting system for California students, teachers, and schools. To provide context to the data collected from the MSIN and DataQuest, WestEd and the CDE gathered data directly from migratory youths, parents, and MEP staff through online surveys and virtual focus groups. This data helps provide an understanding of the experiences of MEP participants by articulating the strengths, goals, and broad areas of need of migratory children and youths.

In exploring the qualitative and quantiative data collected for this profile, the identified needs are similar. Both types of data point to needs for educational services (e.g., English language arts [ELA], mathematics, and English language development [ELD]). Key findings in these areas include:

* While the Covid-19 pandemic negatively impacted proficiency rates in both ELA and math for all student populations, migratory students were disporportionately affected statewide expanding the acheivement gap in both content areas.
* In 2022–23, migratory students were 23.2 percent less likely to score proficient on the overall ELA standards than the all student group with the largest drops in proficiency since 2018–19 seen in the reading and writing claims.
* In 2022–23, migratory students were 20.3 percent less likely to score at proficient on the overall math standards than the all student group with the largest drop in proficiency since before the pandemic seen in concepts and procedures.
* Even though the achievement gap in Enligsh lanaguage proficiency exists, it has continued to shrink since 2018–19. In 2022–23, migratory students were only 4.7 percent less likely to score at proficient compared to all students.
* Qualitative and quantative data also confirmed the need for medical and mental health services with parent survey and focus group data further pointing to the need for social emotional learning opportunities for migratory children. Analyzing data from vision, dental, medical, and mental health services led to the following key findings:Health services specifically included in the 2017 state SDP (i.e., mental health services) showed that 80 percent of migratory students and youth with an identified mental health need received some type of mental health service in 2022–23. Whereas vision and dental services were provided to approximately 37 and 22 percent of migratory children and youth respectively who identified a need in these areas during the 2022–23 grant year.
* In 2022–23, only eight percent of students with a medical need received a related service, down from approximately ten percent the year prior.

These data points and others will provide the CNA SDP Committee with the information and background necessary to identify and prioritize the needs of migratory children, youth, and families. The profile will also be integral to the development of specific strategies to address these prioritized needs in developing the next CNA and SDP.

## Background

With the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, through the passage of the Every Student Succeeds Act, the U.S. Department of Education requires that each state educational agency grantee of Title I, Part C Migrant Education Program periodically review and revise its state plan to provide services. As the state plan is based on a statewide CNA of the MEP, developing a current CNA is the first step in the process of revising the state plan. The CDE Migrant Education Office (MEO) contracted with WestEd to prepare this Migrant Student Profile (profile) as part of its 2024 CNA process. This profile provides a descriptive analysis of California’s MEP-eligible migratory child and youth population and serves as a foundation for the development of the 2024 statewide CNA and SDP.

### Who Are Migratory Children and Youths?

A child or youth is considered *migratory* if they are no older than twenty-one years old, have not yet graduated from high school, and have made a qualifying move in the preceding three years either as a migratory worker in the agricultural, dairy, lumber, or fishing industries or to join a parent, guardian, or spouse who is a migratory worker in those industries. A *qualifying move* is one in which a child or youth changes residences and moves across school district boundaries because of economic necessity.[[3]](#footnote-4)

Young adults may qualify on their own, as a worker, if they have moved on their own in the past three years for qualifying work or in search of qualifying work. Out-of-school youths (OSYs) are youths through age twenty-one years who are entitled to a free public education and who meet the definition of a migratory child but who are not currently enrolled in a K–12 institution. They may include youths who have dropped out of school, are working toward their high school equivalency degree outside a K–12 school, or are “here to work.”[[4]](#footnote-5) More detail about eligibility requirements can be found at the U.S. Department of Education’s Office of Elementary and Secondary Education’s website in Section II of the *[Non-Regulatory Guidance for the Title I, Part C Education of Migratory Children](https://oese.ed.gov/files/2021/11/MEP-Non-Regulatory-Guidance-March-2017-1.docx)*, 2017.

### Profile Purpose

This profile is designed to assist interested parties in understanding the demographic characteristics and unique educational needs of California’s MEP-eligible children and youths, including OSYs.It provides a snapshot of migratory children’s, youths’, and students’ age and grade distributions, home languages, and educational outcomes.   
It also explores their unique strengths, goals, interest in specific MEP services, and academic and health service needs. Members of the CNA SDP committee will refer to this profile as they work to interpret the needs of migratory children and youth in a series of engagement sessions to be held in 2024 which will inform CNA and SDP development.

### Guiding Questions

When contracting with WestEd, the CDE identified a series of questions and specific analyses to use as a guide while developing this profile. These questions align to federal, state, and MEP-specific accountability requirements. In addition, WestEd partnered with the CDE to identify study questions that acknowledge relevant cultural, historical, and community contexts. These questions focus on the goals, strengths, needs, barriers, and opportunities of migratory children and youths. The questions addressed in this profile fall into six broad categories and focus on child, youth, and student populations in California.

#### Demographics

* What are the demographic characteristics of migratory children and youths based on their age, grade level, and home languages?
* What percentage of migratory students are classified as English learner (EL) or long-term English learner (LTEL) students?
* What percentage of migratory students receive special education services?

#### Context for Identifying Needs

* What are the goals of migratory children and youths?
* In which areas do migratory children and youths thrive?
* What are the needs of migratory children and youths?
* What are some of the educational barriers that California’s migratory children and youths experience?

#### Academic Achievement

* What are the four-year cohort graduation and dropout rates for migratory students?
* How do their graduation and dropout rates compare with those of all students in the state?
* How have migratory students and migratory priority-for-service (PFS)[[5]](#footnote-6) students performed on the English Language Proficiency Assessments for California (ELPAC)?
* How did their performance compare with that of all students in the state?
* How have migratory students and migratory PFS students performed on the California Assessment of Student Performance and Progress (CAASPP) for English language arts, mathematics, and science?
* How did their performance compare with that of all students in the state?

#### Health Service Needs

* What are the health service needs of migratory children and youths as identified in their individual needs assessment/individual learning plan (INA/ILP)?
* As an indicator of unmet needs, what gaps exist between migratory children’s and youths’ needs and the delivery of aligned MEP services?

#### School Readiness

* To what extent is the California MEP serving eligible preschool-aged children?
* Does the reach of the service vary by the age of the child?

#### Out-of-School Youth

* What are the demographic characteristics of migratory OSYs based on their age, home languages, and here-to-work versus credit-recovery status?
* What are OSYs’ interests in educational and health services as identified in their INA/ILP?
* As an indicator of unmet needs, what gaps exist between OSYs’ needs and the delivery of aligned MEP services?

## Methods

### Data Sources

WestEd used the following data sources to develop this profile:

* MEP surveys for the Migratory Student Profile, February 2023
* MEP focus groups for the Migratory Student Profile, April 2023
* The MSIN databases for the MEP, school years (SYs) 2017–18 through   
  2022–23
* ELPAC Summative Assessment data files, SYs 2017–18 through 2022–23
* CAASPP data files, SYs 2017–18 through 2022–23
* DataQuest reports, SYs 2017–18 through 2022–23

The MEP surveys for the Migratory Student Profile included three online surveys administered between January 29 and February 17, 2023, to OSYs, parents, and MEP staff from all 20 local MEPs. OSYs and parents had the option to complete their surveys in Spanish or English. Exhibit 1 summarizes the total number of survey respondents, by language.

Exhibit 1. Total Number of Survey Participants by Language

| Survey Language | OSYs | Parents | Staff |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Spanish | 118 | 977 | 0 |
| English | 2 | 36 | 444 |
| Total | **120** | **1,013** | **444** |

Source: MEP surveys for the Migratory Student Profile, February 2023.

Informed by a preliminary analysis of the survey data, WestEd developed three focus group protocols (one for each group) to further explore data gathered in the surveys. Recruitment efforts for focus group participants included outreach to all 20 local MEPs. The focus groups for OSYs and parents were conducted in Spanish, and the focus group with staff was conducted in English. Focus group participants included six OSYs, eight parents, and five local MEP staff.

### Methods of Analysis

WestEd used descriptive statistics to analyze migratory child, youth, and student data for this profile, including frequencies, percentages, and cross-tabulations. WestEd explored differences in academic performance between migratory students, migratory PFS students, and all students by comparing the graduation and dropout rates of each student population and the percentages of students who achieved specific performance levels on four different standardized assessments.

When analyzing the survey and focus group data, WestEd recognized the significance of collecting data from OSYs and parents of children and youths who were enrolled in the MEP. The WestEd team engaged in reflective conversations with one another and the CDE to ensure that the methods of analysis were grounded in culturally relevant, equitable evaluation and that equity-centered and strength-based approaches were used.

Survey data was analyzed comprehensively using descriptive statistics. A high-level thematic analysis was conducted to identify themes that emerged from the open-ended responses. Focus group data was used to contextualize findings from the surveys.

For a more complete description of the methodology used to inform this profile, please see appendix A.

### Data Limitations

#### COVID-19 Global Pandemic’s Effect on Assessment Data Availability

Because of the COVID-19 global pandemic, assessment data was not available for SY 2019–20. Additionally, because of the low numbers of students with CAASPP assessment scores in SY 2020–21, CAASPP data from that year was not included in the analysis.

#### Limited Science Assessment Data

Because the CAASPP California Science Test (CAST) was not implemented statewide until SY 2018–19, the CAST data was available only for SYs 2018–19, 2021–22, and 2022–23. In addition, the CDE did not provide CAST scores to the MSIN, so WestEd had to rely on the [CAASPP and ELPAC reporting site, Test Results for California’s Assessments](https://caaspp-elpac.ets.org/caaspp/Default), for student performance data on this assessment. This site disaggregates student performance results by migratory students and all students but not by migratory PFS students. Therefore, WestEd was not able to examine migratory PFS students’ performance on the CAST. Another limitation is that the site did not allow for accurate determination of the percentage of students across all grades scoring at each level for SY 2018–19. Therefore, this profile examined CAST domain data only for SYs 2021–22 and 2022–23.

#### Migrant Education Program Parent Engagement Data

The CDE sought to include a section in this profile on MEP parent engagement as measured by their participation in MEP services. However, this was not possible because of limitations in data maintained in the MSIN. The MSIN does not currently collect data on parent participation in MEP services, and a separate data collection was not feasible at the time.

### A Note About Performance Periods and School Years

This profile refers to data from both performance periods and school years. Migratory children’s and youths’ demographic and service data is reported in performance periods because the MSIN organizes student data by performance period. The performance period begins on September 1 and concludes on August 31 of the following year. To improve the readability of this profile, performance periods are sometimes referred to as “years” in narrative sections.

“SY” refers to an academic year of enrollment for a student. When this profile examines data associated with migratory students’ enrollment in school, the reporting period is referred to as an SY. An example of data associated with enrollment in school is students’ achievement levels on standardized assessments.

## Student Demographics: Performance Periods 2017–18 Through 2022–23

### Number of Eligible Students and Youths

California has the largest migratory child and youth population of all MEP-funded states. After declining steadily between 2017–18 and 2021–22, the number of MEP-eligible individuals in California increased to 74,655 children and youths in 2022–23 (see exhibit 2).

Exhibit 2. Number of Migrant Education Program–Eligible Children and Youths, 2017–18 Through 2022–23

Note: See [exhibit B1](#EB01) in appendix B for a table of the data in this exhibit.

Source: The MSIN Databases for the MEP, 2017–18 through 2022–23.

An examination of recent trends in child and youth counts by age group reveals that   
the number of MEP-eligible children between three and twelve years old has declined since 2017–18. But in recent years, the number of youths between sixteen and twenty-one years old has increased. Exhibit 3 shows the trend in child counts over the past six years for children aged three through twelve years at the start of the performance period. Exhibit 4 shows the same trend for youths aged thirteen through twenty-one years.

Exhibit 3. Number of Migrant Education Program–Eligible Children Aged Three Years Through Twelve Years, by Age Group at the Start of the Performance Period, 2017–18 Through 2022–23

Note: See [exhibit B2](#EB02) in appendix B for a table of the data in this exhibit.

Source: The MSIN Databases for the MEP, 2017–18 through 2022–23.

Exhibit 4. Number of Migrant Education Program–Eligible Youths Aged Thirteen Years Through Twenty-One Years, by Age Group at the Start of the Performance Period, 2017–18 Through 2022–23

Note: See [exhibit B3](#EB03) in appendix B for a table of the data in this exhibit.

Source: The MSIN Databases for the MEP, 2017–18 through 2022–23.

### Grade-Level Distribution

Between 2017–18 and 2022–23, the grade-level distribution of California’s migratory students and youths shifted in a way that aligns with the changes in age group counts shown in exhibits 3 and 4. During the six-year period, the percentage of MEP-eligible students in grades seven to twelve increased, as did the percentage of OSYs. The percentage of MEP-eligible students in preschool through grade three decreased over the same time period. Exhibit 5 shows the change in the distribution of migratory students and OSYs by grade group between 2017–18 and 2022–23.

Exhibit 5. Distribution of Migratory Students by Grade Group and Out-of-School Youth Status at the Start of the Performance Period, 2017–18 Through 2022–23

| Grade Group | 2017–18 | 2018–19 | 2019–20 | 2020–21 | 2021–22 | 2022–23 |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| P3–P5 | 10.4% | 10.8% | 10.6% | 10.2% | 9.6% | 9.1% |
| K | 10.6% | 10.3% | 10.1% | 9.7% | 9.2% | 9.7% |
| Grades 1–3 | 18.8% | 18.4% | 18.8% | 18.3% | 17.6% | 17.5% |
| Grades 4–6 | 19.1% | 18.1% | 19.1% | 19.3% | 19.1% | 18.6% |
| Grades 7–9 | 18.0% | 18.0% | 19.1% | 19.3% | 18.8% | 18.9% |
| Grades 10–12 | 15.8% | 15.6% | 16.6% | 17.1% | 17.7% | 17.9% |
| OSY | 7.2% | 8.8% | 5.7% | 6.1% | 7.9% | 8.4% |

Source: The MSIN Databases for the MEP, 2017–18 through 2022–23.

### English Learner Status

An EL student is one in kindergarten through grade twelve for whom there is a report of a language other than English on the Home Language Survey and who, upon initial assessment in California using an appropriate state assessment (currently the ELPAC) and from additional information when appropriate, is determined to be still developing the clearly defined English language skills of listening, speaking, reading, and/or writing necessary to succeed in a school’s regular instructional programs.

Per California *Education Code* Section 313.1(a)(1), an LTEL student is an EL student to whom all of the following apply: (1) is enrolled on Census Day (the first Wednesday in October) in grades six to twelve, inclusive; and (2) has been enrolled in a U.S. school for six or more years; and (3) has remained at the same English language proficiency level for two or more consecutive prior years, or has regressed to a lower English language proficiency level, as determined by the ELPAC; and (4) for students in grades six to nine, inclusive, who have scored at the “standard not met” level on the prior year administration of the CAASPP-ELA.[[6]](#footnote-7)

Statewide, approximately 20 percent of all students are classified as EL students. Among migratory students, the percentage of those classified as EL students is far greater. Across all grades, migratory students are at least three times as likely as all students to be classified as EL students. During SY 2022–23, 65 percent of migratory students in grades kindergarten through twelve were classified as EL students. The highest concentration of students in this group were in grades kindergarten through five (75 to 83 percent).

Exhibit 6 shows the percentage of migratory students and all students who were classified as EL students, by grade, in SY 2022–23.

Exhibit 6. Percentage of Migratory Students and All Students Who Were Classified as English Learner Students in School Year 2022–23, by Grade

Note: See [exhibit B4](#EB04) in appendix B for a table of the data in this exhibit.

Source: The MSIN Databases for the MEP, 2017–18 through 2021–22.

Exhibit 7 shows that during SY 2022–23, 17 percent of migratory students in grades six through twelve were classified as LTEL students, at least double the percentage of all students. The 2022–23 LTEL data shows the largest gap between the percent of migratory and all students classified as LTEL students is in sixth grade at 13 percentage points. From there the gap decreases from grades six through nine, until tenth grade when gap expands again to 12 percent.

Exhibit 7. Percentage of Migratory and All Students Who Were Classified as Long-Term English Learner Students, School Year 2022–23

Note: See [exhibit B5](#EB05) in appendix B for a table of the data in this exhibit.

Source: The MSIN Databases for the MEP, 2017–18 through 2021–22.

### Home Languages

Between SYs 2018–19 and 2022–23, at least 25 different home languages were reported for California’s migratory students who were also EL students. For the   
2022–23 program year, Spanish was the most prevalent home language (94.99 percent), followed by Mixteco (3.48 percent) and then Punjabi (less than 1 percent). The two languages that have increased in prevalence over the past six years are Mixteco and Zapoteco. Exhibit 8 details the prevalence of the most common home languages reported for California’s migratory students over the past six program years.

Exhibit 8. Home Languages for California’s Migratory English Learners, School Years 2018–19 Through 2022–23

| Home Language | 2018–19 (N=29,939) | 2019–20 (N=29,338) | 2020–21 (N=28,384) | 2021–22 (N=28,181) | 2022–23 (N=28,130) |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Spanish | 95.28% | 94.77% | 94.66% | 94.72% | 94.99% |
| Mixteco | 2.86% | 3.26% | 3.44% | 3.51% | 3.48% |
| Punjabi | 0.92% | 0.82% | 0.81% | 0.70% | 0.59% |
| Zapoteco | 0.12% | 0.18% | 0.18% | 0.21% | 0.22% |
| Hmong | 0.10% | 0.07% | 0.05% | 0.07% | 0.07% |
| Urdu | 0.03% | 0.06% | 0.04% | 0.04% | 0.03% |
| Arabic | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.01% | 0.01% |
| Ilocano | 0.06% | 0.02% | 0.00% | 0.01% | 0.01% |

Note: This exhibit includes home languages that represented at least 0.01 percent of migratory students in program year 2021–22. Reported languages with percentage distributions less than 0.01 percent in that program year included Cebuano (Visayan), Vietnamese, Portuguese, Serbo-Croatian (Bosnian, Croatian, Serbian), and other non-English languages that were not specified.

Source: [CDE DataQuest, English Learner Students by Language by Grade](https://dq.cde.ca.gov/dataquest/SpringData/StudentsByLanguage.aspx?Level=State&TheYear=2021%2022&SubGroup=Mig&ShortYear=2122&GenderGroup=B&CDSCode=00000000000000&RecordType=EL), accessed October 26, 2023.

### Students with Disabilities

During SY 2022–23, 11.2 percent of migratory students in kindergarten through grade twelve received special education program services. This percentage is below the statewide percentage of all California students (13.6 percent) who received these services. The percentage varied by grade span, ranging from 10.5 percent of migratory students in kindergarten through grade three to 11.7 percent of migratory students in grades four through six.

Exhibit 9 compares the percentage of migratory students with disabilities to that of all students by grade span during SY 2022–23.

Exhibit 9. Percentage of Migratory Students and All Students Who Have a Disability, by Grade Span, School Year 2022–23

Note: See [exhibit B6](#EB06) in appendix B for a table of the data in this exhibit.

Source: The MSIN Databases for the MEP, 2022–23; CDE DataQuest, 2022–23 [Special Education Enrollment by Program Setting Report](https://dq.cde.ca.gov/dataquest/DQCensus/SPEDEnr.aspx?cds=00&agglevel=State&year=2022-23&ListReportRows=GrdSpan&charter=All&Display=Pct&ro=1), accessed January 26, 2023.

Over the past six school years, the percentage of migratory students served by special education services increased slightly, from 9.2 percent to 11.2 percent of students in grades kindergarten through twelve. The increase has been largest for students in kindergarten and grade twelve. Exhibit 10 shows the percentage of migratory students with disabilities during SYs 2017–18 through 2022–23.

Exhibit 10. Percentage of Migratory Students with Disabilities, School Years 2017–18 Through 2022–23

| Grade(s) | 2017–18 | 2018–19 | 2019–20 | 2020–21 | 2021–22 | 2022–23 |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| K | 5.7% | 6.4% | 6.9% | 8.1% | 9.0% | 9.0% |
| 1 | 7.5% | 8.1% | 7.9% | 8.0% | 9.5% | 10.1% |
| 2 | 8.3% | 8.9% | 9.0% | 8.7% | 9.4% | 11.4% |
| 3 | 9.5% | 10.5% | 10.2% | 9.9% | 10.5% | 11.7% |
| 4 | 11.0% | 11.2% | 10.7% | 11.2% | 10.9% | 11.2% |
| 5 | 11.3% | 12.2% | 11.6% | 11.6% | 12.1% | 11.2% |
| 6 | 11.5% | 11.5% | 12.3% | 11.6% | 11.7% | 12.8% |
| 7 | 11.3% | 11.6% | 11.7% | 12.6% | 11.4% | 11.4% |
| 8 | 10.2% | 11.9% | 11.4% | 11.8% | 11.9% | 11.5% |
| 9 | 9.2% | 9.9% | 12.1% | 12.3% | 11.4% | 11.6% |
| 10 | 8.2% | 9.3% | 10.5% | 11.9% | 11.9% | 11.4% |
| 11 | 8.1% | 8.3% | 9.2% | 10.8% | 11.4% | 11.1% |
| 12 | 7.5% | 8.5% | 8.2% | 10.3% | 11.3% | 11.3% |
| K–12 | 9.2% | 9.9% | 10.2% | 10.7% | 11.0% | 11.2% |

Source: The MSIN Databases for the MEP, 2022–23.

## Setting the Context for Understanding the Needs of Migratory Children and Youths

The purpose of this profile is to serve the CNA SDP committee in exploring and articulating the needs of migratory children and youths so that services that best meet those needs can be integrated into a new SDP. As the committee uses the academic achievement and service data available in this profile to articulate those needs, they are encouraged to also consider the broader context in which these needs exist. Readers of this profile are strongly encouraged to focus on the experiences of migratory children and youths when articulating the needs of this community.

This section shares the goals, strengths, and needs of migratory children and youths as articulated directly by OSYs, MEP parents, and MEP staff. These findings, based on primary voices, result from an analysis of survey data from OSYs, parents, and MEP staff and from three virtual focus group sessions with individuals from these communities. The results that follow include valid percentages, which are based on nonmissing values and provide a representation of the distribution of the valid cases.

### Demographic Characteristics of Survey Respondents

The ages of migratory OSYs who responded to the survey ranged from fifteen to twenty-one years. Approximately half of the OSY respondents were between the ages of twenty and twenty-one years. Most (57 percent) reported that they were here to work. About one third (35.1 percent) indicated that they were here to both work and complete classes.

