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DEDICATION

This research is dedicated to homeless children and youths everywhere, and to the dream that they all might have the opportunity to know the excitement and wonderment of learning. It is hoped that by this research, awareness of the educational issues surrounding homelessness will increase and, so too, will sensitivity and consciousness of the problem. I propose a moral call to educators to commit themselves to the cause of educating homeless youths and to deliberate action as advocates for homeless students. As educational opportunities improve for disadvantaged youths, so will their well-being.
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Chapter I
INTRODUCTION

Introduction and Purpose

The numbers of homeless children and youths are increasing, and all preschool-age and school-age homeless youths need to be identified and appropriately educated as are housed youths. Empirical data suggests that many school-age homeless youths are not being identified for school enrollment, and that many school-age homeless youths are not meeting with success in public schools. The possible gap between the ideal and current conditions in schools forms the purpose of this research. This dissertation research examines the progress made in educating homeless youths in New Jersey (NJ) by monitoring the district-level implementation of the federal mandates for the education of homeless youths.

Homeless people are the poorest of the poor in society and in America homelessness remains one of the most complicated and important social issues (Burt et al., 1999). Beach (1996) estimated that of the approximately 14 million children and youths who live in poverty, as many as 1.6 million are homeless. Researchers for the Children’s Defense Fund (CDF) (2002) estimated that in 2001, there were 850,000 homeless children and youths. The average age of a homeless person is 9 years (Somerdink, 2000). Although the estimates of the number of homeless children range from 800,000 to 2 million (National Coalition for the Homeless [NCH], 1999a), these conditions, supported by
other research, present a formidable problem for society and create many challenges for educators. Despite slight discrepancies among them, collectively the data on the number of homeless adults support the potential magnitude of the numbers of school-age homeless youths.

The focus of this research is an examination of the extent to which the Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Act (Public Law 100-77) of 1987, now renamed the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act (McKinney), is being implemented at the local level of education in NJ. It has been 16 years since the passage of this comprehensive federal legislation designed to assist adult homeless persons and families. Subtitle VII-B (Sections 721-726) of this act pertains to the Education of Homeless Children and Youths (EHCY) program. It is the first and only federal government response specifically addressing the education of homeless youths. McKinney has been amended and reauthorized several times, further elaborating and strengthening the mandates for the education of homeless youths.

The key provisions of this legislation require that all youths in homeless situations have access to the same free appropriate public education (FAPE) that is provided to other children. McKinney specifically stipulates that homelessness alone is not sufficient reason to separate students from the mainstream school environment. It requires state education agencies to appoint a coordinator for the education of homeless youths, and develop a state plan to provide for the education of homeless youths. Every state is required to review and revise all laws, regulations, practices or policies of local educational agencies that may act as a barrier to the enrollment, attendance, or success in school of homeless youths (McKinney Subtitle VII-B, Sec 722(g)(1)(I)).
McKinney authorizes federal funds for the states, which are then distributed in competitive, discretionary subgrants to support local programs that are created specifically to meet the needs of homeless youths, including homeless preschoolers. Local school districts that apply for subgrants must appoint a district-level homeless liaison and develop a local educational plan for the education of homeless youths. In summary, McKinney requires that homeless youths have access to the free public education and services they need in order to ensure them an opportunity to meet the same challenging state standards to which all students are held.

Educators and advocates for homeless people report that the implementation progress of McKinney is slow and unacceptable. What happens at the schoolhouse door is often subject to chance rather than to consistent application of law, policies, and procedures. Efforts of state and community leaders have only scratched the surface of the problems associated with homelessness and with the education of homeless youths (Stronge & Popp, 1998). The Better Homes Fund (BHF) (1999) cited a lack of funding and poor compliance with federal law as contributing factors to the low percentage of homeless youths enrolled in school. The number of homeless youths is steadily increasing over the past two decades yet, at times funding has decreased. As the number of homeless youths is increasing, funding is not increasing proportionately.

Inadequate funding has posed a threat to the greatly needed McKinney programs. Lack of funding and state noncompliance with McKinney legislation prevent the statute from being effective in guaranteeing homeless youths an education (O’Leary, 2001). Many states are using more restrictive definitions of both homeless and school age, which further diminishes the effectiveness of the legislation (Rafferty, 1999). In accordance
with the provisions of this act, the implementation of McKinney programs should be continually monitored and evaluated. Federal monitoring of McKinney continues to be lax (Ernst, 1995). McKinney authorizes money for the education of homeless youths, but it does not make provisions for enforcement of the federally mandated practices.

To meet their needs, educational administrators must know, or be able to estimate, the numbers of homeless youths. A strong body of research supports that federal, state, and local agencies need to develop better methods for counting the homeless population (Burt, 1992, 1996, 1998). This is especially critical for school systems, as student enrollment projections are vital in planning for educational services. Adequate funding, staffing, facilities, programs, supplies, and other factors hinge on an accurate anticipation of student enrollment. Underestimates of projected student enrollments tend to increase class size, a condition known to be undesirable in the American education system, especially in the early grades (Achilles & Mitchel, 2001-2002).

Are the homeless youths of our nation, and particularly in NJ, getting a thorough and efficient education? Students who are homeless create special challenges to public schools, and several barriers to school success still remain. These challenges include appropriate grade-level placement, the lack of quiet places to do homework, parents with low literacy levels, limited access to extracurricular activities, limited exposure to technology, and other challenges. In addition to the usual domains of education, homeless youths also require special services to address their physical, social, emotional, and moral development. Some states, such as NJ, do not consider homeless preschoolers to be of school age. Therefore, they are denied access to educational programs during their critical periods of development (Shore, 1997). Few studies of homeless adolescents
at the middle and high school levels of education exist (Nichols-Pierce, 1992; Robertson & Toro, 1998). These and other educational issues inherent in educating homeless students are detailed in the literature review of this dissertation.

Failure to give immediate attention to the special needs of homeless students will only perpetuate and magnify their misfortune. School administrators and educators need awareness and understanding of this special segment of the student population (Stronge & Popp, 1998). In addition to the academic reasons, educators need to be advocates for the voiceless poor children in our society for moral reasons, and education must play a vital role in easing the hardships of homeless youths. By analyzing compliance with McKinney legislation, this research will assess the efforts toward delivery of the FAPE to which all homeless youths have the legal right.

In the late 1990's, several studies researched the compliance with McKinney and all recommended that increased monitoring of progress is needed (Anderson, Janger, & Pandon, 1995; Duffield & James, 1999). These studies revealed areas of difficulty to be the low numbers of district liaisons, inadequate funding, difficulty with counting homeless youths, the expense of transportation, difficulty serving the best interests of students in sending and receiving agreements, underutilization of special education services, underutilization of preschool services, lack of special programs, and other barriers. These barriers to school access and success for homeless youths are addressed in the Review of Related Literature section of this dissertation, as are previous national studies of McKinney implementation progress.

This researcher considers and draws upon the results of several studies in planning the design of this study. Conclusions about the recommendations for further research
delineated in previous McKinney implementation studies were developed into a comprehensive descriptive survey research design methodology. This researcher, through the survey instruments, monitors the state and local level progress in educating homeless youths, and monitors opinions on issues related to homelessness. The research design serves as a flexible and useful model to study McKinney compliance and progress in any school district or state. This researcher utilized the high poverty school districts of NJ as a sample, but the survey instruments are applicable in any state.

Research is needed to investigate that current legislation, policies, funding, and human resources are sufficiently meeting the educational needs of homeless students in NJ. Despite federal intervention, misdirected resources have contributed to the exacerbation of homelessness (Burt, 2001). The findings of this research will determine if there is a need for more aggressive measures in providing an education to homeless youths, on the part of government, educators, and service providers in NJ. The findings of this research will determine the baseline of practice from which to evaluate the effectiveness of the changes made to McKinney as it was strengthened during the 2001 reauthorization.

The desirable normative condition is that all homeless students have the opportunity to enroll, attend, and succeed in our free system of public education. Empirical data for NJ is needed to investigate this potential problem. A goal of this research is to keep a continued focus on the progress made in educating homeless youths by monitoring the district-level implementation of McKinney in the high poverty districts of NJ. An education is a vital method by which to improve one’s well being, and break cycles of intergenerational poverty (Nunez, 1994a; Stronge, 1993c). Giving immediate attention to educating homeless youths could potentially affect thousands of lives for the better, and
education is paramount to realizing the “American Dream” (Stronge, 1993a). The problems of homelessness are multi-dimensional and rooted in the community, and so, too, must be the solutions (Stronge, 1997). There is a need to continually monitor and evaluate the degree of compliance, progress, and shortcomings of McKinney programs for homeless youths at the local level of education in order to guarantee educational equity in NJ and in our society.

Statement of the Problem

As all youths have the right to a public education, there is a discrepancy between the empirical evidence on homeless enrollment and what should be the normative condition. This study examines the extent to which the educational provisions of McKinney are being implemented at the local level in public schools, specifically, in the high poverty districts of NJ. Although investigations on the adequacy of educational programs for homeless students have been undertaken nationally and elsewhere in other states, there has been a paucity of similar studies specific to the state of NJ.

In this study, the researcher’s purpose was to investigate the current policies, range of services, and practices that are in place to educate homeless youths in NJ, in order to draw conclusions about the availability and quality of education being provided to homeless youths. By examining local implementation, this study monitors and determines the degree of compliance with the McKinney legislation, and its overall effectiveness in guaranteeing a FAPE for homeless youths.

McKinney outlines a comprehensive federal policy for the education of homeless youths, but it will only benefit homeless youths to the extent that it is effectively
implemented. The U.S. Department of Education (USDOE) has been negligent in monitoring compliance and ensuring that state education coordinators remove the barriers to education that are still exist in some school districts (Rafferty, 1995). The USDOE has been criticized for its lack of leadership in reviewing state plans. It has been lax in submitting reports to Congress in a timely manner, and it has failed to forward all the required information to evaluate the progress of the education of homeless youths (Rafferty, 1999).

Homeless youths still are not guaranteed access to school. Translating state policy into local policy is a never-ending process fraught with difficulty, and should be continually monitored (Anderson et al., 1995). Little research has assessed the adequacy of collaboration between state coordinators and other service providers, and little research is available on the extent to which local education agencies provide direct services to homeless youths (Rafferty, 1999). The mandates set forth by McKinney need to be enforced if continuity in educational services for homeless youths is to be achieved, and the USDOE should monitor state and local education agencies rigorously to ensure program compliance and implementation.

Anderson et al. (1995) reviewed the state plans submitted to the USDOE between 1988 and 1992, focusing on compliance with five areas of McKinney: access to school, access to educational programs and services, awareness raising activities, coordination and collaboration, and support to local school districts. They found state plans to be vague about the actual level of implementation, support, and resources directed for the education of homeless youths. Many states did not include any detailed information on their activities in one or more of these five areas of study, and references that were
included were ambiguous. Several state plans described programs being considered for future implementation; however, later reports made no reference to the proposed programs, suggesting that they had not actually been implemented. Further evaluation of the implementation of state plans is needed.

In reauthorizing McKinney in 1994, Congress eliminated the requirement that state officials report on the numbers of homeless children and youths, and instead required that they provide estimates. It also allowed for individual state plans to be replaced with plans that are consolidated with other educational programs. The National Law Center on Homelessness and Poverty (NLCHP) (as cited in Ernst, 1995) reviewed the 1995 state plans submitted to the USDOE to assess whether they addressed the specific educational needs of homeless youths. Overall, 41 states chose to include the EHCY program in a consolidated plan and 9 states, including NJ, submitted individual plans. Of the 41 consolidated plans, 32 (78%) made no mention of homeless children, and few addressed the key requirements for state planning under McKinney (Ernst, 1995). A history of lax treatment of the McKinney mandates has undermined the effectiveness of this legislation, and is causing regressions in the limited progress made to date.

Homeless people are often regarded as somehow able to improve their condition if they would simply exert the effort to do so, a belief that interferes with agency personnel's inclination to provide them with public assistance. The nature and success of the McKinney legislation reflect this complacent attitude (Helm, 1993). There has been inadequate federal commitment to actualizing the intentions of McKinney, and the potential impact of the legislation is diminished by the way Congress wrote and funded the legislation. State personnel can apply for grant money authorized by Congress to
implement the act, however, the personnel of very few local education agencies apply for grants.

McKinney does not provide a statutory guarantee for a FAPE for homeless youths. If states receive grant money but do not comply with the act, there is no penalty (Rafferty, 1991). No sanctions are imposed for noncompliance, and no case has cited McKinney as a legal remedy for a local educational agency’s failure to comply with the McKinney provisions (Kilpatrick, 1992). The District of Columbia withdrew from the McKinney program and returned their funds rather than comply with a court-ordered directive to implement McKinney mandates (Ernst, 1995). In many instances where homeless youths have benefited from McKinney, such benefits have been the result of voluntary state or local initiatives to secure the available grant funding (Helm, 1993). Monitoring the local level implementation of McKinney is necessary to assess compliance and progress, and to ensure a FAPE for all homeless youths.

This study builds upon the conclusions and recommendations discussed in recent research on national McKinney compliance and progress. The questions posed encompass a comprehensive array of issues, and are intended to ascertain the areas of progress, as well as the continued barriers that prevent a quality education for homeless youths, specifically in the high poverty school districts of NJ. As guided by the mandates of McKinney, this research examines the methods used to estimate the number of homeless school-age youths, recent trends in enrollment, availability of special services, and adequacy of funding. Given that the numbers of homeless youths are increasing rapidly, it is immediately important to understand how federal legislation is being translated and implemented at the local level of education.
The research question, which this study raises and answers, is: "Are homeless students receiving an adequate education in the state of NJ?" By adequacy, it is meant that to what degree homeless youths are being identified for school enrollment, and are receiving an education that is commensurate with the provisions set forth in McKinney. As stated previously, McKinney governs the types of educational experiences those local school districts are expected to provide to their homeless student population.

In answering the primary research question, three subsidiary questions are posed. It is hoped that the answers to these questions will allow for a determination as to whether or not homeless students in the state of NJ are receiving a FAPE, and will allow for a determination as to what should be done in policy and practice to enhance the implementation of this legislation.

Subsidiary Research Questions

This research focuses on the following subsidiary questions:

1. To what degree are the federally mandated educational provisions of McKinney being implemented in the high poverty districts of NJ?

2. What barriers impact on successful implementation of these programs?

3. What policy recommendations can be made to strengthen federal, state, and local compliance with McKinney?

Background of the Problem

The related literature reviewed for this study included: definitions of homelessness, approximate numbers of homeless youths, methods used to count homeless youths, legal
frameworks for a free public education, the unique educational and developmental needs of the homeless student population, the challenges inherent in meeting those needs, programs instituted in response to the challenges inherent in the education of homeless youths, perceptions of homelessness, attitudes toward segregated settings for homeless youths, recent studies of McKinney implementation progress, and appropriation of funds targeted specifically for homeless youths.

Delimitations and Limitations

Homelessness is a very complex societal and educational issue. Given this assumption, this researcher will not address: the education of youths who live in extreme poverty but are not yet homeless, children of illegal aliens and migrants whose educational rights are addressed by other federal legislation, children in correctional facilities or other state institutions, litigation related to the residency requirements used in making a determination of homelessness for purposes of school enrollment, data collection from county homeless liaisons, analysis of Abbott compliance, the history and impact of various other non-McKinney sources of education funding, variables related to the leadership styles of principals, and philosophical missions of each individual school. Societal issues such as the causes of homelessness, the lack of affordable housing, shelter systems, the problems associated with urban decay, the needs of the adult homeless population, adult homeless assistance programs and funding, and international models for educating homeless youths also will not be addressed.

The execution of this study was limited by the following factors: different operational definitions of homelessness are being used, the methods used to count the actual numbers
of homeless youths are different, there are problems comparing studies that used different data collection methods, the potential overlap of Title I or other funding, and the limited data available regarding homeless adolescents.

Significance of the Study

This research does not constitute a needs assessment as the need for special educational services for homeless youths is well established. This research is an implementation study and the start of a growing trend to evaluate the effectiveness of federal education mandates. By increased legislation and Supreme Court decisions, the federal government is increasing playing a larger role in education. This study meets the needs of current mandates to evaluate the capacities of local public schools to comply with the McKinney legislation (McKinney Subtitle VII-B, Sec 724(d)). Results of this study should add to the general knowledge base regarding the current conditions surrounding the education of homeless youths at the local level of education, specifically in the high poverty districts of NJ. This study determines the ability of NJ education administrators in local school districts to identify the number of school-age homeless youths, to implement federally mandated programs, and to secure multiple avenues of interagency support. The findings of this study can be used to assess the impact of the recent reauthorization of McKinney and the more stringent federal mandates to aid homeless youths.

The need for the creation of more extensive local policies and innovative practices to aid such a severely at-risk student population is investigated. Providing educational services in today's society is a delicate balance between available resources and perceived
need. Appropriate policy must be guided by research to identify need and target funds effectively. With the ever-increasing trend of the federal government to introduce education mandates, research is needed to evaluate and assess the implementation of federal guidelines.

The results of this study may aid school administrators and educators in meeting the challenges of educating homeless youths, and may help them to be better informed of the school's responsibility in this endeavor. The results of this research may be useful for structuring the direction of future policies and practices at the local level of education. These policies might include campaigns for public awareness, outreach programs, increased funding, homeless liaisons at all levels of government in public education, changes in curriculum, and modifications of classroom practices. School administrators will self-assess the status of their district’s implementation progress. Educators at the local level will reflect on their current practices, and consider ways in which practices can be improved. It is hoped that when guided by research, more proactive measures will be taken on the part of local school district leaders to collaborate with parents and community agencies to secure available governmental resources in order to serve homeless youths better within public schools.

As a nation, we need to initiate and maintain practices that reflect a shared vision for continued social justice in our education goals. A concern for the well being of these very needy young people should be a top priority. As stated in the Improving America's Schools Act of 1994, "a high-quality education for all individuals and a fair and equal opportunity to obtain that education are a societal good, a moral imperative, and [ultimately] improve the life of every individual."
Operational Definitions of Terms

Terms that have relevance to this study are defined below:

1. **Abbott District: N. J.** One of 30 poor school districts in NJ, which are legally, designated as special needs districts. Due to high levels of poverty these school districts receive special federal funds, especially for preschool programs.

2. **District Factor Group Designation:** Classification system based on socioeconomic variables and other demographic variables. There are eight DFG designations ranging from A to J, with A being the most impoverished.

3. **Educational barriers:** Circumstances that thwart enrollment, attendance, access to special services, and success in public schools. These are areas that should be identified and rectified by school administrators and educators.

4. **Educational programs:** Refers to programs designed specifically to address the special needs of homeless youths at the federal, state and local levels of education.

5. **Homeless liaison:** An individual designated by a local education agency to be responsible for ensuring that homeless children are able to enroll and succeed in school, to act as a link between families and schools, to receive and obtain referrals for all the services for which homeless youths are eligible, and to facilitate McKinney mandates.

6. **Homeless youths:** In this dissertation, youths will refer to all young people in homeless situations who are under age 18, including toddlers of preschool-age, children of elementary school age, and adolescents of middle and high school-age. In some studies, youths can refer to individuals up to age 24. The exact definition of school age varies in different states, and for different classifications of students.

7. **Homelessness:** The condition of lacking a fixed, regular, and adequate residence;
nighttime residence at a temporary shelter; certain types of institutionalization; residence in public or private places not ordinarily designated as housing.

8. Legal framework: Legislation that forms the foundation for educational jurisprudence and assumptions regarding the right to a free, appropriate, and quality public education.

9. McKinney: Indicates a reference to the Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Act of 1987 and its Amendments and Reauthorizations. This act authorizes federal monies to combat homelessness, and includes the Education of Homeless Children and Youths (EHCY) program as Subtitle VIIB. This act was renamed the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act in 2000. It was last reauthorized under the No Child Left Behind Act of 2002 (PL 107-110), with more stringent measures that became effective July 2002 for the 2002-2003 school year.

10. Special needs: Social, psychological, moral, emotional, physical and developmental issues, beyond the normal academic expertise of educators, which require specialized school services or assistance from outside agencies.

11. State Coordinator: Homeless liaisons at the state-level of education. This position was mandated by the original 1987 McKinney legislation to coordinate and implement EHCY activities and programs.

12. Throwaway youths: Persons in homeless situations who are adolescents of teen age that are not living with their parents as a result of running away, fleeing domestic violence, or being asked to leave home. In the literature, homeless adolescents are referred to as throwaway, thrownaway, cast-off, runaway, unaccompanied, minor, juvenile, emancipated, abandoned, missing, and abducted. The education and welfare of
this special age group of the homeless population may be facilitated by legislation beyond McKinney that specifically targets this extremely at-risk population of students.

In addition to defining relevant terms for the reader, this dissertation contains a list of commonly used acronyms in Table 1. The reader can refer to this table for further assistance in reading this dissertation.