Spanish was the primary home language of 89.8 percent of OSY respondents and 85.6 percent of parent respondents. English was also a common home language, with 10.9 percent of parents and 3.4 percent of OSY respondents reporting it as their home language. Respondents also reported languages spoken by indigenous people in Mexico as their primary home language. These included Mixteco (9.3 percent of OSY and 5.5 percent of parent respondents), Triqui, Zapoteco, and Chatino. The use of these languages highlights the presence of indigenous peoples and language diversity in migratory communities. These findings are consistent with analyses of the MSIN data, which showed that the percentages of migratory families with a home language of Mixteco and Zapoteco are increasing (see the section on [Home Languages](#Demographics_Home_Languages)). Furthermore, both OSYs and parents commented through open-ended responses that their primary home language included more than one language, most often Spanish and English. In their open-ended responses, some parents signaled that bilingualism or multilingualism (for example, English and Spanish or English, Spanish, and Mixteco) was a strength their children possess.

Over half of parents (55.7 percent) had young children who were currently enrolled in kindergarten through grade six. Most MEP staff represented local programs that served students from this same grade level. Approximately 81 percent of MEP staff served migratory children at the elementary level (kindergarten through grade six). A total of 43.2 percent of MEP staff indicated that their local programs served OSYs.

MEP staff were the only group of participants who were asked to identify the subgrantee they represented. MEP staff represented the diversity of migratory students served in California, with at least three respondents from each of the 20 local MEPs in the state.[[7]](#footnote-8)

### Goals

Through survey questions, WestEd and the CDE explored OSYs’ goals. Nearly 44 percent of OSYs reported that their educational goal included graduating from high school or earning a high school equivalency certificate. Twenty-two percent indicated that going to college was an educational goal, and 21 percent aspired to attend a certificate program or trade school.

These goals align with the top three services or topics of referral information OSYs were interested in receiving, which included

* graduating from high school or earning a high school equivalency certificate (50.5 percent);
* gaining access to job opportunities (48.5 percent); and
* obtaining access to educational services (45.5 percent).

Almost one quarter (23.9 percent) of OSY survey respondents reported that they did not have educational goals. This may be a result of the high proportion of youth respondents who are currently focused on working (57 percent) compared with smaller proportions who were in the process of completing classes (7.9 percent) or were focused on both working and completing classes (35.1 percent).

Learning English was also a top educational goal of OSYs. Of 10 open-ended responses to a question about their educational goals, six OSYs wrote about learning English.

### Strengths

When asked about the strengths of their children in the MEP parent survey, over two thirds of parents provided an open-ended response in which they described the personal qualities their children possess. These qualities included being responsible, determined, and motivated in school (that is, putting in the effort to do well in school) and focused on accomplishing their goals. These aligned with the qualities that about two thirds of OSYs reported feeling proud about in their surveys.

The importance of family came through as another area of strength and motivation for migratory children and youths. Parents attributed their children’s success in school to both a supportive family (61.9 percent) and supportive teachers (61.6 percent). OSYs’ responses aligned with those of MEP parents regarding the importance of family. In their open-ended survey responses, over 75 percent of OSYs named family members (such as parents, grandparents, children, spouses, and siblings) as a part of their daily motivation in wanting to succeed.

Aside from a supportive family and teachers, parents believed that after school programs that help their children complete their homework also contribute to their success in school (39.5 percent). In open-ended survey responses, parents elaborated on this by emphasizing the importance of engaging school activities that could motivate their children to attend, enjoy, and stay or become interested in school. The examples of engaging school activities that parents provided included those that helped their child gain skills (such as leadership, financial literacy, or college knowledge), were subject- or homework-focused (for example, mathematics, English, or general homework help), or were related to sports or the arts (for example, sewing, music, or sports in general).

Although 61.1 percent of MEP parents believe that their children’s interest in school is a strength, they also reported that maintaining or increasing interest in school is an area of concern for them. During the focus group with parents, several agreed that communication between parents and their children and the school was key to helping their children maintain their interest in and motivation to continue going to school. One parent explained how local MEP programs assist in supporting communication between children and youths, parents, and teachers: “I like that about the migrant program, the fact that they have included this activity of having communication, of showing it in every meeting we have with the parents, with different resources and workshops so that we can learn and also help our children.”

### Needs

The analysis of the survey and focus group data revealed several prominent needs for migratory children and youths:

* educational services to support students’ progress in school and OSYs’ educational goals, including services that specifically support English language acquisition
* medical health (including mental health) services
* career and technical education for OSYs and college and career counseling for all students
* social–emotional learning

#### Educational Services

OSYs reported that educational services were among the top topics of referral information that they were interested in receiving (45.5 percent) and sought from MEP staff or teachers (63.7 percent).

Parents agreed. They reported that migratory students need help in the following educational areas:

* mathematics (43.6 percent)
* ELA (35.3 percent)
* ELD (26.0 percent)

MEP staff also indicated that mathematics, ELA, and ELD were among the top three areas of high-priority need in all ages and grade levels. (See exhibit 16.)

Supports to help students graduate from high school were identified as a top need by MEP staff (71 percent) and OSYs (50.5 percent). OSY survey respondents reported that, in particular, they were interested in services that would support them in graduating from high school or earning a high school equivalency certificate (general education development [GED] test prep courses or high school equivalency programs [HEP]). In addition, 47.0 percent of OSY respondents reported that they were aware the MEP provided help in this area, and 42.2 percent of respondents affirmed they were currently interested in participating in such services.

MEP parent survey respondents did not consider this a high-priority need. Regardless of the grades in which their children were enrolled, no more than 16 percent of parents reported that their children would benefit from services to support graduating from high school. (For data regarding the graduation and dropout rates of migratory students, see the section titled [Academic Performance: School Years 2017–18 through 2021–22](#Academic_Performance).) However, several parents noted in open-ended survey questions that educational supports for students with disabilities was important. (For more data regarding migratory students with disabilities, see the section titled [Students with Disabilities](#Demographics_Students_with_Disabilities).)

##### Mathematics

Mathematics was identified as a top need by MEP parents (43.6 percent), regardless of the grade levels in which their children were enrolled. This need was higher than any other parent-reported need, and the percentage of parents who reported it as a high-priority need increased slightly as students advanced from preschool to grade eight. Exhibit 11 shows the percentage of parents who reported mathematics as a need for their child(ren) by grade levels. Furthermore, many parents who responded to open-ended survey questions explained that mathematics was a subject for which their child(ren) needed additional support. Mathematics was also one of the top three high-priority needs reported by MEP staff for migratory students at all grade levels (see exhibit 16). For additional information on migratory students’ needs related to mathematics, see an analysis of migratory students’ performance on the CAASPP mathematics assessment in the section titled [California Assessment of Student Performance and Progress](#Academic_Performance_CAASPP).

Exhibit 11. Percentage of Parents Reporting a Need for Mathematics Supports for Their Child(ren), by Grade Group

Note: See [exhibit B7](#EB07) in appendix B for a table of the data in this exhibit.

Source: MEP Parent Survey for the Migrant Student Profile, February 2023.

##### English Language Arts

ELA was one of the top needs for migratory children that parents (35.3 percent overall) and OSY (77.8 percent) reported. Exhibit 12 shows the percentage of parents who reported ELA as a need for their child(ren) by grade levels. In addition, MEP staff reported that ELA was one of the top three high-priority needs for migratory students at all grade levels (see exhibit 16). Staff reported that this was a need for 75 percent or more of the student population. For additional information on needs related to ELA, see an analysis of migratory students’ performance on the CAASPP ELA assessment in the section titled [California Assessment of Student Performance and Progress](#Academic_Performance_CAASPP).

Exhibit 12. Percentage of Parents Reporting a Need for English Language Arts Supports for Their Child(ren), by Grade Group

Note: See [exhibit B8](#EB08) in appendix B for a table of the data in this exhibit.

Source: MEP Parent Survey for the Migrant Student Profile, February 2023.

##### English Language Development

The need to support OSYs in ELD was prominent in the surveys and focus groups. In the OSY survey, 73.3 percent of respondents reported that they wanted support with learning English. ELD was also one of the top three high-priority needs reported by MEP staff for migratory students at all grade levels (see exhibit 16), a top three need reported by parents with children enrolled in preschool and grades kindergarten through six, and a top five need reported for parents with children enrolled in grades nine through twelve.

This need was underscored in the focus group data. During the OSY focus group, most OSYs reported the importance of learning to speak English, understanding English, and having a need and desire to take English as a second language (ESL) courses. One youth spoke about the challenges she has encountered by not speaking English and how she uses a translation app to communicate in English. She said, “There are always people who only speak English. And to communicate with my teachers, for example, I understand most of them, but when it’s time to answer, I use Google Translate to express myself because it’s really hard.” Another youth agreed, commenting, “One of the things would be learning the language, because here in this country most people speak English. It’s hard to go outside. And if you have a question, it’s hard to ask questions or to move around if you don’t know the language. So, I think learning English would be necessary for me.”

When presented with a list of needs for migratory students and youths, a parent in the focus group described the importance and impact of local MEPs supporting migratory students in communicating in English. She said,

In my case, I would say it’s more about English language learning, although my children do speak English. Because it’s one thing to speak and another thing to be understood when you want to express an idea. For example, my boy [reclassified] in third grade, but my girl started high school and hasn’t [reclassified] yet. So I had to sit down with her and talk, and I told her, ‘Why is it that you can’t pass? What’s going on in the exam? What are the questions about?’ And when I talked to her, I realized her answers were too short—she didn’t elaborate. So I asked the migrant program for help. She started [participating in] the speech and debate activities, and they helped her and she [reclassified] that year.

For additional information regarding the needs of migratory students who are EL students, see the section titled [English Language Proficiency Assessments for California](#Academic_Performance_ELPAC).

#### Medical and Mental Health Services

MEP parents, OSYs, and staff believe medical and mental health services are high-priority needs for migratory students and youths. OSYs have sought several medical and mental health services from local MEPs that align with the types of supports parents indicated their children need from their communities or schools. OSYs reported needing the following services or referral information related to medical and mental health:

* physical and medical health services (45.1 percent)
* food services (31.4 percent)
* counseling or mental health services (30.4 percent)

Parents indicated that their children need the following:

* vision care (83.9 percent)
* dental care (83.2 percent)
* counseling/social–emotional health/mental health services (81.9 percent)

In open-ended responses, parents provided additional examples of the types of health-related supports children need. These included supports for different aspects of health (for example, physical care and drug-, alcohol-, and tobacco-use prevention) and food or nutrition (such as obtaining food and receiving information about healthy eating habits).

The need to access health and mental health services was considered an especially high-priority need for OSYs by MEP staff, with 62.8 percent reporting health services as a high-priority need and 57.4 reporting the same for mental health services.

#### Career and Technical Education and College and Career Counseling

Nearly half of OSYs (44.4 percent) reported that information about career and technical education was a high need for them. Relatedly, 93.7 percent of parents overall believe it would be helpful if their child or youth received college and career counseling from their school or community. Exhibit 13 shows the percentage of parents who reported that college and career counseling would be a helpful support for their child(ren), by grade group.

Exhibit 13. Percentage of Parents Reporting College and Career Counseling as a Helpful Support for Their Child(ren), by Grade Group

“N” represents the “number of students with scores” for each student population and grade level.

| Grade Group | N | Percentage Reporting |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Preschool | 140 | 92.5% |
| K–6 | 350 | 92.0% |
| 7–8 | 180 | 99.0% |
| 9–12 | 300 | 97.9% |

Source: MEP Parent Survey for the Migrant Student Profile, February 2023.

#### Social–Emotional Learning

Social–emotional learning was rated as a high-priority need by the MEP staff for all grade levels. However, the percentage of staff who rated it as a priority decreased slightly as students got older (see exhibit 14).

Exhibit 14. Percentage of Migrant Education Program Staff Indicating Social–Emotional Learning Was a High-Priority Need, by Grade Group

Note: See [exhibit B9](#EB09) in appendix B for a table of the data in this exhibit.

Source: MEP Staff Survey for the Migratory Student Profile, February 2023.

Parents were also highly likely to indicate that counseling and social–emotional support would be helpful for their children. At least 80 percent reported that this service would be helpful, regardless of their child(ren)’s grade group (see exhibit 15).

Exhibit 15. Percentage of Parents Reporting Counseling and Social-Emotional Support as Helpful for Their Child(ren), by Grade Group

| Grade Group | N | Percentage Reporting |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Preschool | 140 | 81.8% |
| K–6 | 350 | 81.7% |
| 7–8 | 180 | 85.1% |
| 9–12 | 300 | 80.6% |

Source: MEP Parent Survey for the Migratory Student Profile, February 2023.

During the parent focus group, social–emotional learning was a need highlighted by several parents. They noted that they saw the need for supports in social–emotional learning increase as students advanced grade levels, such as from elementary to middle school and from middle to high school. In contrast, MEP staff were less likely to identify social–emotional learning as a high-priority need at higher grade levels (see exhibits 18–21).

Another parent shared how social–emotional learning opportunities could be opened up to MEP parents so that they could support their students and the broader community:

If [the migrant program] had those kinds of workshops, ... maybe the parents could get involved with them and find out how to help [their children]. Maybe it’s one of our children’s friends, but we don’t know how to help them. They could teach us a little, prepare us to know what to do in those cases.

Another parent commented, “Sadly, the school environment nowadays is not very good, especially with all that’s happening at the national level. There’s so much violence in schools, and I think if they offered some workshops to children depending on their stage at school, it would help.”

Exhibit 16. Migrant Education Program Staff’s Top Three High-Priority Needs of Migratory Students by Age or Grade Range

| Grade Group | High-Priority Need 1 | High-Priority Need 2 | High-Priority Need 3 |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Preschool | Instructional supports in ELA  (74.2%) | Instructional supports in ELD  (72.9%) | Bilingual services  (70.0%) |
| K–6 | Instructional supports in ELD  (77.8%) | Instructional supports in ELA  (77.1%) | Instructional supports in math  (75.3%) |
| 7–8 | Instructional supports in ELA  (72.2%) | Instructional supports in math  (71.8%) | Instructional supports in ELD  (71.6%) |
| 9–12 | Supports for graduating from high school  (71.3%) | Supports for college entrance  (70.2%) | Instructional supports in math  (69%) |
| OSY | Supports in earning a GED  (65.8%) | Instructional supports in ELD  (65.3%) | Career and technical education  (65.1%) |

Note: Although not among the top three needs, ELA was reported as a high-priority need for high school students (grades nine through twelve) by 67.5 percent of MEP staff, and ELD was reported as a high-priority need by 66.3 percent of MEP staff.

Source: MEP Staff Survey for the Migratory Student Profile, February 2023.

### Barriers

By far, the largest barrier to participation in MEP programming that OSYs reported (71.0 percent) is the conflict between their responsibilities and when services are offered by local MEPs. In addition, about half of OSYs (50.9 percent) lack access to transportation that would enable them to participate in the MEP services. More than half of OSYs (58.5 percent) reported having transportation needs: 76.1 percent indicated that they needed a car, and 53.7 percent indicated that they needed a driver’s license. In open-ended responses, parents also identified the need for more transportation support to and from school activities. During the staff focus group, one participant said, “I would say that transportation is ... the linchpin for making powerful services and for eliminating barriers for our families.”

Survey and focus group data revealed the need for a strong and secure internet connection and technology devices such as laptops, smartphones, and tablets. About 18 percent of parents indicated that their child needed access to an adequate internet connection and to devices. About 64 percent of MEP staff reported that access to devices was a high-priority need, particularly for OSYs. In terms of access to a reliable, high-speed internet connection, MEP staff reported adequate internet access as a high-priority need, especially for younger students (preschool and grades kindergarten through six) and OSYs (see exhibit 17).

The need for internet connectivity and devices also emerged as a theme in the local MEP staff focus group. Local MEP staff described how the lack of a reliable internet connection and devices has made it challenging for students to engage in virtual MEP activities and complete their regular schoolwork. One local MEP staff member spoke about a district that provided every student with a device at the start of the COVID–19 pandemic. But when pandemic restrictions eased, students were asked to return their devices to the district, leaving many without access.

Exhibit 17. Percentage of Migrant Education Program Staff Reporting That Access to Technology Was a High-Priority Need, by Grade Group

Note: See [exhibit B10](#EB10) in appendix B for a table of the data in this exhibit.

Source: MEP Staff Survey for the Migratory Student Profile, February 2023.

Another barrier that local MEP staff commented on was the challenge of reaching MEP-eligible migratory students. Several staff discussed how local MEPs need to develop instructional models that engage and retain students. They also identified challenges that include teacher turnover and competitiveness between programs and districts over funding (for example, attendance drives funding).

### Opportunities

Local MEP staff shared that migratory EL students need opportunities to master basic English language communication skills, including conversational skills. Currently, ELD support is embedded in ELA or course content taught during the regular school day. Staff explained that MEP services now appear to mimic these lessons but that, instead, such services should be designed as supplemental services. Staff also suggested that providing students with instruction in their home language(s) would encourage more of them to participate. One local MEP staff member commented on how helpful it would be for students if staff had more options for using bilingual support to provide services. She described an after-school journalism class with newcomers that the teacher taught in English. The staff member and the teacher found that few students were engaged and participating. The staff member explained:

We decided [to explain to the class] during the introduction ... “It’s journalism. We’re doing it in English, but we know Spanish in case you have trouble or you need help. We’re here to help you.” Now they’re having fun learning because ... they understand what they’re doing because we’re explaining it in Spanish. And, yes, we’re explaining it in English too. I mean, it’s double work, but it’s okay because that’s what we’re there for, to help them learn.

The different views of the local MEP staff, parents, and OSYs about the service and support needs of migratory children, students, and youths offer an opportunity for further exploration. MEP parents consistently emphasized the need for supports in social–emotional learning and accessing health and mental health services across grade level groups. MEP staff tended to emphasize instructional supports for mathematics, ELA, and ELD. MEP staff’s inclination to identify these needs is expected, given that the primary role of the MEP is to provide supplemental academic support for migratory children, students, and youths. MEP staff also reported that all services and supports for OSYs were needed more or less equally, although OSYs were more likely to report needing instructional supports for ELA and ELD.

It may be helpful to compare the survey responses of MEP parents, MEP staff, and OSYs side by side in order to highlight their differing views. Exhibits 18–22 compare how likely MEP staff and parents or staff and OSYs were to report that a type of service or support was needed for migratory children, students, and youths.

Exhibit 18. Percentage of Migrant Education Program Staff and Parents Reporting Services and Supports Needed for Preschool-Aged Children, by Service or Support Type

Note: See [exhibit B11](#EB11) in appendix B for a table of the data in this exhibit.

Source: MEP Staff and Parent Surveys for the Migratory Student Profile, February 2023.

Exhibit 19. Percentage of Migrant Education Program Staff and Parents Reporting Services and Supports Needed for Students in Grades Kindergarten Through Six, by Service or Support Type

Note: See [exhibit B12](#EB12) in appendix B for a table of the data in this exhibit.

Source: MEP Staff and Parent Surveys for the Migratory Student Profile, February 2023.

Exhibit 20. Percentage of Migrant Education Program Staff and Parents Reporting Services and Supports Needed for Students in Grades Seven and Eight, by Service or Support Type

Note: See [exhibit B13](#EB13) in appendix B for a table of the data in this exhibit.

Source: MEP Staff and Parent Surveys for the Migratory Student Profile, February 2023.

Exhibit 21. Percentage of Migrant Education Program Staff and Parents Reporting Services and Supports Needed for Students in Grades Nine Through Twelve, by Service or Support Type

Note: See [exhibit B14](#EB14) in appendix B for a table of the data in this exhibit.

Source: MEP Staff and Parent Surveys for the Migratory Student Profile, February 2023.

Exhibit 22. Percentage of Migrant Education Program Staff and Out-of-School Youths Reporting Services and Supports Needed for Out-of-School Youths, by Service or Support Type

Note: See [exhibit B15](#EB15) in appendix B for a table of the data in this exhibit.

Source: MEP Staff and Parent Surveys for the Migratory Student Profile, February 2023.

### Out-of-School Youth and Parent Engagement in Local Migrant Education Programming

OSYs and MEP parents reported deep appreciation for local MEP programming and staff. During the OSY focus group, participants shared appreciation for how the MEP supported them in pursuing their educational goals while they also had to work. One youth shared:

I want to thank the Migrant Education Program. I’m so happy because it has really helped me a lot. Sometimes not everyone has the choice to give up your job in order to finish school. And for those who do, good for you. But not everyone has that chance, and I think this program makes it easier to keep our focus on our jobs and continue to achieve our goals.

Another youth explained:

I work in agriculture. It’s a heavy job, and sometimes when it’s hot, we have to keep working, even though it’s hot. And I’d like to finish my studies to have a better future and to be able to look for another job or a job in a cool place. The migrant program gave me the option to enroll in another program where I could continue a career, or at least help me finish high school. One of my goals is to finish my studies so that I can have a better job in the future.

A third OSY focus group participant expressed appreciation for the MEP for providing a teacher who helped them improve their mathematics skills when they struggled with the content.

During the focus group, several parents expressed a similar level of appreciation for the MEP. One example of the MEP’s support and impact was explained by a parent who shared:

I feel that the migrant program is highly supportive for children. My eldest daughter participated in the speech and debate, and it was really helpful for her to overcome her shyness. She was so shy, and every migrant program class has helped her. All the trips she’s taken to visit universities are encouraging. They know they shouldn’t limit themselves—they can enter the university they want to because there are resources, and they find the way to achieve what they want.

MEP staff have been effective at demonstrating that they understand and respect OSYs and MEP parents. Both parents and OSYs reported feeling understood and respected by their local MEP staff. About 61 percent of OSYs reported that MEP staff *always* understand their culture, compared with 43.3 percent reporting the same of teachers. Similarly, 67 percent of parents felt their local MEP staff *always* respected their culture, and 57 percent reported the same of teachers.

Through the staff focus group, local MEP staff described how their lived experiences connected them with the culture of the families they work with. They expressed a deep and personal understanding of the migratory community. Several of them shared that this was rooted in their own experiences as former migratory students. Local MEP staff were able to provide examples of the strong, trusting, and lasting relationships they have with migratory families.

All of the individuals who participated in the staff focus group described how they had been sought out by families as a trusted resource. For example, staff provided families with information that connected parents and OSYs to food and health services and to programs that supported their educational goals. One local MEP staff member described how she supported a family who moved to another district. The family contacted her and asked for help in connecting with their new local MEP. The staff member decided to also connect the family to medical, dental, and other services they might need. Local MEP staff recounted, “The contact that you have with the families—they call you right away, even though they’re far away from you. And they always say, ‘I’m sorry to call you. I know we’re not there anymore, but we don’t know what to do. Can you help us out?’”

## Academic Performance: School Years 2017–18 Through 2022–23

This section examines differences between California’s migratory students, migratory PFS students, and all students in key academic performance indicators. These indicators include performance on the ELPAC summative assessment (Summative ELPAC), performance on the CAASPPfor ELA and mathematics, performance on the CAST, and graduation and dropout rates.

Due to data limitations, some indicators include comparisons only between migratory students and all students in California. These include indicators for graduation and dropout rates and the CAST.