Theoretical Framework

This dissertation presents the complexities of serving homeless youths in public school settings. This dissertation speaks to the necessity that school administrators reevaluate their organization, and be more responsive to the greater societal milieu. Fullan and Stiegelbauer (1991) suggests that change is more of an ally than an adversary, if change is confronted, and educational leaders can be more effective at achieving desired improvements. Fullan and Stiegerlbauer (1991) suggested norms of collaboration and continuous improvement by drawing on and contributing to the pool of ideas and solutions. This research incorporates these ideas by examining the potential for more interactive forms of educational professionalism, as alliances provide both the power of ideas and the power to act on them. The Review of Related Literature presents the many variables surrounding the education of homeless youths. The Review of Related Literature makes it apparent that to serve the population of homeless youths, school administrators need to develop inter-institutional partnerships (Fullan & Stiegelbauer, 1991).

The task of educational leadership is to respond to changing conditions in society.
Table 1

**List of Acronyms**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Meaning of the Acronym</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AECF</td>
<td>Annie E. Casey Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHF</td>
<td>Better Homes Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDF</td>
<td>Children's Defense Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DFG</td>
<td>District Factor Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EHCY</td>
<td>Education for Homeless Children and Youths (program)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELC</td>
<td>Education Law Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESEA</td>
<td>Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAPE</td>
<td>Free Appropriate Public Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUD</td>
<td>(U.S. Department of) Housing and Urban Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICH</td>
<td>Interagency Council for the Homeless</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICP</td>
<td>Institute for Children and Poverty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDEA</td>
<td>Individuals with Disabilities Education Act of 1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAYORS</td>
<td>United States Conference of Mayors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McKinney</td>
<td>Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Act of 1987, re-named the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act in 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAEH</td>
<td>National Alliance to End Homelessness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAEHCY</td>
<td>National Assoc. for the Education of Homeless Children/Youths</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCH</td>
<td>National Coalition for the Homeless</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NJ</td>
<td>New Jersey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCHE</td>
<td>National Center for Homeless Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NJDOE</td>
<td>New Jersey Department of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NLCMP</td>
<td>National Law Center on Homelessness and Poverty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTIA</td>
<td>National Telecommunications and Information Adm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USDOE</td>
<td>United States Department of Education</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Transitional leaders can confront a problem and understand the necessary steps in policy and practice needed to overcome homelessness. This researcher will determine the level of McKinney implementation in NJ, and to study how to ensure that all homeless youths have the opportunity for school access and success. For this goal to be attained, the educational leader must be able to adjust the internal transformation process to the forces in the external environment (Green, 2001). The focus of change should be institutional renewal at the school level, and changing the culture of a school involves examining new values, norms, skills, practices and structures (Fullan & Stiegelbauer, 1991).

Senge (1990) argued that in the complex world of today, school administrators must cope with continuous change and in order to be successful at this, school administrators must become learning organizations. He proposed five disciplines that organizations need to practice to become learning organizations: personal mastery, mental models, building of a shared vision, team learning and systems thinking. The ideas behind these disciplines are embodied in the recommendations for policy and practice in this study.

The first discipline, personal mastery, is practiced when individuals have a good understanding of themselves and what they wish to achieve. This study gives educators a chance to direct their energies and potentials to the goal of equity. The second discipline, mental models, involves opening thinking patterns to wider ranges of ideas. Solving the complexities related to the education of homeless youths will require creative and divergent thinking. The third discipline, building of a shared vision, calls for educators to clarify their values and strive for the future they wish to create. In the case of educating homeless youths, this is clearly the opportunity for school access and success. The fourth discipline, team learning, encourages educators to participate in open dialogues of
communication and cooperation with other groups. Collaborative approaches can be very beneficial to homeless students. The fifth discipline, systems thinking, enables educators to achieve the previous four (Senge, 1990).

Organization of the Dissertation

The following chapters present a literature review of the educational issues pertaining to the education of homeless youths, the descriptive survey, grounded research design methodology and procedure, and an analysis of the research findings. A discussion of the results, conclusions, implications, recommendations, suggestions for future research, and the references used are presented. The appendixes include federal and state legislation pertaining to the education of homeless youths, a list of the Abbott school districts in NJ and their DFG ranking, the correspondence letters and survey instruments used in this research, an outline of the topics discussed in the review of related literature, and additional readings on homelessness.

Summary

The homeless population is a highly transitory and ephemeral group who is difficult to serve in the normal channels of our current system of free public education. Legislation has been enacted to assist school-age persons in homeless situations, however, levels of implementation of this act in NJ are generally not known. Local compliance with these measures needs to be monitored and continually evaluated. Through a descriptive survey research design methodology, this researcher examined the variety of challenges associated with educating homeless youths, and conclusions were drawn about specific
areas of progress and need, specifically, in the high poverty districts NJ.

Recommendations for legislators, policy makers, education administrators, and school practitioners are made to improve the availability and quality of education for homeless youths.

Homelessness exists on a macro level of society and in the long term, increasing affordable housing, adult education, raising the minimum wage, and alleviating poverty should address it. Homelessness also exists on a micro level of society and in the short term, educators need to respond immediately to the present challenges of educating the great and increasing numbers of homeless youths. Proactive efforts such as reaching out into the community and identifying homeless youths for school enrollment are needed. School administrators and educators need knowledge to assist the homeless students who are in our communities, and in some cases, already enrolled in our schools. Every hour of delay in this mission translates into lifetimes of lost opportunity for hundreds of thousands of homeless young people.
Chapter II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Introduction

This chapter presents definitions of homelessness, estimates of the number of homeless people, profiles of homeless people, the legal framework for a free appropriate public education (FAPE), and educational issues related to the education of homeless youths. An analysis of the previous national studies on compliance with McKinney, research on McKinney implementation in other states, and an overview of McKinney funding are presented. The chapter ends with a summary.

Homelessness

This section presents definitions of homelessness, estimates of the pervasiveness of homelessness, and describes characteristics of the American homeless population. Definitions and estimates of homelessness may vary, but growing numbers of homeless families with school-age youths, and the growing numbers of homeless unaccompanied minors are a fact. Education administrators must come to agreement on how homelessness is defined in order to reach out to all homeless youths, and to assure equity in eligibility for educational services.

Education administrators will make critical decisions when making a determination of homelessness for the purpose of school enrollment. Homelessness is difficult to define
but several operational definitions exist (Jones, Levine, & Rosenberg, 1991; Stronge, 1997; Stronge & Helm, 1991). Restrictive definitions accentuate the literal nature of homelessness; more expansive definitions include all who lack a fixed residence. This nuance becomes critical to making a determination of homelessness for persons living in doubled up situations, who in actuality are itinerant, and therefore homeless (Stronge, 1993a).

In a study of 35 state’s plans for educating homeless youths, only 9 plans included broad definitions of homelessness, and 6 did not include definitions of homelessness in their plans (Stronge, 1993b). To serve homeless youths better, education administrators need agreement on a common definition of homelessness so they can identify homeless students. Adequate methods need to be in place by which to measure the number of homeless youths so educators can plan educational programs. Comparisons of studies on homelessness are impossible without this agreement, and the USDOE has difficulty compiling data from the states (USDOE, 1997).

Educators should use the McKinney federal guidelines to make a determination of homelessness. According to McKinney, a homeless person is one who lacks a fixed, regular, and adequate nighttime residence. All three conditions should be considered collectively when determining the condition of homelessness. Living in shelters, institutions (other than prison), or places not usually inhabited by human beings is considered homelessness. Guidelines for defining homelessness were expanded by the 2001 reauthorization of McKinney to widen the scope of the definition, and to reduce confusion at the district-level in practical application.

According to NJ law, housing and living arrangements specified as homelessness
include transitional housing for families, sleeping accommodations not usually used by
human beings, public or private shelters, and facilities for abandoned youths. To assist
persons in defining homelessness, further criteria may need to be examined, such as,
when there is current domicile within the district, residence in the home of another person
domiciled within the district who supports a child gratis, and any person not domiciled
within the district but residing temporarily therein.

Foster children and children in some court-ordered placements or state facilities are
not considered homeless. Other situations may be considered on a case-by-case basis,
such as migratory families, living in motels or hotels, living in trailer parks, and living
with families or friends, commonly referred to as doubling up. In the immediate period
following the enactment of McKinney (1987), litigation set precedents for further
refinement of the law regarding the definition of homelessness as it pertains to school
eligibility (First & Cooper, 1989). A lack of consensus on definitions of homelessness
continues to create a barrier to school enrollment for some homeless youths. Policies of
each local district cannot be contrary to McKinney mandates.

Education services are hindered by the methodological problems related to counting
people in homeless situations. Challenges encountered when counting homeless persons
include the use of different data sources, duplication or double counting, seasonal
variations in homelessness, and variations in the average length of homeless spells (Burt
& Aron, 2000). There is a great deal of disagreement about the actual numbers of
homeless youths, and only estimates are possible (Stronge & Popp, 1998). The numbers
of homeless people quoted in the literature are conservative as the methods presently used
to count homeless people are highly flawed and inaccurate (Burt, 1992; NCH, 2001b;
USDOE, 1992). State personnel's attempts to count their homeless populations have been notoriously inaccurate (Anderson et al., 1995). Federal attempts to count the American homeless population have also been inadequate, and counting the homeless population defies U.S. Census Bureau strategies (NCH, 2001b).

The homeless population is amorphous and ephemeral; therefore, it is very difficult to measure their extent. Actual counts are nearly impossible and there are differences among estimates. Education administrators need to be savvy consumers of data as they review studies that estimate the numbers of homeless youths. The two most common methods used to count homeless people are the point-in-time prevalence and period-prevalence counts (NCH, 1999). Using the first approach, researchers plan to count the number of homeless people in given locations on a given day or week, and using the latter approach, researchers attempt to count the number of homeless people who access certain services over a given period of time.

The commonly used point-prevalence and point-in-time methods of sampling can bias estimates of the size, stability, and composition of homeless persons; such studies also show ranges in the estimated persistence of homelessness (Phelan & Link, 1999). Point-prevalence and point-in-time studies may use homeless shelters as the site of their count, but people who are homeless may live in nontraditional areas and do not always utilize shelter services. Therefore, many homeless people are not included in this type of count (Anderson et al., 1995). Both of these methods may be inaccurate when shelter counts are used, for example, in cases when shelters are unavailable, selective in their clientele, or filled to capacity (NCH, 1999).

In the 1980's, there were several widely used estimates of the scope of national
homelessness. Burt and Cohen (1989) conducted a point-in-time prevalence study for one week in 1988, counting people who used shelters or soup kitchens, and people whom congregated on the streets. From their sample, they conservatively estimated 500,000 to 600,000 homeless people. When this estimate is updated using a modest projected rate of increase of 5% a year, it can confirm the current estimates that over 700,000 people may be homeless on any given night. The NCH (Burt, 1989) reported that national estimates included over 500,000 homeless children. Kozol (1988) estimated the number of people who experienced homelessness to be between two and three million. According to the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) (1994), by the end of the 1980's, the number of people estimated as homeless at least once in the course of their lives ranged as high as six million.

The Clinton administration based its policies on a study by Link et al. (1994), which used lifetime and 5-year prevalence estimates. Link et al. (1994) concluded that lifetime and 5-year prevalence (1985 through 1990) of all types of homelessness combined were 14% (26 million people) and 4.6% (8.5 million people), respectively. Lifetime literal homelessness was 7.4% (13.5 million people) and 5-year prevalence (1985 through 1990) literal homelessness was 3.1% (5.7 million people). Current estimates suggest that the number of adults in America who have been homeless at some time in their lives ranges as high as 12 million people (NCH, 1999). Several million Americans experience homelessness each year (Burt & Aron, 2000; NCH, 1999). Burt and Aron (2000) estimated that 39% of the homeless population (1,365,000) are children.

Problems associated with counting homeless populations usually lead to severe undercounts. These problems include: a tendency to miss the so-called hidden homeless,
respondents who deliberately hide their homelessness, a tendency to miss the people who experience short episodes of homelessness, and extrapolation of data to different geographic areas (Link et al., 1994). Burt (1998) examined the findings of nine studies of homeless populations conducted in the past two decades and concluded that the homeless populations appraised (and the determination of services needed) depends on the data source used in each study. In Burt’s, recommendations suggest that local jurisdictions should develop feasible, cost-effective methods to collect comprehensive data needed for local decision making.

In a recent survey of Nobel laureates (N=259), 92% of respondents indicated poverty and homelessness as the single greatest or most major problem of our times (Cisco Systems, 2001). In America, one in five children is born poor; this totals 13.5 million children, many of whom experience homelessness (CDF, 2000). Researchers for the Better Homes Fund (BHF) (1999) concluded that more than one million children and youths each night in America are homeless. Four hundred thousand families live in shelters, and another four million families are one step away from homelessness (Somerindyke, 2000). The National Alliance to End Homelessness (NAEH) (2002) estimated that 3.5 million Americans experience homelessness annually, many of whom are children. Although the numbers provided in these estimates vary, even the lowest estimate points present a serious condition to society, and to the school systems therein.

As poverty and homelessness are inextricably linked, the scope of this problem is great. While each year about 1% of the U.S. general population will experience homelessness, the rate increases to five to six percent among the poor (DHHS, 2002). Despite the wealth in the United States of America (USA), the child poverty rate is
among the highest in the developed world. In a study of 17 developed countries, the USA had the highest child poverty rate, and was 50% higher than the next highest country (Rainwater & Smeeding, 1995). In a recent United Nations study (2000), only Russia had a higher child poverty rate among the industrialized nations studied, then did the USA.

Research suggests that homelessness, like poverty, is becoming intergenerational (Bassuk & Rubin, 1987). Childhood homelessness is a strong risk factor for adult homelessness (Burt & Aron, 2000). Among all American children, one in eight is born to a teenage mother, one in five is born to a mother who did not graduate from high school, one in three is behind a year or more in school, one in eight never graduates from high school, and two in five never complete a single year of college (CDF, 2000). Education can be a method by which to break the cycle of poverty and homelessness.

It is logistically difficult to count the exact numbers of homeless people, however, reasonable estimates are needed to plan public policy and educational services. Education administrators calculate school enrollment projections, and plan policy and staffing based on their conclusions. An analysis of the general trend indicates that poverty and homelessness show no signs of abating; therefore, local educators need to initiate more aggressive procedures to identify and enroll homeless students.

The shelter methods of counting homeless populations create a special area of difficulty, namely the inability to count the actual number of homeless adolescents who do not access social services (Powers & Jaklitsch, 1993; Vissing & Diament, 1997). A population of teenage homeless adolescents, known in the literature as throwaway youths, rarely accesses shelters. They tend to use non-traditional or outdoor housing and therefore are not included in counting methods that use shelters as their sample
(Markward, 1994). There is a lack of available shelter beds for youths, and they also do not use shelters for greater personal autonomy (Robertson, 1996). Consequently, it may be very difficult for education administrators to identify homeless adolescents for middle school and high school enrollment.

Homeless adolescents are called throwaways, thrownaways, runaways, unaccompanied, emancipated, minors, cast-off, juveniles, abandoned, missing, and abducted in the literature. Regardless of the differing ways they came to be homeless, these adolescents have the same problems associated with homelessness (Taylor, 2000). The more common approaches used for sampling the adolescent homeless population may incur distortions, presenting a more deviant profile, under representing youths who have a longer history of homelessness, and under-representing older (preadult) age homeless adolescents (Robertson & Toro, 1998).

Some studies on homelessness specifically state that homeless adolescents were not included in their sample (Burt, 1998; HUD, 1999; Nunez, 2000). There are some national studies on the number of runaway homeless adolescents. According to the Administration for Children and Families (ACF) (2000), an estimated 500 thousand to 1.5 million youths run away from home in the course of a year. The ages of these runaways ranges from younger than 11 to over 18, with more than half being age 15 or 16.

The Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (U.S. Department of Justice, 1990) reported 446,700 runaways from households in 1988, and an additional 127,100 thrownaway youths. The National Institute of Justice (as edited in McCracken, 2001) estimated the number of runaway and homeless youths may range from 1.3 to 2
million each year. School enrollment and achievement data for this special population of homeless adolescents is presently unknown.

In the first incidence study of missing, abducted, runaway and thrown away youths, the U.S. Department of Justice (1990) reported a total of 573,800 homeless youths. This figure was arrived at by a telephone survey to 23,000 households inquiring about youths who were missing, abducted, runaway, and throwaway. The researchers sought to understand the experiences of approximately 10,000 homeless youths that they contacted regarding their bout with homelessness. Over a decade later in 2002, the U.S. Department of Justice is conducting a follow up study that will extend the methodology, approach and concepts of the first study. Several new categories of missing children will be added, and updated national estimates of youths in these situations are reported.

The U.S. Conference of Mayors has been reporting data on the numbers of homeless people and the composition of the homeless population in America’s largest cities since the early 1980’s. Table 2 presents a 16-year comparison of data on homelessness as reported by the U.S. Conference of Mayors (2001). This figure presents longitudinal data on a number of issues addressed in this review of related literature, and will be referred to several times. Data on unaccompanied homeless adolescents was not available for several years of research as compiled by the U.S. Conference of Mayors. Data show that unaccompanied adolescents constituted an average of four percent of the homeless population in their samples (U.S. Conference of Mayors, 2001). Robertson and Toro (1998) estimated an annual prevalence of 5% of all youths aged 12-17 (approximately 3.5 million youths) are homeless. Education administrators should ensure that middle and high school staffs devise methods by which to reach out into the community and identify
homeless adolescents.

Advocacy groups for homeless people believe that government figures under-represent the true scope of the situation (Reilly, 1993). Underestimates are problematic as they threaten much-needed funds and make accurate educational planning impossible. The most recent U.S. Census count of the homeless population came under attack by several advocacy groups, including the NCH (2001b), who charged it with being inaccurate, distorted, and inappropriate. Although the U.S. Census Bureau personnel refused to adjust the figures and release a new report, they agreed to research the discrepancies, and to make adjustments for those not present on the days of the count and other problems. According to the U.S. Census Bureau (2002), 280,527 people were counted as homeless by point-prevalence methods on several days in March of 2000. Their estimate is flagrantly discrepant from commonly accepted estimates, and it cannot be used as a measure of homelessness (NCH, 2001b).

Homeless people were counted as a part of the “noninstitutionalized population”, people who live in nonhousehold group quarters other than institutions (U.S. Census Bureau, Census 2000, p. B-5). The 22nd Census counted a national sample of people who stayed in emergency or transitional shelters overnight on March 27, 2000; people who accessed soup kitchens on March 28, 2000; and those who inhabited targeted non-sheltered outdoor locations on March 29, 2000. Included in the figures reported (as the noninstitutionalized populations) are many other nonhomeless groups, such as, homes for the mentally ill, mentally retarded, physically handicapped, drug half-way houses, communes, and maternity homes for unwed mothers. Also included are dormitory situations, such as, rectories, college dormitories, military quarters, migratory farm
Table 2.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KEY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key:
1. Percent increase in demand for emergency shelter
2. Percent cities in which demand increased
3. Percent demand for emergency shelter unmet
4. Percent cities in which shelters must turn people away
5. Percent cities which expect demand for shelter to increase next year
6. Percent single men
7. Percent families with children
8. Percent single women
9. Percent unaccompanied youth
10. Percent children
11. Percent severely mentally ill
12. Percent substance abusers
13. Percent employed
14. Percent veterans

camps, construction worker's camps, and staff residents of institutions.

Consequently, it is very difficult to draw conclusions regarding the approximate numbers of homeless people from the data published by the U.S. Census Bureau. This researcher sent a written request for data on homelessness to the U.S. Census Bureau, and received the following response from the Customer Service Department: "... (the Customer Service Department) was unable to find any information done by the Bureau to assist you."

Education administrators should keep themselves informed regarding the changing demographics of society, and of the profile of the population in their school district. There has been a dramatic increase in the number of poor people who become homeless, and homeless families, as the fastest growing segment of the homeless population (McChesney, 1993; NCH, 1997b; Nunez, 1994b), represent 40% of people who are homeless (NCH, 1987, 1999b; Shinn & Weitzman, 1996). This is commensurate with the more recent estimates of the U.S. Conference of Mayors (2001) that homeless families constituted 36% of the homeless population in their 2000 report, and in their 2001 report, that homeless families constituted 40% of the homeless population. Longitudinal data on the increase in the number of homeless families are included in Table 2. In some cities, this percentage is substantially higher. According to the U.S. Conference of Mayors (2001), homeless families comprise 77% of the homeless population in Trenton, NJ, and 68% of the homeless population in nearby Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. The number of homeless people in the New York City shelter system in the winter of 2001 rose above 25,000, the most since the late 1980's, with the largest increases coming among women and children (Bernstein, 2001).
Homelessness is usually associated with urban areas, yet, the proportion of homeless families is likely to be higher in rural areas than would be expected (Visiing, 1996). Rural family homelessness is just as prevalent as urban homelessness, but it is more difficult to count the rural homeless population. Rural homeless families tend to double up for living arrangements, and fewer social services are available in rural rather than in urban areas, which creates less opportunity to conduct shelter counts (Visiing, 1998). Education administrators in rural areas may have a more difficult time identifying homeless youths than do their urban colleagues.

Many homeless families have school-age children, and many are headed by a single female parent (NCH, 1996). In 1997, 3 in 10 children lived in single-parent homes, and almost half of children living with only their mothers lived in poverty (Snyder & Sickmund, 1999). Poor single mothers have weak support networks, which may contribute to their vulnerability for homelessness (Bassuk & Rosenberg, 1988). Researchers for the BHF (1999) estimated that single females head 85% of homeless families. The U.S. Conference of Mayors (2000) reported that a single parent heads 63% of the homeless families. In NJ, 23% of homeless families with children are headed by a single female parent (Annie E. Casey Foundation [AECF], 2001). With a rate of five percent, the U.S. has the highest occurrence of teen birth rates among industrialized nations (AECF, 2002b). The large and growing numbers of transitory homeless families with school-age children present a serious challenge to the normal functioning of public school systems.

The average homeless family consists of a 20 year-old single woman and two children under age 6 years (Nunez, 1994b). The average homeless parent is a young single mother
with a 10th-grade education and a sixth-grade reading level (Nunez & Collignon, 1997). The NCH (1999b) reported that school-age children under age 18 constitute 27% of the homeless population. The average age of a homeless person is 9 years (Somerindyke, 2000). The population of independent homeless youths unaccompanied by adults is growing (Powers & Jaklitsch, 1993; Stronge, 1993a).

Given the large numbers of female-headed single-parent households, most homeless family studies focus on the mother as the respondent, and virtually nothing is known about homeless fathers (McChesney, 1993). What is known is that homeless fathers have many problems of their own: 31% have physical or mental health problems, 32% are in jail or on probation, 43% have problems with drugs or alcohol, and 50% are unemployed (BHF, 1999). These facts are important considerations for education administrators as they attempt to involve parents in their children's education. Despite the existing difficulties, public school educators should reach out and develop partnerships with homeless parents (Eddowes, 1993). The large and growing numbers of school-age youths should be of increasing concern to education administrators as they oversee and train their staff. Teachers need to understand the profile of homeless families in the planning of their curriculum and in instituting classroom practices.

Since the surveys conducted by the U.S. Conference of Mayors first concluded that high numbers of the homeless population are families with children, the percentage continues to grow (U.S. Conference of Mayors, 2001). Moving from endemic to epidemic proportions, this growth represents the first large-scale family homelessness since the Great Depression (McChesney, 1993). In the late 1980's, reports of the increased numbers of homeless families brought homelessness to public attention. The
composition of the homeless population continued to change in the 1990’s, with increasing numbers of homeless youths. In the new millennium, a renewed sense of urgency regarding homelessness is warranted. Education administrators should be familiar with recent profiles of homeless families as they seek to provide educational services to homeless youths.

The Interagency Council for the Homeless (ICH) is a working group of the White House Domestic Policy Council. In December of 1999 (after a long delay), the group published data collected between October 1995 and November 1996 (Burt et al., 1999). The nature of homelessness described in the results of this study is intended as a guide to legislators and policy makers. Those who provide assistance to the homeless, such as educators, need to know the characteristics of the homeless population that they serve, and need to understand the emerging networks among service providers.

The ICH study was not designed to count the number of homeless people, nor did it examine homelessness at a regional or local level. It does describe the profile of a national sample of homeless people. The findings suggest that of homeless clients, families (as defined by having one or more of their own children aged under 18 with them) have 2.2 children with them on average (Burt et al., 1999). With the children included as a part of the total, 34% of homeless service users are members of families; 23% are minor children and 11% are their parents (Burt et al., 1999).

In the ICH sample, the children of homeless parents were 53% male and 47% female; and their ages were young: 20% were ages 0 to 2, 22% were ages 3 to 5, 20% were ages 6 to 8, 33% were ages 9 to 17, and age was not given for 5% (Burt, et al., 1999). The large numbers of young children among homeless youths has important implications for the
potential of overburden to preschool and elementary school programs. It is necessary to
determine the needs of the homeless population at the different levels of education
regarding staffing and special programs. Education administrators should know the
characteristics of their student population, especially their age distribution. Not only will
they vary by community, but also the numbers and characteristics of homeless youths will
change over time within the same community, depending on economic conditions and the
enactment of local public policies (Fosburg & Dennis, 1999).

Homelessness is associated with the breakup of families. Homeless families may have
to break up in order to be accommodated in emergency shelters (U.S. Conference of
Mayors, 2000); homeless parents want to spare their children the horrors of homelessness
and send them to live with friends or relatives (Shinn & Weitzman, 1996); and homeless
parents fear that their children will be taken away from them by child protective agencies
and do not come forward for shelter assistance or school services (Stronge & Popp,
1998). High levels of family mobility, the trauma of separation, and a general
apprehension regarding institutions impacts the delivery of education services to
homeless youths. In the ICH study (Burt et al., 1999), 60% of homeless women have
children ages 0 to 17, and 65% of these women live with at least one of their minor
children; 41% of homeless men have children ages 0 to 17, and only 7% of these men live
with at least one of their minor children.

The Urban Institute (as cited in Burt, 1987) conducted a similar study to the ICH 1999
report. A comparison of these two reports shows that homeless people are less likely to
be White and more likely to be better educated (Burt et al., 1999). Racial profiles of
people in homeless situations vary by location (NCH, 1999e). There is great diversity
among the homeless population, and currently the homeless population represents all segments of society (Rosenheck, Bassuk, & Salomon, 1998). Racial profiles of homeless people are included in the data gathered by the U.S. Conference of Mayors as shown on Table 2. Studies of formerly homeless people indicate that many ordinary Americans experience acute periods of homelessness, as opposed to the point-prevalence studies which suggest that homelessness is a chronic problem among a small population of deviant individuals (Phelan & Link, 1999). Homelessness in America is a revolving-door phenomenon, and although each episode may be for a short time, the effects are devastating (Burt, 2001).

Homelessness affects many Americans, many of who are both educated and gainfully employed (NAEH, 2002). Contrary to the popular public perception, some homeless people are, in fact, employed. Almost half of the children living in poverty come from homes where at least one adult is working (Reed & Sautter, 1990). An average of the 16-year data of the U.S. Conference of Mayors (2001) as presented in Table 2 reports that 20.5% of homeless people are employed. Education administrators often times negotiate between parents and school personnel. Understanding the circumstances, concerns, and needs of homeless parents and youths may do this more effectively.

Arguments to support the growing numbers of homeless youths are found by analysis of the use of shelter services. In America, it is estimated that more than one million people are homeless each night, and that the demand for emergency shelter by families with children has increased 50% since 1995, and 15% from 1999-2000 alone (Nunez, 2000). In the cities surveyed by the U.S. Conference of Mayors (2001), requests for emergency shelter by homeless families increased in 81% of the cities, and 37% of shelter
requests by homeless people went unmet, despite an increase in the number of emergency shelter beds. The longitudinal data of the U.S. Conference of Mayors (2001) as presented in Table 2 documents continuous increases in demand for services and consistently high levels of unmet need for services. Nunez (2000) reported that each night, 49% of all children needing shelter do not find it.

An analysis of the rising estimates of school-age homeless youths reveals a disturbing trend. The number of homeless youths doubled between 1991 and 1993 (USDOE, 1997). In 1994, as many as one half of all homeless youths may not have attended school regularly (HUD, 1996). The Institute for Health Policy Studies (1995) estimated the homeless youths population to be 300,000 per year. By the late 1990’s, more than 750,000 school-age children may be homeless, and school-age children are the fastest growing segment of the homeless population (Nunez & Collignon, 1997). A survey of State Coordinators for the EHCY program reported that the states served only 230,000 homeless youths in the 1997-1998 school year (Duffield & James, 1999). In 1998, the USDOE (1999) reported that there were over 600,000 school-age homeless students. The CDF (2002) estimates that there were more than 850,000 school-age homeless youths in 2001. Trend analysis of data indicates that the number of school-age homeless children and youths will continue to grow (BHF, 1999).

Table 3 shows the USDOE data reported to Congress on the Numbers & School Enrollment of Homeless Students. In their 1995 report to Congress, the USDOE stated that of the approximately 615,000 school-age children between ages 7 to 17, 57% are of elementary school age, 22% are of junior high school age, 19% are of high school age, and age was not specified for 2%. It should be noted that in all of their reports to
### Table 3

**U.S. Department of Education, Selected Data from Summary Reports To Congress, 1989 – 2000**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number of School-Age Homeless Children and Youth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>States reported approximately 272,773 school-age homeless (K-12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>States reported approximately 327,416 school-age homeless (K-12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>States reported approximately 714,266³ school-age homeless (K-12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>States reported approximately 625,530³ school-age homeless (K-12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>States reported approximately 930,232 school-age homeless (K-12)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Hurricane Andrew and other natural disasters may account for the particularly high count in 1993.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>School Enrollment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>28% of homeless children and youth (K-12) were not attending school during their period of homelessness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>20% of homeless children and youth (K-12) were not attending school during their period of homelessness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>23% of homeless children and youth (K-12) were not attending school during their period of homelessness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>45% of homeless children and youth (K-12) were not attending school on a regular basis during their period of homelessness¹.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>44% of homeless children and youth (K-12) were not attending school on a regular basis during their period of homelessness¹.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Not attending school on a regular basis was defined by the states.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Regular School Attendance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>12% of homeless children and youth (K-12) were not enrolled in school during their homelessness¹. 10% of homeless children (K-5) were not enrolled in school during their homelessness. 24% of homeless youth (9-12) were not enrolled in school during their homelessness.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Question on the data collection form was worded differently.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number of Homeless Preschool Children</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>States reported approximately 205,749 preschool homeless children¹. Approximately 21% are enrolled in preschool programs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>States reported approximately 257,076 preschool homeless children¹. Approximately 16% are enrolled in preschool programs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Ten states and D.C. did not report estimates of the number of preschool homeless children.

---

school age and the different operational definitions used to make a determination of homelessness in each state. Although the federal government publishes them, the USDOE openly admits that these figures should be viewed with some skepticism.

An accurate count of homeless youths is needed to better serve their educational needs. The USDOE should conduct a nationwide census on the numbers of homeless children and youths (Duffield & James, 1999). Local units of government should also conduct counts, especially since local communities are better able to identify more of the places where people live literally outside (NCH, 2001b). In addition, local geographic areas need to conduct their own studies as homelessness varies greatly within different locations, and changes over time (Burt, 1998).

Table 4 presents the data that was submitted by the NJDOE to the USDOE to be compiled into the McKinney mandated reports to Congress. Despite large numbers of homeless youths, few municipalities have secured McKinney subgrants, very few homeless preschoolers are enrolled in educational programs, and many homeless students attend school irregularly.

Homeless adolescents present unique challenges in both identification and education. Ringwalt, Greene, Robertson, and Pheeters (1998) investigated the annual prevalence of homelessness among adolescents derived from a nationally representative household survey of 6,496 respondents between the ages of 12 and 17. Their results were that 7.6% of the sample reported a homeless episode. This suggests that 1 in 13 adolescents have a bout with homelessness in the course of a year. This estimate is considered lower bound as it is based on self-reported retrospective data that is subject to recall bias and underreporting because of social stigma.
Table 4


**HOMELESS CHILDREN AND YOUTHS BY GRADE LEVEL – ESTIMATED TOTALS, NUMBERS ENROLLED, AND ATTENDING REGULARLY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School grade</th>
<th>Estimated</th>
<th>Enrolled</th>
<th>Attending regularly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-K</td>
<td>1,626</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>2,269</td>
<td>1,944</td>
<td>1,029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior High School</td>
<td>790</td>
<td>779</td>
<td>315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>676</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5,361</td>
<td>3,464</td>
<td>1,690</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PRIMARY NIGHT TIME RESIDENCE OF HOMELESS CHILDREN AND YOUTHS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of residence</th>
<th>Number attending</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shelters</td>
<td>6,435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doubled-up</td>
<td>1,064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsheltered</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (motels, etc.)</td>
<td>8,940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>16,515</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCIES WITH THE GREATEST NUMBER OF HOMELESS CHILDREN AND YOUTHS, INCLUDING PRESchoolers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of LEA</th>
<th>Number of Homeless</th>
<th>LEA Classification</th>
<th>McKinney Subgrants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Newark</td>
<td>567</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trenton</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>52,994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Orange</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>66,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridgeton</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Branch</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCIES IN WHICH THE GREATEST PERCENTAGE OF HOMELESS YOUTHS RESIDE RELATIVE TO THE TOTAL NUMBER OF YOUTHS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of LEA</th>
<th>% of Homeless Youths vs. Total Youths</th>
<th>LEA Classification</th>
<th>McKinney Subgrants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bridgeton</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Branch</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seaside Heights</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>suburban / resort</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*will receive $80,000 in 2000-2001 school year

Currently in NJ, it is estimated that as many as 13,000 youths aged 12-18 experience homelessness each year, and of the 800 who annually age out of the Division of Youth and Family Services (DYFS) programs, many experience subsequent episodes of homelessness (DiFrancesco, 2001). These statistics do not include the homeless youths in foster care and some group homes. For the adolescent age group, the demand for services, programs, and transitional living beds significantly exceeds availability in some counties (DiFrancesco, 2001). Often times, shelters do not accept families with older children, particularly adolescent boys, who are seen as disruptive to other residents (CDF, 1988; U.S. Conference of Mayors, 1987).

Homeless adolescents are invisible to shelter prevalence counting methods. Only one third of homeless youths are in shelters, others are in doubled up situations, cars, campgrounds, outdoors, or other accommodations (Rafferty, 2000). The educational services that exist are designed for younger homeless children, while teenage homeless youths are for the most part ignored (Powers & Jaklitsch, 1993). Many adolescents are functioning in adult roles before they are developmentally ready, especially if they are left to care for younger siblings (Reganick, 1997). Other problems unique to the education of homeless adolescents are presented later in the educational issues section of this literature review.

Some data from national studies are available on the extent of homelessness and the education of homeless youths in NJ. Table 5 data presents a profile of one NJ city, Trenton, as studied by the U.S. Conference of Mayors (2000, 2001). For the past 2 years, the data present a picture of an increasing and unmet need for services among the homeless population. Trenton is an Abbott school district.

Table 6 and Table 7 present profiles of two NJ cities, Trenton and Newark, respectively, as studied by Nunez (2000). This research profiled 30 cities, including
### Table 5

**U.S. Conference of Mayors, Profile of Trenton, New Jersey, 2000 and 2001 Data.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Question</th>
<th>2000 (1)</th>
<th>2001 (2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hunger:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent requesting emergency food assistance as members of family with children</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City data on homelessness:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent increase in request by families for emergency shelter</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family break-up for shelter</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family leave shelter during day</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McKinney Funds Used to Support Homeless Services</td>
<td>$206,000</td>
<td>$136,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelter beds:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Beds</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family shelter beds</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family transitional units</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing requests</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wait in Months</td>
<td>Increased</td>
<td>Increased</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stopped accepting Sec. 8 applications</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of need met</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Trenton and Newark, NJ. Newark is an Abbott school district. In the nationwide Nunez (2000) research, almost 2,000 families with more than 4,000 children were surveyed by the ICP to assess the state of homeless children across America. In this large-scale study, data were gathered from 200 organizations in 24 locations.

This section has quantified homelessness and described the profile of the homeless population. There are discrepancies in attempts to count the numbers of homeless correct persons due to definitional and methodological variables, and rather than hinge on exactly
Table 6


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TRENTON, NEW JERSEY</th>
<th>Homless Child Demographics, N=191</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Homless Parent Demographics, N=60</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sex</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (Mean 6.4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Age (Mean 29)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;5</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-17</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race / Ethnicity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong># of times homeless</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twice or more</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Health and Nutrition</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have asthma</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sick more often since homeless</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not eat enough</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Emotional impact of homeless</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angry and aggressive</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fearful and anxious</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depressed and sad</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative comparison</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stayed the same</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Violence</strong></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Abandoned building / street camp</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Witnessed domestic violence</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Witnessed community violence</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experienced youth violence</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Couldn't pay rent / evicted</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education (Children ages 5-17)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currently enrolled in school</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Domestic violence</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graded PreK</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Substandard housing</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kindergarten</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>Transferred from another shelter</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grades 1-4</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Length of time homeless in months</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grades 7-12</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>(mean 8.5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attended preschool or Head Start</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td># of times homeless</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In special education classes</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Current receiving</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taunted for being homeless</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Currently receiving</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repeated a grade</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>TANF</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changed schools in last year</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Food stamps</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of changes (Mean 1.2)</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>Impacts of reductions</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>TANF Reduced in last year</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twice or more</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Impacts of reductions</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average # of years of school in last year</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>TANF Reduced in last year</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasons for missing school illness</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Impacts of reductions</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problems enrolling</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Rate of rehospitalization</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stress of homelessness</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>TANF Reduced in last year</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No transportation</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>Impacts of reductions</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child too tired or refused</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>TANF Reduced in last year</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of school supplies</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Social indicators</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple reasons</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>History of foster care as a child</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>History of substance abuse</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NEWARK, NEW JERSEY</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>NEWARK, NEW JERSEY</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Housing Child Demographics, N=29</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Housing Parent Demographics, N=64</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sex</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Sex</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (Mean 6.6)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Age (Mean 29)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;5</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>&lt;5</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-17</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race / Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>93</td>
<td># of children (Mean 2.6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>One</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Two</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Three or more</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Education level</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of times homeless</td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt; high school</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ever</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twice or more</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Annual income (median $10,920)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Health and Nutrition</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have asthma</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sick more often among homeless</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>More than 6 months</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not eat enough</td>
<td>23</td>
<td># of residences in last year (mean 2.5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ever less than homeless</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>One</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional impact of homeless</td>
<td></td>
<td>Two or three</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angry and aggressive</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Four or more</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fearful and anxious</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Last place of residence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depressed and sad</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Own apartment or house</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative combination</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Family or friends</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Served the same</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>Welfare on hold or motel</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cares and support</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>A shelter</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Violence</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Shack / shanty / trailer</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Witnessed domestic violence</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>Abandoned building / streets / car / campground</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Witnessed community violence</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Reasons left last residence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experienced youth violence</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Couldn't pay rent / evicted</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education (Children age 5-17)</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>Overcrowded / displacement</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currently enrolled in school</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>Domestic violence</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grade</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Substandard housing</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-school</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Transferred from another school</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kindergarten</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Length of time homeless in months</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grades 1 - 6</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>(mean 2.5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grades 7 - 12</td>
<td>18</td>
<td># of times homeless</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attended preschool or Head Start</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>Once</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In special education classes</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Twice or more</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treated for being homeless</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Public assistance history</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repeated a grade</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Length of time on TANF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changed schools in last year</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>(as a result of homelessness)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of changes (Mean 1.2)</td>
<td></td>
<td>&gt; 2 years</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>&lt; 2 years</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twice or more</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missed &gt; 4 weeks of school in last year</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Currently receiving</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missed &gt; 2 weeks of school in last year</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>TANF</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reason for missing school</td>
<td></td>
<td>Food stamps</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illness</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Medicaid</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problems enrolling</td>
<td></td>
<td>TANF reduced in last year</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of homelessness</td>
<td></td>
<td>Impacts of incarceration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No transportation</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Recruit homeless</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child too ill or disabled</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Put child in limbo care</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of school supplies</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Social indicators</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple reasons</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>History of foster care as a child</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>History of mistreatment</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


correct numbers, assume that the numbers are too large (Jones et al., 1991). The composition of the homeless population will vary by geographic area, and also by the
venues from which data are assembled (Burt, 1998).

The case is strong that there are many homeless families with school-age children, whose numbers are growing, and great numbers of homeless unaccompanied adolescents, who are not being identified for social services or school enrollment. The challenges inherent in forming school partnerships with the adult homeless population are apparent. The following section will build the legal framework under which homeless youths are entitled to a quality public education.

Legal Framework

This section presents the legal framework by which homeless youths are entitled to a quality public education. This legal framework is supported through a combination of federal, state, and judicial law. Local policies and special programs for homeless youths are also presented. Education administrators are ultimately responsible for a familiarity with the legislation that guides public education. Adequate communication from program developers is essential for successful implementation of legislation. This knowledge should be used to guide policies and practices that implement governmental mandates.