The following section lists several key findings:

* Over the five assessment years included in this profile, migratory PFS students narrowed their prior performance gaps with migratory students on the Summative ELPAC for overall performance and on all four domains: listening, speaking, reading, and writing.
* On the CAASPP ELA, migratory PFS students, migratory students, and all students experienced performance declines SYs 2017–18 through 2022–23 on all claims with the exception of the listening claim. On their overall performance and the reading, writing, and research claims, PFS students declined the least, causing a narrowing of the performance gap between migratory students and migratory PFS students.
* On the CAASPP mathematics, migratory and all students experienced performance declines from SYs 2017–18 through 2022–23. During that same time period, the performance of migratory PFS students remained steady, causing a narrowing performance gap between migratory students and migratory PFS students.
* On the CAST, the performance gap between migratory students and all students for overall achievement remained steady SYs 2018–19 through 2022–23.
* The gap between the graduation rates of migratory and all students increased from 1.3 percentage points to 3.4 percentage points for SYs 2017–18 through 2022–23. The gap has narrowed since SY 2020–21, when it was at 4.2 percentage points.
* The gap between the dropout rates of migratory and all students increased from 0.9 percentage point to 1.9 percentage points for SYs 2017–18 through 2022–23 because the dropout rate for all students declined more than the rate for migratory students did.

### English Language Proficiency Assessments for California

The Summative ELPAC is the required state test to assess current EL students’ English language proficiency. The overall composite score of this assessment consists of scores from four domains: listening, speaking, reading, and writing. To be considered for reclassification or exit from EL status, students currently identified as EL students must score at level 4 for their overall composite score.

To identify the potential needs of migratory student in English language proficiency, this profile examines differences in ELPAC performance overall and by domain for migratory PFS students, migratory students, and all students who are identified as English learners for SYs 2017–18 through 2018–19 and SYs 2020–21 through 2022–23. No ELPAC assessment data is available for SY 2019–20 because of the COVID-19 pandemic.

#### Overall English Language Proficiency Assessment for California Score

Between SYs 2017–18 and 2018–19, all three student populations experienced declines in the percentage of students scoring at level 4 for overall performance on the Summative ELPAC. The percentage of migratory students and all students scoring at level 4 continued to decline between SYs 2018–19 and 2020–21. They did not start to increase until SY 2021–22, when, over the five school years examined, the percentage of migratory PFS students scoring at level 4 increased, leading to a much narrower performance gap between migratory and all students on overall performance.

##### Key Findings

* By SY 2020–21, migratory PFS students narrowed their earlier performance   
  gap with migratory students from a difference of 13.6 percentage points in SY 2017–18 to a difference of 0.4 percentage point on the overall performance   
  of the ELPAC.
* In SY 2022–23, migratory PFS students were 6.7 percentage points less likely than all students to score at level 4. Migratory students overall were 4.7 percentage points less likely than all students to score at level 4.

Exhibit 23 shows the percentage of all students, migratory students, and migratory PFS students who scored at level 4 for overall performance for SYs 2017–18, 2018–19, 2020–21, 2021–22, and 2022–23.

Exhibit 23. Percentage of All Students, Migratory Students, and Migratory Priority-for-Service Students Scoring at Level 4 for Overall Performance on the Summative English Language Proficiency Assessments for California for All Grades, by Student Population, School Years 2017–18, 2018–19, and 2020–21 Through 2022–23

Note: See [exhibit B16](#EB16) in appendix B for a table of the data in this exhibit.

Source: CDE ELPAC data files, SYs 2017–18 through 2022–23, and the MSIN Databases for the MEP, 2017–18 through 2022–23 performance periods. Accessed February 2023 for SYs 2017–18 through 2021–22 and December 2023 for SY 2022–23.

The remainder of this section provides exhibits that show the percentage of students who scored as well developed for the four ELPAC domains across all five assessment years. For the most recent assessment year (SY 2022–23), the section also provides the distribution of students who scored as well developed, somewhat/moderately developed, and beginning to develop.

#### English Language Proficiency Assessment for California Listening Domain

Between SYs 2017–18 and 2020–21, the performance of migratory PFS, migratory, and all students on the ELPAC listening domain was similar to their overall performance on the ELPAC. Between SYs 2017–18 and 2018–19, all three student groups experienced significant declines in the percentage of students scoring as well developed*.* From SYs 2020–21 through 2021–22, all three student groups experienced a slight increase in the percentage of students scoring at well developed, with a slight decrease in SY 2022–23.

##### Key Findings

* By SY 2020–21, migratory PFS students narrowed their earlier performance   
  gap with migratory students from a difference of 10.4 percentage points in SY 2017–18 to a difference of 0.5 percentage point on the ELPAC listening domain.
* In SY 2022–23, migratory PFS students were 6.7 percentage points less likely than all students to score as well developed. Migratory students overall were 4.0 percentage points less likely than all students to score as well developed.
* When analyzing SY 2022–23 data for students starting their English language proficiency journey, just under 19 percent of all students scored at beginning to develop on the ELPAC listening domain while migratory students and migratory PFS students were eight and 16 percentage points more likely to scored at the begnning to develop stage respectively.

Exhibit 24 shows the percentage of all students, migratory students, and migratory PFS students who scored as well developed on the listening domain over the past five assessment years.

Exhibit 24. Percentage of All Students, Migratory Students, and Migratory Priority-for-Service Students Scoring Well Developed on the English Language Proficiency Assessments for California Listening Domain for All Grades, School Years 2017–18, 2018–19, and 2020–21 Through 2022–23

Note: See [exhibit B17](#EB17) in appendix B for a table of the data in this exhibit.

Source: CDE ELPAC data files, SYs 2017–18 through 2022–23, and the MSIN Databases for the MEP, 2017–18 through 2022–23 performance periods. Accessed February 2023 for SYs 2017–18 through 2021–22 and December 2023 for SY 2022–23.

Exhibit 25 shows the distribution of student performance on the listening domain for SY 2022–23. Compared with all students, both groups of migratory students were less likely to score as somewhat/moderately developed or well developed.

Exhibit 25. Percentage of Students, by Student Population, Scoring at Each Level on the English Language Proficiency Assessments for California Listening Domain for All Grades, School Year 2022–23

Note: See [exhibit B18](#EB18) in appendix B for a table of the data in this exhibit.

Source: CDE ELPAC data files, SY 2022–23, and the MSIN Databases for the MEP, 2022–23 performance period. Accessed December 2023.

#### English Language Proficiency Assessment for California Speaking Domain

Between SYs 2017–18 and 2020–21, the performance of migratory PFS, migratory, and all students on the ELPAC speaking domain was similar to their overall performance on the ELPAC. Since SY 2020–21, the percentage of all students and migratory students scoring as well developed has increased, while that of migratory PFS students has remained relatively steady.

##### Key Findings

* Of the four ELPAC domains, the speaking domain had the highest percentages of proficiency for all students, migratory students, and migratory PFS students for the past five years.
* By SY 2020–21, migratory PFS students narrowed their earlier performance gap with migratory students on the ELPAC speaking domain from a difference of 9 percentage points to a difference of 1.6 percentage points.

In SY 2022–23, migratory PFS students were 15.4 percentage points less likely than all students to score as well developed, and migratory students overall were 10.3 percentage points less likely than all students to score as well developed. Exhibit 26 shows the percentage of all students, migratory students, and migratory PFS students that scored as well developed on the speaking domain over the past five assessment years.

Exhibit 26. Percentage of All Students, Migratory Students, and Migratory Priority-for-Service Students Scoring Well Developed on English Language Proficiency Assessments for California Speaking Domain for All Grades, School Years 2017–18, 2018–19, and 2020–21 Through 2022–23

Note: See [exhibit B19](#EB19) in appendix B for a table of the data in this exhibit.

Source: CDE ELPAC data files, SYs 2017–18 through 2022–23, and the MSIN Databases for the MEP, 2017–18 through 2022–23 performance periods. Accessed February 2023 for SYs 2017–18 through 2021–22 and December 2023 for SY 2022–23.

Exhibit 27 shows the distribution of student performance on the speaking domain for SY 2022–23. In this domain, both groups of migratory students were less likely than all students to score as well developed. Migratory students performed slightly better than migratory PFS students, with a higher percentage scoring as well developed and a lower percentage scoring as beginning to develop.

Exhibit 27. Percentage of Students, by Student Population, Scoring at Each Level on the English Language Proficiency Assessments for California Speaking Domain for All Grades, School Year 2022–23

Note: See [exhibit B20](#EB20) in appendix B for a table of the data in this exhibit.

Source: CDE ELPAC data files, SY 2022–23, and the MSIN Databases for the MEP, 2022–23 performance period. Accessed December 2023.

#### English Language Proficiency Assessment for California Reading Domain

Between SYs 2017–18 and 2018–19, all three student populations experienced a decline in the percentage of students scoring as well developed on the ELPAC reading domain. Since 2018–19, the percentage of all students and migratory students scoring as well developed has remained steady, while that of migratory PFS students increased.

##### Key Findings

* By SY 2020–21, migratory PFS students had closed their prior performance gap with and surpassed migratory students on the ELPAC reading domain (compared with an 8.9 percentage point difference in SY 2017–18).
* In SY 2022–23, migratory PFS students were 4.5 percentage points less likely than all students to score as well developed. Migratory students overall were 3.2 percentage points less likely than all students to score as well developed.
* During the last two school years, the ELPAC reading domain had the lowest percentages of proficiency for all three student groups compared to other ELPAC domains.

Exhibit 28 shows the percentage of all students, migratory students, and migratory PFS students who scored as well developed on the reading domain over the past five assessment years.

Exhibit 28. Percentage of All Students, Migratory Students, and Migratory Priority-for-Service Students Scoring Well Developed on English Language Proficiency Assessments for California Reading Domain for All Grades, School Years 2017–18, 2018–19, and 2020–21 Through 2022–23

Note: See [exhibit B21](#EB21) in appendix B for a table of the data in this exhibit.

Source: CDE ELPAC data files, SYs 2017–18 through 2022–23, and the MSIN Databases for the MEP, 2017–18 through 2022–23 performance periods. Accessed February 2023 for SYs 2017–18 through 2021–22 and December 2023 for SY 2022–23.

Exhibit 29 shows the distribution of student performance on the reading domain for SY 2022–23. In this domain, both groups of migratory students were less likely than all students to score as well developed. Migratory students performed slightly better than migratory PFS students, with a higher percentage scoring as well developed and a lower percentage scoring as beginning to develop.

Exhibit 29. Percentage of Students, by Student Population, Scoring at Each Level on the English Language Proficiency Assessments for California Reading Domain for All Grades, School Year 2022–23

Note: See [exhibit B22](#EB22) in appendix B for a table of the data in this exhibit.

Source: CDE ELPAC data files, SY 2022–23, and the MSIN Databases for the MEP, 2022–23 performance period. Accessed December 2023.

#### English Language Proficiency Assessment for California Writing Domain

Between SYs 2017–18 and 2020–21, all three student populations experienced a sharp decline in the percentage of students scoring as well developed on the ELPAC writing domain. However, between SYs 2020–21 and 2022–23, all student populations experienced a similar increase in the percentage of students scoring as well developed.

##### Key Findings

* By SY 2020–21, migratory PFS students had nearly closed their earlier performance gap with migratory students on the ELPAC writing domain.
* Since SY 2020–21, each student group assessed continued to build proficiency by approximately three percentage points through SY 2022–23 on the ELPAC writing domain.
* In SY 2022–23, migratory PFS students were 6.0 percentage points less likely than all students to score as well developed. Migratory students overall were 4.3 percentage points less likely than all students to score as well developed.

Exhibit 30 shows the percentage of all students, migratory students, and migratory PFS students that scored as well developed on the writing domain over the past five assessment years.

Exhibit 30. Percentage of All Students, Migratory Students, and Migratory Priority-for-Service Students Scoring Well Developed on English Language Proficiency Assessments for California Writing Domain for All Grades, School Years 2017–18, 2018–19, and 2020–21 Through 2022–23

Note: See [exhibit B23](#EB23) in appendix B for a table of the data in this exhibit.

Source: CDE ELPAC data files, SYs 2017–18 through 2022–23, and the MSIN Databases for the MEP, 2017–18 through 2022–23 performance periods. Accessed February 2023 for SYs 2017–18 through 2021–22 and December 2023 for SY 2022–23.

Exhibit 31 shows the distribution of student performance on the writing domain for SY 2022–23. In this domain, both groups of migratory students were less likely than all students to score as well developed. Migratory students performed slightly better than migratory PFS students, with a higher percentage scoring as well developed and a lower percentage scoring as beginning to develop.

Exhibit 31. Percentage of Students, by Student Population, Scoring at Each Level on the English Language Proficiency Assessments for California Writing Domain for All Grades, School Year 2022–23

Note: See [exhibit B24](#EB24) in appendix B for a table of the data in this exhibit.

Source: CDE ELPAC data files, SY 2022–23, and the MSIN Databases for the MEP, 2022–23 performance period. Accessed December 2023.

### California Assessment of Student Performance and Progress

The CAASPP is an assessment system that includes ELA and mathematics, the CAST, the California Alternate Assessments for ELA, mathematics, and science, and the optional California Spanish Assessment.[[8]](#footnote-9) In order to better understand migratory student academic performance and possible needs, this profile compares migratory students, migratory PFS students, and all students’ performance on the CAASPP ELA and mathematics for grades three through eight and grade eleven. Because of data limitations, this profile offers a comparison of CAST performance only for migratory students and all students. Students take the CAST in grades five and eight and then one time in high school (in grade ten, eleven, or twelve).

#### Assessment Years Included

The following assessment years are included in this profile: SYs 2017–18, 2018–19, 2021–22, and 2022–23. Because of the COVID-19 pandemic, there were no CAASPP or CAST assessment scores for SY 2019–20. And because of the low number of students with CAASPP and CAST assessment scores in SY 2020–21, that assessment year was not included in the analysis for this profile. Finally, because the CAST was not implemented statewide until SY 2018–19, the only years available for that assessment are SYs 2018–19, 2021–22, and 2022–23.

#### Achievement Levels Examined

Student scores are reported on overall achievement and by claims (ELA and mathematics) or domains (CAST) that focus on specific knowledge and skills. Overall, ELA, mathematics, and CAST achievement levels consist of level 1 (standard not met), level 2 (standard nearly met), level 3 (standard met), and level 4 (standard exceeded). This profile examines the percentage of migratory PFS, migratory, and all students scoring at level 3 and level 4 on each assessment for the available assessment years.

Student performance on specific claims or domains are also examined to identify specific areas of strengths and weaknesses within ELA, mathematics, and science. For the CAASPP ELA and mathematics claims and the CAST domains, achievement levels consist of below standard, near standard, and above standard. This profile examines the percentage of migratory PFS, migratory, and all students scoring at above standard for each claim and domain across available assessment years. It also examines the distribution of students’ claim or domain scores for SY 2022–23.

#### Overall Score on the California Assessment of Student Performance and Progress for English Language Arts

Between SYs 2017–18 and 2022–23, the percentage of students who met or exceeded the standard declined for migratory (3.9 percentage points) and all (3.2 percentage points) students. For migratory PFS students, the percentage of students who met or exceeded the standard remained steady (0.6 percentage point decline).

##### Key Findings

* By SY 2021–22, migratory PFS students had narrowed their performance gap with migratory students on the CAASPP ELA overall achievement to a 7.9 percentage point difference (compared with an 11.3 percentage point difference in SY 2017–18).
* In SY 2022–23, migratory PFS students were 31.2 percentage points less likely than all students to score at standard met or standard exceeded. Migratory students overall were 23.2 percentage points less likely than all students to score at standard met or standard exceeded.
* The achievement gap on the CAASPP ELA overall achievement was the highest at 23.2 percentage points since 2017–18, but that was only an increase of 0.1 percentage points from 2021–22. Reviewing data between 2018–19 through 2021–22, the achievement gap grew more rapidly from 21.9 to 23.1 percentage points (a change of 1.2 percentage points).

Exhibit 32 shows the percentage of all students, migratory students, and migratory PFS students who scored at standard met or standard exceeded for overall achievement on the CAASPP ELA for SYs 2017–18, 2018–19, 2021–22, and 2022–23.

Exhibit 32. Percentage of All Students, Migratory Students, and Migratory Priority-for-Service Students Scoring at Standard Met or Exceeded for Overall Achievement on California’s English Language Arts Assessment for All Grades, School Years 2017–18, 2018–19, 2021–22, and 2022–23

Note: See [exhibit B25](#EB25) in appendix B for a table of the data in this exhibit.

Source: CDE CAASPP data files, SYs 2017–18, 2018–19, 2021–22, and 2022–23, and the MSIN Databases for the MEP, 2017–18, 2018–19, 2021–22, and 2022–23 performance periods. Accessed February 2023 for SYs 2017–18 through 2021–22 and December 2023 for SY 2022–23.

The remainder of this section provides exhibits that show the percentage of students who scored above standard for each of the four claims of the CAASPP ELA assessment across four SYs (2017–18, 2018–19, 2021–22, and 2022–23). For the most recent SY (2022–23), the section also provides the distribution of students who scored above standard, near standard, or below standard*.*

#### California Assessment of Student Performance and Progress for English Language Arts Reading Claim

From SYs 2017–18 through 2018–19, all three student populations increased the percentage of students scoring above standard for the CAASPP ELA reading claim. Between SYs 2018–19 and 2021–22, the percentage of students who were above standard on the reading claim declined for migratory and all students, but it increased slightly for migratory PFS students.

##### Key Findings

* By SY 2021–22, migratory PFS students narrowed their earlier performance   
  gap with migratory students on the CAASPP ELA reading claim to a 3.3 percentage point difference (compared with a 5.4 percentage point difference in SY 2017–18).
* In SY 2022–23, migratory PFS students were 15.4 percentage points less likely than all students to score at above standard. Migratory students overall were 11.9 percentage points less likely than all students to score at above standard.
* Effects of the COVID-19 pandemic especially affected proficiency levels for all students and migratory students as illustrated in the following claim data.

Exhibit 33 shows the percentage of all students, migratory students, and migratory PFS students who scored at above standard on the CAASPP ELA reading claim over the past four assessment years.

Exhibit 33. Percentage of All Students, Migratory Students, and Migratory Priority-for-Service Students Scoring Above Standard on the California Assessment of Student Performance and Progress English Language Arts Reading Claim for All Grades, School Years 2017–18, 2018–19, 2021–22, and 2022–23

Note: See [exhibit B26](#EB26) in appendix B for a table of the data in this exhibit.

Source: CDE CAASPP data files, SYs 2017–18, 2018–19, 2021–22, and 2022–23, and the MSIN Databases for the MEP, 2017–18, 2018–19, 2021–22, and 2022–23 performance periods. Accessed February 2023 for SYs 2017–18 through 2021–22 and December 2023 for SY 2022–23.

Exhibit 34 shows the distribution of student performance on the reading claim for SY 2022–23. For this claim, both populations of migratory students were much more likely than all students to score below standard and less likely to score near standard or above standard. Compared with migratory students, slightly lower percentages of migratory PFS students scored near or above standard.

Exhibit 34. Percentage of Students, by Student Population, Scoring at Each Level on the English Language Arts Reading Claim for All Grades, School Year 2022–23

Note: See [exhibit B27](#EB27) in appendix B for a table of the data in this exhibit.

Source: CDE CAASPP data files, SY 2022–23, and the MSIN Databases for the MEP, 2022–23 performance period. Accessed December 2023.

#### California Assessment of Student Performance and Progress for English Language Arts Writing Claim

From SYs 2017–18 through 2021–22, migratory PFS students narrowed their performance gap with migratory students on the writing claim from a 5.7 percentage point difference to a 2.8 percentage point difference. Between SYs 2017–18 and   
2018–19, the percentage of students who were above standard on the writing claim remained steady for migratory PFS and all students but increased for migratory students. Between SYs 2018–19 and 2022–23, the percentage of students who were above standard on the writing claim decreased for all three student populations, with migratory PFS students experiencing the smallest decline.

##### Key Findings

* By SY 2021–22, migratory PFS students narrowed their earlier performance gap with migratory students on the CAASPP ELA writing claim to a 3.2 percentage point difference (compared with a 5.7 percentage point difference in   
  SY 2017–18).
* Of all the claims, migratory PFS student had the second to lowest proficiency (3.6 percent) rate in writing after the reading claim (3.3 percent).
* In SY 2022–23, migratory PFS students were 15.6 percentage points less likely than all students to score at above standard. Migratory students overall were 11.9 percentage points less likely than all students to score at above standard.

Exhibit 35 shows the percentage of all students, migratory students, and migratory PFS students who scored at above standard on the CAASPP ELA writing claim over the past four assessment years.

Exhibit 35. Percentage of All Students, Migratory Students, and Migratory Priority-for-Service Students Scoring Above Standard on the English Language Arts Writing Claim for All Grades, School Years 2017–18,   
2018–19, 2021–22, and 2022–23

Note: See [exhibit B28](#EB28) in appendix B for a table of the data in this exhibit.

Source: CDE CAASPP data files, SYs 2017–18, 2018–19, 2021–22, and 2022–23, and the MSIN Databases for the MEP, 2017–18, 2018–19, 2021–22, and 2022–23 performance periods. Accessed February 2023 for SYs 2017–18 through 2021–22 and December 2023 for SY 2022–23.

Exhibit 36 shows the distribution of student performance on the CAASPP ELA writing claim. For this claim, both groups of migratory students were much more likely than all students to score below standard and less likely to score near or above standard. Compared with migratory students, slightly lower percentages of migratory PFS students scored near or above standard in SY 2022–23.

Exhibit 36. Percentage of Students, by Student Population, Scoring at Each Level on the English Language Arts Writing Claim for All Grades, School Year 2022–23

Note: See [exhibit B29](#EB29) in appendix B for a table of the data in this exhibit.

Source: CDE CAASPP data files, SY 2022–23, and the MSIN Databases for the MEP, 2022–23 performance period. Accessed December 2023.

#### California Assessment of Student Performance and Progress for English Language Arts Listening Claim

From SYs 2017–18 through 2018–19, all three student populations experienced an increase in the percentage of students who were above standard on the CAASPP ELA listening claim. Between SYs 2018–19 and 2022–23, migratory and all students experienced a decline in the percentage who were above standard, but migratory PFS students experienced an increase.

##### Key Findings

* By SY 2021–22, migratory PFS students narrowed their earlier performance   
  gap with migratory students on the CAASPP ELA listening claim to a 2.2 percentage point difference (compared with a 3.7 percentage point difference in SY 2017–18).
* In SY 2022–23, migratory PFS students were 9.1 percentage points less likely than all students to score at above standard. Migratory students overall were 7.0 percentage points less likely than all students to score at above standard.
* Approximately six percent of migratory students and four percent of migratory PFS students scored at above standard in SY 2022–23.

Exhibit 37 shows the percentage of all students, migratory students, and migratory PFS students who scored at above standard on the CAASPP ELA listening claim over the past four assessment years.