According to the 10th Amendment of the United States Constitution, free public education is governed by each individual state, and according to the 14th Amendment, persons are guaranteed equal protection under the law. The NJ State Constitution provides for a thorough and efficient free public education. As was the case with the education of handicapped children, the early efforts of advocates for homeless youths involved public schools allowing access, but mere access was soon found to be insufficient to the ultimate goal of school success (Helm, 1993).
Americans emphasize equity in educational practices, but many practices need to be adjusted to the greater or lesser needs of certain children (Scherer, 1992-1993). For equity to exist for homeless youths, a wide range of needed special services must exist (Stronge, 1993b). Education administrators need an increased consciousness of their moral obligation to homeless students. McKinney does not guarantee an education for homeless youths, it only guarantees that funds will be available for education administrators to access for the implementation of federal policies.

In the 1980's, the growing numbers of homeless people brought increased public pressure for the federal government to respond. As a result, the Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Act of 1987 (Public Law 100-77) was passed to provide comprehensive federal assistance to homeless persons. It was named after the death of its chief Republican sponsor, Representative Stewart B. McKinney of Connecticut. The Education for Homeless Children and Youths (EHCY) program was enacted as Subtitle VII-B of this act, and included measures that required states to identify and remove the barriers of residency requirements that prevented homeless youths from school enrollment and from receiving a FAPE.

On October 30, 2000, President William J. Clinton signed legislation (Public Law 106-400) to rename the Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Act, the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act. This was done to honor the passing of Representative Bruce Vento (D-MN), a leading voice for education and social justice on Capitol Hill. Subtitle VII-B (Education for Homeless Children and Youths or EHCY) of this legislation, as reauthorized in 2001, is included as Appendix A of this dissertation.

The EHCY program is administered through the USDOE Office of Elementary and
Secondary Education, and through the NJDOE Office of Specialized Programs. The mandates of this act also include that school administrators in each state develop a plan for the education of homeless youths, establish an office for a coordinator of services, and collect data on the number and needs of homeless youths. The act defined for the states the educational rights of homeless children, and represents a uniform national policy for the education of homeless youths. Currently, all 50 states (not the District of Columbia) participate in the EHCY program.

The McKinney Amendment of 1990 (Public Law 101-645) provided several new directives for the public education of homeless youths. The list of access barriers was expanded and now states were required to address problems imposed by transportation issues, enrollment delays, immunization requirements, residency requirements, lack of birth certificates, lack of school records, lack of any other documentation, and guardianship issues. The new Amendment also addressed barriers that affected school success, in addition to access barriers, that should be removed. In order to promote school success, interagency support should be coordinated by state and local school districts. The Amendment expressly permitted the use of funds for direct educational services, such as, tutoring and remedial education. Direct educational services also included related activities, such as, staff development, preschool programs, parent education, and after school programs.

Homeless youths should be mainstreamed into public school classrooms. The 1990 Amendment reemphasized the original mandate that a public school education is a legal right preferable to shelter schools or the many other illegal separate facilities for homeless youths that are starting to emerge nationwide. The controversies surrounding segregated
schools for homeless youths are detailed later in this literature review. State Departments of Education are required by McKinney mandates to assure that homeless children are not isolated or stigmatized.

The McKinney Amendment of 1990 expanded the role for state departments of education to include: reviewing the adequacy of state plans, determining the best means by which to identify and count homeless youths, and providing assistance to local education agencies. The McKinney Amendment of 1990 also clarifies two points of the original McKinney Act that intend to increase the continuity of educational services for homeless youths. It was emphasized that enrollment into either the original school district or the school district where the homeless student currently resides should be the choice of the parent, and transportation should be a comparable service due to homeless youths.

In 1994, the EHCY program was reauthorized for a period of 5 years as a part of the Improving America's Schools Act (IASA) of 1994 (Public Law 103-382), along with ESEA Title I and other educational programs. The 1994 program authorizations expired September 31, 1999, but continued until 2001 under their existing authority. The Amendment extended services to homeless preschoolers, and schools on sectarian property. The Amendment also expanded services to homeless youths by granting greater flexibility in spending to the states. Flexibility was accomplished by allowing states to incorporate McKinney requirements into consolidated state plans with other eligible federal programs, such as, Title I Compensatory Education of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (1965, 1994). This Amendment created greater emphasis for increased student outcomes, increased coordination with other services, and
increased evaluation of McKinney program outcomes (Reed-Victor & Stronge, 1997).

On January 8th, 2002, President George W. Bush signed into law the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act of 2001 (Public Law 107-110); legislation intended to promote educational excellence for all students in America. Overall, this legislation is intended to close the performance gap between students in rich versus poor area schools. The No Child Left Behind legislation reauthorizes ESEA Title I and other federal education programs, including the EHCY program, and is effective as of July 1, 2002. The policy revisions will be implemented for the first time in the 2002-2003 school year. Reauthorization is important because it provides the opportunity to make changes that strengthen and clarify the existing law.

Notable changes to McKinney included certain exceptions to the prohibition of segregated schools for homeless students. The Amendment names several counties in California and Arizona that are exempt from the prohibition regarding segregation, and this is addressed in a greater detail later in this review of related literature. As amended in 2001, McKinney also clarified the definition of homelessness, and elaborated on the processes that should be used to resolve enrollment disputes. The new legislation also describes methods by which local education agencies can manage the costs of tutoring and transportation for homeless youths.

Critics of the federal response to the education of homeless youths suggest several areas of shortcomings. Lack of leadership at the federal level has been translated into inadequate implementation at the local level, and state plans may be submitted, but not actually implemented (Friedman, 1991). McKinney is neither written nor sufficiently funded to be regulatory or seriously enforced, which causes state officials to be reluctant
to comply (Christensen, 1994). The USDOE’s monitoring of McKinney should include field visits to education agencies in order to ensure compliance (Nichols-Pierce, 1992). Standards and indicators to assess the quality of McKinney programs were not proposed until 15 years after its enactment (National Center for Homeless Education, 2002).

Recommendations for improving the situation of homeless children and youths should also include continued maintenance of more specific federal statutes that directly address the educational needs of homeless youths (Duffield & James, 1999). The policies defined in the McKinney legislation have been unevenly applied and implemented, and a lack of awareness of the issues associated with homelessness explains the frequently nonexistent policies at the local level of education (Stronge & Popp, 1998). Local school districts have the capacities to lessen many of the problems associated with homelessness, however, they need to use their resources more effectively to ensure a quality education for homeless youths (Mahoney, 1998).

McKinney required each state to designate a state-level coordinator to administer the EHCY program. In the 1997-1998 school year most states still did not designate a full time homeless state coordinator and where state coordinators do exist, many spend only a fraction of their time facilitating homeless programs (Duffield & James, 1999). McKinney fully describes the functions that the state coordinator should perform, including providing information and technical assistance to local education agencies.

McKinney required state coordinators to conduct an estimate of homeless children and youths annually, and to submit this data to the USDOE to be compiled into a report to Congress due every 3 years. When McKinney was reauthorized in 1990, Congress eliminated the requirement that states report annually on the actual numbers of homeless
youths, and instead required states to provide biennial numbers. When McKinney was reauthorized in 1994, Congress eliminated the requirement that states report on the actual numbers of homeless youths, and instead required states to provide estimates. State coordinators report the three most difficult mandates to implement as gathering data on the number of homeless youths, maintenance of school records, and the placement of students in original school districts versus districts close to shelters (Baltimore, 1991).

Very few local districts have appointed homeless liaisons. According to the original provisions of McKinney, local school districts that applied for McKinney grants were required to assign a homeless liaison. As reauthorized in 2001, all local education agencies are required to appoint a district-level homeless liaison. In NJ, Administrative Code 6A: 17-2.5 requires all local districts to appoint a homeless liaison. Local districts are deficient in creating specific policies for homeless youths; one state surveyed 92% of its school districts and found that less than half had any policy related to the enrollment of homeless youths (Stronge & Popp, 1998).

The McKinney Act and its Amendments make no specific mention of children with disabilities who are homeless. Youths with disabilities are guaranteed the right to a FAPE under other federal legislation. Congress passed the Education for all Handicapped Children Act (EHCA) of 1975 (Public Law 94-142), which was later amended as the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) of 1990 (Public Law105-17), to grant educational rights to youths with disabilities. Although homeless youths were always covered by this legislation, they were not explicitly mentioned until the final regulations for the 1997 amendments to Public Law105-17, which were issued in March of 1999. For homeless students who qualify, this legislation expands the age of eligibility for
school services from 3 to 21 years. Students receiving services under this act are entitled to individual educational plans and a wide array of other services.

Disabilities are to be expected among youths that are homeless, just as they exist among the housed student population. Homelessness compounds the challenges presented by disabilities creating a unique, and even more challenging, population of special needs students (Walther-Thomas, Korinek, McLaughlin, & Williams, 1996). Many legal definitions of disabilities contain criteria (such as persistence over time or not due to environmental deficits) that sometimes make it difficult for homeless students to qualify for services under these categories (Walther-Thomas et al., 1996). Providing special services for homeless students with disabilities presents a formidable challenge to public schools, and requires skilled leadership to assist this special population.

In addition, homeless youths are eligible for educational services under Title I, Part A, of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) of 1965 (Public Law 89-10) by virtue of their homelessness alone, whether or not they live in a Title I school attendance area. Any state desiring to receive funding must submit a plan to the USDOE that is coordinated with McKinney. Local education agencies must reserve Title I funds to serve eligible students who do not attend participating schools, including providing services to homeless youths in shelters. Homeless students may receive such services in schools, shelters, or other outside facilities. These funds can be used for basic medical equipment, compensation of a coordinator, professional development, and awareness raising campaigns to further assist in meeting the needs of homeless youths. Title I funds can also be used to meet the basic needs of homeless students, such as, health care services, school supplies, and clothing.
Regarding the schooling of disadvantaged children, increased research on the degree of special services provided is needed. Also needed are improvements in program evaluation processes that provide immediate interventions aimed at increasing school success for disadvantaged youths (Natriello, McDill, & Pallas, 1990). Homeless children and youths may participate in other Title I opportunities, such as, the Reading is Fundamental Program, the Learning Doll Project, and library programs and services.

Also by virtue of their poverty status, homeless youths are entitled to special programs offered under other federal legislation. Although they are not specifically named, homeless youths are eligible for services under the following federal education legislation: National School Lunch Act of 1946 (Public Law 79-396), School Milk Program of 1954 (Public Law 83-597), the Civil Rights Act of 1964, (Public Law 88-352), and others.

Based on demographic data gathered by the NCES and NCHS, juveniles represent 70.2 million Americans, or 26% of the population, thus one in four people is under age 18 (Snyder & Sickmund, 1999). For both homeless and housed juveniles, one in five live in poverty, and both are more likely to live in poverty today than 20 years ago (Snyder & Sickmund, 1999). Homeless adolescents are a largely invisible population often exploited by adults or turning to delinquency as a way to survive on the streets. It is in the best interest of society to establish a support network geared specifically towards this population, including outreach programs, through additional legislation and funding (N.J. Homeless Youth Act, 1999). Apart from the McKinney programs, the government, through the Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS), funds programs that target unaccompanied homeless youths.
McKinney required states to remove all enrollment barriers and develop a plan for the education of homeless youths. The state of NJ responded to the McKinney legislation by: establishing a state program for the education of homeless youths in 1988, by developing a revised state plan in 1995, by developing a statewide survey for school districts to collect data on homeless youths, and by adopting amendments to NJ education laws. N.J.A.C. Chapter 6:5 established statewide policies and procedures for providing homeless youths access to an appropriate public education. This statute was later revised as N.J.A.C. Chapter 17, Students at Risk of Not Receiving a Public Education. This legislation, specific to the education of homeless youths in NJ, is included as Appendix B of this dissertation.

The State of New Jersey Department of Education (NJDOE, 2000) published a reference pamphlet designed to assist educators local in implementing state statutes and in developing policies to comply with the laws pertaining to homeless youths. The pamphlet addressed guidelines for the following legislative mandates: responsibilities of the district of residence, responsibilities of the district liaison, educational placement, disputes and appeals, tuition, transportation, and evaluation procedures for compliance (NJDOE, 2000). Available through the Office of Specialized Populations, this pamphlet represents much needed positive progress in increasing awareness of the special concerns of homeless youths. In several other states, school officials have developed similar instructional guides.

New Jersey progress with the implementation of McKinney can be gauged against other states. Pennsylvania, which borders NJ, was one of the first states to develop a state plan and initiate McKinney EHCY programs. The Pennsylvania Department of
Education (PADOE) estimated that Pennsylvania has many as 25,000 homeless children (birth to age 18) per year (PADOE, 2002). Based on 1998-1999 end-of-year school program reports, 13 sites linked with 137 school districts served 6,104 school-age homeless children, and 1,112 homeless preschoolers (PADOE, 2002). Every school district in Pennsylvania has voluntarily designated a homeless contact person in each district. The main strategy of the PADOE is capacity building through collaboration with outside agencies. Specific activities include using computer-tracking systems, providing tutoring programs, ensuring transportation services, and a case management approach.

In Missouri, school personnel developed a state plan and implemented McKinney EHCY programs. The Missouri Department of Education (MIDOE) conducted a census study of their state’s EHCY program in 2000, reporting that 13,831 (79%) homeless children and youths were regularly attending schools, out of the total 17,527 in the state (MIDOE, 2002). Of the estimated 5,668 homeless preschoolers in the state, 999 (17%) were enrolled in preschool programs. The most frequently cited barriers identified in the Missouri study included a lack of available preschool programs and a lack of personal records for homeless youths.

In 1988, Arizona developed a state plan and presently has many exemplary programs operating to assist the public school systems in the state to absorb homeless students (Stark, 2000). The segregated Thomas J Pappas School in Arizona recently has gained national attention due to a lawsuit that was filed to close it down. The debate over the value of segregated schools is addressed in the educational issues section of this literature review. Wisconsin also has a very comprehensive state plan (Nichols-Pierce, 1992). Most state programs are in their first decade of operation (Ernst, 1995). It is worthwhile
for states to consider the policies and practices of other states, given the large numbers of homeless youths, and the newness of having so many homeless students in our schools.

Education administrators should provide legal knowledge and promote sensitivity regarding homelessness among all school staff. Only two states, Illinois and Iowa, have state-level legal versions of McKinney (Rafferty, 2000; Stronge & Popp, 1998). When Illinois passed its Education for Homeless Children Act in 1994, homelessness was at a crisis level, and there were more than 35,000 school-age homeless children in the state. Even when legislation does exist, a lack of awareness of the conditions surrounding homelessness still poses problems for educators (Rafferty, 2000). There is a continued need to monitor implementation of this legal framework. Bureaucratic obstacles are compounded by poor communication, and both factors impede opportunities for sharing the resources, knowledge, and skills needed to assist homeless students (Walther-Thomas et al., 1996).

In addition to state and federal legislation, the education of homeless youths is guided by judicial decisions. The U.S. Supreme Court decision in Brown v. the Board of Education of Topeka, Kansas (1954) ruled that separate educational facilities are inherently unequal. Although this case fought racial discrimination, the decision set a precedent applicable to other special populations and oppressed groups. Homeless youths have the right to a mainstream public education, as specifically emphasized in the McKinney legislation. Controversy related to the illegal practice of maintaining separate schools for the homeless will be discussed later in the educational issues section of this literature review, as are the issues of social stigma.

Another pertinent lawsuit is Abbott v. Burke, which is actually a series of eight New
Jersey Supreme Court decisions reached over the last two decades. In 1981, the Education Law Center (ELC) filed this suit against the state of NJ on behalf of disadvantaged urban students. In 1985, the plaintiffs proved that economically disadvantaged students begin school 2 years behind the achievement levels of their suburban peers. Abbott v. Burke provides the legal framework for: funding at parity with suburban schools in order to assure high quality education, funding for special programs such as preschool, funding for school building improvements, and standards based teaching reforms.

In 1990, the Abbott II decision declared that the education system in the state of NJ did not achieve parity, and remained unconstitutional for 30 urban school districts. These districts were determined using the DFG designation system discussed in Chapter III. The Abbott districts in NJ and their DFG designations are presented as Appendix C of this dissertation. These districts are included in the sample used for this research. Recognizing the gross inequities of educational programs, the New Jersey Supreme Court ordered that remedial measure be taken. In 1994 by a later Abbott decision, the state provided funding for preschool to Abbott districts and to 98 other districts serving disadvantaged youths. By 1997, Abbott IV declared the preschool funding unconstitutional as the state failed to establish adequacy of such funding. In 1998, the Abbott V decision ordered and defined well-planned, high quality preschool, and once again mandated compliance.

With the 1998 Abbott decision, the NJ Supreme Court mandated the Abbott districts to implement the NJ Whole School Reform initiative, a school reform model. Compliance with this initiative was studied in its first year of implementation by a survey
of 22 (79%) of Abbott districts (Walker & Gutmore, 2000). A lack of information from
the NJDOE, and other problems associated with the flow of information, presented
substantial implementation barriers. In the Walker and Gutmore study (2000), the Abbott
districts also reported that the overall relationship with the USDOE thwarted
implementation. Historically, the USDOE has had a regulatory (as opposed to a
collaborative) role regarding the implementation of mandates, which is not conducive to
positive progress. This research will assess the degree of similar attitudes at the local
level of education regarding the implementation of McKinney mandates.

The state still failed to implement preschool as ordered by the court, and in 2000, the
Abbott VI decision re-directed the state to implement Abbott V by further detailing the
meaning of high quality preschool. Litigation continued with Abbott VII (2000), Abbott
VIII (2002), and as of this writing, litigation to compel state compliance with the Abbott
mandates continues. In February of 2002, NJ Governor James McGreevey created the
Abbott Implementation and Compliance Coordinating Council. This council includes
state education officials and members of the ELC. Only 42% of low-income children
between ages 3 and 5 are in preschool programs, as compared with 65% of high-income
children (CDF, 2000).

The richest school districts still spend 56% more per student than do the poorest
school districts (CDF, 2000). The CDF (2000) also reports great racial disparity in
education, and homeless students who are Black, Latino or Native American remain
much less likely to succeed in school. The education of homeless youths also parallels
the previous development of educational equity for other groups of children, such as,
those who are migrants or aliens (First & Cooper, 1989).
This section has presented the federal, state, and judicial legal framework by which homeless youths are entitled to a FAPE. Education administrators should be familiar with the legislative struggles experienced by homeless youths in order to serve this special population better (Somerindyke, 2000). Studies of McKinney implementation progress, and the adequacy of McKinney funding, are presented later in this literature review.

The next section presents research regarding the conditions of homelessness and their impact on the education of homeless youths. The increase in policies to accommodate homeless youths has not been commensurate with the increase in the numbers of homeless youths (First & Oakley, 1993; U.S. Conference of Mayors, 2001). There are great gaps in the research on homelessness, and there are exists many well-documented areas of the unmet programmatic need for homeless youths (Jones et al., 1991).

Educational Issues

This section presents educational issues related to homeless youths at both the macro level of society and the micro level of the individual. In addition, the conditions of homelessness are discussed as they relate to the physical, emotional, social and psychological well being of homeless youths. The impact of high levels of mobility, the structure of the homeless family, and the characteristics of homeless parents, as they affect educational efforts, are discussed.

Barriers to school access and success are presented. Attendance, achievement, developmental delays, social, emotional, behavioral, and psychological problems, access to special services, treatment rates, and the digital divide are some of the variables
addressed. Special programs for preschoolers, classroom practices, and program designs created by districts specifically to serve the needs of homeless youths are reviewed. Potential solutions that exist are considered by an analysis of staff development programs, collaboration with shelters, integrated community support, and interagency consolidated efforts. Controversies related to the illegal practice of segregation are discussed. The stereotypical perceptions of the public, schools, teachers, and fellow students are addressed. The self-perception of homeless youths is also considered.

The education of homeless youths exists in the greater milieu of American culture. Societal conditions may influence students’ schooling outcomes more than does education, and related to economic disparities, children are worse off today than they were in the past (Achilles & Mitchell, 2001-2002). Homelessness impacts students in ways that affect their ability to enroll, attend, and succeed in school. Education administrators should research (and address) the special educational and developmental needs of homeless youths proactively. High levels of failure among America’s youngest and most economically disadvantaged students suggest that education administrators must create educational settings that can help economically disadvantaged students benefit from the educational opportunities to which they have a legal right (Achilles & Mitchell, 2001-2002).

With abject poverty comes a constellation of risk factors that compound each other to have a devastating impact on well being (Rafferty & Shinn, 1991). Successful school participation is fundamental to improving adult outcomes for homeless youths (Reed-Victor & Pelco, 1999). The better educated a person is, the more likely that person is to report being in very good to excellent health, regardless of true health status or level of
income (Condition of Education, USDOE, 2001, Indicator No. 17). Academic success is essential to breaking the grips of poverty, but social and psychological needs may be more immediately pressing for homeless youths. Counseling services and the development of social skills may first need to be addressed (Stronge, 1993b). Educators should rethink their role as solely education providers, and both school and community personnel should be empowered to assume collective responsibility for homeless youths (Quint, 1993). If both health and academic problems of homeless youths are not treated during their developing years, the ill effects may be irreversible, and consequently, homeless children are robbed of the chance for adult success (Strawser, Markos, Yamaguchi, & Higgins, 2000).

Homelessness makes learning difficult for homeless youths. Homeless youths are under great stress, lack sufficient sleep, and are hungry, factors that contribute to difficulties in concentration (Beach, 1996). Proper nutrition is required for maximal cognition, and hunger remains a barrier to educating homeless youths. One out of every five homeless children (19%) does not eat enough, a rate nearly four and a half times that of all children nationwide (Nunez, 2000). Fourteen percent of homeless mothers report that their children go hungry because they have no food at all, and 37% report having to skip meals (BHF, 1999).

Homeless children do not have the necessary requirements to ensure that their physical development will proceed normally (Eddowes, 1993). Associated with abject poverty in the early years of life are some risks to brain development. The window of optimal brain development is from the prenatal period to the first year of a child's life (Shore, 1997). Research on the developmental effects of homelessness on infants and toddlers suggests
that the ill effects accumulate over time, and become more severe in later years (Garcia-Coll, Buckner, Brooks, Weinreb, & Bassuk, 1998).

Homeless children suffer from poor health more often than do their housed peers, and 40% have two or more major illnesses within a given year (BHF, 1999). Homelessness literally makes children sick. From infancy through childhood they have substantially higher levels of both acute and chronic illnesses, and also stress related psychosomatic symptoms such as headaches and sleeping problems (BHF, 1999). In the first study of its kind, Weinreb, Goldberg, Bassuk and Perloff (1998) researched the extent to which homelessness independently predicts poor health outcomes. Their findings highlight the adverse impact of homelessness on children’s health, and the need for early preventative interventions.

Homeless youths experience many stressful events. The death of a friend or imprisonment of a parent, are common events that homeless youths experience (Buckner, Bassuck, Weinreb, & Brooks, 1999). Within a single year, 22% are sent to live with someone else, 25% have witnessed acts of violence within their family, 30% are evicted from their homes, 68% have attended two or more schools, and 97% move, some up to three times (BHF, 1999). Buckner and Bassuk (1997) reported that 39% of homeless youths had witnessed some form of violence at home or in the community within the previous year. The conditions of homelessness make homeless youths unable to develop the trust necessary for normal emotional development (Eddowes, 1993).

Violence is present in the lives of homeless youths: 15% have seen their father hit their mother and 11% have seen their mother abused by a male partner (BHF, 1999). Exposure to violence is associated with cognitive, social, and emotional effects, which
may manifest in the classroom as learned helplessness and poor performance (Craig, 1992). Homeless children are physically abused at twice the rate of other children, sexually abused at three times the rate of other children, and 35% have been investigated by child protection agencies (BHF, 1999). Homelessness is only one of the many extreme stressors facing poverty-stricken children.

The nature of the homeless family itself presents barriers to the education of homeless youths. The presence of disorganization, dysfunction, mental illness, substance abuse problems, lack of parental motivation, and low education levels of parents are all prevalent factors (Strawser, et al., 2000). Homeless youths lack positive parent-child relationships, as the stresses of poverty consume the resources of their parents, leaving little time to nurture young children (Achilles & Mitchel, 2001-2002). Homeless parents are consumed with tasks of daily survival, and are often uninformed of their children’s rights or of the resources available to them (Stronge & Helm, 1991).

The NLCHP (Ernst, 1995) found that 45.5% of shelter providers (N=110) reported that parents are not being informed about the educational rights of their children and that school officials make the decisions regarding school placement of homeless youths. Only 12.7% of parents reported being well informed of their children’s rights. Federal funds are not adequate to inform the public and ensure compliance in most school districts, and school districts do not understand their obligations to assist homeless students (Chaddock, 1998).

Disputes may arise over school enrollment or selection, and students should be enrolled immediately in their school of choice, and remain in school, while disputes are being resolved. Homeless parents are frequently unaware that a grievance process exists,
or how to use it (Biggert, 2000). Duffield and James (1999) recommended that simple educational information for homeless parents should be posted at shelters. Education administrators should disseminate information at shelters and into the community regarding the rights of homeless students.

Shelter programs may present obstacles to educating homeless youths: school placements are made without regard to community ties or educational continuity, shelter transfers mean new schools and the loss of valuable school days, noisy environments make sleep difficult, and rarely do shelters provide quiet places to do homework (Rafferty, 1997-1998). Limited information exists regarding the processes involved in creating and maintaining shelters (Hartnett, 2000). Many shelters are staffed by untrained volunteers who suddenly become counselors, referees, nurses, parents, educators, and advocates (Peifer, 1999). The scarcity of environmental print and the lack of structure in shelters prove to be lost opportunities for the development of literacy in homeless youths (Warsi, 2000). Shelter personnel could benefit from collaboration with educators to thereby improve services.

Shelters may also contribute to other problems experienced by homeless youths. Often times, they are overcrowded, unavailable, increase family separation, cause psychological destruction, and undermine parent roles (Reganick, 1997). Homelessness can break up families because of shelter policies, placement of children into foster care, or parents wanting to spare their children the ordeal of homelessness. In Maryland, 57% of homeless parents in shelters had children who were not with them; in New York City, 60% of homeless parents in shelters had children who were not with them; and in Chicago, 91% of a street and shelter sample of homeless parents did not have their
children with them (Shinn & Weitzman, 1996).

By age group, homeless youths who have lived apart from their families include 9% of infants and toddlers, 19% of children between 3 and 6 years old, and 34% of school-age children (BHF, 1999). Separation, an extremely traumatic event in a child’s life, is a common occurrence among homeless youths. It is typical for homeless youths to live in fractured families with only one parent present, or with one or more siblings placed in a temporary limbo care separated from their families. Nearly 1 in 10 homeless families has at least one child living in such limbo care (Nunez, 2000).

Although they are greatly challenged to provide for their children, homeless parents do not lack concern or aspirations for their children (Stronge & Hudson, 1999). Homeless parents love their children and want quality lives for them (McGee, 1996). Conversely, 95% of homeless youths worry about their parents, and 75% worry about their brothers and sisters (BHF, 1999). Certainly alleviating these anxieties are compelling and humane reasons to come to the assistance of students and families in homeless situations.

High family mobility and discontinuity in educational programs have negative effects on student success and academic achievement (Masten et al. 1997). To move once is a very traumatic change for any child; consider the fact that homeless youths move at a rate 16 times greater than that of the average American family (Bartlet, 1997). Nunez (2000) reports that 93% of families relocate at least once and 20% move three or more times. Each time a child changes schools, he or she loses 4 to 6 months of academic and developmental time; moving just twice a year can endanger a child’s long-term chance at success (Illinois Department of Education [ILDOE], 2001). Mobility issues should be addressed to increase continuity of educational services (Rafferty, 2000). Computerized
tracking systems could be used to follow the movements of homeless youths, to
coordinate the transfer of homeless children's records (including academic and health
records), and to increase the continuity of their educational programs (Goins & Cesarone,
1993). The national evaluation conducted by Anderson et al. (1995) reported family
mobility as the greatest barrier to school services for homeless youths. Mobility presents
both academic and social problems, and homeless youths have a difficult time
establishing stable friendships. Group learning activities or buddy pairing models
provide homeless students with an opportunity to interact with their peers, build social
skills, develop friendships, and enhance feelings of belonging (Yamaguchi, Strawser,
Markos & Higgins, 1997). Homeless youths may feel alienated by their peers as they are
unable to bring friends home after school, talk to them on the telephone, or join in
conversations about television programs.

High levels of mobility make enrollment projections difficult, and there is the risk of
unanticipated increases in class size. Current research indicates that small class sizes in
the early grades are important for academic achievement (Mosteller, 1995; Word et al.,
1990). Small class sizes can be especially beneficial for minority and low-income
students (Finn & Achilles, 1990). Other benefits of small class sizes include decreases in
grade retention, discipline problems, and dropout rates, and increases in graduation rates
(Achilles, 1999; Achilles, Finn, & Pate-Bain, 1997/1998). As the great numbers of young
homeless students are identified, the research on small class size should not be ignored.
In order to be effective, small class size must begin in the early grades, continue for
several years and occur in all classes (Achilles, Finn & Pate-Bain, 2002). To do so will
lessen the positive impact that schools can have to alleviate the plight of homeless youths.
To let unanticipated numbers of homeless students swell class sizes will have negative effects on achievement for all students. Education administrators need proactive systems for timely identification and enrollment of homeless youths, especially in the early grades.

Homelessness has profound effects on school attendance and one fifth of homeless youths do not attend school at all (BHF, 1999). In times of increased education accountability, administrators are concerned about performance measures. Attendance rates are typically used as a performance measure of accountability for schools. Reilly (1993) studied 28 New York City public schools with homeless populations of 5% or more, and found a significant negative relationship between attendance rates and the number of homeless students enrolled in the schools. Poor school attendance, and consequently lower academic achievement, are some negative effects of the transience of homelessness (Christensen, 1994). Low attendance rates mean that homeless youths may lack classroom-learning experiences, not intelligence, and they can be successful in school (Beach, 1996).

Attendance rates among homeless youths have little validity because of inconsistencies in how states define homeless, whether preschoolers are counted, and the inability of state coordinators to calculate them (Rafferty, 1999). The stigma attached to the general living conditions of homelessness may also reinforce nonattendance in school (Markward, 1994). Guardianship presents difficulties for school enrollment by unaccompanied homeless adolescents who cannot or will not contact their parents. Case managers at social service agencies may request to enroll the students as guardians, but without parental permission, the legal status of this option is questionable (Gracenin, 1994).
Greater measures need to be taken to assist with the education of homeless youths as indicated by their levels of achievement. Assuming decreased levels of achievement are the result of many school changes, increased absenteeism, and frequent repetition of grades, programs should be established to provide continuity of school services for homeless youths (Rubin & Erikson, 1996). Most homeless students read below grade level and score below grade level on mathematics ability testing; consequently, homeless youths on average are two or more years over age for their grade (Pawlas, 1994). The National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) conducted by the American Association of School Administrators (AASA) estimated the gap between high and low poverty schools to be four grade levels in reading and three grade levels in math (Holmes, 2001). Children at-risk begin kindergarten with markedly lower reading and mathematics skills than do more advantaged children, and this gap is growing, particularly for more advanced skills (USDOE & NCES, 2001). Residential instability is a major factor in the low-test scores, and other educational problems among homeless youths (Masten et al., 1997).

Homeless youths are twice as likely to repeat a grade (BHF, 1999). The likelihood of dropping out of school is near 100% for students who have been retained more than once (Shepard & Smith, 1989). Ninety percent of all high school dropouts can be predicted by the fourth grade: 81% of students with low behavior grades in the first, second or third grade will drop out of school; 72% of students with low academic grades first, second or third grade will drop out of school; 66% of students who missed 20 or more school days a year during the first, second or third grade will drop out of school (ILDOE, 2001). High school dropouts are more likely to be unemployed, to earn less when they are employed,
and are more likely to receive public assistance than do their housed peers. Although drop out rates for young adults declined as a group, the rate of this decline varied by ethnicity (USDOE & NCES, 2001). In 1999, 1.3 million teens between the ages of 16 and 19 were neither enrolled in school nor working; African-American and Hispanic youths were twice as likely as White youths to be idle (AECF, 2002a).

No study has looked at dropout rates for homeless children (Rafferty, 1997-1998). In high-poverty neighborhoods in large cities, one-fifth of 16-19 year olds are high school dropouts (AECF, 2002a). According to Annie E. Casey Foundation (2001), six percent of teenagers aged 16-19 in NJ are high school dropouts, as are ten percent nationally. Poor school attendance, lack of educational services, inadequate shelter, and instability are factors that exacerbate the educational underachievement of homeless youths (Rafferty & Shinn, 1991).

Progress has been made in removing residency barriers to school enrollment. Anderson et al. (1995) reported that school enrollment of homeless youths has increased to 86%. Less progress has been made in eliminating other barriers, such as, immunization, parental choice of school district, and transportation (Anderson et al., 1995; NCH, 1999e). Many homeless preschoolers are denied school access and homeless school-age students are forced to transfer into schools proximal to shelters because districts disregard the federal mandates on transportation pertaining to their education (Rafferty, 1998). Lack of funding continues to hinder the education of homeless youths. Sixty-three percent of the State Coordinators surveyed by the NCH (1997a) reported reducing services such as transportation, tutoring, purchase of school supplies, and the coordination of services for homeless youths. They also reported that because of funding
cuts, 41 local programs were eliminated, denying services to over 12,000 homeless youths. The amounts and adequacy of McKinney funding are discussed fully later in this review of related literature.

Homeless preschoolers experience developmental delays in their language, motor, and social skills (Bassuk & Rubin, 1987; Rescorla, Parker, & Stolley 1991). The poor prenatal care and lack of early stimulation associated with homelessness contribute to academic learning disabilities among homeless youths. When compared to housed children, homeless youths have four times the rate of developmental delays, twice the number of learning disabilities, twice the rate of school suspension, and three times as many behavioral and emotional problems (BHF, 1999).

Behavioral and emotional problems are associated with homelessness. Homeless preschoolers exhibit a high incidence of behavioral problems, such as shyness, withdrawal, aggression, short attention spans, regressive behaviors, sleep disorders, and immature motor behavior (Bassuk & Rubin, 1987; Kobinsky & Taylor, 1991; Rescorla et al., 1991). At least one fifth of homeless youths aged 3 to 6 years have behavioral and emotional problems severe enough to warrant professional care (BHF, 1999). Social problems are associated with homelessness. The prevalence of anti-social behavior among homeless youths is one detrimental effect of homelessness (Masten, 1992).

Homeless adolescents face educational barriers unique to their age group. They are prone to depression, low self-esteem, alcohol and or drug use, trouble with law enforcement officials, antisocial behavior, survival sex, pregnancy, prostitution, and sexually transmitted diseases (Kurtz, Jarvis, & Kurtz, 1991). Liability and safety concerns have led some schools to refuse to admit homeless adolescents (Strong & Popp,
Unaccompanied adolescents should be included in future studies of mental health among homeless populations (Buckner & Bassuk, 1997). Aggressive outreach programs characterized by easy access and integrated support systems for homeless adolescents are needed (Shane, 1996). With limited assistance, homeless adolescents become desperate; 26% of young people in emergency shelters and 32% of those on the street have made at least one suicide attempt (Alston, 1998).

Homeless children require many of the public school special services offered to housed children, such as school meals, special education, compensatory education, Limited English Proficiency (LEP) programs, programs for the gifted and talented, and before or after school programs. Educators may wait to find out if a child is staying in the district before investing in the assessment and placement process (Stronge, 1993b). Delayed testing, placement, and a lack of continuity in social services contribute to the lack of special services and school success for homeless youths (Helm, 1993).

The NLCHP reported that homeless youths were being denied access to these services in 55% of the states in its survey (Friedman & Christiansen, 1990). When homeless youths transfer into new schools, they often have difficulties accessing the services that they previously received due to problems with the transfer of records, and due to a general noncompliance with the law (Rafferty, 1997-1998). Certain services prescribed on Individual Education Programs (IEP) may not exist in transitional school settings, preventing homeless youths from receiving an appropriate education (Rafferty, 1999).

Despite these many well-documented problems, less than one third of homeless youths are being treated by a doctor, psychiatrist, psychologist, social worker, or other counselor (BHF, 1999). Homeless youths seldom receive the same educational services available to
their housed peers (Rafferty, 1999). Zima, Bussing, Forness, and Benjamin (1997) investigated the proportion of sheltered homeless children in Los Angeles, California, who were eligible for special education evaluations and the extent to which those needs were being met. Their results showed that 45% met criteria for special education evaluations, yet only 22% of those who met the criteria had ever received testing or placement. More than three fourths of the eligible homeless youths did not receive the services to which they are entitled under federal law. Buckner and Bassuk (1997) found that 32% of homeless and poor-housed youths in their sample had mental disorders, yet only 28% reported receiving mental health services.

These examples indicate high levels of unmet programmatic need among homeless youths. Timely, appropriate, and multi-disciplinary assessment is needed to address their special needs and to educate homeless students (Rafferty, 2000). Especially for homeless adolescents, discreet and sensitive emotional support can help defeat the stressors of homelessness (Vissing, Schroepfer, & Bloise, 1994). The cycle of homelessness can be interrupted by integrated and comprehensive programs and services (Nunez, 1994b).

Many existing programs would benefit homeless youths. The Head Start program, administered through the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS), is the federal government’s largest investment in early childhood services, serving 800,000 preschoolers in 1998 (USDOE, 1999). Head Start offers homeless preschoolers stability, structure, and guidance. Head Start can be effective in helping to solve many complex problems associated with homelessness (Koblinsky & Anderson, 1993).

Head Start offers the parents of homeless youths education, life skills and empowerment. It offers the entire family access to social service agencies and an
increased chance at well-being. In a study of homeless and low-income housed preschoolers, Bassuk, Weinreb, Dawson, Perloff & Buckner (1997) reported that the mother's emotional status is one of the strongest predictors of negative behavioral outcomes, which also supports the importance of early family-oriented interventions. For many homeless youths, their mother is the last bastion of stability in their chaotic lives. Head Start grantees report several impediments to serving homeless families, including program regulations, performance standards, project funding, and technical assistance (DHHS, 1998).

Approximately 42% of homeless youths are under age 5 (Burt et al., 1999), but only 21% of homeless children are enrolled in preschool programs which is less than half the rate of children nationally (USDOE, 1997). Many countries have recognized the importance of preschool, and several educate over 90% of preschool-age youths; the US, by educating 63% of preschool-age youths, ranks near the bottom of major industrialized nations (Johnson-Hunter, 1997). The previous statistics show that large numbers of students are not being served by our system of free public education.

In survey results from the National Law Center on Homelessness and Poverty (NLCHP), 30% of state coordinators estimated that few or no homeless children were enrolled in preschool (Johnson-Hunter, 1997). In their states, 70% of respondents were unable to estimate the number of homeless children eligible for preschool services, and 66% admitted that there were few reliable studies on the subject (Johnson-Hunter, 1997). Lack of data and lack of programs for preschoolers suggest noncompliance with the McKinney statutes.

Preschool waiting lists are incongruent with the nature of homelessness, and private
tuition is beyond the means of homeless parents (Stronge & Popp, 1998). Homeless preschoolers should receive immediate attention, especially considering what is known about critical periods of human development. Early childhood plays a critical role in creating a foundation for future learning; therefore, early intervention is greatly needed (Klein, Bittel, & Molnar, 1993). Attention to language, cognitive, and behavioral development is essential during a homeless child's early formative years (Yamaguchi et al., 1997).

Tutoring is often suggested to remediate the effects of homelessness; however, it must be instituted tactfully. In research conducted by Christensen (1994), homeless students who received tutorial services still did not meet with success. In this study, tutorial programs were found to increase defeatist attitudes and reduce the self-esteem of homeless youths. Tutorial programs can be effective, and tutoring programs are included under the special programs section of this literature review. A continued need for teacher sensitivity to the special needs of homeless youths is necessary, including provisions for the completion of homework (Eddowes, 1993).

Transient children require special and flexible educational strategies. Homeless youths benefit from individualized instruction, time in computer laboratories, tutoring, and remediation (Beck, Kratzer, & Isken, 1997). Reform efforts should include a focus on assisting learning environments to change their culture to include homeless youths. Schools must value what homeless youths bring to this environment, and their unique experiences must be considered as potential contributions (Beach, 1996). Educational strategies to integrate homeless students into the activities of their peers, and into the extracurricular activities of the school, should be employed (Linehan, 1992). Lack of
transportation often makes participation in extracurricular and social activities difficult for homeless youths.

The culture of both the school and classroom can lead to acceptance of homeless youths, and positively influence academic achievement (Nichols-Pierce, 1992). Education administrators oversee curriculum in local school districts, and they need to make informed decisions as to what the curriculum should consist of. The National Alliance to End Homelessness (NAEH) (2002) presents lesson plans and age appropriate exercises to infuse the topic of homelessness into school curricula. Educators should take a proactive stance to raise social awareness and to aid homeless youths by revising classroom curricula (Somerindyke, 2000). Teachers can be innovative and extend themselves beyond normal classroom practices to alleviate stressors among homeless students. Housed youths can promote greater sensitivity among themselves to the plight of their homeless peers.