Exhibit 37. Percentage of All Students, Migratory Students, and Migratory Priority-for-Service Students Scoring Above Standard on the English Language Arts Listening Claim for All Grades, School Years 2017–18, 2018–19, 2021–22, and 2022–23

Note: See [exhibit B30](#EB30) in appendix B for a table of the data in this exhibit.

Source: CDE CAASPP data files, SYs 2017–18, 2018–19, 2021–22, and 2022–23, and the MSIN Databases for the MEP, 2017–18, 2018–19, 2021–22, and 2022–23 performance periods. Accessed February 2023 for SYs 2017–18 through 2021–22 and December 2023 for SY 2022–23.

Exhibit 38 shows the distribution of student performance on the CAASPP ELA listening claim for SY 2022–23. For this claim, both groups of migratory students were more likely than all students to score below standard and less likely to score near or above standard.

Exhibit 38. Percentage of Students, by Student Population, Scoring at Each Level on the English Language Arts Listening Claim for All Grades, School Year 2022–23

Note: See [exhibit B31](#EB31) in appendix B for a table of the data in this exhibit.

Source: CDE CAASPP data files, SY 2022–23, and the MSIN Databases for the MEP, 2022–23 performance period. Accessed December 2023.

#### California Assessment of Student Performance and Progress for English Language Arts Research/Inquiry Claim

Between SYs 2017–18 and 2021–22, the percentage of students who were above standard on the CAASPP ELA research/inquiry claim decreased for all three student populations, with migratory and migratory PFS students experiencing smaller declines than all students. Between SYs 2021–22 and 2022–23, these percentages remained steady for all three student groups.

##### Key Findings

* By SY 2021–22, migratory PFS students narrowed their earlier performance   
  gap with migratory students on the CAASPP ELA research/inquiry claim to a 3.2 percentage point difference (compared with a 6.5 percentage point difference in SY 2017–18).
* In SY 2021–22, migratory PFS students were 13.5 percentage points less likely than all students to score at above standard. Migratory students overall were 10.0 percentage points less likely than all students to score at above standard.
* Of the four CAASPP ELA claims, migratory and migratory students had the highest proficiency scores for the research/inquiry claim. Eight and a half percent of migratory students scored at above standard and approximately five percent of migratory PFS students scored at above standard in 2022–23.

Exhibit 39 shows the percentage of all students, migratory students, and migratory PFS students who scored at above standard on the CAASPP ELA research/inquiry claim over the past four assessment years.

Exhibit 39. Percentage of All Students, Migratory Students, and Migratory Priority-for-Service Students Scoring Above Standard on the English Language Arts Research/Inquiry Claim for All Grades, School Years   
2017–18, 2018–19, 2021–22, and 2022–23

Note: See [exhibit B32](#EB32) in appendix B for a table of the data in this exhibit.

Source: CDE CAASPP data files, SYs 2017–18, 2018–19, 2021–22, and 2022–23, and the MSIN Databases for the MEP, 2017–18, 2018–19, 2021–22, and 2022–23 performance periods. Accessed February 2023 for SYs 2017–18 through 2021–22 and December 2023 for SY 2022–23.

Exhibit 40 shows the distribution of student performance on the CAASPP ELA research/inquiry claim. Both groups of migratory students were more likely than all students to score below standard and less likely to score near or above standard.

Exhibit 40. Percentage of Students, by Student Population, Scoring at Each Level on the English Language Arts Research/Inquiry Claim for All Grades, School Year 2022–23

Note: See [exhibit B33](#EB33) in appendix B for a table of the data in this exhibit.

Source: CDE CAASPP data files, SY 2022–23, and the MSIN Databases for the MEP, 2022–23 performance period. Accessed December 2023.

#### Overall Score on the California Assessment of Student Performance and Progress for Mathematics

Between SYs 2018–19 and 2021–22, the percentage of students who met or exceeded the standard for overall achievement declined for all three student populations. Migratory students experienced the largest decline, while migratory PFS students had the smallest decline and narrowed their performance gap with migratory students. From SYs 2021–22 through 2022–23, all three student groups experienced an increase in the percentage of students who met or exceeded the standard.

##### Key Findings

* By SY 2021–22, migratory PFS students narrowed their performance gap with migratory students on the CAASPP mathematics overall achievement to a 7.5 percentage point difference (compared with a 13.7 percentage point difference in SY 2018–19).
* In SY 2022–23, migratory PFS students were 27.8 percentage points less likely than all students to score at standard met or standard exceeded. Migratory students overall were 20.3 percentage points less likely than all students to score at standard met or standard exceeded.
* An achievement gap of 20.3 percentage points, the largest gap between migratory students and all students from 2017–18 through 2022–23, was recorded in SY 2022–23.

Exhibit 41 shows the percentage of all students, migratory students, and migratory PFS students who scored at standard met or standard exceeded for overall achievement on the CAASPP mathematics for SYs 2017–18, 2018–19, 2021–22, and 2022–23.

Exhibit 41. Percentage of All Students, Migratory Students, and Migratory Priority-for-Service Students Scoring at Standard Met or Exceeded for Overall Achievement on California’s Mathematics Assessment for All Grades, School Years 2017–18, 2018–19, 2021–22, and 2022–23

Note: See [exhibit B34](#EB34) in appendix B for a table of the data in this exhibit.

Source: CDE CAASPP data files, SYs 2017–18, 2018–19, 2021–22, and 2022–23, and the MSIN Databases for the MEP, 2017–18, 2018–19, 2021–22, and 2022–23 performance periods. Accessed February 2023 for SYs 2017–18 through 2021–22 and December 2023 for SY 2022–23.

The remainder of this section provides exhibits that show the percentage of students who scored above standard on each of the three claims of the CAASPP mathematics assessment across four SYs (2017–18, 2018–19, 2021–22, and 2022–23). For the most recent SY (2022–23), the section also provides the distribution of students who scored above standard, near standard, or below standard.

#### California Assessment of Student Performance and Progress for Mathematics Concepts and Procedures Claim

Between SYs 2018–19 and 2021–22, the percentage of students who were above standard on the CAASPP mathematics concepts and procedures claim decreased across all three student populations, with migratory PFS students experiencing the smallest decline. Between SYs 2021–22 and 2022–23, this percentage of students remained steady for all three student groups.

##### Key Findings

* By SY 2021–22, migratory PFS students had narrowed their earlier performance gap with migratory students on the CAASPP mathematics concepts and procedures claim to a 3.3 percentage point difference (compared with a 9.1 percentage point difference in SY 2018–19).
* Down from three percent in 2017–18, only about two percent of migratory PFS students scored above standard on the CAASPP matematics concepts and procedures claim. Only 5.8 percent of migratory students scored above standard on the same claim.

In SY 2022–23, migratory PFS students were 17.1 percentage points less likely than all students to score at above standard, and migratory students overall were 13.5 percentage points less likely than all students to score at above standard.Exhibit 42 shows the percentage of all students, migratory students, and migratory PFS students who scored at above standard on the CAASPP mathematics concepts and procedures claim over the past four assessment years.

Exhibit 42. Percentage of All Students, Migratory Students, and Migratory Priority-for-Service Students Scoring Above Standard on the Mathematics Concepts and Procedures Claim for All Grades, School Years 2017–18, 2018–19, 2021–22, and 2022–23

Note: See [exhibit B35](#EB35) in appendix B for a table of the data in this exhibit.

Source: CDE CAASPP data files, SYs 2017–18, 2018–19, 2021–22, and 2022–23, and the MSIN Databases for the MEP, 2017–18, 2018–19, 2021–22, and 2022–23 performance periods. Accessed February 2023 for SYs 2017–18 through 2021–22 and December 2023 for SY 2022–23.

Exhibit 43 shows the distribution of student performance on the CAASPP mathematics concepts and procedures claim. Compared with migratory students, a lower percentage of migratory PFS students scored near standard or above standard in SY 2022–23. Both populations of migratory students were much more likely than all students to score below standard.

Exhibit 43. Percentage of Students, by Student Population, Scoring at Each Level on the Mathematics Concepts and Procedures Claim for All Grades, School Year 2022–23

Note: See [exhibit B36](#EB36) in appendix B for a table of the data in this exhibit.

Source: CDE CAASPP data files, SY 2022–23, and the MSIN Databases for the MEP, 2022–23 performance period. Accessed December 2023.

#### California Assessment of Student Performance and Progress for Mathematics Problem Solving/Modeling and Data Analysis Claim

From SY 2017–18 through SY 2018–19, all students and migratory students had a slight increase in the percentage of students who were above standard for the CAASPP mathematics problem solving/modeling and data analysis claim. In SY 2021–22, all students and migratory students experienced a decline in the percentage of students who were above standard. During this same time period, the percentage of migratory PFS students who were above standard remained steady. In SY 2022–23, both migratory and all students experienced a slight increase in this percentage, while migratory PFS students experienced a slight decline.

##### Key Findings

* By SY 2021–22, migratory PFS students had narrowed their earlier performance gap with migratory students on the CAASPP mathematics problem solving/modeling and data analysis claim to a 2.1 percentage point difference (compared with a 5.6 percentage point difference in SY 2018–19).
* In SY 2022 – 23, migratory PFS students were 14.7 percentage points less likely than all students to score at above standard. Migratory students overall were 11.9 percentage points less likely than all students to score at above standard.
* Of all the claims, migratory PFS students had the lowest proficiency on the CAASPP mathematics and problem solving claim with only 1.6 percent of migratory PFS students scoring at proficient in SY 2022–23.

Exhibit 44 shows the percentage of all students, migratory students, and migratory PFS students who scored at above standard on the CAASPP mathematics problem solving/modeling and data analysis claim over the past four assessment years.

Exhibit 44. Percentage of All Students, Migratory Students, and Migratory Priority-for-Service Students Scoring Above Standard on the Mathematics Problem Solving/Modeling and Data Analysis Claim for All Grades, School Years 2017–18, 2018–19, 2021–22, and 2022–23

Note: See [exhibit B37](#EB37) in appendix B for a table of the data in this exhibit.

Source: CDE CAASPP data files, SYs 2017–18, 2018–19, 2021–22, and 2022–23, and the MSIN Databases for the MEP, 2017–18, 2018–19, 2021–22, and 2022–23 performance periods. Accessed February 2023 for SYs 2017–18 through 2021–22 and December 2023 for SY 2022–23.

Exhibit 45 shows the distribution of student performance on the CAASPP mathematics problem solving/modeling and data analysis claim. Both populations of migratory students were much more likely than all students to score below standard.

Exhibit 45. Percentage of Students, by Student Population, Scoring at Each Level on the Mathematics Problem Solving/Modeling and Data Analysis Claim for All Grades, School Year 2022–23

Note: See [exhibit B38](#EB38) in appendix B for a table of the data in this exhibit.

Source: CDE CAASPP data files, SY 2022–23, and the MSIN Databases for the MEP, 2022–23 performance period. Accessed December 2023.

#### California Assessment of Student Performance and Progress for Mathematics Communicating Reasoning Claim

From SYs 2017–18 through 2018–19, migratory and all students had a slight increase in the percentage of students who scored above standard on the CAASPP mathematics communicating reasoning claim. Between SYs 2018–19 and 2021–22, the percentage of migratory and all students who scored above standard for this claim declined noticeably and then increased slightly in SY 2022–23. Over these same assessment years, the percentage of migratory PFS students who scored above standard remained steady.

##### Key Findings

* By SY 2021–22, migratory PFS students had narrowed their earlier performance gap with migratory students on the CAASPP mathematics communicating reasoning claim to a 1.8 percentage point difference (compared with a 6.2 percentage point difference in SY 2018–19).
* In SY 2022–23, migratory PFS students were 13.5 percentage points less likely than all students to score at above standard. Migratory students overall were 11.0 percentage points less likely than all students to score at above standard.
* Equal to the CAASPP mathematics problem solving/modeling and data analysis claim, only 4.4 percent of migratory students scored above standard on the communicating and reasoning claim in SY 2022–23. Migratory PFS student group only had 1.9 percent of students scoring above standard.

Exhibit 46 shows the percentage of all students, migratory students, and migratory PFS students who scored at above standard on the CAASPP mathematics communicating reasoning claim over the past four assessment years.

Exhibit 46. Percentage of All Students, Migratory Students, and Migratory Priority-for-Service Students Scoring Above Standard on the Mathematics Communicating Reasoning Claim for All Grades, School Years 2017–18, 2018–19, 2021–22, and 2022–23

Note: See [exhibit B39](#EB39) in appendix B for a table of the data in this exhibit.

Source: CDE CAASPP data files, SYs 2017–18, 2018–19, 2021–22, and 2022–23, and the MSIN Databases for the MEP, 2017–18, 2018–19, 2021–22, and 2022–23 performance periods. Accessed February 2023 for SYs 2017–18 through 2021–22 and December 2023 for SY 2022–23.

Exhibit 47 shows the distribution of student performance on the CAASPP mathematics communicating reasoning claim. Both groups of migratory students were more likely than all students to score below standard.

Exhibit 47. Percentage of Students, by Student Population, Scoring at Each Level on the CAASPP Mathematics Communicating Reasoning Claim for All Grades, School Year 2022–23

Note: See [exhibit B40](#EB40) in appendix B for a table of the data in this exhibit.

Source: CDE CAASPP data files, SY 2022–23, and the MSIN Databases for the MEP, 2022–23 performance period. Accessed December 2023.

#### Overall Score on the California Science Test

CAST scores are available only for migratory students and all students and include only three assessment years: SYs 2018–19, 2021–22, and 2022–23. During all three assessment years, the percentage of migratory students who met or exceeded the standard for overall achievement on the CAST was lower than that of all students, and the performance gap remained consistent (ranging from a 17.7 to 18.5 percentage point difference). Between SYs 2018–19 and 2021–22, the percentage of students who met or exceeded the standard for overall achievement declined slightly for both student populations. From SYs 2021–22 through 2022–23, this percentage increased for all students but remained steady for migratory students, leading to an increasing performance gap.

##### Key Finding

* In SY 2022–23, migratory students were 18.5 percentage points less likely than all students to score at standard met or standard exceeded for overall achievement on the CAST.

Exhibit 48 shows the percentage of all students and migratory students who scored at standard met or standard exceeded for overall achievement on the CAST for SYs 2018–19, 2021–22, and 2022–23.

Exhibit 48. Percentage of All Students and Migratory Students Scoring Standard Met or Exceeded for Overall Achievement on the California Science Test for All Grades, School Years 2018–19, 2021–22, and 2022–23

Note: See [exhibit B41](#EB41) in appendix B for a table of the data in this exhibit.

Source: [Test Results for California’s Assessments](https://caaspp-elpac.ets.org/caaspp/Default), CAST, SYs 2018–19, 2021–22, and 2022–23. Accessed December 7, 2022, for SYs 2018–19 and 2021–22 and October 17, 2023, for SY 2022–23.

Because of limitations in how CAST domain data for SY 2018–19 is reported on the [CAASPP and ELPAC reporting site, Test Results for California's Assessments](https://caaspp-elpac.ets.org/caaspp/Default), WestEd was not able to accurately determine the percentage of students across all grades who scored at each level, including those scoring above standard. Therefore, the remainder of this section examines the percentages of migratory and all students who scored above standard on the CAST domains only for SYs 2021–22 and 2022–23.

#### California Science Test Life Science Domain

From SYs 2021–22 through 2022–23, both student groups experienced a slight increase in the percentage of students who scored above standard for the CAST life science domain, with all students experiencing a larger increase.

##### Key Finding

* In SY 2022–23, migratory PFS students were 8.9 percentage points less likely than all students to score at above standard, a 0.3 percentage point larger gap than in SY 2021–22.

Exhibit 49 shows the percentage of all students and migratory students who scored at above standard on the CAST life science domain over the past two assessment years.

Exhibit 49. Percentage of All Students and Migratory Students Scoring Above Standard on the California Science Test Life Science Domain for All Grades, School Years 2021–22 and 2022–23

Note: See [exhibit B42](#EB42) in appendix B for a table of the data in this exhibit.

Source: [Test Results for California’s Assessments](https://caaspp-elpac.ets.org/caaspp/Default), CAST, SY 2021–22 and   
SY 2022–23. Accessed December 7, 2022, for SY 2021–22 and October 17, 2023, for SY 2022–23.

Exhibit 50 shows the distribution of student performance on the CAST life science domain. Migratory students were more likely than all students to score below standard.

Exhibit 50. Percentage of Students, by Student Population, Scoring at Each Level on the California Science Test Life Science Domain for All Grades, School Year 2022–23

Note: See [exhibit B43](#EB43) in appendix B for a table of the data in this exhibit.

Source: [Test Results for California’s Assessments](https://caaspp-elpac.ets.org/caaspp/Default), CAST, SY 2022–23. Accessed October 17, 2023.

#### California Science Test Physical Science Domain

From SYs 2021–22 through 2022–23, both student groups experienced a decline in the percentage of students who scored above standard for the CAST physical science domain, with the all students population experiencing a larger decline.

##### Key Finding

* In SY 2022–23, migratory PFS students were 8.9 percentage points less likely than all students to score at above standard. This is a 0.3 percentage point smaller gap than in SY 2021–22.

Exhibit 51 shows the percentage of all students and migratory students who scored at above standard on the CAST physical science domain over the past two assessment years.

Exhibit 51. Percentage of All Students and Migratory Students Scoring Above Standard on the California Science Test Physical Science Domain for All Grades, School Years 2021–22 and 2022–23

Note: See [exhibit B44](#EB44) in appendix B for a table of the data in this exhibit.

Source: [Test Results for California’s Assessments](https://caaspp-elpac.ets.org/caaspp/Default), CAST, SYs 2021–22 and 2022–23. Accessed December 7, 2022, for SY 2021–22 and October 17, 2023, for SY 2022–23.

Exhibit 52 shows the distribution of student performance on the CAST physical science domain. Migratory students were more likely than all students to score below standard.

Exhibit 52. Percentage of Students, by Student Population, Scoring at Each Level on the California Science Test Physical Science Domain for All Grades, School Year 2022–23

Note: See [exhibit B45](#EB45) in appendix B for a table of the data in this exhibit.

Source: [Test Results for California’s Assessments](https://caaspp-elpac.ets.org/caaspp/Default), CAST, SY 2022–23. Accessed October 17, 2023.

#### California Science Test Earth Science Domain

Between SYs 2021–22 and 2022–23, the percentage of students who scored above standard for the CAST earth science domain remained steady for all students and declined slightly for migratory students.

##### Key Finding

* In SY 2022–23, migratory PFS students were 8.8 percentage points less likely than all students to score at above standard. This gap is 0.1 percentage point larger than it was in SY 2021–22.

Exhibit 53 shows the percentage of all students and migratory students who scored at above standard on the CAST earth science domain over the past two assessment years.

Exhibit 53. Percentage of All Students and Migratory Students Scoring Above Standard on the California Science Test Earth Science Domain for All Grades, School Years 2021–22 and 2022–23

Note: See [exhibit B46](#EB46) in appendix B for a table of the data in this exhibit.

Source: [Test Results for California’s Assessments](https://caaspp-elpac.ets.org/caaspp/Default), CAST, SYs 2021–22 and 2022–23. Accessed December 7, 2022, for SY 2021–22 and October 17, 2023, for SY 2022–23.

Exhibit 54 shows the distribution of student performance on the CAST earth science domain. Migratory students were much more likely than all students to score below standard.

Exhibit 54. Percentage of Students, by Student Population, Scoring at Each Level on the California Science Test Earth Science Domain for All Grades, School Year 2022–23

Note: See [exhibit B47](#EB47) in appendix B for a table of the data in this exhibit.

Source: [Test Results for California’s Assessments](https://caaspp-elpac.ets.org/caaspp/Default), CAST, SY 2022–23. Accessed October 17, 2023.

### Graduation Rates

Compared with all students, migratory students had lower four-year cohort graduation rates for SYs 2017–18 through 2022–23. The gap in graduation rates increased from SYs 2018–19 through 2020–21 and then narrowed in SY 2021–22, when both student populations experienced marked increases in their graduation rates. The gap increased again in SY 2022–23, when migratory students experienced a larger decline in their graduation rate. Exhibit 55 shows the four-year cohort graduation rates for migratory and all students for SYs 2017–18 through 2022–23.

Exhibit 55. Four-Year Cohort Graduation Rates for Migratory and All Students, School Years 2017–18 Through 2022–23

Note: See [exhibit B48](#EB48) in appendix B for a table of the data in this exhibit.

Source: CDE Dataquest, “Four-Year Cohort Adjusted Cohort Outcome” Table for SYs 2017–18 through 2022–23. Accessed September 14, 2022, for SYs 2017–18 through 2021–22 and January 26, 2024, for SY 2022–23.

### Dropout Rates

In SY 2022–23, the four-year dropout rate for migratory students was 1.9 percentage points higher than that of all students. The dropout rates for both student populations have declined over the past six school years. Exhibit 56 shows the dropout rates for migratory and all students from SYs 2017–18 through 2022–23.

Exhibit 56. Dropout Rates for Migratory and All Students, School Years 2017–18 Through 2022–23

Note: See [exhibit B49](#EB49) in appendix B for a table of the data in this exhibit.

Source: CDE Dataquest, “Four-Year Cohort Adjusted Cohort Outcome” Table for SYs 2017–18 through 2022–23. Accessed September 14, 2022, for SYs 2017–18 through 2021–22 and January 26, 2024, for SY 2022–23.

## Migratory Children’s Health Service Needs Indicated by Individual Needs Assessments

This section explores the health service needs indicated by parents of migratory children or by OSYs on an INA form. During the 2020–21 performance period, the MEP implemented the statewide use of a standardized, electronic INA/ILP form in order to collect data about migratory children’s service needs. Local MEP programs were then able to use INA/ILP data to connect individuals with services.

During the past three performance periods, the MEP has increased the percentage of MEP-eligible children who have an INA/ILP to 82 percent. Exhibit 57 shows the number and percentage of migratory children with an INA/ILP. (For health and educational service needs that OSYs indicated when completing their INA/ILPs, please see the section titled [OSYs’ Service Needs Indicated by INA/ILPs](#OLE_LINK12).)

Exhibit 57. Number and Percentage of Migratory Children (Excluding Out-of-School Youth) with a Completed Individual Needs Assessment and Learning Plan, 2020–21 Through 2022–23 Performance Periods

| Performance Period | Number of Migratory Children | Number with an INA/ILP | Percentage with an INA/LP |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 2020–21 | 68,654 | 48,418 | 71% |
| 2021–22 | 67,887 | 55,510 | 82% |
| 2022–23 | 68,365 | 55,847 | 82% |

Source: The MSIN Databases for the MEP, 2020–21 through 2022–23 performance periods. Accessed December 2023.

During the 2020–21 through 2022–23 performance periods, the percentage of migratory children with an indicated health services need remained steady. Exhibit 58 shows the number of children who have a completed INA/ILP in each performance period, along with the number and percentage of children who have an indicated need for a health service.