Opportunities for control and opportunities to meet with success in the classroom can foster academic achievement. Suggestions for changes in classroom organization include alternate assessments, dividing assignments into manageable segments, providing instructional menus for homeless youths to choose assignments, assigning each student a personal space, and providing a study hall period near the end of the day (Yamaguchi et al., 1997). Educators can communicate with parents and shelter personnel to ensure adequate clothing, school supplies, and snacks (Yamaguchi et al., 1997). Children’s stays in shelter have negative effects on achievement, and unless subsequent academic support is given when they become housed, long-term negative effects may result (Attles, 1997). Homeless youths live very transient lifestyles, and rarely stay in one place long enough to
attain a sense of belonging (Anglin, 1999). The need for feelings of belonging is essential to the human condition (Maslow, 1954). Educators in schools and classrooms can serve to satisfy this need.

Education administrators are responsible for initiating staff development programs. Teachers and other school personnel can be specifically trained, and therefore better qualified, to implement best practices and programs. Educators must employ specific strategies to accommodate homeless youths, and a key strategy is to train faculty and staff in the characteristics and needs of homeless students (Black, 1994). Teachers need to know the needs and strategies related to working with homeless students, and workshops or staff development classes could be beneficial (Mahoney, 1998; Rafferty, 2000). Homeless students need a safe, stable, and nonthreatening classroom free of social stigma in order to contrast their experiences outside of school.

Local education personnel should conduct extensive training of all staff, including secretaries, guidance counselors, nurses, principals, and teachers (McCarthy, 2000). McKinney funds can be used fruitfully to design professional development programs. The Star Center (James, Lopez, Rouse & Walker, 1997) published a manual to provide information and materials to assist central office staff in creating professional development courses. The courses are intended to launch other effective programs that address the special educational needs of homeless youths. The manual is organized by the three goals of awareness, understanding, and opportunity, and it includes trainer tips and action steps for each goal.

In conjunction with the University of South Carolina and the South Carolina State Department of Education, the Richland School District created a professional
development course offered to teachers as a vehicle for understanding homeless youths and families. This model includes journaling as a technique for educators to deal with their feelings (Swick, 1996). Journaling is one of many techniques that hold potential for creating success with mainstream programs for homeless youths.

An informational guide was also produced by the St. Paul, Minnesota, public schools, funded as an ESEA Title I program for homeless children and families (Seifert & Stauffer, 2000). It defines homelessness and provides resources to support persons in homeless situations. This informational guide also presents data on the numbers of homeless students, why families are homeless, common problems of homelessness, educational strategies for schools, the importance of attending school, and social, emotional, behavioral, and educational issues related to homelessness. The appendix to this guide includes a useful list of contacts and descriptions of local shelters to foster communication between schools and shelters.

Stronge and Reed-Victor (1999) recommend user-friendly information, geared toward principals, teachers, and other practitioners, aimed at bridging the gap between current research on homelessness and best practices in schools. Pamphlets on how to initiate homeless programs are available from many other private organizations, and also from federal, state and local levels of government in many states. Education administrators should examine these guides, and disseminate similar information in their school district.

The Annie E. Casey Foundation tracks the educational, social, economic, and physical well-being status of children in the United States, and publishes an annual data book with state and national statistics. The goal of these efforts is a data-driven advocacy for children, and to that end, grantees are encouraged to conduct public awareness campaigns
regarding the plight and rights of homeless individuals. This is a much-needed step in raising the public consciousness regarding homelessness and the needs of homeless youths.

Educators must have an awareness and understanding of the sensitive experiences of the homeless youths in order to cushion the devastation and trauma (Rafferty, 1997-1998). Negative psychological responses to traumatic events can be prevented or mitigated by supportive environments; educators can help to empower and support persons in homeless situations (Goodman, Saxe, & Harvey, 1991). Sensitivity and awareness training for all school personnel should be provided (Rafferty, 1995). School personnel have the power to mitigate the potentially harmful effects of homelessness (Rafferty, 1999). Schools should maintain a trained staff with stable schedules to assure consistency for students, and to foster individualized relationships built on trust, care, and dignity (Stronge & Helm, 1999). These are features often absent from the chaotic lives of homeless youths.

Teachers should address the need for relationships by ensuring that homeless children are included in the culture of the classroom in positive ways by using inclusion strategies such as peer pairing, cooperative learning groups, acceptance of diversity, and promotion of friendship development (Goins & Cesarone, 1993). The use of buddy systems and scheduled playtime in the classroom may also be especially beneficial for the social development of homeless students (Pawlas, 1994).

Although educators are not able to provide all of the services needed by homeless youths, they can assume the role of linking homeless students to such services (First & Cooper, 1989). Schools are ideal settings for developing and coordinating educational
and social services needed by homeless youths. School is a universal part of children's lives; therefore, the delivery of homeless services within this system can be accomplished with less isolation and stigma than in other systems (Wall, 1996). Children will attempt to hide homelessness, and the teachers who interact with them on a daily basis are in the best position to identify problems unobtrusively (Vissing, 1998).

Education administrators should understand the potentiality and flexibility of their district’s personnel. Proper staffing is critical to serving the needs of the student body most effectively and efficiently, and should include the appointment of a district homeless liaison, a district social worker, and well trained guidance counselors. School social workers should be explored as a possibility, given that they are trained and skilled at developing extensive networks among social agencies. Social workers could forge collaboration and develop comprehensive arrays of services for homeless youths in cost efficient ways (Wall, 1996). Under the Abbott (1998) state urban reform efforts, all Abbott districts were required to hire school social workers, and districts should have the social workers in place by now. The ELC argues that NJ has not fully carried out the court’s order, and it is unclear whether schools have hired licensed social workers, or simply reassigned existing staff in such a role (Sciarra, 2002).

Nunez and Collignon (1999) recommend the creation of communities of learning that combine the educational expertise of schools with the experience and services of shelters. Immediate educational problems of homeless students should be addressed in conjunction with interventions that address family problems, and the greater issues of homelessness. Model programs could include tutoring, homework assistance, parent education, and family support to link shelters and schools.
Every community should establish an interagency collaboration team, which includes educators and service providers, to meet the needs of homeless youths (Reganick, 1997). Collaboration with outside agencies may be a necessary direction for educators to respond to the plight of homeless students (Rafferty, 2000). Little research has addressed the adequacy of collaboration between state coordinators and other service providers (Rafferty, 1999). To help homeless youths to succeed in school, educators must realize that additional support services and programs are needed (Helm, 1993; Rescorla et al., 1991).

School counselors are prepared to deal with issues concerning the general school population, but rarely do counselors have courses to prepare them to provide services to children who are homeless (Strawser et al., 2000). With proper training, school counselors can serve as liaisons between educators, families, and shelter personnel to facilitate the education of homeless youths in direct and indirect ways by ensuring them access to resources within and outside the school setting (Strawser et al., 2000). School counselors can help homeless students deal with the loss of self-esteem and the general embarrassment related to shelter life (Walsh & Buckley, 1994).

Educators should be proactive in establishing collaboration with social-service agencies (Nichols-Pierce, 1992). Staff training should address sensitization to the conditions of homelessness, instruction in the use of customized education strategies, and how to work effectively as a part of a case management team (Schwartz, 1995). In a case management approach, a case manager works to coordinate school staff, counselors, shelter workers, health care, and family support services in a comprehensive effort to serve homeless students better (Goins & Cesarone, 1993). Over the past two decades,
case management has become a common practice in the delivery of services to homeless individuals. Morse (1999) examined a synthesis of studies and concluded that the case management approach can be very effective for certain client subgroups of the homeless population. Case management services have been effectively initiated for young children, runaway adolescents, pregnant adolescents, and homeless families.

Communication and collaboration characterize successful school homeless programs, yet these are items most often missing from school efforts to serve homeless youths (Nunez & Collignon, 1997). Educators need to redefine schools as collaborative social agencies, and there needs to be a paradigm shift to serving the whole child (Tucker, 1999). Resilient individuals spring back from adversity in a dynamic process of adaptation (Reed-Victor & Stronge, 1997). The school community can help homeless youths develop the skills for building resilience to the impact of the emotional and environmental stressors of homelessness (Reed-Victor & Pelco, 1999).

According to McKinney, homelessness alone is not sufficient reason to separate students from a mainstream public school environment. A controversial area surrounding the education of homeless youths is whether or not there should be segregated or transitional schools that isolate homeless students. Despite the fact that they are illegal, a number of them exist. In addition to the intangible qualities inherent in any separate facility as discussed in Brown vs. Board of Education (1954), there are many tangible measures of inequality in these schools. The majorities of separate schools do not have a wide range of resources, exacerbate stigma, accommodate the prejudice of the housed population, and increase the potential number of school changes. Standardized test scores are low, and so may be the student expectations, in segregated settings (NCH, 2002).
Separate and Unequal (McCarthy, 2000) was published by the NLCHP to document the continuing pattern of violation of the federal laws, which grant homeless youths access to school. The NLCHP researchers investigated how these violations have led to the rise of separate schools for homeless youths, and it is the first-ever study of the legal and policy implications of separate schools. Separate schools for homeless youths are a flagrant violation of federal education laws and judicial decisions. They disregard the McKinney stipulations that local schools should remove access barriers, that homeless youths have school placement rights, and homeless youths should not be isolated or stigmatized. Homeless youths have the right to the same educational opportunities as their housed peers.

A Republican from Illinois, U.S. Representative Judy Biggert (2000) argues that most segregated schools have substandard conditions, deprive homeless students of the full range of educational opportunities to which they are entitled, and further stigmatize homeless students. Separate schools are bad educational policy because separate schools do not follow public school curriculum, may be staffed by non-certified teachers, often times group many age and grade levels into one classroom, and do not offer the same special services or extracurricular activities. Separate schools may be located at sites in shelters or churches that were not designed as schools, and may violate school building health and safety codes. Immunization requirements are important to the rights of others, and separate schools that disregard their importance may be putting all students at-risk for disease.

The NLCHP (as cited in McCarthy, 2000) recommends that separate schools be transformed into community resource programs for homeless youths, that local public
school districts conduct extensive awareness training for all staff, and that liaisons be appointed in every school district. It recommends that states review and revise the barriers to school enrollment, and increase public awareness campaigns. It also recommends that the USDOE should inform states with separate schools of their obligation to immediately cease such practices, and then monitor state compliance. Congress should strengthen federal programs and increase funding to ensure integration of homeless youths into mainstream public school programs.

In 2001, the Arizona Department of Education (2002) received over $421,000 in McKinney funds to serve 4,000 homeless students across the state. Seventeen applications for funding were received from local districts, including Maricopa County Regional District, which oversees the Thomas J. Pappas School, the segregated school for homeless students in Phoenix, Arizona. Pappas is one of ten schools in Arizona that caters to special populations, what Arizona calls accommodation schools. In a Congressional testimony, Stark (2000) criticized the Thomas J. Pappas School contending that the Pappas School actively recruits students from homeless agencies, and makes no attempt to inform families about their children’s rights to a choice of placement or to a mainstream education.

According to the data presented by Stark (2000), the Pappas School does not provide a quality education, it does not follow the standards based academic curriculum, and it conveys that the homeless students are unable to master the same standards offered in mainstream schools. Homeless students at Pappas have low-test scores, and lower levels of academic achievement than homeless students in the integrated programs at mainstream schools. There is no gymnasium or music program. A high turnover rate
among principals and administrators creates a lack of continuity in educational programs, and the instability on the school environment compounds the instability in the lives of homeless youths. Although the physical plant is impressive, and amenities such as school supplies and clothing are provided, the Pappas School students are not thriving academically.

Pappas exists partly because of a misconception on the part of the community, including the school districts themselves, about their obligations to serve homeless students, and schools need to be educated regarding their responsibilities (Keegan, 2000). Stark (2000) argues against segregated schools for homeless youths, as compromising their education is compromising their future. U.S. Senator Bill Kyl, a Republican from Arizona, authored the amendment to the recent reauthorization of McKinney, which not only allows for the Pappas school to stay open, but that it also receive McKinney funds.

In addition to the Pappas school the amendment also specifically protects segregated schools for homeless students in three California counties. The Harbor Summit School is a segregated school, self-contained, shelter-based elementary school in San Diego, California, administered by the San Diego County Office of Education. It is protected by the county exemptions listed in the 2001 reauthorization of McKinney. In addition to academic instruction, homeless youths are given support for problems with stress and low self-concept, and families are given assistance with finding permanent housing. Good intentioned persons establish separate schools for homeless students to provide them with educational options, and some schools for homeless students are highly acclaimed.

Nunez (1994a) reviewed findings from an ongoing study conducted by Homes for the Homeless, and suggested that shelters be transformed into multi-service facilities with
innovative shelter-based education programs. As Residential Educational Training Centers, shelters can address the educational needs of both children and their parents. This model includes early childhood education, after school programs to teach homeless youths concepts, analysis, and problem solving, supportive extracurricular enrichment activities, adult learning programs, and family counselors. This model is based on the assumption that education, not housing, holds the greatest potential for a solution to the problem of homelessness (Nunez, 1994a). The success of this program gives testimony to the power of collaboration, and presents a rationale for the restructuring of school organization and moving towards a more collaborative function.

As the controversies surrounding the necessity of segregated schools for the homeless continues research is needed to determine the efficacy of this approach. More research needs to be done to determine whether or not these programs are beneficial for homeless youths (NCHE, 2002). Does separate and unequal always imply inferior? Maybe segregation is necessary while the problem of homelessness is at a crisis level. Homeless youths who were not forecasted in enrollment projections may present a great burden to resources, and public schools may not be able to handle their influx under the present conditions of record numbers of homeless youths. The McKinney legislation implies that public schools need to become more flexible and proactive in their practices in order to better serve homeless youths. The preferred solution should not be to return to the immoral and illegal segregation practices of the previous centuries in our nation’s history.

Stronge (1993b) examined the educational programs designed or adapted specifically for homeless youths by a search of related literature, and a survey of the states, the District of Columbia, and federal territories. This process resulted in the identification of
78 programs, which were classified into three primary models of service delivery: transitional programs, mainstreamed programs, and supplemental support services.

Transitional programs are designed to provide intermediate educational opportunities; they are characterized by immediacy of service and an emphasis on social and support services. Mainstreamed programs seek to educate homeless youths within the context of existing schools; they focus on increasing academic accessibility and accommodation. Professional development experiences are an important aspect to successful mainstreamed programs. Supplemental support services are programs characterized by beyond school hours modes of delivery. Academic support (tutoring), counseling, cultural enrichment, and parental support are examples of such services.

Eddowes (1993) also researched the variety of exemplary school programs for homeless youths, which are meeting with success. She noted that many are designed for the specific age group of younger homeless children, and few address the specific needs of adolescent homeless students. Eddowes (1993) categorized these programs into three types as transitional, mainstreamed, and supplementary support service models. Homeless students have unique needs, and very specific school policies, programs, and services need to be developed (Nichols-Pierce, 1992).

Yamaguchi et al. (1997) described the special programs for homeless youths as outreach programs, district schools, transition rooms in neighborhood schools, transition and shelter schools, and after school programs. Outreach programs are district-based programs that employ a coordinator to maintain communication among schools, shelters, and social service agencies. District schools are located in the areas of homeless shelters and provide special services, such as, assisting with school registration, assessing
academic achievement level for grade placement, completing application forms for services, and providing clothing and school supplies. Transition rooms in neighborhood schools are considered temporary settings; they aid in preparing students for their permanent classrooms. Characterized by a safe environment that addresses the emotional needs of the child, transition rooms also provide clothing and school supplies. Transition and shelter schools are usually designed specifically for homeless students and focus on basic academic skills. Immediate and intense assistance with food, health care, coping strategies for stress, and other basic needs are addressed. After school programs include tutoring, help with homework, counseling, and recreation.

School districts have developed various multi-disciplinary program approaches to meeting the needs of homeless youths, and there are some innovative school programs that exist nationwide. Education administrators in local districts should self-assess their own needs, and design the most appropriate programs given the situation in their local area. The research supports that homeless students need much more support, and many more services, than the traditional school can usually provide (Griggs, 1997).

This research will ascertain the special programs for homeless students that exist in the high poverty districts of NJ. Nationally, differences between the educational needs of homeless youths and a lack of existing policies and programs has been documented (Nichols-Pierce, 1992). The NJ DOE reports that in the 2001-2002 school year, six innovative school programs exist for homeless students in NJ. They are located in Cedar Grove, East Orange, Jersey City, Paramus, Sewell, and Trenton. East Orange, Jersey City, and Trenton are DFG A Designation Abbott districts.

An emphasis on collaboration is a paradigm shift in how schools define themselves
(Tucker, 1999). The realities of homelessness cannot be overlooked or underestimated for their impact on a student's readiness to learn and ability to cooperate in a group setting, such as the classroom. The USDOE (1992, 1997) provides information on ideas for policy changes and examples of model interventions. Each jurisdiction should gather its own information about the numbers and composition of its homeless population to determine service needs, and for decision making and planning purposes (Burt, 1998).

McKinney specifically stipulates that homeless students should not be stigmatized. It is the responsibility of school administrators to foster a culture of caring conducive to learning for homeless youths in their district schools. Academic and social problems are compounded by distorted stereotypical perceptions of persons in homeless situations.

In a study by Cozzarelli, Wilkinson, and Tagler (2001), public attitudes and attribution theories regarding poverty were investigated. Attitudes towards the poor were significantly more negative than attitudes towards the middle class, including beliefs that the poor are uneducated, unmotivated, lazy and socially irresponsible. Respondents were more likely to blame poor people themselves for their poverty, making internal rather than societal attributions. These feelings have an impact on national sentiment, on voting behavior, and on the willingness to help people in such extreme poverty. These psychological underpinnings will need to be addressed to advance with social policies for the homeless (Cozzarelli et al., 2001).

Media images have the power to educate, raise consciousness, and shape public attitudes. Bullock, Fraser-Wyche, and Williams (2001) studied the classism, racism, and sexism that exist in the stereotypic imagery of televised and print media framing. Framing can be described as selecting some elements of reality and suppressing others, in
an intentional way, to construct a biased story about a social problem. Bullock et al. (2001) presented an overview of the imagery in media framing and concluded that it depicts poverty as a source of a threat (leading to crime, drugs and gangs). Media framing also perpetuates stereotypes of the poor as lazy and promiscuous, presents poor mothers as neglectful, and is disproportionately low given the scope of the poverty.

The media agenda usually precedes the public agenda, and media interest in homelessness declined in the early 1990’s (Curtis, 2000). A lack of media coverage reinforces a perceived conception that homeless people do not deserve assistance. In the early 1990’s, three quarters of the 50 largest cities in the U.S. had imposed anti-begging laws (Alston, 1998).

Nationally, there has been a proliferation of punitive anti-vagrancy laws intended to remove homeless people from the streets (Morse, J., 1999). Removing the homeless population from plain sight distances the housed population from the problem. This practice can be interpreted as a lack of sympathy for homeless persons, as a way for the government to ignore the situation, and as a method for decreasing public consciousness of the problems of homelessness. In Seattle, officials practice strict enforcement of sidewalk and trespass laws, making it difficult for homeless people even to sit on benches in the downtown area (Alston, 1998).

Even within the homeless population, certain subgroups are seen as more or less deserving of assistance (Rosenheck, Bassuk, & Salomon, 1998). Many people fail to recognize the lack of affordable housing, low wages, or declines in public assistance as causes of homelessness. Instead, they turn to the personal problems of individuals, to explain homelessness. Education administrators need to address these misperceptions in
the community in order to increase the levels of concern for persons in homeless situations, and to promote the academic success of homeless youths.

Teachers and administrators may also subscribe to the dominant beliefs that low income parents do not care about their children's schooling, are not competent to help with homework, do not value education, and do not promote achievement (Lott, 2001). The true standpoint of low-income parents might be recognized and respected if schools take the initiative to involve them beyond the role of consent giver, and if schools promote frequent communication of success, as opposed to occasional contacts to convey trouble (Lott, 2001).

Stereotyping and prejudice may constitute institutional barriers to educating homeless youths. The negative attitudes of administrators, faculty, and staff makes homeless families feel unwelcome at school, a factor that can discourage both attendance and achievement (Wall, 1996). Education administrators can prevent this situation in their schools by making homeless parents feel welcome and by fostering sensitivity to homeless youths among all school staff.

The effects of homelessness on well-being are influenced by many other variables. The personal characteristics of a child, length of time without a home, nature of shelter environments, age, gender, and other factors affect a homeless student's self-perception of homelessness (Lineham, 1992). Previous research suggests that preadolescent boys are more vulnerable to the effects of stress than girls, but this has not been researched specifically within homeless populations (Bassuk et al., 1997). Emotional trauma experienced through family violence and at school via harassment from peers produces feelings of not being safe (ILDOE, 2001).
Homeless youths suffer emotional distress from taunting at school (Nunez, 2000). Homeless adolescents report lower self-worth, and more negatively perceived academic confidence, than their housed peers (Masten, Miliotis, Graham-Berman, Rumors & Neumann, 1993). Homeless youths are aware of their homelessness, feel shame, become self-critical, and eventually associate their life situation as a negative reflection of their self-worth (Bassuk et al., 1997). Homeless youths that are most resilient to homelessness have greater interpersonal skills, higher levels of self-confidence, lower levels of internalizing symptoms, and are usually first homeless at a later age (Voegler, 2000). It is critical for education administrators to be aware of and make allowances for these social and psychological variables associated with the self-perception of homeless youths.