Exhibit 58. Number and Percentage of Migratory Children Indicating a Health Service Need, 2020–21 Through 2022–23 Performance Periods

| Performance Period | Number of Migratory Children with an INA/ILP | Number Indicating a Health Service Need | Percentage Indicating a Health Service Need |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 2020–21 | 48,418 | 4,173 | 8.6% |
| 2021–22 | 55,510 | 4,921 | 8.9% |
| 2022–23 | 55,847 | 4,728 | 8.5% |

Source: The MSIN Databases for the MEP, 2020–21 through 2022–23 peformance periods. Accessed December 2023.

Despite the consistency in the percentage of children with an indicated health need, the distribution of those needs has shifted slightly. This is detailed in the next section.

### Changes in Migratory Children’s Health Needs

Measured as a percentage of children with a health need indicated on their INA/ILPs, migratory children have had an increasing need for vision services, fluctuating needs for dental services, and a declining need for medical services.

During the 2020–21 performance period, 3.7 percent of migratory children with an INA/ILP had a need for vision services. That percentage increased to 4.1 percent during the 2021–22 and 2022–23 performance periods. Between the 2020–21 and 2021–22 performance periods, the need for dental health services declined from 3.5 percent to 2.7 percent of children who had an INA/ILP. During the 2022–23 performance period, that need increased slightly to 3 percent of children. Over the same three-year period, the need for medical services declined from 1.9 percent to 1.3 percent. The need for mental health services remained steady at about 0.9 percent.

Exhibit 59 shows the prevalence of health needs among migratory children with an indicated health need on their INA/ILPs during past three performance periods.

Exhibit 59. Prevalence of Health Needs Among Migratory Children with an Indicated Health Need on an Individual Needs Assessment and Learning Plan, by Need Type, 2020–21 Through 2022–23 Performance Periods

Note: See [exhibit B50](#EB50) in appendix B for a table of the data in this exhibit.

Source: The MSIN Databases for the MEP, 2020–21 through 2022–23 performance periods. Accessed December 2023.

### Unmet Health Service Needs

This section illustrates gaps between migratory children’s indicated needs and the delivery of aligned MEP services. The purpose of this section is to help articulate differences between what is and what could be within the CA MEP in meeting the health needs of migratory children. Because this profile does not examine services that a child received from local programs or providers outside the MEP, findings should be used as an exploratory indicator of unmet needs rather than as an authoritative source.

#### Number of Migratory Children with a Health Need Compared with Number Who Received an Aligned Service

Across all four health service areas examined in this profile, the number of migratory children with an indicated need for a service exceeded the number who received an aligned service from the MEP. Overall, the following key findings have been identified for all health service data:

* The largest service gaps are for vision and dental services, but the gap for medical services is also substantial.
* Health services specifically included in the 2017 state SDP (i.e., mental health services) showed that 80 percent of migratory students and youth with an identified mental health need received some type of mental health service in 2022–23. Whereas vision and dental services were provided to approximately 37 and 22 percent of migratory children and youth respectively who identified a need in these areas during the 2022–23 grant year.
* In 2022–23, only eight percent of students with a medical need received a related service, down from approximately ten percent the year prior.

The following sections detail the identified need for each of the health services provided by the MEP and the services provided for vision, dental, medical, and mental health services.

##### Vision Services

Between the 2020–21 and 2022–23 periods, the number of migratory children who had a need for vision services increased from 1,794 to 2,307. The number of children who received an aligned service also increased, from 208 to 859. Exhibit 60 shows the number of migratory children who had indicated a need for vision services and the number who received vision services from the MEP.

Exhibit 60. Number of Migratory Children with an Indicated Need for Vision Services and the Number Who Received Services Aligned to That Need, 2020–21 Through 2022–23 Performance Periods

Note: See [exhibit B51](#EB51) in appendix B for a table of the data in this exhibit.

Source: The MSIN Databases for the MEP, 2020–21 through 2022–23 performance periods. Accessed December 2023.

##### Dental Services

Between the 2020–21 and 2022–23 performance periods, the number of migratory children who had a need for dental services decreased slightly, from 1,713 to 1,676, with a larger dip to 1,479 children during the 2021–22 performance period. During the three performance periods, the number of children who received an aligned service increased from 190 to 363. Exhibit 61 shows the number of migratory children who had indicated a need for dental services and the number who received dental services from the MEP.

Exhibit 61. Number of Migratory Children with an Indicated Need for Dental Services and the Number Who Received Services Aligned to That Need, 2020–21 Through 2022–23 Performance Periods

Note: See [exhibit B52](#EB52) in appendix B for a table of the data in this exhibit.

Source: The MSIN Databases for the MEP, 2020–21 through 2022–23 performance periods. Accessed December 2023.

##### Medical Services

Between the 2020–21 and 2022–23 performance periods, the number of migratory children who had a need for medical services decreased from 921 to 711. The number of children who received an aligned service increased from 16 to 76 children between the first two performance periods and dropped to 58 children during the 2022–23 performance period. Exhibit 62 shows the number of migratory children who had indicated a need for medical services and the number who received medical services from the MEP.

Exhibit 62. Number of Migratory Children with an Indicated Need for Medical Services and the Number Who Received Services Aligned to That Need, 2020–21 Through 2022–23 Performance Periods

Note: See [exhibit B53](#EB53) in appendix B for a table of the data in this exhibit.

Source: The MSIN Databases for the MEP, 2020–21 through 2022–23 performance period. Accessed December 2023.

##### Mental Health Services

Between the 2020–21 and 2022–23 performance periods, the number of migratory children who had a need for mental health services increased from 435 to 507. The number of children who received an aligned service increased from 68 to 408. During the 2022–23 performance period, over 80 percent of migratory children who indicated a need for mental health services received a mental health service from the MEP. Exhibit 63 shows the number of migratory children who had indicated a need for mental health services and the number who received mental health services from the MEP.

Exhibit 63. Number of Migratory Children with an Indicated Need for Mental Health Services and the Number Who Received Services Aligned to That Need, 2020–21 Through 2022–23 Performance Periods

Note: See [exhibit B54](#EB54) in appendix B for a table of the data in this exhibit.

Source: The MSIN Databases for the MEP, 2020–21 through 2022–23 performance periods. Accessed December 2023.

#### Discussion

The section [Setting the Context for Understanding the Needs of Migratory Children and Youths](#Goals_Strengths_Needs) of this profile reports on the goals, strengths, and needs of migratory children as articulated directly by their parents and the MEP staff who partner with them. Findings from that section indicate that migratory children need vision care, dental care, and social–emotional health or mental health services. These findings align with the findings in this section regarding service gaps, which indicate growing unmet needs for vision and dental services and a growing need for mental health services.

Data from the MEP parent survey indicated a strong need for supports in accessing mental health services. The relatively smaller percentage (0.9 percent) of migratory children with an indicated need for mental health services in their 2022–23 INA/ILPs (see exhibits 59 and B59) may result from the small survey sample size (1,013 parents) compared with the total number of INA/ILPs completed in 2022–23 (55,847). It may also relate to differences in the data collection methods. Perhaps MEP parents are more comfortable reporting mental health needs through an anonymous survey than they are on an INA/ILP form, which collects identifying information.

It is interesting to note the large increase in the percentage of migratory children with an indicated mental health need who also received an aligned service (see exhibits 63 and B63). During the 2020–21 performance period, only 16 percent of children (68 of 435) with this need received an aligned service. During the 2022–23 performance period, the percentage increased to 80 percent (408 of 507). This increase may indicate both an increase in the availability of mental health services and a willingness of children and their families to access those services.

## Out-of-School Youth

California’s migratory OSYs are youths through age twenty-one who are entitled to a free public education and meet the definition of migratory children but are not currently enrolled in a K–12 school. These youths may or may not have attended school in California previously. Those who have attended school previously and are working on a high school equivalency degree outside of a K–12 school setting are referred to as having *credit recovery* status. OSYs who have migrated with the primary purpose of working are referred to as *here-to-work* OSYs, many of whom are traveling without a guardian. The MEP seeks to serve all OSYs with health and social services, referrals, and educational opportunities. OSYs under the age of eighteen, who are required by California’s compulsory education law to attend school, are referred for school enrollment.

This section examines trends from 2017–18 through 2022–23 in California’s migratory OSY population size, their here-to-work status versus credit recovery status, their home languages, and their service needs as recorded on their INA/ILPs during the 2020–21 through 2022–23 performance periods.

This section includes several key findings:

* California’s migratory OSY population has increased over the past four years, from 4,309 youths in 2019–20 to 6,274 youths in 2022–23. Most of this recent growth is made up of OSYs aged nineteen through twenty-one years.
* Most of California’s OSYs (93 percent) are aged eighteen years or older.
* According to OSYs’ 2022–23 INA/ILP data,
* Spanish is OSYs’ most common home language (84 percent), followed by English (6 percent);
* 87 percent of California’s OSYs were here to work, up from 82 percent in 2020–21; and
* OSYs are most interested in English literacy services (including ELA, ESL, and ELD courses), followed by general education development and high school equivalency programs (GED/HEP), home language literacy, and dental and vision services.

The largest service gaps for OSYs over the past three performance periods are in English literacy services and GED/HEP.

For additional important information about OSYs, as reported directly by the OSYs, MEP parents, and the MEP staff who partner with them, please see the section of this profile titled.

### Number of Out-of-School Youths

The total number of OSYs in California has fluctuated over the past six performance periods. The OSY population experienced an 18 percent jump between the 2017–18 and 2018–19 performance periods. Most of this increase was driven by the number of older OSYs who were aged twenty-one years at the start of the performance period. During the 2019–20 performance period, the number of OSYs in California declined by nearly 40 percent. This may be because of difficulties in identifying and recruiting OSYs during the COVID-19 pandemic. But since that performance period, the population of OSYs has been increasing generally. Most of the state’s OSYs are aged eighteen through twenty-one years.

Exhibit 64 shows the number of OSYs over the past six years, disaggregated by their age at the start of each performance period.

Exhibit 64. Number of Out-of-School Youths by Age at the Start of the Performance Period, 2017–18 Through 2022–23

| OSY Age | 2017–18 | 2018–19 | 2019–20 | 2020–21 | 2021–22 | 2022–23 |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 15 years | 46 | 58 | 18 | 38 | 57 | 47 |
| 16 years | 116 | 127 | 57 | 85 | 126 | 129 |
| 17 years | 229 | 266 | 117 | 175 | 216 | 254 |
| 18 years | 631 | 617 | 329 | 379 | 508 | 580 |
| 19 years | 1,209 | 1,302 | 736 | 809 | 1,020 | 1,119 |
| 20 years | 1,511 | 1,651 | 1,082 | 1,090 | 1,327 | 1,411 |
| 21 years | 2,327 | 3,144 | 1,965 | 1,824 | 2,542 | 2,734 |
| Total | 6,098 | 7,191 | 4,309 | 4,424 | 5,811 | 6,274 |

Source: The MSIN Databases for the MEP, 2017–18 through 2022–23 performance periods. Accessed December 2023.

### Service Needs of Out-of-School Youths Indicated by Individual Needs Assessments

The MEP began collecting statewide INA/ILP data during the 2020–21 performance period. Over the past three performance periods, the efforts of local MEP programs have resulted in nearly double the number of OSYs with INA/ILPs, from 1,724 to 3,017. Exhibit 65 shows the number and percentage of OSYs who completed an INA/ILP during the past three performance periods.

Exhibit 65. Number and Percentage of Out-of-School Youths with a Completed Individual Needs Assessments and Learning Plan, 2020–21 Through 2022–23 Performance Periods

| Performance Period | Number of OSYs | Number with an INA/ILP | Percentage with an INA/LP |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 2020–21 | 4,424 | 1,724 | 39% |
| 2021–22 | 5,811 | 3,086 | 53% |
| 2022–23 | 6,274 | 3,017 | 48% |

Source: The MSIN Databases for the MEP, 2020–21 through 2022–23 performance periods. Accessed December 2023.

The needs assessment data gathered in INA/ILPs includes information about OSYs’ home languages. Based on data from the 2022–23 performance period, Spanish is the home language for 84.1 percent of OSYs, and English is the home language for 6.4 percent. Since the 2020–21 performance period, the percentage of OSYs who reported speaking an indigenous Mesoamerican language decreased from 5.7 percent of youths to less than 1 percent. Exhibit 66 shows the percentage distribution of OSYs by their reported home language for the most recent three performance periods.

Exhibit 66. Percentage Distribution of Out-of-School Youths by Home Language Reported on Individual Needs Assessment and Learning Plans in Each Performance Period, 2020–21 Through 2022–23

| OSY Home Language Indicated on INA/ILP | 2020–21 (N=1,724) | 2021–22 (N=3,086) | 2022–23 (N=3,017) |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Spanish | 79.4% | 88.9% | 84.1% |
| English | 8.3% | 6.0% | 6.4% |
| Mixteco | 4.5% | 0.6% | 0.4% |
| Triqui | 0.4% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| Zapoteco | 0.2% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| Punjabi/Urdu | 0.2% | 0.1% | 0.2% |
| Tagalog | 0.2% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| Chatino | 0.1% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| Purépecha | 0.1% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| Amuzgo | 0.1% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| Arabic | 0.1% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| Quetzal | 0.1% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| Huichol | 0.1% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| Q’anjob’al | 0.1% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| Mam | 0.1% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| Nadictle | 0.1% | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| Other | 0.3% | 0.3% | 0.2% |
| No language indicated | 6.3% | 4.2% | 8.7% |

Source: The MSIN Databases for the MEP, 2020–21 through 2022–23 performance periods. Accessed December 2023.

### Status of Out-of-School Youths: Credit Recovery and Here-to-Work

Based on INA/ILP data from the past three performance periods, the vast majority of California’s OSYs (86.7 percent in 2022–23) are categorized as having here-to-work status. Exhibit 67 shows the distribution of OSYs by their here-to-work versus credit recovery status for the 2020–21 through 2022–23 performance periods.

Exhibit 67. Percentage of Out-of-School Youths by Status, 2020–21 Through 2022–23 Performance Periods

| OSY Status Indicated on INA/ILP | 2020–21 (N=1,724) | 2021–22 (N=3,086) | 2022–23 (N=3,017) |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Here-to-work | 81.8% | 89.5% | 86.7% |
| Credit recovery | 18.1% | 10.4% | 13.3% |
| Both here-to-work and credit recovery | 0.1% | 0.1% | 0.0% |

Source: The MSIN Databases for the MEP, 2020–21 through 2022–23 performance periods. Accessed December 2023.

### Changes in Out-of-School Youths’ Interest in Migrant Education Program Educational Services

Because OSYs are no longer enrolled in school, the local MEPs cannot rely on academic performance data to help identify the educational needs of these youths. The INA/ILP forms for OSYs ask youths specifically about their interest in certain educational services, including English literacy, home language literacy, and GED/HEP. Between the 2020–21 and 2022–23 performance periods, the percentage of OSYs who indicated an interest in an educational service on their INA/ILP forms decreased from 77 percent to 44 percent.Exhibit 68 shows the number of OSYs who completed an INA/ILP each performance period and the number and percentage who indicated an interest in educational services.

Exhibit 68. Number and Percentage of Out-of-School Youths Indicating an Interest in an Educational Service, 2020–21 Through 2022–23 Performance Periods

| Performance Period | Number of OSYs Completing an INA/ILP | Number Indicating an Interest in Educational Services | Percentage Indicating an Interest in Educational Services |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 2020–21 | 1,724 | 1,324 | 77% |
| 2021–22 | 3,086 | 1,764 | 57% |
| 2022–23 | 3,017 | 1,318 | 44% |

Source: The MSIN Databases for the MEP, 2020–21 through 2022–23 performance periods. Accessed December 2023.

Measured as a percentage of youths who indicated an interest in a type of service on their INA/ILP, OSYs’ interest in English literacy declined by 27 percentage points between the 2020–21 and 2022–23 performance periods (from 60 percent to 33 percent). Their interest in GED/HEP also declined during that time, from 35 percent to 24 percent. Despite these large declines, English literacy and GED/HEP services continue to be the educational services that OSYs are most interested in. Exhibit 69 shows the percentage of OSYs who indicated an interest in a particular educational service type from the 2020–21 through the 2022–23 performance periods.

Exhibit 69. Percentage of Out-of-School Youths Indicating an Interest in an Educational Service, by Service Type, 2020–21 Through 2022–23 Performance Periods

Note: See [exhibit B55](#EB55) in appendix B for a table of the data in this exhibit.

Source: The MSIN Databases for the MEP, 2020–21 through 2022–23 performance periods. Accessed December 2023.

### Unmet Educational Service Needs

Gaps between indicated needs and the delivery of aligned MEP services can be used as indicators of unmet needs. This section explores the extent to which OSYs have not received educational services that align to their indicated interests and needs for the following service areas:

* English literacy
* GED/HEP
* home language literacy

#### Number of Out-of-School Youths Who Indicated an Interest Compared with Number Who Received an Aligned Service

Between the 2020–21 and 2022–23 performance periods, the number of OSYs who indicated an interest in GED/HEP services and home language literacy services increased. During the same period, the number who indicated an interest in English literacy services increased and then decreased by nearly 30 percent each year. The largest service gap in the 2022–23 performance period was for English literacy services, with 989 youths indicating an interest in services and 334 receiving an aligned service.

##### English Literacy Services

Between the 2020–21 and 2021–22 performance periods, the number of OSYs who indicated an interest in English literacy services increased by 35 percent (from 1,030 to 1,391) and then dropped by nearly 30 percent (to 989) during the 2022–23 performance period. During those three performance periods, the number of those youths who received aligned services increased from 153 to 334. Exhibit 70 shows the number of OSYs in each performance period who indicated an interest in English literacy services and the number who received services aligned to that need.

Exhibit 70. Number of Out-of-School Youths Indicating an Interest in English Literacy Services and the Number Who Received Services Aligned to That Need, 2020–21 Through 2022–23 Performance Periods

Note: See [exhibit B56](#EB56) in appendix B for a table of the data in this exhibit.

Source: The MSIN Databases for the MEP, 2020–21 through 2022–23 performance periods. Accessed December 2023.

##### General Education Development and High School Equivalency Program Services

Between the 2020–21 and 2022–23 performance periods, the number of OSYs who indicated an interest in GED/HEP services increased from 608 to 727. During the same periods, the number of those youths who received aligned services also increased, from 137 to 236. Exhibit 71 shows the number of OSYs in each performance period who indicated an interest in GED/HEP services and the number who received services aligned to that need.

Exhibit 71. Number of Out-of-School Youths Indicating an Interest in General Education Diploma Services and the Number Who Received Services Aligned to That Need, 2020–21 Through 2022–23 Performance Periods

Note: See [exhibit B57](#EB57) in appendix B for a table of the data in this exhibit.

Source: The MSIN Databases for the MEP, 2020–21 through 2022–23 performance periods. Accessed December 2023.

##### Home Language Literacy Services

Between the 2020–21 and 2022–23 performance periods, the number of OSYs who indicated an interest in home language literacy services tripled, from 42 to 126. During the same periods, the number of those youth who received aligned services increased from zero to 22. Exhibit 72 shows the number of OSYs in each performance period who indicated an interest in home language literacy services and the number who received services aligned to that need.

Exhibit 72. Number of Out-of-School Youths Indicating an Interest in Home Language Literacy Services and the Number Who Received Services Aligned to That Need, 2020–21 Through 2022–23 Performance Periods

Note: See [exhibit B58](#EB58) in appendix B for a table of the data in this exhibit.

Source: The MSIN Databases for the MEP, 2020–21 through 2022–23 performance periods. Accessed December 2023.

#### Discussion

Although this section indicates that an increasing percentage of California’s OSYs have a here-to-work status and may have a declining interest in educational services (see exhibits 69 and B69), there is still strong evidence that OSYs have an unmet need for ELA, ELD, and GED/HEP services (see exhibits 70, B70, 71, and B71). This is supported by the section [Setting the Context for Understanding the Needs of Migratory Children and Youths](#Goals_Strengths_Needs) earlier in this profile. That section reports on the goals, strengths, and needs of OSYs as articulated directly by the OSYs, MEP parents, and the MEP staff who partner with them. Findings from that section indicate that OSYs have a strong interest in instructional supports for ELA and ELD, followed by career and technical education and GED/HEP services.

### Changes in the Health Service Needs of Out-of-School Youths

Between the 2020–21 and 2022–23 performance periods, the percentage of OSYs who indicated a health service need on their INA/ILP declined from 13 percent to 6 percent. Exhibit 73 shows the number of OSYs who completed an INA/ILP in each performance period and the number and percentage who indicated an interest in a health service.

Exhibit 73. Number and Percentage of Out-of-School Youths Indicating a Health Service Need, 2020–21 Through 2022–23 Performance Periods

| Performance Period | Number of OSYs Completing an INA/ILP | Number Indicating a Health Service Need | Percentage Indicating a Health Service Need |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 2020–21 | 1,724 | 218 | 13% |
| 2021–22 | 3,086 | 186 | 6% |
| 2022–23 | 3,017 | 187 | 6% |

Source: The MSIN Databases for the MEP, 2020–21 through 2022–23 performance period. Accessed December 2023.

Measured as a percentage of youth who indicated a need for different types of health services on their INA/ILP, OSYs’ need for dental services declined by 6 percentage points between the 2020–21 and 2022–23 performance periods. Their need for medical, vision, and mental health services held relatively steady, with no more than a 1 percentage point change between the 2020–21 and 2022–23 performance periods. Exhibit 74 shows the percentage of OSYs who indicated a need for a particular health service from the 2020–21 through the 2022–23 performance periods.

Exhibit 74. Percentage of Out-of-School Youths Indicating a Particular Health Need, by Need Type, 2020–21 Through 2022–23 Performance Periods

Note: See [exhibit B59](#EB59) in appendix B for a table of the data in this exhibit.

Source: The MSIN Databases for the MEP, 2020–21 through 2022–23 performance periods. Accessed December 2023.

### Unmet Health Service Needs

This section illustrates gaps between the needs that OSYs indicated on their INA/ILP and the delivery of aligned MEP services. The purpose of this section is to help articulate differences between what is and what could be within the MEP in meeting the needs of OSYs. Because this profile does not examine services that a youth received from local programs or providers outside the MEP, findings should be used as an exploratory indicator of unmet needs rather than as an authoritative source.

#### Number of Out-of-School Youths With a Health Need Compared with Number Who Received an Aligned Service

Across all four health service areas examined in this profile, the number of OSYs with an indicated need for a health service exceeded the number who received an aligned service from the MEP. The largest service gaps are in vision and dental services, but the gap in medical services is also substantial.

##### Vision Services

Between the 2020–21 and 2022–23 performance periods, the number of OSYs who indicated a need for vision services increased steadily from 56 to 92. The number who received vision services dropped slightly, from 10 to 8, in the first two performance periods and then increased substantially, to 43, during the 2022–23 performance period. Exhibit 75 shows the number of OSYs who indicated a need for vision services on their INA/ILP and the number who received an aligned service in each performance period.

Exhibit 75. Number of Out-of-School Youths Indicating a Need for Vision Services and the Number Who Received Services Aligned to That Need, 2020–21 Through 2022–23 Performance Periods

Note: See [exhibit B60](#EB60) in appendix B for a table of the data in this exhibit.

Source: The MSIN Databases for the MEP, 2020–21 through 2022–23 performance periods. Accessed December 2023.

##### Dental Services

Between the 2020–21 and 2021–22 performance periods, the number of OSYs who indicated a need for dental services declined from 149 to 84. That number increased during the 2022–23 performance period to 102. During that same period, the number of those youths who received an aligned service dropped from 28 to 8 and then increased substantially to 51. Exhibit 76 shows the number of OSYs who indicated a need for dental services on their INA/ILP and the number who received an aligned service in each performance period.

Exhibit 76. Number of Out-of-School Youths Indicating a Need for Dental Services and the Number Who Received Services Aligned to That Need, 2020–21 Through 2022–23 Performance Periods

Note: See [exhibit B61](#EB61) in appendix B for a table of the data in this exhibit.

Source: The MSIN Databases for the MEP, 2020–21 through 2022–23 performance periods. Accessed December 2023.

##### Medical Services

Between the 2020–21 and 2021–22 performance periods, the number of OSYs who indicated a need for medical services increased from 31 to 46. During the 2022–23 performance period, the number of youths who indicated that need on their INA/ILP dropped slightly to 39. The number of youths who received medical services through the MEP increased from 3 to 7 and then to 8 over the three-year period. Exhibit 77 shows the number of OSYs who indicated a need for medical services on their INA/ILP and the number who received an aligned service in each performance period.

Exhibit 77. Number of Out-of-School Youths Indicating a Need for Medical Services and the Number Who Received Services Aligned to That Need, 2020–21 Through 2022–23 Performance Periods

Note: See [exhibit B62](#EB62) in appendix B for a table of the data in this exhibit.

Source: The MSIN Databases for the MEP, 2020–21 through 2022–23 performance periods. Accessed December 2023.

##### Mental Health Services

Between the 2020–21 and 2021–22 performance periods, the number of OSYs who indicated a need for mental health services decreased from 12 to 6. During the same period, the number who received mental health services remained at zero. During the 2022–23 performance period, the number of youths who indicated a need for mental health services increased to 11. The number who received an aligned service increased to 9, an 82 percent service rate. Exhibit 78 shows the number of OSYs who indicated a need for mental health services on their INA/ILP and the number who received an aligned service from the MEP in each performance period.

Exhibit 78. Number of Out-of-School Youths Indicating a Need for Mental Health Services and the Number Who Received Services Aligned to That Need, 2020–21 Through 2022–23 Performance Periods

Note: See [exhibit B63](#EB63) in appendix B for a table of the data in this exhibit.

Source: The MSIN Databases for the MEP, 2020–21 through 2022–23 performance periods. Accessed December 2023.

## School Readiness Services

School readiness skills are essential to establishing a solid academic foundation for children as they progress through the education system. The MEP’s first role in school readiness is to ensure that prekindergarten children are enrolled in a high-quality preschool. If, for whatever reason, a migratory child is unable to attend, the MEP provides school readiness services.

This section examines trends in the numbers and percentages of eligible children aged three to five years served by the California MEP and the service gaps for eligible children aged three and four years. Over the past six performance periods,

* the MEP has served an increasing percentage of eligible children aged three to five years, although percentages declined during the most recent year; and
* service gaps for children aged three years have been much smaller than for children aged four years.

Over the past six performance periods, the California MEP has increased the number and percentage of eligible children aged three to five years served, with those numbers and percentages peaking during the 2020–21 performance period. In contrast, the program provided school readiness services to comparatively low numbers and percentages of children aged five years (see exhibits 79, 80, and B80). This is likely because children aged five years are enrolled in transitional kindergarten or kindergarten programs. Exhibit 79 shows the number of children aged three through five years who received MEP school readiness services during the 2017–18 through   
2022–23 performance periods. Exhibit 80 shows the percentage of children served, by age, for the same performance periods.

Exhibit 79. Number of Migratory Children Aged Three Through Five Years Served by School Readiness Services, by Age, 2017–18 Through 2022–23 Performance Periods

| Child’s Age | 2017–18 | 2018–19 | 2019–20 | 2020–21 | 2021–22 | 2022–23 |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 3 years | 731 | 1,530 | 1,306 | 1,397 | 1,205 | 1,270 |
| 4 years | 785 | 1,461 | 1,243 | 1,453 | 1,378 | 1,193 |
| 5 years | 12 | 31 | 9 | 37 | 39 | 42 |
| Total (3–5 years) | 1,528 | 3,022 | 2,558 | 2,887 | 2,622 | 2,505 |

Source: The MSIN Databases for the MEP, 2017–18 through 2022–23 performance periods. Accessed January 2024.

Exhibit 80. Percentage of Migratory Children Aged Three Through Five Years Served by School Readiness Services, by Age, 2017–18 Through 2022–23 Performance Periods

Note: See [exhibit B64](#EB64) in appendix B for a table of the data in this exhibit.

Source: The MSIN Databases for the MEP, 2017–18 through 2022–23 performance periods. Accessed January 2024.

For additional information about the needs of California’s migratory children who are aged three to five years, please see the section [Setting the Context for Understanding the Needs of Migratory Children and Youths](#Goals_Strengths_Needs) earlier in this profile. That section includes findings from surveys and focus group discussions with MEP parents and the MEP staff.

## Next Steps in the Continuous Improvement Cycle

This profile provides a foundation for research and exploration regarding the priority and nonpriority needs of migratory children and youths. Members of the CNA SDP committee will use this information to understand and articulate the needs of California’s migratory children and youth as they conduct the statewide CNA. The CNA will, along with program evaluation, inform the development of the California SDP, the plan for providing services to the state’s migratory children and youths. The CNA SDP committee will begin their work with this profile during a series of CNA SDP meetings scheduled to take place in the latter half of 2024.

## Appendix A: Methodology

This profile is a result of two complementary efforts designed to capture data in order to help identify strengths and areas of need of California’s migratory children, students, and youths. One effort relied heavily on descriptive analyses of children’s and youths’ demographic, needs assessment, and service data available in the Migrant Student Information Network (MSIN). The MSIN is a central student information system for California’s migratory child and youth population. The descriptive analysis also utilized statewide assessment files provided by the California Department of Education (CDE) and DataQuest, California’s K–12 public data reporting system.

The second effort was a mixed-methods analysis of the goals, strengths, and needs of migratory students and youths. This effort involved online surveys administered to out-of-school youths (OSYs), Migrant Education Program (MEP) parents, and local MEP staff; virtual focus group sessions with OSY, MEP parents, and MEP staff; and a thorough analysis of the surveys and focus groups, informed by themes that emerged from each data collection effort.

In consideration of the significance of collecting data for the first time from OSYs and parents of children and youths who are enrolled in the MEP for the purpose of informing this profile, the WestEd team engaged in reflective conversations with one another and the CDE to design a mixed-methods approach that was grounded in culturally relevant, equitable evaluation and that used equity-centered and strength-based approaches. The approach is intended to capture data from different perspectives in order to triangulate results and have the necessary information that honors the diversity of migratory students in California while also highlighting areas of strength and need.

In practice, the WestEd team designed the mixed-methods analyses by following several strategies listed in the WestEd guide [*Anti-Racist Evaluation Strategies: A Guide for Evaluation Teams*](https://www.wested.org/resources/anti-racist-evaluation-strategies/). One key strategy included “employing multiple levels of analysis to account for the complex systems and contextual factors that influence the program’s implementation and outcomes.”[[9]](#footnote-10)

### Design and Approach

#### Descriptive Analyses of Demographic, Needs Assessment, Service, and Assessment Data

WestEd developed its data collection and analyses based on a series of guiding questions requested by the CDE. The time period examined in this study begins with the 2017–18 performance period[[10]](#footnote-11) and concludes with the 2022–23 performance period. WestEd’s data analyst developed structured query language (SQL) queries and analytical tools in Microsoft Excel to examine trends for the demographic characteristics and needs as expressed by migratory children and youths in their individual needs assessment/individual learning plan (INA/ILP). The data analyst was also able to explore whether children and youths with INA/ILPs that indicated certain types of needs received MEP services that aligned to those needs. Finally, WestEd explored differences in academic performance between migratory students, migratory priority-for-service (PFS) students, and all students by comparing the graduation and dropout rates of each student population and the percentages of students who achieved specific performance levels on four different standardized assessments.

The WestEd team met regularly with the CDE to identify and mitigate data limitations and develop strategies for visualizing findings that would be accessible to a range of profile readers and users (especially to members of the CAN SDP committee).

##### Data Sources

WestEd used the following data sources for the descriptive analyses:

* The MSIN Databases for the MEP, school years (SYs) 2017–18 through   
  2022–23
* CDE English Language Proficiency Assessments for California (ELPAC) Summative Assessment data files, SYs 2017–18 through 2022–23
* CDE California Assessment of Student Performance and Progress (CAASPP) data files, SYs 2017–18 through 2022–23
* CDE DataQuest Reports, SYs 2017–18 to 2022–23

##### Data Limitations

###### COVID-19 Global Pandemic’s Effect on Assessment Data Availability

Because of the COVID-19 global pandemic, assessment data was not available for SY 2019–20. Additionally, because of the low number of students with CAASPP assessment scores in SY 2020–21, CAASPP data from that year was not included in the analysis.

###### Limited Science Assessment Data

Because the CAASPP California Science Test (CAST) was not implemented statewide until SY 2018–19, the only years available for CAST data were SYs 2018–19, 2021–22, and 2022–23. In addition, the CDE does not provide CAST scores to the MSIN, so WestEd had to rely on the [CAASPP reporting site, Test Results for California’s Assessments](https://caaspp-elpac.ets.org/caaspp/Default), for student performance data on this assessment. This site disaggregates student performance results by migratory students and all students but not by migratory PFS students. Therefore, WestEd was not able to examine migratory PFS students’ performance on the CAST. Another limitation is that the site did not allow for accurate determination of the percentage of students across all grades scoring at each level for SY 2018–19. Therefore, this profile examined CAST domain data only for SYs 2021–22 and 2022–23.

#### Mixed-Methods Analyses of the Goals, Strengths, and Needs of Migratory Students and Youths

The WestEd and CDE teams crafted the survey questions by considering the relevant cultural, historical, and political community context. They also leaned on anti-racist methods and approaches, such as addressing bias when constructing the survey items and focus group questions. They engaged in a critical reflection of any assumptions that might be embedded in the protocols and sought the input of migratory parents during a State Parent Advisory Council (SPAC) meeting. Parents in the SPAC meeting provided feedback and insights that informed the procedures used to implement the focus groups.

The WestEd team worked closely with CDE staff, who communicated with the local MEPs to recruit participants and also helped OSYs and parents fill out the survey or gain access to the virtual focus groups if assistance was needed. The team paid attention to the accessibility of language and offered the survey to OSYs and parents in English and Spanish. They also held the focus groups for OSYs and parents in Spanish. The team applied practices during all the focus group sessions that promoted equity of voice and cultural humility.

##### Five Key Areas

The WestEd team identified five areas of focus to help them answer key questions and guide the development of the survey and focus group protocols. These five areas were goals, strengths, needs, barriers, and opportunities:

* **Goals**. Responses to questions in this area informed the team about OSYs’ personal and educational aspirations,goals, and motivations. Responses provided insight into what OSYs wanted to accomplish and what they needed from the MEP in order to achieve those goals.
* **Strengths**. Identifying the areas in which students, children, and youths thrived highlighted the program supports that are important for students, children, and youths.
* **Needs**. Learning about the needs of migratory students informed the delivery of services provided by the MEP. The team asked about met and unmet needs, particularly in the following areas, which had been pre-identified by the CDE:
* English language arts
* Mathematics
* English language development
* High school graduation
* Parent engagement
* Health (including mental health)
* Other areas not listed
* **Barriers**. To inform the MEP’s service delivery, OSYs and parents were asked about educational barriers and how children, youths, and families have navigated or overcome such barriers.
* **Opportunities**. OSYs and parents were asked about opportunities the MEP staff and state leaders have to improve the supports and services for migratory children and youths.

##### Instruments and Protocols

The five focus areas served as a guide in the development of the survey instruments and focus group protocols, all of which were developed collaboratively by WestEd and the CDE. WestEd drafted all the surveys and focus group protocols in English, which were then reviewed and approved by the CDE. The CDE then translated the protocols related to OSYs and parents into Spanish.

###### Surveys

Three online surveys were administered between January 29 and February 17, 2023, one to each of three groups: OSYs, parents of children enrolled in the MEP, and MEP staff employed by subgrantees. The surveys took approximately 10 to 15 minutes to complete, and OSYs and parents had the option to take the survey in Spanish or English.

The surveys for OSYs and parents focused on identifying needs through discreet close-ended items and open-ended written responses. The survey for MEP staff was slightly different from the surveys for OSYs and parents in that MEP staff were asked to rate a list of needs that affected children and youths as low priority (about 25 percent of children and youths served), medium priority (about 50 percent), or high priority (at least 75 percent). Staff also had the options to select “I don’t know” and to write in needs that were not identified in the survey. The list of needs for each survey was developed collaboratively by the WestEd team and the CDE.

###### Focus Groups

Informed by a preliminary analysis of the survey data, three focus group protocols (one each for OSYs, parents, and local MEP staff) were developed to explore the five areas further. All three focus group sessions were held virtually in April 2023, each lasted approximately 75 minutes, and each was facilitated by two WestEd staff members. The focus group sessions for OSYs and parents were conducted in Spanish, and the focus group for MEP staff was conducted in English.

###### Recruitment

The CDE and their existing relationship with the local MEPs were key in developing, coordinating, and implementing recruitment efforts. For the surveys, the CDE sent a notification email to local MEP directors to provide advanced notice about the surveys, which would be administered through Qualtrics. Local MEP directors and staff communicated with migratory youths and parents in their networks to invite them to complete the surveys during a span of approximately three weeks.

For the focus groups, the CDE worked with local MEP directors and staff to identify one to two OSYs and parents to take part in a virtual focus group. Names and contact information of the enlisted participants were securely shared with the WestEd team, who contacted the participants by email and text message.

All communication with OSYs and parents was in English and Spanish. The WestEd team, the CDE, and the local MEP directors and staff worked closely to ensure that all participants received the information (links to the online survey and virtual focus group, date and time of the focus group, and so on) and had the necessary support to participate (for example, the participant had a working device and a reliable internet or phone connection). For example, during the focus group with the OSYs, a MEP staff member used their phone to set up a conference call with two OSYs in their region so that they could all call in to the virtual focus group.

##### Survey Sample Sizes and Responses Rates

MEP directors and staff distributed the surveys to 1,059 OSYs, 12,557 MEP parents, and 864 staff members. Survey responses rates ranged from eight percent (parents) to 51 percent (staff).

When calculating survey response rates, WestEd used the survey sample and population sizes. Survey sample sizes were based on the number of surveys included in the analysis for this profile. WestEd excluded surveys that were marked as “spam” by the survey platform and those for which fewer than 20 percent of the possible survey items had been completed. The vast majority of the excluded surveys included responses only to the introductory items that asked about demographics: home languages (OSYs and parents), current age (OSYs), grade levels of children at home (parents), or grade levels served by the local MEP (MEP staff). Virtually all of the excluded cases were missing responses to items that asked about the needs of MEP students, children, and youths. When developing case exclusion criteria, WestEd carefully examined initial survey summaries and individual response cases in order to maximize feedback about the strengths, needs, and desired services of MEP students, children, and youths while also ensuring consistency in data cleaning practices across the three surveys.

Exhibit A1 shows the population size, total number of initial responses (before data cleaning and application of exclusion criteria), survey sample size, and response rates for each of the three surveys.

Exhibit A1. Survey Population Size, Number of Initial Responses, Excluded Cases, Sample Size, and Response Rates

| Survey Information | OSY | Parent | Staff |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Survey population size | 1,059 | 12,557 | 864 |
| Number of survey responses (non-spam) | 171 | 1,370 | 550 |
| Number of excluded cases | 51 | 357 | 106 |
| Survey sample size | 120 | 1,013 | 444 |
| Survey response rate | 11.3% | 8.1% | 51.4% |

Source: MEP surveys for the Migratory Student Profile, February 2023.

### Methods of Analysis

#### Descriptive Analysis Study

WestEd used descriptive statistics to analyze migratory child, student, and youth data for this profile, including frequencies, percentages, and cross-tabulations.

In exploring differences between the needs of migratory children and youths as expressed on their INA/ILP and the delivery of MEP services aligned to those needs, WestEd compared the number of students with an indicated need with the number of students in that specific population who received an aligned MEP service as recorded in the MSIN. WestEd worked closely with the CDE to identify MEP services recorded in the MSIN that were designed to meet specific categories of needs.

#### Mixed-Methods Study of the Goals, Strengths, and Needs of Migratory Students and Youths

The analyses of this mixed-methods study were conducted in phases that allowed for an iterative analysis process as more data was being gathered. This section details the analyses that were conducted with the survey and focus group data.

##### Surveys

The CDE translated all the Spanish responses from the student and parent surveys into English. The WestEd team conducted a preliminary analysis to identify questions and themes in order to inform the focus group protocol. The preliminary analysis included descriptive statistics, a review of the frequencies for each survey question, and a read-through of open-ended responses to identify general themes.

The team then analyzed the survey data more comprehensively, implementing a data cleaning process, running descripted statistics, and exploring a series of cross-tabulations. The team conducted a high-level thematic analysis to identify themes that emerged from the open-ended responses.

##### Focus Groups

A translated transcript was produced from an audio recording of the OSY and parent focus group sessions. The WestEd team read these transcripts, along with the transcript from the focus group with the MEP staff, and then conducted a high-level thematic analysis.

Focus group data was used to contextualize findings from the surveys. The team paid particular attention to results and content that informed the five areas of focus.

## Appendix B: Data Tables for Exhibits

Exhibit B1. Number of Migrant Education Program–Eligible Children and Youths, 2017–18 Through 2022–23

| Performance Period | 2017–18 | 2018–19 | 2019–20 | 2020–21 | 2021–22 | 2022–23 |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Number of MEP-eligible children and youths | 85,198 | 82,171 | 75,631 | 73,078 | 73,698 | 74,655 |

Note: This data corresponds with [exhibit 2](#Ex02).

Source: The MSIN Databases for the MEP, 2017–18 through 2022–23.

Exhibit B2. Number of Migrant Education Program–Eligible Children Aged Three Years Through Twelve Years, by Age Group at the Start of the Performance Period, 2017–18 Through 2022–23

| Age Group | 2017–18 | 2018–19 | 2019–20 | 2020–21 | 2021–22 | 2022–23 |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 9–12 years | 22,442 | 20,745 | 19,823 | 19,001 | 18,396 | 18,272 |
| 6–8 years | 15,593 | 14,554 | 13,620 | 12,843 | 12,511 | 12,480 |
| 3–5 years | 9,801 | 9,742 | 8,745 | 8,043 | 7,719 | 7,779 |

Note: This data corresponds with [exhibit 3](#Ex03).

Source: The MSIN Databases for the MEP, 2017–18 through 2022–23.

Exhibit B3. Number of Migrant Education Program–Eligible Youths Aged Thirteen Years Through Twenty-One Years, by Age Group at the Start of the Performance Period, 2017–18 Through 2022–23

| Age Group | 2017–18 | 2018–19 | 2019–20 | 2020–21 | 2021–22 | 2022–23 |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 13–15 years | 14,953 | 14,471 | 14,503 | 14,547 | 14,511 | 14,423 |
| 16–18 years | 12,962 | 12,448 | 11,855 | 11,953 | 12,757 | 13,462 |
| 19–21 years | 6,057 | 6,985 | 4,437 | 4,314 | 5,509 | 5,832 |

Note: This data corresponds with [exhibit 4](#Ex04).

Source: The MSIN Databases for the MEP, 2017–18 through 2022–23.

Exhibit B4. Percentage of Migratory Students and All Students Who Were Classified as English Learner Students in School Year 2022–23, by Grade

| Grade(s) | Migratory Students (N=59,190) | All Students (N=5,852,544) |
| --- | --- | --- |
| K | 80% | 26% |
| 1 | 83% | 26% |
| 2 | 82% | 25% |
| 3 | 82% | 25% |
| 4 | 78% | 24% |
| 5 | 75% | 23% |
| 6 | 67% | 20% |
| 7 | 59% | 17% |
| 8 | 55% | 16% |
| 9 | 49% | 14% |
| 10 | 48% | 13% |
| 11 | 45% | 12% |
| 12 | 41% | 11% |
| K–12 | 65% | 19% |

Note: This data corresponds with [exhibit 6](#Ex06).

Sources: The MSIN Databases for the MEP, 2022–23; [CDE DataQuest, 2022–23 “At-Risk” and LTEL by Grade Statewide Report](https://dq.cde.ca.gov/dataquest/longtermel/EverElType.aspx?cds=00&agglevel=State&year=2022-23), accessed October 26, 2023.

Exhibit B5. Percentage of Migratory and All Students Who Were Classified as Long-Term English Language Students, School Year 2022–23

| Grade(s) | Migratory Students (N=32,202) | All Students (N=3,251,825) |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 6 | 21% | 8% |
| 7 | 18% | 7% |
| 8 | 16% | 6% |
| 9 | 14% | 6% |
| 10 | 20% | 8% |
| 11 | 16% | 7% |
| 12 | 18% | 7% |
| 6–12 | 17% | 7% |

Note: This data corresponds with [exhibit 7](#Ex07).

Sources: The MSIN Databases for the MEP, 2022–23; and [CDE DataQuest, 2022–23 “At-Risk” and LTEL by Grade Statewide Report](https://dq.cde.ca.gov/dataquest/longtermel/EverElType.aspx?cds=00&agglevel=State&year=2022-23), accessed October 26, 2023.

Exhibit B6. Percentage of Migratory Students and All Students Who Have a Disability, by Grade Span, School Year 2022–23

| Grades | Migratory Students (N=59,190) | All Students (N=5,852,544) |
| --- | --- | --- |
| K–3 | 10.5% | 13.5% |
| 4–6 | 11.7% | 13.8% |
| 7–8 | 11.5% | 13.6% |
| 9–12 | 11.3% | 13.5% |
| K–12 | 11.2% | 13.6% |

Note: This data corresponds with [exhibit 9](#Ex09).

Sources: The MSIN Databases for the MEP, 2022–23; [CDE DataQuest, 2022–23 Special Education Enrollment by Program Setting Report](https://dq.cde.ca.gov/dataquest/DQCensus/SPEDEnr.aspx?cds=00&agglevel=State&year=2022-23&ListReportRows=GrdSpan&charter=All&Display=Pct&ro=1), accessed January 26, 2023.