Teacher prejudices and reactions to homelessness lead to differential treatment of students, which in turn influences students’ responses to their homeless peers (Gibel, 1996). Homeless youths confront stigma, insensitivity, and rejection by teachers and classmates (Rafferty, 1998). Teachers should remember that homeless children are foremost children, and although their special needs should be recognized and met, in the classroom they should be treated just like all other children (Stronge, 1995). The lack of awareness to the needs of homeless students and misperceptions about homelessness continue to plague education efforts for homeless students (Stronge, 1997). Administrators in state and local education agencies should increase awareness among school staff of homelessness and of the educational rights of homeless youths (McCarthy, 2000).

Education administrators govern the acquisition and usage of computer technology in a local school district. Assuming that advancements in implementing technology are
highly coveted by the district, education administrators should examine the variables that impact on the success of this curriculum, especially for homeless students. A limited amount of literature exists on the relationship between lack of achievement and lack of exposure to technology specifically for homeless youths, however, some federal data that has been gathered regarding youths living in extreme poverty can be applied.

The National Telecommunications and Information Administration (NTIA) collects data for the U.S. Department of Commerce on the usage of computers according to income, race, educational attainment, region, and geographic categories (rural, urban, suburban). The results show a gap in the types of technology users, which is commonly referred to as the digital divide (U.S. Department of Commerce, 1995). According to the NTIA, certain minority standings or geographic areas can accentuate the computer literacy problems associated with poverty status. Homeless youths may be in several of the at-risk categories for limited computer literacy. In several NTIA follow up studies, the digital divide continued to widen (U.S. Department of Commerce, 1998, 1999, 2000).

The NTIA results also showed that two parent households are nearly twice as likely to have Internet access as single parent households (U.S. Department of Commerce, 2000). Many students in homeless situations live in single parent households, and therefore have a limited amount of access to and proficiency with computers, as compared to their housed peers. According to AECF (2001), six percent of poor children in NJ, and nine percent nationally, live in families that do not even have a telephone. Regarding access to computers outside of school, 76% of households earning over $75,000 in 1997 owned a computer, compared with less than 17% of households earning less than $20,000 (USDOE, 1999). Educators should be sensitive to these findings when planning lessons
that incorporate technology, especially in high poverty areas.

Princeton Survey Research Associates was commissioned by Cisco Systems to survey Nobel Laureates (N=259) as to their speculations on the impact that the Internet would have on people's education, innovation, their work lives, and global living standards in the future (Cisco Systems, 2001). The key findings of the Princeton research include that: 92% of the laureates feel that illiteracy and inadequate educational opportunity are critical issues in our world; 87% believe that the Internet will have a positive effect on improving education; 91% believe that the Internet will play a very big or moderate role in providing educational opportunities; and 44% think that those who already have the access to technology will expand their dominance in the world. These findings suggest that the digital divide will persist and grow unless interventions are initiated.

Students living in extreme poverty and homelessness need increased access to technology, in order to close the gap, and in order to have the opportunity to prosper with the rest of society. According to the 2002 employment projections of the U.S. Department of Labor, 8 of the 10 fastest growing occupations are computer-related. As futurists predict that technology will play a greater role in both the home and workplace, the impact of the digital divide is becoming increasingly evident. Academic success in math and science can be predicted by the presence of educational resources, such as computers, in the home (USDOE, National Center for Education Statistics, 1997). In low-income central-city neighborhoods, 84% of households with children do not have a computer (Wilhelm, Carmen, & Reynolds, 2002).

No population of students is more at-risk for school exclusion and school failure than homeless youths (Stronge, 1993b). Education administrators should be aware of the
psychological and emotional factors associated with homelessness. Without a home or a school, homeless youths lose an anchor to any sort of stability (Rafferty, 1998). It can be concluded that attention to this special population of students is urgent, though not easy. The issues related to homeless youths are broad in scope, and increased awareness of the concomitant changes needed in educational practices is necessary.

The barriers to school access and success that persist are unacceptable at any level. There is a unique complexity to the special concerns of homeless youths and their families, and nonconventional educational practices may need to be developed. Responses can be developed by the local community in an attempt to cultivate social capital, such as, providing field trips to libraries and museums to acculturate homeless youths (Maeroff, 1998). The time is here to initiate specific policies that delineate more proactive strategies to improve the quality of education for homeless youths. Homeless youths should receive adequate school services characterized by stability and continuity.

This section has addressed the issues surrounding the education of homeless youths. Providing educational opportunity to homeless youths is a just and caring response, and it requires much more than the traditional, school-centered delivery model (Tucker, 1999). The next section presents evaluations of the implementation progress and the degree of compliance with the McKinney legislation.

Evaluations of McKinney Progress

This section includes reviews of the areas of progress in compliance with McKinney, and areas that may create continued implementation barriers to the education of homeless youths. It includes state reports to the USDOE and USDOE reports to Congress. This
section includes the results of studies regarding the education of homeless youths conducted by State Coordinators, private studies conducted by advocacy groups, and studies of the implementation barriers of related federal education legislation. This section contains the findings of doctoral dissertations on the education of homeless students, and the conclusions of experts as conveyed in journal articles on the status of McKinney implementation. Lastly, this section contains an overview of the history and adequacy of funding for McKinney programs.

Right from the start, there were substantial delays in implementing the EHCY program. The act was signed in July of 1987, but it took a lawsuit in federal court to get the U.S. Department of Education to expedite implementation. In December of 1987, homeless children in Virginia and NJ joined with the National Coalition of the Homeless and Sasha Bruce Youth Work Incorporated in filing a lawsuit in federal district court in Washington. They contended that the USDOE was not acting with all possible speed, and that the delays would cost thousands of homeless youths another year of schooling. The first round of grant monies was not made available by the USDOE until 10 months after McKinney was enacted. The USDOE was also slow to review, critique, and approve the state plans required for McKinney grants (Friedman & Christiansen, 1990).

Some progress has been made in providing access to education for homeless youths as evidence by increasing rates of school enrollment (Friedman & Christiansen, 1990; Rafferty, 1995). In the 1980's, only 50% of homeless youths were attending school regularly (NCH, 1997a). The USDOE (1995) reported that by the early 1990's, 77% of the approximate 744,000 homeless school-age youths did attend school during their period of homelessness. Policy Studies Associates (as cited in Anderson et al., 1995)
reported that school enrollment of homeless youths had increased to 86%. The BHF (1999) reported that 80% of homeless school-age youths do attend school. School participation for homeless youths should be 100%, and barriers should continue to be addressed. Although some progress has been made in access to education for homeless youths, several barriers to school success remain.

McKinney mandated the USDOE to oversee its implementation. This oversight should include reviewing applications, reviewing state plans, and allocating funds. The USDOE is responsible for monitoring and reviewing compliance by states; reporting to Congress at the end of each fiscal year; disseminating information on exemplary programs; determining the best means of identifying, locating and counting homeless youths; and providing support and technical assistance to state education agencies.

In accordance with the provisions of McKinney, state educational agencies are instructed to submit reports to the Secretary of the USDOE. These reports should contain: estimates of the number and location of homeless children and youths; information on the extent of barriers homeless youths encounter gaining access to public preschool, elementary school, and secondary school; progress made in addressing the special needs of homeless youths, and successes in enrollment, attendance, and school success of homeless youths. As recently as 1997, three states and the District of Columbia did not even submit reports to Congress.

The USDOE’s early reports to Congress stated that due to problems with gathering data on homeless youths, the information should be viewed with caution. In the USDOE’s 2000 report, problems associated with identification of homeless youths and differing state definitions of homelessness continued. It is advised that these reports only
be used as an estimate of the numbers of homeless youths, and the difficulties that they face in attending and succeeding in school (USDOE, 1997a).

Table 3 presents a summary of information contained in the USDOE EHCY program reports to Congress. In 1997, the states reported that there were approximately 625,330 school-age (K-12) homeless children and youths; 45% were not attending school on a regular basis during their homelessness. By grade level, states reported 50% were in grades K-5, 22% were in grades 6-8, and 24% were in grades 9-12 (percentages do not total 100 because Washington did not submit a breakdown, however, their total population was included in the total number for this category). States reported approximately 216,391 preschool homeless children, and only 21% are enrolled in preschool programs.

The 1990 Amendment to McKinney directed the Secretary of the USDOE to determine the best means of identifying, locating, and counting homeless youths, and in response, the Urban Institute was contracted to conduct such a study. The Urban Institute (Burt, 1996) presented a complete design involving primary data collection with service using and street homeless, and an add-on national survey to obtain data in doubled up households. The estimated cost of the project was 2.44 million dollars, and Congress never funded it.

In their reports to the USDOE, states were asked which educational and school related activities continue to be problematic, and what barriers remain to the academic success of homeless youths. Among the states responses, 44 indicated tutoring and remediation, 40 indicated transportation, 39 reported preschool programs, 24 indicated transfer of records, 23 indicated enrollment, and 20 states indicated the need for special education as
continued problems. States also reported that guardianship and residency requirements were not interpreted uniformly among schools.

Table 4 summarizes the data submitted by NJ for the 2000 Report to Congress. Also in this report, local school districts were asked what barriers to school enrollment and attendance persist for homeless youths. In response to this question, states cited residency requirements, legal guardianship requirements, and availability of school records as the greatest barriers.

Since the passage of McKinney, there have been several national evaluations of McKinney progress. In 1999, the National Association for the Education of Homeless Children and Youths (NAEHCY) and the NCH (as cited in Duffield & James, 1999) published the most extensive data collection effort in the history of the EHCY program. The Duffield and James study is the 1996 position document of the National Association of State Coordinators for the Education of Homeless Children and Youths (NASCEHCY). This organization was started in 1989, and in 1998, membership was extended beyond state coordinators to include any party concerned with the educational welfare of homeless youths.

The research design of this study included two surveys: one for State Coordinators who administer McKinney programs and one for local schools that receive McKinney funding. All 50-state departments of education and Puerto Rico returned the state surveys, 79% of all local school districts that received McKinney grants in 1997-1998 returned the local surveys, and information was gathered from an additional 25 local programs.

Duffield and James (1999) reported the following state findings: 39 states and Puerto
Rico had an increase in homelessness, 85% of McKinney education funds went to only 4% of the nation’s school districts, many state coordinators spend only a fraction of their time on the McKinney program, and a lack of funding hampered the state’s abilities to increase essential services. States reported accomplishments in raising awareness, improving school access, and improving collaboration with outside agencies. At the local level lack of funding was reported as the most frequently cited obstacle to providing comprehensive services to those eligible. As a result of insufficient funding, local programs were not able to serve the special needs of 67,000 homeless children. Local programs generated additional funding from public and private sources, and reported successes in school access, tutoring, and supplemental assistance.

Policy Studies Associates (as cited in Anderson et al., 1995) conducted research for the USDOE to determine the extent to which state educational agencies are ensuring that homeless youths have equal access to public education. The findings are based on a survey of state coordinators in all 50 states, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and the Bureau of Indian Affairs, site visits, and an analysis of state plans. States reported success in removing the barriers once posed by residency requirements and problems with records, however, 42 states reported immunization requirements to continue to be a barrier. Homeless students are rarely placed in their school of origin, and states report few resources to address transportation needs. Family mobility may be the greatest barrier to school success for homeless youths, and housing authorities are generally unaware of educational needs when making housing placements. Although access to school has increased, large proportions of homeless youths have difficulty gaining access to special educational services. Homeless teens face extreme barriers to school access
and success; many move six or seven times a year in statewide placements.

The NLCHP closely monitors McKinney programs. They have conducted several major studies in the past decade: *Shut Out: Denial of Education to Homeless Children* (Friedman & Christiansen, 1990), *Small Steps: An Update on the Education of Homeless Children Program* (Friedman, 1991), *A Foot in the Schoolhouse Door: Progress and Barriers to the Education of Homeless Children* (Ernst, 1995), *Blocks to Their Future: A Report on the Barriers to Preschool Education for Homeless Children* (Johnson-Hunter, 1997), and *Separate and Unequal: Barriers to the Education of Homeless Children* (McCarthy, 2000). The NLCHP advocates for the homeless based on their documentation that shows high levels of unmet programmatic need among the homeless student population.

Three years after the enactment of McKinney, the NLCHP researched the extent to which the USDOE was properly implementing the McKinney mandates (Friedman & Christiansen, 1990). The findings revealed that the USDOE had failed in each of its statutorily mandated duties. There were delays in the distribution of funds, inadequate guidance to the states, limitations on direct services, a failure to monitor states, and late and inaccurate reports to Congress. The state DOEs were also found to have failed to implement McKinney adequately. Many State plans omitted provisions expressly mandated by McKinney, and state plans were minimal at best. The statute imposes a separate responsibility for the USDOE to monitor states, distinct from the USDOE’s duty to review state plans and read reports. This duty has been completely ignored (Friedman & Christiansen, 1990). Lax monitoring often leads to implementation failure.

In order to study compliance with McKinney, the NLCHP researchers surveyed
service provider in family shelters in 20 states, including NJ, and the District of Columbia. They also reviewed the state plans of 47 states, and surveyed the program coordinators in the 50 states. In the recommendations of this study, they suggest that the USDOE should evaluate consolidated state planning as it affects smaller education programs such as McKinney, and that state and local homeless education coordinators increase collaboration with shelters (Ernst, 1995).

The existence and functions of state coordinators, county liaisons, and district liaisons need to be monitored. It should be noted that because these programs are new, few coordinators would have experience in their offices, or with counting homeless youths. In local school districts where there is not a homeless liaison, educators should advocate for one (Rafferty, 2000). In NJ, the county superintendent is a State Department of Education employee charged with monitoring and assuring compliance with the school laws for the districts within the county. Educators could contact county superintendents to advocate that a liaison be appointed to assist homeless students. All school districts are now required to have a homeless liaison, not just districts that receive McKinney grants, which is only three to four percent of school districts nationwide (Rafferty, 2000).

Doctoral dissertations have also studied various aspects to the education of homeless youths. Baltimore (1991) studied the impact of McKinney on administration of state programs, and concluded that effective administration of programs by the state coordinator is a key factor in the success of the McKinney legislation. Mahoney (1998) conducted a qualitative research study to examine the needs of homeless children and to determine how a school district can best use its resources effectively and appropriately. In an extensive ethnographic design, Nichols-Pierce (1992) provides valuable data to
support the need for the development and implementation of programs to meet the educational needs of homeless youths. Other doctoral dissertations and masters thesis investigate the rates of school attendance (Reilly, 1993), levels of school achievement (Christensen, 1994), and literacy development (Warsi, 2000) among homeless youths.

The studies presented in this section document many areas of unmet programmatic need towards the education of homeless youths. Homelessness is a very dynamic condition, and the current trends and conditions should be closely monitored. Given the growing numbers of homeless youths, there should be constant evaluations of the ability of the McKinney provisions to meet the current demand and need. There has been both a lack of data and a lack of consciousness of the problems of homelessness, both of which contribute to a slow implementation of programs (First & Cooper, 1989). An increased amount of valid and reliable data on issues related to homeless youths is still needed (Rafferty, 2000).

Although some schools may have illegal practices, there are no federal penalties for noncompliance (Helm, 1993). A lack of awareness and training keeps educators from being sensitive to the difficulties faced by homeless youths. Often times, the fruition of McKinney policies often rests at the local level with the philosophy of the school principal (Stronge, 1993a). Simple posters in public places, dissemination of conference materials, and public service announcements could be used immediately to increase awareness regarding the educational needs and rights of homeless youths (Rafferty, 2000). The magnitude of the problems associated with homelessness will only be lessened by prompt and appropriate responses. Some states, such as New York, are currently training superintendents in the implementation of McKinney (The New York
State Technical and Education Assistance Center for Homeless Students [NYTEACHS], 2002).

Adequate funding is the cornerstone to success for most any educational mandate. The McKinney legislation authorizes the U. S. Secretary of Education to make state grants in order to carry out the activities described in this legislation. Each state, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico is allotted a formula grant, an amount in the same ratio as the amount appropriated for such year (under Title I funds) as appropriated under Section 1122 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (except that no state shall receive less than $150,000). No state can receive a grant unless an application is submitted to the Secretary of Education that contains a description of the state’s plan for educating homeless youths. The plan should describe: how homeless youths will be given the same opportunities as all students, how homeless youths will be identified, and how the special needs of homeless youths will be assessed.

The state grants are then allocated to local districts as competitive, needs based subgrants in order to facilitate enrollment, attendance, and success in school of homeless youths. A local educational agency that desires to receive a grant must submit an application to the state which includes a description of the services and programs for which assistance is sought, a description of the problems to be addressed by such programs, an assurance that the applicant will use requested funds to come into McKinney compliance, and a description of policies to ensure that homeless youths will not be isolated or stigmatized under proposed programs. Grants awarded shall be for terms not to exceed 3 years, and districts that receive grants must appoint a district homeless liaison.
The original McKinney Act authorized 4.6 million in 1987 and 4.8 million in 1988. These small appropriations averaged $50,000 per state in Fiscal Year 1987 to $130,000 per state in Fiscal Year 1991. This was the equivalent of less than $10 per year for every homeless child in the United States (Rafferty, 1991). In each of the next Fiscal Years 1989 and 1990, the total appropriation was $4.8 million. In the 1990 McKinney Amendment Congress appropriated $7.2 million.

For the purpose of carrying out the provisions in McKinney for educating homeless youths, appropriations were authorized in the amount of $30 million for the Fiscal Year 1995, and such sums as may be necessary for each of the Fiscal Years 1996 through 2001. When McKinney was reauthorized in 2001, $50 million was appropriated for fiscal year 2002, and such sums as may be necessary for each of Fiscal Years 2003 through 2007.

Educators, private advocacy groups, and experts in the field all believed that funding for McKinney EHCY programs should be dramatically increased. Duffield and James (1999) recommended that Congress provide $50 million for the education of homeless youths in the 1998-1999 fiscal year, and funding should be increased as necessary in the years that follow. In a public policy report from the Better Homes Fund (1999), it was recommended that funding for McKinney programs are increased to $50 million in the year 2000, with increased authorizations as required in successive years to ensure full funding. These recommendations for increased funding became reality with the most recent reauthorization of McKinney. Rafferty (2000) also suggests a federally funded initiative to promote collaboration between school and community providers by authorizing seed money for model demonstration projects.

Advocates for persons in homeless situations suggest that the current amounts of
funding are still insufficient, and the small amount of funding appropriated for McKinney EHCY programs undermines the importance of this program. The extensive federal funds appropriated for IDEA are important and give the law power, without which it would have less of an impact. The McKinney EHCY program has substantially less funding than IDEA, which means it has a small impact, and less power (Rafferty, 2000).

The nation's largest school districts receive the bulk of McKinney funding. States awarded 71% of their 1993–994 McKinney grants allocations directly to local school districts, yet nationally only 3% of local education agencies received any funding (Anderson et al., 1995). This suggests that the absolute number of homeless youths benefiting from McKinney programs is not great. Duffield and James (1999) reported that State coordinators used 16% of the McKinney homeless education funds at the state-level, and sent nearly 85% of the remaining McKinney funds to about 4% of the nation's school districts. Based on figures provided by 48 states, only 597 of their 15,204 school districts received funding. By adding collaborative efforts with outside funding sources, still only homeless students in 988 school districts (6% nationwide) actually received services (Duffield & James, 1999).

The process of grant application may present an obstacle to providing education to homeless youths. As only a small percentage of communities are receiving assistance, advocacy groups should inform educators and community leaders about the availability of grants (Reganick, 1997). Local school districts need to be familiar with the methods by which to access available funds, and all districts should have coordinators for homeless education, not just those receiving grants (Rafferty, 2000).

Lack of funding seriously hampers a state's abilities to increase essential services and
to remove enrollment barriers. At the local level of education, lack of funding was the most frequently cited biggest obstacle to providing comprehensive services to all eligible homeless youths (Duffield & James, 1999). In 1996 there was a decrease in McKinney funding, and federal programs for McKinney were cut by 20% (Somerindyke, 2000). Researchers for the NCH surveyed state homeless education programs and reported that due to funding cuts, 41 local homeless education programs had to be eliminated, denying services to 12,806 homeless youths (Duffield, 1997). It was also reported that loss of funding forced 63% of the states to reduce the amount of tutorial hours, transportation, school supplies, preschool education, and coordination of services for homeless youths (Duffield, 1997).