Exhibit B7. Percentage of Parents Reporting a Need for Mathematics Supports for Their Child(ren), by Grade Group

| Grade Group | N | Percentage Reporting |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Preschool | 174 | 36.9% |
| K–6 | 477 | 47.6% |
| 7–8 | 238 | 52.1% |
| 9–12 | 376 | 46.5% |

Note: “N” represents the “number of students with scores” for each student population and grade level. This data corresponds with [exhibit 11](#Ex11).

Source: MEP Parent Survey for the Migrant Student Profile, February 2023.

Exhibit B8. Percentage of Parents Reporting a Need for English Language Arts Supports for Their Child(ren), by Grade Group

| Grade Group | N | Percentage Reporting |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Preschool | 174 | 40.8% |
| K–6 | 477 | 41.7% |
| 7–8 | 238 | 35.3% |
| 9–12 | 376 | 27.1% |

Note: “N” represents the “number of students with scores” for each student population and grade level. This data corresponds with [exhibit 12](#Ex12).

Source: MEP Parent Survey for the Migrant Student Profile, February 2023.

Exhibit B9. Percentage of Migrant Education Program Staff Indicating Social–Emotional Learning Was a High-Priority Need, by Grade Group

| Grade Group | N | Percentage Reporting |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Preschool | 261 | 69.6% |
| K–6 | 353 | 68.0% |
| 7–8 | 306 | 64.9% |
| 9–12 | 252 | 64.9% |
| OSY | 190 | 57.4% |

Note: “N” represents the “number of students with scores” for each student population and grade level. This data corresponds with [exhibit 14](#Ex14).

Source: MEP Staff Survey for the Migratory Student Profile, February 2023.

Exhibit B10. Percentage of Migrant Education Program Staff Reporting That Access to Technology Was a High-Priority Need, by Grade Group

| Grade Group | N | Percentage Reporting Access to Technology (Computers, Laptops, or Chromebooks) | Percentage Reporting Access to Technology (Adequate Internet Services) |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Preschool | 261 | 54.4% | 62.3% |
| K–6 | 353 | 54.9% | 58.4% |
| 7–8 | 306 | 48.5% | 56.9% |
| 9–12 | 252 | 49.4% | 55.8% |
| OSY | 190 | 63.7% | 64.9% |

Note: “N” represents the “number of students with scores” for each student population and grade level. This data corresponds with [exhibit 17](#Ex17).

Source: MEP Staff Survey for the Migratory Student Profile, February 2023.

Exhibit B11. Percentage of Migrant Education Program Staff and Parents Reporting Services and Supports Needed for Preschool-Aged Children, by Service or Support Type

| Service and Support Needs | MEP Staff (N=262) | MEP Parents (N=174) |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Supports in social–emotional learning | 70.0% | 81.8% |
| Reading and writing in English (ELA) | 74.2% | 41.0% |
| Mathematics | 69.6% | 37.0% |
| Speaking and understanding English (ELD) | 72.9% | 34.0% |
| Access to fast and reliable internet service | 70.0% | 18.0% |
| Access to computers, laptops, or Chromebooks to complete schoolwork | 62.3% | 11.0% |

Note: This data corresponds with [exhibit 18](#Ex18).

Source: MEP Staff and Parent Surveys for the Migratory Student Profile, February 2023.

Exhibit B12. Percentage of Migrant Education Program Staff and Parents Reporting Services and Supports Needed for Students in Grades Kindergarten Through Six, by Service or Support Type

| Service and Support Needs | MEP Staff (N=353) | MEP Parents (N=477) |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Supports in social–emotional learning | 68.0% | 81.7% |
| Supports in accessing mental health services | 54.3% | 81.7% |
| Supports in accessing health services | 52.7% | 80.2% |
| Instructional supports in mathematics | 75.3% | 47.6% |
| Instructional supports in ELA | 77.1% | 41.7% |
| Instructional supports in ELD | 77.8% | 27.3% |
| Access to technology (adequate internet service) | 58.4% | 17.6% |
| Instructional supports in science | 57.3% | 15.3% |
| Access to technology (computers, laptops, or Chromebooks) | 54.9% | 11.5% |

Note: This data corresponds with [exhibit 19](#Ex19).

Source: MEP Staff and Parent Surveys for the Migratory Student Profile, February 2023.

Exhibit B13. Percentage of Migrant Education Program Staff and Parents Reporting Services and Supports Needed for Students in Grades Seven and Eight, by Service or Support Type

| Service and Support Needs | MEP Staff (N=306) | MEP Parents (N=238) |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Supports in social–emotional learning | 71.6% | 85.1% |
| Supports in accessing mental health services | 55.4% | 85.1% |
| Supports in accessing health services | 49.0% | 72.8% |
| Instructional supports in mathematics | 71.8% | 52.1% |
| Instructional supports in ELA | 72.2% | 35.3% |
| Access to technology (adequate internet service) | 56.9% | 23.1% |
| Instructional supports in science | 57.9% | 21.8% |
| Instructional supports in ELD | 71.6% | 19.7% |
| Supports in graduating from high school | 0.0% | 16.4% |
| Access to technology (computers, laptops, or Chromebooks) | 48.5% | 12.2% |

Note: This data corresponds with [exhibit 20](#Ex20).

Source: MEP Staff and Parent Surveys for the Migratory Student Profile, February 2023.

Exhibit B14. Percentage of Migrant Education Program Staff and Parents Reporting Services and Supports Needed for Students in Grades Nine Through Twelve, by Service or Support Type

| Service and Support Needs | MEP Staff (N=252) | MEP Parents (N=376) |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Supports in social–emotional learning | 64.9% | 80.6% |
| Supports in accessing mental health services | 55.8% | 80.6% |
| Supports in accessing health services | 46.8% | 78.4% |
| Instructional supports in mathematics | 69.0% | 46.5% |
| Instructional supports in ELA | 67.5% | 27.1% |
| Instructional supports in ELD | 66.3% | 22.3% |
| Access to technology (adequate internet service) | 55.8% | 21.5% |
| Supports in graduating from high school | 71.3% | 16.2% |
| Instructional supports in science | 56.6% | 14.4% |
| Access to technology (computers, laptops, or Chromebooks) | 49.4% | 13.0% |

Note: This data corresponds with [exhibit 21](#Ex21).

Source: MEP Staff and Parent Surveys for the Migratory Student Profile, February 2023.

Exhibit B15. Percentage of Migrant Education Program Staff and Out-of-School Youths Reporting Services and Supports Needed for Out-of-School Youths, by Service or Support Type

| Service and Support Needs | MEP Staff (N=190) | OSYs (N=120) |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Instructional supports in ELA | 62.5% | 78.0% |
| Instructional supports in ELD | 65.4% | 73.0% |
| Career and technical education | 65.1% | 44.0% |
| Supports in graduating from high school | 60.5% | 42.0% |
| Supports for college entrance | 58.7% | 36.0% |
| Access to technology (computers, laptops, or Chromebooks) | 63.7% | 33.0% |
| Supports in accessing health services | 62.8% | 31.7% |
| Access to technology (adequate internet service) | 64.9% | 27.0% |
| Supports in accessing mental health services | 57.4% | 17.5% |
| Supports in earning a GED | 65.8% | 11.0% |

Note: This data corresponds with [exhibit 22](#Ex22).

Source: MEP Staff and Parent Surveys for the Migratory Student Profile, February 2023.

Exhibit B16. Percentage of All Students, Migratory Students, and Migratory Priority-for-Service Students Scoring at Level 4 for Overall Performance on the Summative English Language Proficiency Assessments for California for All Grades, by Student Population, School Years 2017–18, 2018–19, and 2020–21 Through 2022–23

| Grade | Student Population | 2017–18 | 2018–19 | 2020–21 | 2021–22 | 2022–23 |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| All | All students | 30.6% | 16.4% | 14.0% | 15.6% | 16.5% |
| All | Migratory students | 21.6% | 11.5% | 8.4% | 10.5% | 11.8% |
| All | Migratory PFS students | 8.0% | 5.0% | 8.0% | 9.0% | 9.8% |

Note: This data corresponds with [exhibit 23](#Ex23).

Source: CDE ELPAC data files, SYs 2017–18 through 2022–23, and the MSIN Databases for the MEP, 2017–18 through 2022–23 performance periods. Accessed February 2023 for SYs 2017–18 through 2021–22 and December 2023 for SY 2022–23.

Exhibit B17. Percentage of All Students, Migratory Students, and Migratory Priority-for-Service Students Scoring Well Developed on the English Language Proficiency Assessments for California Listening Domain for All Grades, School Years 2017–18, 2018–19, and 2020–21 Through 2022–23

| Grade | Student Population | 2017–18 | 2018–19 | 2020–21 | 2021–22 | 2022–23 |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| All | All students | 44.3% | 21.6% | 21.2% | 22.2% | 21.3% |
| All | Migratory students | 37.4% | 17.7% | 15.5% | 17.7% | 17.3% |
| All | Migratory PFS students | 27.0% | 13.0% | 15.0% | 16.0% | 14.6% |

Note: This data corresponds with [exhibit 24](#Ex24).

Source: CDE ELPAC data files, SYs 2017–18 through 2022–23, and the MSIN Databases for the MEP, 2017–18 through 2022–23 performance periods. Accessed February 2023 for SYs 2017–18 through 2021–22 and December 2023 for SY 2022–23.

Exhibit B18. Percentage of Students, by Student Population, Scoring at Each Level on the English Language Proficiency Assessments for California Listening Domain for All Grades, School Year 2022–23

| Grade | Student Population | N | Beginning to Develop | Somewhat/ Moderately Developed | Well Developed |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| All | Migratory PFS students | 8,235 | 34.7% | 50.7% | 14.6% |
| All | Migratory students | 34,962 | 27.0% | 55.7% | 17.3% |
| All | All students | 1,046,263 | 18.7% | 60.0% | 21.3% |

Note: “N” represents the “number of students with scores” for each student population and grade level. This data corresponds with [exhibit 25](#Ex25).

Source: CDE ELPAC data files, SY 2022–23, and the MSIN Databases for the MEP, 2022–23 performance period. Accessed December 2023.

Exhibit B19. Percentage of All Students, Migratory Students, and Migratory Priority-for-Service Students Scoring Well Developed on English Language Proficiency Assessments for California Speaking Domain for All Grades, School Years 2017–18, 2018–19, and 2020–21 Through 2022–23

| Grade | Student Population | 2017–18 | 2018–19 | 2020–21 | 2021–22 | 2022–23 |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| All | All students | 53.7% | 43.5% | 42.4% | 44.6% | 46.5% |
| All | Migratory students | 42.0% | 33.4% | 32.6% | 33.5% | 36.2% |
| All | Migratory PFS students | 33.0% | 26.0% | 31.0% | 31.0% | 31.1% |

Note: This data corresponds with [exhibit 26](#Ex26).

Source: CDE ELPAC data files, SYs 2017–18 through 2022–23, and the MSIN Databases for the MEP, 2017–18 through 2022–23 performance periods. Accessed February 2023 for SYs 2017–18 through 2021–22 and December 2023 for SY 2022–23.

Exhibit B20. Percentage of Students, by Student Population, Scoring at Each Level on the English Language Proficiency Assessments for California Speaking Domain for All Grades, School Year 2022–23

| Grade | Student Population | N | Beginning to Develop | Somewhat/ Moderately Developed | Well Developed |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| All | Migratory PFS students | 8,202 | 38.9% | 30.0% | 31.1% |
| All | Migratory students | 34,837 | 29.5% | 34.3% | 36.2% |
| All | All students | 1,043,439 | 17.4% | 36.0% | 46.5% |

Note: “N” represents the “number of students with scores” for each student population and grade level. This data corresponds with [exhibit 27](#Ex27).

Source: CDE ELPAC data files, SY 2022–23, and the MSIN Databases for the MEP, 2022–23 performance period. Accessed December 2023.

Exhibit B21. Percentage of All Students, Migratory Students, and Migratory Priority-for-Service Students Scoring Well Developed on English Language Proficiency Assessments for California Reading Domain for All Grades, School Years 2017–18, 2018–19, and 2020–21 Through 2022–23

| Grade | Student Population | 2017–18 | 2018–19 | 2020–21 | 2021–22 | 2022–23 |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| All | All students | 22.8% | 10.9% | 11.2% | 10.4% | 11.0% |
| All | Migratory students | 16.9% | 7.9% | 6.7% | 6.9% | 7.8% |
| All | Migratory PFS students | 8.0% | 5.0% | 7.0% | 6.0% | 6.5% |

Note: This data corresponds with [exhibit 28](#Ex28).

Source: CDE ELPAC data files, SYs 2017–18 through 2022–23, and the MSIN Databases for the MEP, 2017–18 through 2022–23 performance periods. Accessed February 2023 for SYs 2017–18 through 2021–22 and December 2023 for SY 2022–23.

Exhibit B22. Percentage of Students, by Student Population, Scoring at Each Level on the English Language Proficiency Assessments for California Reading Domain for All Grades, School Year 2022–23

| Grade | Student Population | N | Beginning to Develop | Somewhat/ Moderately Developed | Well Developed |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| All | Migratory PFS students | 8,232 | 58.1% | 35.3% | 6.5% |
| All | Migratory students | 34,950 | 51.8% | 40.3% | 7.8% |
| All | All students | 1,045,962 | 41.1% | 47.9% | 11.0% |

Note: “N” represents the “number of students with scores” for each student population and grade level. This data corresponds with [exhibit 29](#Ex29).

Source: CDE ELPAC data files, SY 2022–23, and the MSIN Databases for the MEP, 2022–23 performance period. Accessed December 2023.

Exhibit B23. Percentage of All Students, Migratory Students, and Migratory Priority-for-Service Students Scoring Well Developed on English Language Proficiency Assessments for California Writing Domain for All Grades, School Years 2017–18, 2018–19, and 2020–21 Through 2022–23

| Grade | Student Population | 2017–18 | 2018–19 | 2020–21 | 2021–22 | 2022–23 |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| All | All students | 28.0% | 16.4% | 9.9% | 12.9% | 15.7% |
| All | Migratory students | 21.2% | 11.9% | 5.2% | 8.6% | 11.4% |
| All | Migratory PFS students | 14.0% | 8.0% | 4.0% | 7.0% | 9.7% |

Note: This data corresponds with [exhibit 30](#Ex30).

Source: CDE ELPAC data files, SYs 2017–18 through 2022–23, and the MSIN Databases for the MEP, 2017–18 through 2022–23 performance periods. Accessed February 2023 for SYs 2017–18 through 2021–22 and December 2023 for SY 2022–23.

Exhibit B24. Percentage of Students, by Student Population, Scoring at Each Level on the English Language Proficiency Assessments for California Writing Domain for All Grades, School Year 2022–23

| Grade | Student Population | N | Beginning to Develop | Somewhat/ Moderately Developed | Well Developed |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| All | Migratory PFS students | 8,197 | 41.8% | 48.5% | 9.7% |
| All | Migratory students | 34,872 | 33.0% | 55.6% | 11.4% |
| All | All students | 1,044,580 | 23.5% | 60.8% | 15.7% |

Note: “N” represents the “number of students with scores” for each student population and grade level. This data corresponds with [exhibit 31](#Ex31).

Source: CDE ELPAC data files, SY 2022–23, and the MSIN Databases for the MEP, 2022–23 performance period. Accessed December 2023.

Exhibit B25. Percentage of All Students, Migratory Students, and Migratory Priority-for-Service Students Scoring at Standard Met or Exceeded for Overall Achievement on California’s English Language Arts Assessment for All Grades, School Years 2017–18, 2018–19, 2021–22, and 2022–23

| Grade | Student Population | 2017–18 | 2018–19 | 2021–22 | 2022–23 |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| All | All students | 49.8% | 51.1% | 47.0% | 46.6% |
| All | Migratory students | 27.3% | 29.2% | 23.9% | 23.4% |
| All | Migratory PFS students | 16.0% | 16.0% | 16.0% | 15.4% |

Note: This data corresponds with [exhibit 32](#Ex32).

Source: CDE CAASPP data files, SYs 2017–18, 2018–19, 2021–22, and 2022–23, and the MSIN Databases for the MEP, 2017–18, 2018–19, 2021–22, and 2022–23 performance periods. Accessed February 2023 for SYs 2017–18 through 2021–22 and December 2023 for SY 2022–23.

Exhibit B26. Percentage of All Students, Migratory Students, and Migratory Priority-for-Service Students Scoring Above Standard on the English Language Arts Reading Claim for All Grades, School Years 2017–18,   
2018–19, 2021–22, and 2022–23

| Grade | Student Population | 2017–18 | 2018–19 | 2021–22 | 2022–23 |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| All | All students | 25.0% | 26.1% | 19.5% | 18.7% |
| All | Migratory students | 9.2% | 10.6% | 6.9% | 6.8% |
| All | Migratory PFS students | 3.8% | 3.8% | 3.6% | 3.3% |

Note: This data corresponds with [exhibit 33](#Ex33).

Source: CDE CAASPP data files, SYs 2017–18, 2018–19, 2021–22, and 2022–23, and the MSIN Databases for the MEP, 2017–18, 2018–19, 2021–22, and 2022–23 performance periods. Accessed February 2023 for SYs 2017–18 through 2021–22 and December 2023 for SY 2022–23.

Exhibit B27. Percentage of Students, by Student Population, Scoring at Each Level on the English Language Arts Reading Claim for All Grades, School Year 2022–23

| Grade | Student Population | N | Below Standard | Near Standard | Above Standard |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| All | Migratory PFS students | 5,601 | 49.3% | 47.4% | 3.3% |
| All | Migratory students | 12,466 | 43.3% | 50.0% | 6.8% |
| All | All students | 728,671 | 24.6% | 56.6% | 18.7% |

Note: “N” represents the “number of students with scores” for each student population and grade level. This data corresponds with [exhibit 34](#Ex34).

Source: CDE CAASPP data files, SY 2022–23, and the MSIN Databases for the MEP, 2022–23 performance period. Accessed December 2023.

Exhibit B28. Percentage of All Students, Migratory Students, and Migratory Priority-for-Service Students Scoring Above Standard on the English Language Arts Writing Claim for All Grades, School Years 2017–18,   
2018–19, 2021–22, and 2022–23

| Grade | Student Population | 2017–18 | 2018–19 | 2021–22 | 2022–23 |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| All | All students | 26.7% | 26.2% | 19.4% | 19.2% |
| All | Migratory students | 9.9% | 11.5% | 6.7% | 6.8% |
| All | Migratory PFS students | 4.2% | 5.4% | 3.9% | 3.6% |

Note: This data corresponds with [exhibit 35](#Ex35).

Source: CDE CAASPP data files, SYs 2017–18, 2018–19, 2021–22, and 2022–23, and the MSIN Databases for the MEP, 2017–18, 2018–19, 2021–22, and 2022–23 performance periods. Accessed February 2023 for SYs 2017–18 through 2021–22 and December 2023 for SY 2022–23.

Exhibit B29. Percentage of Students, by Student Population, Scoring at Each Level on the English Language Arts Writing Claim for All Grades, School Year 2022–23

| Grade | Student Population | N | Below Standard | Near Standard | Above Standard |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| All | Migratory PFS students | 5,598 | 58.8% | 37.7% | 3.6% |
| All | Migratory students | 28,790 | 50.8% | 42.4% | 6.8% |
| All | All students | 2,954,281 | 30.6% | 50.2% | 19.2% |

Note: “N” represents the “number of students with scores” for each student population and grade level. This data corresponds with [exhibit 36](#Ex36).

Source: CDE CAASPP data files, SY 2022–23, and the MSIN Databases for the MEP, 2022–23 performance period. Accessed December 2023.

Exhibit B30. Percentage of All Students, Migratory Students, and Migratory Priority-for-Service Students Scoring Above Standard on the English Language Arts Listening Claim for All Grades, School Years 2017–18, 2018–19, 2021–22, and 2022–23

| Grade | Student Population | 2017–18 | 2018–19 | 2021–22 | 2022–23 |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| All | All students | 17.7% | 18.7% | 13.3% | 13.3% |
| All | Migratory students | 7.0% | 8.0% | 6.5% | 6.3% |
| All | Migratory PFS students | 3.3% | 3.6% | 4.3% | 4.2% |

Note: This data corresponds with [exhibit 37](#Ex37).

Source: CDE CAASPP data files, SYs 2017–18, 2018–19, 2021–22, and 2022–23, and the MSIN Databases for the MEP, 2017–18, 2018–19, 2021–22, and 2022–23 performance periods. Accessed February 2023 for SYs 2017–18 through 2021–22 and December 2023 for SY 2022–23.

Exhibit B31. Percentage of Students, by Student Population, Scoring at Each Level on the English Language Arts Listening Claim for All Grades, School Year 2022–23

| Grade | Student Population | N | Below Standard | Near Standard | Above Standard |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| All | Migratory PFS students | 5,602 | 31.0% | 64.8% | 4.2% |
| All | Migratory students | 28,819 | 27.2% | 66.6% | 6.3% |
| All | All students | 2,956,931 | 15.8% | 71.0% | 13.3% |

Note: “N” represents the “number of students with scores” for each student population and grade level. This data corresponds with [exhibit 38](#Ex38).

Source: CDE CAASPP data files, SY 2022–23, and the MSIN Databases for the MEP, 2022–23 performance period. Accessed December 2023.

Exhibit B32. Percentage of All Students, Migratory Students, and Migratory Priority-for-Service Students Scoring Above Standard on the Research/Inquiry Claim for All Grades, School Years 2017–18, 2018–19, 2021–22, and 2022–23

| Grade | Student Population | 2017–18 | 2018–19 | 2021–22 | 2022–23 |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| All | All students | 29.4% | 27.2% | 18.5% | 18.5% |
| All | Migratory students | 14.8% | 13.4% | 8.2% | 8.5% |
| All | Migratory PFS students | 8.3% | 6.0% | 5.0% | 4.9% |

Note: This data corresponds with [exhibit 39](#Ex39).

Source: CDE CAASPP data files, SYs 2017–18, 2018–19, 2021–22, and 2022–23, and the MSIN Databases for the MEP, 2017–18, 2018–19, 2021–22, and 2022–23 performance periods. Accessed February 2023 for SYs 2017–18 through 2021–22 and December 2023 for SY 2022–23.

Exhibit B33. Percentage of Students, by Student Population, Scoring at Each Level on the English Language Arts Research/Inquiry Claim for All Grades, School Year 2022–23

| Grade | Student Population | N | Below Standard | Near Standard | Above Standard |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| All | Migratory PFS students | 5,603 | 39.1% | 56.0% | 4.9% |
| All | Migratory students | 28,822 | 33.8% | 57.6% | 8.5% |
| All | All students | 2,957,349 | 19.6% | 61.9% | 18.5% |

Note: “N” represents the “number of students with scores” for each student population and grade level. This data corresponds with [exhibit 40](#Ex40).

Source: CDE CAASPP data files, SY 2022–23, and the MSIN Databases for the MEP, 2022–23 performance period. Accessed December 2023.

Exhibit B34. Percentage of All Students, Migratory Students, and Migratory Priority-for-Service Students Scoring at Standard Met or Exceeded for Overall Achievement on California’s Mathematics Assessment for All Grades, School Years 2017–18, 2018–19, 2021–22, and 2022–23

| Grade | Student Population | 2017–18 | 2018–19 | 2021–22 | 2022–23 |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| All | All students | 38.6% | 39.7% | 33.3% | 34.6% |
| All | Migratory students | 19.3% | 20.7% | 13.5% | 14.3% |
| All | Migratory PFS students | 7.0% | 7.0% | 6.0% | 6.8% |

Note: This data corresponds with [exhibit 41](#Ex41).

Source: CDE CAASPP data files, SYs 2017–18, 2018–19, 2021–22, and 2022–23, and the MSIN Databases for the MEP, 2017–18, 2018–19, 2021–22, and 2022–23 performance periods. Accessed February 2023 for SYs 2017–18 through 2021–22 and December 2023 for SY 2022–23.

Exhibit B35. Percentage of All Students, Migratory Students, and Migratory Priority-for-Service Students Scoring Above Standard on the Mathematics Concepts and Procedures Claim for All Grades, School Years 2017–18, 2018–19, 2021–22, and 2022–23

| Grade | Student Population | 2017–18 | 2018–19 | 2021–22 | 2022–23 |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| All | All students | 26.5% | 27.5% | 18.2% | 19.3% |
| All | Migratory students | 11.2% | 12.1% | 5.3% | 5.8% |
| All | Migratory PFS students | 3.0% | 3.0% | 2.0% | 2.2% |

Note: This data corresponds with [exhibit 42](#EB42).

Source: CDE CAASPP data files, SYs 2017–18, 2018–19, 2021–22, and 2022–23, and the MSIN Databases for the MEP, 2017–18, 2018–19, 2021–22, and 2022–23 performance periods. Accessed February 2023 for SYs 2017–18 through 2021–22 and December 2023 for SY 2022–23.

Exhibit B36. Percentage of Students, by Student Population, Scoring at Each Level on the Mathematics Concepts and Procedures Claim for All Grades, School Year 2022–23

| Grade | Student Population | N | Below Standard | Near Standard | Above Standard |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| All | Migratory PFS students | 6,029 | 67.8% | 30.0% | 2.2% |
| All | Migratory students | 29,519 | 60.2% | 34.0% | 5.8% |
| All | All students | 2,969,634 | 40.7% | 40.1% | 19.3% |

Note: “N” represents the “number of students with scores” for each student population and grade level. This data corresponds with [exhibit 43](#Ex43).

Source: CDE CAASPP data files, SY 2022–23, and the MSIN Databases for the MEP, 2022–23 performance period. Accessed December 2023.

Exhibit B37. Percentage of All Students, Migratory Students, and Migratory Priority-for-Service Students Scoring Above Standard on the Mathematics Problem Solving/Modeling and Data Analysis Claim for All Grades, School Years 2017–18, 2018–19, 2021–22, and 2022–23

| Grade | Student Population | 2017–18 | 2018–19 | 2021–22 | 2022–23 |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| All | All students | 20.7% | 21.3% | 15.5% | 16.3% |
| All | Migratory students | 7.1% | 7.6% | 4.1% | 4.4% |
| All | Migratory PFS students | 2.0% | 2.0% | 2.0% | 1.6% |

Note: This data corresponds with [exhibit 44](#Ex44).

Source: CDE CAASPP data files, SYs 2017–18, 2018–19, 2021–22, and 2022–23, and the MSIN Databases for the MEP, 2017–18, 2018–19, 2021–22, and 2022–23 performance periods. Accessed February 2023 for SYs 2017–18 through 2021–22 and December 2023 for SY 2022–23.

Exhibit B38. Percentage of Students, by Student Population, Scoring at Each Level on the Mathematics Problem Solving/Modeling and Data Analysis Claim for All Grades, School Year 2022–23

| Grade | Student Population | N | Below Standard | Near Standard | Above Standard |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| All | Migratory PFS students | 6,031 | 60.8% | 37.7% | 1.6% |
| All | Migratory students | 29,525 | 53.1% | 42.5% | 4.4% |
| All | All students | 2,970,261 | 34.5% | 49.3% | 16.3% |

Note: “N” represents the “number of students with scores” for each student population and grade level. This data corresponds with [exhibit 45](#Ex45).

Source: CDE CAASPP data files, SY 2022–23, and the MSIN Databases for the MEP, 2022–23 performance period. Accessed December 2023.

Exhibit B39. Percentage of All Students, Migratory Students, and Migratory Priority-for-Service Students Scoring Above Standard on the Mathematics Communicating Reasoning for All Grades, School Years 2017–18, 2018–19, 2021–22, and 2022–23

| Grade | Student Population | 2017–18 | 2018–19 | 2021–22 | 2022–23 |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| All | All students | 21.2% | 21.5% | 14.8% | 15.4% |
| All | Migratory students | 7.7% | 8.2% | 3.9% | 4.4% |
| All | Migratory PFS students | 2.0% | 2.0% | 2.1% | 1.9% |

Note: This data corresponds with [exhibit 46](#Ex46).

Source: CDE CAASPP data files, SYs 2017–18, 2018–19, 2021–22, and 2022–23, and the MSIN Databases for the MEP, 2017–18, 2018–19, 2021–22, and 2022–23 performance periods. Accessed February 2023 for SYs 2017–18 through 2021–22 and December 2023 for SY 2022–23.

Exhibit B40. Percentage of Students, by Student Population, Scoring at Each Level on the Mathematics Communicating Reasoning Claim for All Grades, School Year 2022–23

| Grade | Student Population | N | Below Standard | Near Standard | Above Standard |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| All | Migratory PFS students | 6,031 | 48.3% | 49.7% | 1.9% |
| All | Migratory students | 29,524 | 42.5% | 53.1% | 4.4% |
| All | All students | 2,970,276 | 28.0% | 56.6% | 15.4% |

Note: “N” represents the “number of students with scores” for each student population and grade level. This data corresponds with [exhibit 47](#Ex47).

Source: CDE CAASPP data files, SY 2022–23, and the MSIN Databases for the MEP, 2022–23 performance period. Accessed December 2023.

Exhibit B41. Percentage of All Students and Migratory Students Scoring at Standard Met or Exceeded on Overall Achievement on the California Science Test for All Grades, School Years 2018–19, 2021–22, and 2022–23

| Grade | Student Population | 2018–19 | 2021–22 | 2022–23 |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| All | All students | 29.9% | 29.5% | 30.2% |
| All | Migratory students | 12.2% | 11.7% | 11.7% |

Note: This data corresponds with [exhibit 48](#Ex48).

Source: [Test Results for California’s Assessments](https://caaspp-elpac.ets.org/caaspp/Default), CAST, SYs 2018–19, 2021–22, and 2022–23. Accessed December 7, 2022, for SYs 2018–19 and 2021–22 and October 17, 2023, for SY 2022–23.

Exhibit B42. Percentage of All Students and Migratory Students Scoring Above Standard on the California Science Test Life Science Domain for All Grades, School Years 2021–22 and 2022–23

| Grade | Student Population | 2021–22 | 2022–23 |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| All | All students | 11.7% | 12.1% |
| All | Migratory students | 3.1% | 3.2% |

Note: This data corresponds with [exhibit 49](#Ex49).

Source: [Test Results for California’s Assessment](https://caaspp-elpac.ets.org/caaspp/Default)s, CAST, SYs 2021–22 and 2022–23. Accessed December 7, 2022, for SY 2021–22 and October 17, 2023, for SY 2022–23.

Exhibit B43. Percentage of Students, by Student Population, Scoring at Each Level on the California Science Test Life Science Domain for All Grades, School Year 2022–23

| Grade | Student Population | N | Below Standard | Near Standard | Above Standard |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| All | Migratory students | 10,303 | 69.9% | 26.9% | 3.2% |
| All | All students | 1,324,632 | 49.4% | 38.5% | 12.1% |

Note: “N” represents the “number of students with scores” for each student population and grade level. This data corresponds with [exhibit 50](#Ex50).

Source: [Test Results for California’s Assessments](https://caaspp-elpac.ets.org/caaspp/Default), CAST, SY 2022–23. Accessed October 17, 2023.

Exhibit B44. Percentage of All Students and Migratory Students Scoring Above Standard on the California Science Test Physical Science Domain for All Grades, School Years 2021–22 and 2022–23

| Grade | Student Population | 2021–22 | 2022–23 |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| All | All students | 12.6% | 11.9% |
| All | Migratory students | 3.4% | 3.0% |

Note: This data corresponds with [exhibit 51](#Ex51).

Source: [Test Results for California’s Assessments](https://caaspp-elpac.ets.org/caaspp/Default), CAST, SYs 2021–22 and 2022–23. Accessed December 7, 2022, for SY 2021–22 and October 17, 2023, for SY 2022–23.

Exhibit B45. Percentage of Students, by Student Population, Scoring at Each Level on the California Science Test Physical Science Domain for All Grades, School Year 2022–23

| Grade | Student Population | N | Below Standard | Near Standard | Above Standard |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| All | Migratory students | 10,303 | 67.9% | 29.1% | 3.0% |
| All | All students | 1,324,632 | 47.8% | 40.3% | 11.9% |

Note: “N” represents the “number of students with scores” for each student population and grade level. This data corresponds with [exhibit 52](#Ex52).

Source: [Test Results for California’s Assessments,](https://caaspp-elpac.ets.org/caaspp/Default) CAST, SY 2022–23. Accessed October 17, 2023.

Exhibit B46. Percentage of All Students and Migratory Students Scoring Above Standard on the California Science Test Earth Science Domain for All Grades, School Years 2021–22 and 2022–23

| Grade | Student Population | 2021–22 | 2022–23 |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| All | All students | 11.5% | 11.5% |
| All | Migratory students | 2.8% | 2.7% |

Note: This data corresponds with [exhibit 53](#Ex53).

Source: [Test Results for California’s Assessments](https://caaspp-elpac.ets.org/caaspp/Default), CAST, SYs 2021–22 and 2022–23. Accessed December 7, 2022, for SY 2021–22 and October 17, 2023, for SY 2022–23.

Exhibit B47. Percentage of Students, by Student Population, Scoring at Each Level on the California Science Test Earth Science Domain for All Grades, School Year 2022–23

| Grade | Student Population | N | Below Standard | Near Standard | Above Standard |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| All | Migratory students | 10,303 | 64.6% | 32.7% | 2.7% |
| All | All students | 1,324,632 | 44.9% | 43.6% | 11.5% |

Note: “N” represents the “number of students with scores” for each student population and grade level. This data corresponds with [exhibit 54](#Ex54).

Source: [Test Results for California’s Assessments](https://caaspp-elpac.ets.org/caaspp/Default), CAST, SY 2022–23. Accessed October 17, 2023.

Exhibit B48. Four-Year Cohort Graduation Rates for Migratory and All Students, School Years 2017–18 Through 2022–23

| Graduation Rate | 2017–18 | 2018–19 | 2019–20 | 2020–21 | 2021–22 | 2022–23 |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| All students | 83.0% | 84.5% | 84.2% | 83.6% | 87.0% | 86.2% |
| Migratory students | 81.7% | 81.6% | 81.5% | 79.4% | 85.0% | 82.8% |

Note: This data corresponds with [exhibit 55](#Ex55).

Source: CDE Dataquest, “Four-Year Cohort Adjusted Cohort Outcome” Table for SYs 2017–18 through 2022–23. Accessed September 14, 2022, for SYs 2017–18 through 2021–22 and January 26, 2024, for SY 2022–23.

Exhibit B49. Dropout Rates for Migratory and All Students, School Years 2017–18 Through 2022–23

| Dropout Rate | 2017–18 | 2018–19 | 2019–20 | 2020–21 | 2021–22 | 2022–23 |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Migratory students | 10.5% | 11.2% | 11.1% | 10.7% | 9.4% | 10.1% |
| All students | 9.6% | 9.0% | 8.9% | 9.4% | 7.8% | 8.2% |

Note: This data corresponds with [exhibit 56](#Ex56).

Source: CDE Dataquest, “Four-Year Cohort Adjusted Cohort Outcome” Table for SYs 2017–18 through 2022–23. Accessed September 14, 2022, for SYs 2017–18 through 2021–22 and January 26, 2024, for SY 2022–23.

Exhibit B50. Prevalence of Health Needs Among Migratory Children with an Indicated Health Need on an Individual Needs Assessment and Learning Plan, by Need Type, 2020–21 Through 2022–23 Performance Periods

| Health Need | 2020–21 (N=4,173) | 2021–22 (N=4,921) | 2022–23 (N=4,728) |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Vision | 3.7% | 4.1% | 4.1% |
| Dental | 3.5% | 2.7% | 3.0% |
| Medical | 1.9% | 1.3% | 1.3% |
| Mental health | 0.9% | 0.8% | 0.9% |

Note: This data corresponds with [exhibit 59](#Ex59).

Source: The MSIN Databases for the MEP, 2020–21 through 2022–23 performance periods. Accessed December 2023.

Exhibit B51. Number of Migratory Children with an Indicated Need for Vision Services and the Number Who Received Services Aligned to That Need, 2020–21 Through 2022–23 Performance Periods

| Performance Period | Number Indicating a Need for Vision Services | Number Who Received an Aligned Service |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 2020–21 (N=4,173) | 1,794 | 208 |
| 2021–22 (N=4,921) | 2,264 | 859 |
| 2022–23 (N=4,728) | 2,307 | 859 |

Note: This data corresponds with [exhibit 60](#Ex60).

Source: The MSIN Databases for the MEP, 2020–21 through 2022–23 performance periods. Accessed December 2023.

Exhibit B52. Number of Migratory Children with an Indicated Need for Dental Services and the Number Who Received Services Aligned to That Need, 2020–21 Through 2022–23 Performance Periods

| Performance Period | Number Indicating a Need for Dental Services | Number Who Received an Aligned Service |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 2020–21 (N=4,173) | 1,713 | 190 |
| 2021–22 (N=4,921) | 1,479 | 317 |
| 2022–23 (N=4,728) | 1,676 | 363 |

Note: This data corresponds with [exhibit 61](#Ex61).

Source: The MSIN Databases for the MEP, 2020–21 through 2022–23 performance periods. Accessed December 2023.

Exhibit B53. Number of Migratory Children with an Indicated Need for Medical Services and the Number Who Received Services Aligned to That Need, 2020–21 Through 2022–23 Performance Periods

| Performance Period | Number Indicating a Need for Medical Services | Number Who Received an Aligned Service |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 2020–21 (N=4,173) | 921 | 16 |
| 2021–22 (N=4,921) | 728 | 76 |
| 2022–23 (N=4,728) | 711 | 58 |

Note: This data corresponds with [exhibit 62](#Ex62).

Source: The MSIN Databases for the MEP, 2020–21 through 2022–23 performance periods. Accessed December 2023.

Exhibit B54. Number of Migratory Children with an Indicated Need for Mental Health Services and the Number Who Received Services Aligned to That Need, 2020–21 Through 2022–23 Performance Periods

| Performance Period | Number Indicating a Need for Mental Health Services | Number Who Received an Aligned Service |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 2020–21 (N=4,173) | 435 | 68 |
| 2021–22 (N=4,921) | 453 | 188 |
| 2022–23 (N=4,728) | 507 | 408 |

Note: This data corresponds with [exhibit 63](#Ex63).

Source: The MSIN Databases for the MEP, 2020–21 through 2022–23. Accessed December 2023.

Exhibit B55. Percentage of Out-of-School Youths Indicating an Interest in an Educational Service, by Service Type, 2020–21 Through 2022–23 Performance Periods

| Educational Service | 2020–21 (N=1,724) | 2021–22 (N=3,086) | 2022–23 (N=3,017) |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| English literacy  (ELA, ESL, ELD) | 60% | 45% | 33% |
| GED/HEP | 35% | 21% | 24% |
| Home language literacy | 2% | 2% | 4% |

Note: This data corresponds with [exhibit 69](#Ex69).

Source: The MSIN Databases for the MEP, 2020–21 through 2022–23 performance periods. Accessed December 2023.

Exhibit B56. Number of Out-of-School Youths Indicating an Interest in English Literacy Services and the Number Who Received Services Aligned to that Need, 2020–21 Through 2022–23 Performance Periods

| Performance Period | Number Indicating Interest in English Literacy Services | Number Who Received an Aligned Service |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 2020–21 (N=1,724) | 1,030 | 153 |
| 2021–22 (N=3,086) | 1,391 | 98 |
| 2022–23 (N=3,017) | 989 | 334 |

Note: This data corresponds with [exhibit 70](#Ex70).

Source: The MSIN Databases for the MEP, 2020–21 through 2022–23 performance periods. Accessed December 2023.

Exhibit B57. Number of Out-of-School Youths Indicating an Interest in an General Education Diploma Services and the Number Who Received Services Aligned to That Need, 2020–21 Through 2022–23 Performance Periods

| Performance Period | Number Indicating Interest in a GED/HEP Service | Number Who Received an Aligned Service |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 2020–21 (N=1,724) | 608 | 137 |
| 2021–22 (N=3,086) | 650 | 94 |
| 2022–23 (N=3017) | 727 | 236 |

Note: This data corresponds with [exhibit 71](#Ex71).

Source: The MSIN Databases for the MEP, 2020–21 through 2022–23 performance periods. Accessed December 2023.

Exhibit B58. Number of Out-of-School Youths Indicating an Interest in a Home Language Literacy Service and the Number Who Received Services Aligned to That Need, 2020–21 Through 2022–23 Performance Periods

| Performance Period | Number Indicating Interest in a Home Language Literacy Service | Number Who Received an Aligned Service |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 2020–21 (N=1,724) | 42 | 0 |
| 2021–22 (N=3,086) | 69 | 3 |
| 2022–23 (N=3017) | 126 | 22 |

Note: This data corresponds with [exhibit 72](#Ex72).

Source: The MSIN Databases for the MEP, 2020–21 through 2022–23 performance period. Accessed December 2023.

Exhibit B59. Percentage of Out-of-School Youths Indicating a Health Need, by Need Type, 2020–21 Through 2022–23 Performance Periods

| Health Need | 2020–21 (N=1,724) | 2021–22 (N=3,086) | 2022–23 (N=3,017) |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Dental | 9% | 3% | 3% |
| Vision | 3% | 2% | 3% |
| Medical | 2% | 1% | 1% |
| Mental health | 1% | 0% | 0% |

Note: This data corresponds with [exhibit 74](#Ex74).

Source: The MSIN Databases for the MEP, 2020–21 through 2022–23 performance period. Accessed December 2023.

Exhibit B60. Number of Out-of-School Youths Indicating a Need for Vision Services and the Number Who Received Services Aligned to that Need, 2020–21 Through 2022–23 Performance Periods

| Performance Period | Number Indicating a Need for Vision Services | Number Who Received an Aligned Service |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 2020–21 (N=1,724) | 56 | 10 |
| 2021–22 (N=3,086) | 74 | 8 |
| 2022–23 (N=3,017) | 92 | 43 |

Note: This data corresponds with [exhibit 75](#Ex75).

Source: The MSIN Databases for the MEP, 2020–21 through 2022–23 performance periods. Accessed December 2023.

Exhibit B61. Number of Out-of-School Youths Indicating a Need for Dental Services and the Number Who Received Services Aligned to that Need, 2020–21 Through 2022–23 Performance Periods

| Performance Period | Number Indicating a Need for Dental Services | Number Who Received an Aligned Service |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 2020–21 (N=1,724) | 149 | 28 |
| 2021–22 (N=3,086) | 84 | 28 |
| 2022–23 (N=3,017) | 102 | 51 |

Note: This data corresponds with [exhibit 76](#Ex76).

Source: The MSIN Databases for the MEP, 2020–21 through 2022–23 performance periods. Accessed December 2023.

Exhibit B62. Number of Out-of-School Youths Indicating a Need for Medical Services and the Number Who Received Services Aligned to That Need, 2020–21 Through 2022–23 Performance Periods

| Performance Period | Number Indicating a Need for Medical Services | Number Who Received an Aligned Service |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 2020–21 (N=1,724) | 31 | 3 |
| 2021–22 (N=3,086) | 46 | 7 |
| 2022–23 (N=3,017) | 39 | 8 |

Note: This data corresponds with [exhibit 77](#Ex77).

Source: The MSIN Databases for the MEP, 2020–21 through 2022–23 performance periods. Accessed December 2023.

Exhibit B63. Number of Out-of-School Youths Indicating a Need for Mental Health Services and the Number Who Received Services Aligned to That Need, 2020–21 Through 2022–23 Performance Periods

| Performance Period | Number Indicating a Need for Mental Health Services | Number Who Received an Aligned Service |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 2020–21 (N=1,724) | 12 | 0 |
| 2021–22 (N=3,086) | 6 | 0 |
| 2022–23 (N=3,017) | 11 | 9 |

Note: This data corresponds with [exhibit 78](#Ex78).

Source: The MSIN Databases for the MEP, 2020–21 through 2022–23 performance periods. Accessed December 2023.

Exhibit B64. Percentage of Migratory Children Aged Three Through Five Years Served by School Readiness Services, by Age, 2017–18 Through 2022–23 Performance Periods

| Child’s Age | 2017–18 | 2018–19 | 2019–20 | 2020–21 | 2021–22 | 2022–23 |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 3 years | 43% | 72% | 75% | 83% | 74% | 74% |
| 4 years | 21% | 41% | 40% | 50% | 51% | 43% |
| 5 years | 0% | 1% | 0% | 1% | 1% | 1% |

Note: This data corresponds with [exhibit 80](#Ex80).

Source: The MSIN Databases for the MEP, 2017–18 through 2022–23 performance periods. Accessed January 2024.

1. This profile refers to MEP-eligible children as “children” and “youths” when reporting on a characteristic that is not related to school enrollment. The profile refers to MEP-eligible children as “students” when discussing educational outcomes and demographic characteristics obtained through a child’s or youth’s enrollment in school. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
2. This profile uses the term *youths* when referring tomigratory children who are aged thirteen years and older. Out-of-school youths are a subset of migratory youths who are not currently enrolled in a K–12 institution. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
3. [U.S. Department of Education, Office of Elementary and Secondary Education, Office of Migrant Education. 2017. *Non-Regulatory Guidance for the Title I, Part C Education of Migratory Children*, Section II.](https://oese.ed.gov/offices/office-of-migrant-education/migrant-education-program/legislation-regulations-and-guidance-migrant-education-program/mep-non-regulatory-guidance-march-2017-1) Accessed November 2, 2022. Although there are other types of qualifying moves, this is the definition that applies in California. Qualifying moves that may apply in other states are moves for economic necessity across administrative areas within a single district or a move of a distance of 20 or more miles to a temporary residence. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
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