The impact of the reductions in funding for fiscal years 1996 and 1997 was felt in a variety of ways by the individual states. Some were able to maintain or expand services for the 1996-1997 school year through the use of carry over, administrative, or non-McKinney funds. Fourteen states that received the minimum funding ($100,000) were not affected by the reduction in funding. Duffield (1997) reported that the impact of the reductions in funding among 40 state respondents caused many states to fund the same number of programs, but with reduced grant awards, resulting in 2,884 fewer homeless children and youths being served. A lack of funding has restricted the efforts of several states to provide services to homeless preschoolers. Budget cuts are unjustifiable when they deny much needed educational services to homeless youths. Currently in NJ, the NJDOE expects that school districts will not receive an increase in state aid for the 2002-2003 school year.

In 1997-1998, 54% of local programs surveyed used their McKinney grant to generate
over $11,000,000 in additional funding from public and private sources, yet, the local programs were still unable to serve nearly 67,000 homeless youths (Duffield & James, 1999). The available funding targeted for direct services to homeless youths can also be made more cost effective by collaboration with outside agencies. The current trend is a consolidation of programs for children at-risk of not receiving a FAPE, and this practice will need to be evaluated for its potential impact on the education of homeless youths.

McKinney programs have a high demand, limited funding, and large administrative burdens. Much of the time consuming record keeping, which is often prepared for multiple funders, can be eliminated by a consolidation of programs. This would improve coordination, eliminate fragmentation, and reduce the human resources and financial costs needed for effective administration (HUD, 1995). The effectiveness of the consolidation of programs is an approach that has yet to be evaluated and should be the immediate focus of future research.

According to the 1993 data from the 1995 U.S. Report to Congress on the EHCY program, it was estimated that there were 17,132 homeless children and youths in NJ. Ten years after the enactment of McKinney, in a survey of state coordinators of homeless education programs, Duffield (1997) reported results based on 40 states (80%) that responded. This study reported the following findings regarding the state of NJ. In the fiscal year 1995, the total McKinney grant for the education of homeless youths was $584,789, which was distributed to nine local education agencies, serving 1,550 homeless youths. In the fiscal year 1996, the total McKinney grant for the education of homeless youths was $461,640, which was distributed to nine local education agencies, serving 1,550 homeless youths. Funding of the nine local education agencies in the fiscal year
1997 was made possible by a continuation grant; however, the impact of the loss of funding was felt in the fiscal year 1998. When the new competitive grant cycle started, funding was insufficient for all of the applicants who received passing scores. NJ eliminated programs during the 1997-1998 school year.

In a survey of 20 states, NJ ranked 11th for receiving the greatest amounts of McKinney funds (Ernst, 1995). In May of 1999, NJ adopted the New Jersey Homeless Youth Act and appropriated $4 million from the General Fund to the Department of Human Services to establish and support a continuum of services for all homeless youths under age 21. In addition to McKinney, this act funds programs geared specifically for homeless adolescents. The legislature assumed that homeless adolescents are a largely invisible population, therefore, street out reach programs were to be developed. The legislation is intended to promote basic shelter programs for homeless youths with walk in emergency access hours (24 hours a day and 7 days a week) for increased residential care. Funds allocated under this legislation could also be used to provide transitional living programs, including access to education or employment training. This act has been in effect in NJ since the 1999-2000 school year, and its impact has yet to be evaluated.

In an address to the people of NJ on February 5, 2001, Acting Governor Donald T. Francesco stated that one out of every eight children in NJ lives in poverty. He announced his administration’s initiative to expand the State Fiscal Year 2002 Initiative Budget to further assist homeless youths through the KidsNeeds Action Plan. The original State fiscal year 2002 budget of $1,018,000 was expanded by $400,000 targeted for a series of initiatives, which are organized by the age of the children, and youths they are intended to serve. The KidsNeeds initiatives include funds for the age 0-6 Abbott
preschool (homeless) population and the age 12-18 sub-population of homeless youths. The goal of the homeless youths initiative is to increase crisis services and transitional living services for 300 of the 13,000 adolescent runaway and throwaway youths in NJ. There are fewer than 70 transitional living beds for homeless adolescents in all of NJ.

President G. W. Bush’s fiscal year 2003 budget requests 56.5 billion dollars for the USDOE, including a record high amount of funding for discretionary programs. The 1.1 billion dollars slated for NJ is a boost of 61 million from the current level of federal education grants to the state. These funds are intended to support the President’s No Child Left Behind framework for improving student achievement, by targeting resources to students and schools with the greatest needs.

The McKinney legislation does not make provisions for college age homeless youths. Homeless students who do graduate from high school and wish to pursue a college education can apply for available scholarships. The LeTendre Education Fund for Homeless Children provides scholarships for students who are currently or have formerly been homeless. Mary Jean LeTendre established this fund in 1998 in memory of her husband, Andre E. LeTendre, who was a former Director of Compensatory Education for the USDOE. The LeTendre fund provides a minimum of two $1,000 scholarships annually, and as of 2001, there have been 14 recipients. Applications can be made through the National Coalition for the Homeless.

Table 8 presents a summary of McKinney EHCY funding authorizations by year since the inception of this legislation. It includes the amounts authorized to the states and to NJ in particular. Note that the amount of funds authorized is usually greater than the amount of funds actually appropriated. An overview of McKinney EHCY funds granted to NJ is
also presented.

Table 8

McKinney-Vento Funding, 1987-2003 (Subtitle VIIB, Education for Homeless Children and Youths)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Funds Appropriated to USDOE by Congress (in millions of dollars)</th>
<th>Grant Amounts Appropriated to New Jersey by USDOE in dollars</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>215,533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>816,509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>659,227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>577,499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>584,789</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>459,671</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>537,788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>622,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>634,079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>621,619</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>864,964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1,239,281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>1,193,048</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Dash indicates data were not obtained.

The information in this section summarizes the recent literature on the studies of McKinney progress, establishes the need for future research, and considers the status of McKinney funding. There is a great need for effective legal and financial responses to the problems of homeless youths and despite the immediate expense, the short and long term human consequences will be much more costly. It may be true that homelessness in our society is not a problem that educators can solve, but they ought not to be a part of the problem. The federal government has increased funding and strengthened the law with
the most recent reauthorization of McKinney, but only local implementation will assist homeless youths to receive a FAPE.

Summary

This research is an effort to measure the efforts towards McKinney implementation in order to assist youths that live in extreme poverty and homelessness. The USDOE has been negligent in monitoring compliance that barriers to education are removed for homeless youths (Ernst, 1995; Rafferty, 1995). Research is needed to assess the adequacy of collaboration between state coordinators and other service providers. Educators, public leaders and citizens should remain steadfast to this cause, and strong federal leadership is needed regarding the education of homeless youths (NCH, 1997a). Today’s district and building level school administrators need a broad base of knowledge and strong administrative skills to serve students at-risk for school failure due to numerous combined factors (Walther-Thomas, et al., 1996). Literacy is important to preserving democracy, and to maintaining the educated workforce required for a sound economy. As a nation, we have moral and ethical obligations to this very needy population of citizens. In the aftermath of the events of September 11, 2001, many Americans have an increased consciousness of our national values, freedoms and potentials. It is in the climate of renewed commitment to our national values that we must resolve to move forward with social justice in education, specifically, by assisting our poor homeless population. Homelessness is not an unsolvable problem given the political will to apply imaginative solutions (Alston, 1998).

Homelessness has been exacerbated unexpectedly by the terrorist attacks, and it can
also be accelerated unexpectedly by natural disasters, as was the case with Hurricane Andrew in 1992. Although there is a certain amount of unpredictability, even without unforeseen tragedies, the projections of the number of homeless people in this new millennium are frightening. A failure to educate all homeless youths should be a gross embarrassment to such a prosperous nation. A failure to comply with the McKinney legislation is both illegal and immoral. The success of a nation is ultimately measured by the health, well-being, and quality of life experienced by its children. All age groups are highly dependent on each other for their mutual well-being.

This chapter has presented a literature review surrounding the education of homeless youths. It has presented the estimated numbers of homeless youths, created a profile of homelessness, established the legal framework for the right to a public education, summarized educational issues surrounding the education of homeless youths, and evaluated the implementation progress of the McKinney legislation. Beyond a collection of data, this review reflects the status of young Americans with needs, feelings, hopes, and dreams. Appendix D (Organization of Chapter II – Review of Related Literature Outline) provides a summary of the issues presented in this review of related literature. Further readings on the complex topic of homelessness are presented as Appendix E (Additional Readings) of this dissertation. The next chapter presents the research methodology used for this study of McKinney implementation.
Chapter III

METHODOLOGY

Introduction

This chapter presents the descriptive survey and grounded research methodology, sampling methods, survey instruments, letters of correspondence, procedures of data collection, and methods of data analysis used in this study. One purpose of this study was to examine the extent to which the McKinney-EHCY program was being implemented in the local public school districts in the state of NJ. This grounded research design included an analysis of descriptive survey data gleaned from a stratified, purposive sample of economically disadvantaged public school districts, including the special needs districts known as the Abbott districts.

Descriptive survey, or what is sometimes called normative survey, was used as the research design for this study because of the number of advantages it has. Using results of descriptive study data, the researcher described and interpreted conditions or relationships that existed, and was concerned with the present (Best & Kahn, 1998; Leedy, 1997). This methodology is generally well suited to evaluations of implementation studies and necessary for the researcher to consider the levels of current progress with the education of homeless youths.

Given a definite problem and objectives, a survey study can be specifically designed with careful planning to yield pertinent information to the goals of the study (Best &
Another purpose of this research was to investigate the availability and quality of education being provided to homeless youths.

Descriptive survey allowed for easy gathering of large amounts of data, and allowed for the analysis of a broad range of research questions (Best & Kahn, 1998). By a description of existing conditions related to a phenomenon, this methodology can be used by researchers to describe the future extent of a problem or condition, extending its conclusions beyond the sample observed (Best & Kahn, 1998). Another purpose of this study was to identify the factors that enhance or impede the implementation of McKinney in NJ, and to make recommendations for increased compliance with this legislation. Through careful analysis, interpretation of the data gathered and skillful reporting, this researcher can bring valuable findings to policy makers and school practitioners.

Well-designed questions can safeguard descriptive survey data from the influence of bias (Leedy, 1997). The way a survey question is asked prescribes the answers, and the questions must be worded properly (Fink, 1995). Descriptive survey data collected without bias are part of a sound foundation for policy planning in educational settings. Survey methods are exploratory in nature, a common fact-finding procedure, and commonly used for needs assessment studies conducted in education, business, and government (Leedy, 1997).

In this study, the descriptive survey method was used as a part of the greater theoretical framework of grounded research design. The self-defined purpose of this qualitative approach was to develop theory about phenomena of interest, guided by what was observed, grounded or rooted in the data (Trochim, 2001). Grounded research design begins with the raising of generative questions that help guide the research. In this
research, the McKinney legislation was used to build generative questions. As the researcher began to gather data, core theoretical concepts were defined, and an iterative process continued (Trochim, 2001).

The central question of grounded theory design is what theoretical constructs, themes, and patterns are evinced in the data (Leedy, 1997). In this study, a broad scope of survey questions was posed to provide the freedom and flexibility to explore the extent to which the various mandates of McKinney were being implemented at the local level of education. The data were analyzed by multiple-stage procedures that lead to the development of theories (Leedy, 1997). These theories can be useful to explore the educational services provided to homeless students in great depth, and to guide the formation of organizational policies for the education of homeless youths, in both the academic and social community.

An important assumption underlying this methodological approach is that all of the issues pertaining to the topic have not yet been identified, and especially not in the specific population and place utilized in this research sample. Although several national studies of McKinney implementation have been conducted, and also studies of other states, this is the first comprehensive homelessness study of the high poverty school districts in NJ.

With roots in sociology, grounded theory process is unique in that it is concept-oriented, and introduces a constant-comparative method (Leedy, 1997). Grounded theory process could continue indefinitely, and theoretically, never ends (Trochim, 2001). Therefore, it is appropriate to evaluations of implementation studies, where ongoing monitoring is often mandated within the legislation, as is the case with McKinney. With
the 2001 reauthorization of McKinney, several changes were made to strengthen its impact (NLCHP, 2002). Grounded research design can establish a baseline condition from which to judge the impact of these changes.

The descriptive survey process can be described by the derivation of the word *survey* (Leedy, 1997). *Sur* is a derivative of the Latin *super*, meaning “above, over, or beyond”; *vey* comes from the Latin verb *videre*, meaning “to look or see.” Thus, descriptive survey provides data that allow the researcher to draw conclusions that extend beyond the superficiality of data gathering and tabulation. The whole phenomenon under study is understood from a holistic perspective as a complex system that is more than the sum of its parts (Best & Kahn, 1998). The researcher analyzed the data and then postulated possible explanations based upon theories to help make sense out of the data.

This researcher drew quantitative as well as qualitative conclusions regarding the condition of education for homeless youths in NJ. A quantitative study is an inquiry into a human or social problem measured with numbers and analyzed with statistics; a qualitative study is an inquiry into a human or social problem measured by building a complex, holistic picture (Leedy, 1997). This was made possible by the variety of formats used in developing the survey questions for this study.

**Sample**

For this study, a stratified and purposive sample was used. Stratified sampling techniques help in selecting the proper proportion of different types of characteristics of the population (Leedy, 1997). Purposive sampling techniques are used to seek one or more predefined groups with a specific purpose in mind (Trochim, 2001). The purposive
sample selected for this study was the high poverty school districts in NJ. They were purposely targeted from the total population of the school districts in NJ by virtue of their poverty status. As poverty and homelessness usually occur together, this sample was selected as it was expected that these school districts would have the challenge of educating greater numbers of homeless students than more affluent school districts.

NJ classifies its school districts into District Factor Group (DFG) designations, which are based on socioeconomic status and other demographic variables. This system was developed to help policy persons interpret test scores and has been in use since 1975. The third DFG has been constructed based on data from the 1990 Census. Given the relationship between socio-economic status and educational outcomes, judgements of the effectiveness of school systems must include analysis of the socio-economic background of the community. There are eight DFGs, ranging from A (which is the lowest socioeconomic district designation), to J (which is the highest socioeconomic district designation). This study solicited participation from all DFG A and B school districts, \(N=115\).

There are over 600 school districts in NJ and 115 districts are hardly a proportionate numerical sample of them all. However, as poverty and homelessness usually occur together, it assumed that the greatest numbers of the homeless youths in NJ are probably in these high poverty school districts. In addition to targeting a specific population, purposive samples can increase the utility of information obtained from small samples. The results of a survey are no trustworthier than the representativeness of the sample (Leedy, 1997).

The DFG criterion was used by the NJ Supreme Court in the *Abbott vs. Burke* (1998)
decision to determine which municipalities in NJ were the poorest, and which would be the 30 Abbott districts to receive financial aid. The Abbott districts exist as extremes on a stratified classification of NJ school districts. Most of the Abbott districts are rated as DFG a designation, and the very few exceptions are rated as B or CD. The Abbott school districts of NJ are included in this sample. A list of the 30 Abbott districts and their District Factor Group (DFG) designation is included as Appendix C. The majority of the 30 Abbott districts are urban municipalities. It was also sensible to assume that some homeless youths were in other areas that would not be targeted by a sample of only Abbott school districts. Therefore, the scope of the sample used in this research was expanded to include all 115 A and B DFG Designation school districts, representing urban, suburban, rural, and resort communities.

The participants in this research were of two distinct groups. School district superintendents (N=115) and school district homeless liaisons (N=115) in each of the high poverty districts were solicited to respond to different surveys. Each survey was specifically designed for the differing roles played by each type of participant in the educational system. District superintendents are the chief school administrators and oversee all the schools in the district. District homeless liaisons oversee the implementation of McKinney mandates at the local school level. The perspective of these two groups on similar issues can be different, as the former is traditionally considered policy makers, and the latter practitioners.

Mailing addresses and the names of the superintendent for each district were obtained from the most recent edition of the New Jersey Municipal Data Book (Homer, 2001), and also by checking for recent changes on each school district’s Internet homepage. A list of
the URLs for each Abbott district homepage can be found at http://www.state.nj.us/cgi-bin/education/abboturls. The names and addresses of the district liaisons were obtained by phone calls to the secretary in each superintendent's office. All participants solicited were professionals in the field of education, and public servants employed in the high poverty districts.

Instruments

Determination of a problem was made after a thorough review of the literature on the education of homeless youths, and a list of subsidiary research questions was developed as presented in Chapter I of this dissertation. This author developed two surveys for this research, which, in combination, were designed to answer the subsidiary research questions. They were developed after examining the techniques of question writing in several research methodology textbooks (Fink, 1995; Oppenheim, 1966; Teitelbaum, 1998). There were open and closed-end questions that yielded numerical, nominal, and ordinal data.

The data obtained reveal the ability of each district to count and enroll homeless youths. The data also provided information on the adequacy of funding, human resources, and awareness levels of school personnel. This comprehensiveness was achieved by combing the recommendations for further research from several studies. Before the researcher-developed surveys were constructed, the survey instruments used by the following authors were first analyzed: Anderson, Janger, and Pandon (1995), Baltimore (1991), Christensen (1994), Duffield and James (1999), Ernst (1995), Johnson-Hunter (1997), Mahoney (1998), Nichols-Pierce (1992), and Reilly (1993). Surveys used
by the USDOE for their reports to Congress, and the surveys used by the NJDOE in preparing their reports to the USDOE, were also analyzed.

As previously stated, the intended target groups for the two different surveys were the district superintendents and the district homeless liaisons. Although some questions were repeated on both surveys, each survey accounts for the different responsibilities of each respondent in the education of homeless youths. Data from these measures were used to determine the degree of compliance with the provisions of McKinney, and to assess the progress being made in the education of homeless youths at the local level of education.

The questions on both surveys were designed to investigate the degree of McKinney implementation by examining: (a) the approximate numbers of homeless youths in each local school district, (b) methods used to make this approximation, (c) the extent to which homeless youths are enrolled in schools, (d) practices of local levels of education, (e) the adequacy of funding, (f) the appointment of local liaisons and their responsibilities, (g) the existence of support staff, (h) the ability to collaborate with outside agencies, (i) district-level programs, (j) school-level practices, (k) attitudes toward segregated settings, and (l) controversial issues related to the education of homeless youths.

The questions designed for the survey instruments represented a variety of formats that yielded both quantitative and qualitative measures. As the McKinney legislation was used in the development of the questions on the survey instruments used in this study, there was construct validity and face validity to the instruments. The questions on the survey instruments used in this study were developed directly from the mandates of McKinney and were concise to the provisions of the act. A delineation of how the data obtained from each question was related to the subsidiary research questions was
presented along with the data analysis in Chapter IV.

To check on the face validity of the survey instruments a field test of the survey instruments was conducted by a jury-of-experts approach. The superintendent survey was sent to school superintendents (N=5) in non-Abbott districts of Essex County, NJ. They were chosen by simple random sampling from a list of the total number of non-Abbott, Essex County, NJ school district superintendents. The list was obtained from New Jersey Municipal Data Book (Horner, 2001). The homeless liaison survey was sent to county liaisons (N=5) in NJ. They were chosen by simple random sampling from a list of the total number of county homeless liaisons in NJ. The list was obtained from the NJDOE.

Both groups of jury members received the respective instruments to evaluate with a cover letter of solicitation and informed consent, and were asked to return a feedback form within 3 weeks (see Appendix F). All experts were also provided with a return addressed envelope, coded for anonymity, to return the written feedback on the instruments. Any reference to their districts was deleted after their response was received. Participants were assured that all data would be confidential, and under no circumstance would identifying data be made known.

After analyzing this feedback, final changes in content, clarity, format, and form were made to the survey instruments. Dissertation committee members were given the instruments to review, and again revisions were made. Correspondence with the New Jersey State Coordinator (SC) for the EHCY program occurred several times by US mail, electronic mail, and by telephone throughout this study. The SC provided data, information, and guidance in developing the research instrumentation and design.
To accompany the surveys, this author also developed several letters of correspondence for this study (Letters of Solicitation and Informed Consent, Reminder Letter, Extension Letter, and Thank You Letter). These correspondence letters are included as Appendix F, and the survey instruments are included as Appendix G. The Institutional Review Board of Seton Hall University approved this research in accordance with the guidelines of the National Institute of Mental Health.

Procedures of Data Collection

The field-testing was completed, and final drafts of the survey instruments were made. Both district superintendents and district liaisons received their surveys together with a cover letter of solicitation and informed consent sent to participants through first class US mail (see Appendix F). Both district superintendents and district liaisons also received a copy of the survey for their files, and a stamped, addressed envelope to return the completed survey, which was numerically coded for anonymity.

As surveys were received, any identifying information was replaced with a numerical coding system. The date of return was noted on the master-coding list to be used at a later date in the calculation and analysis of response rates. Any reference to the district was deleted after the response was received. Participants were assured that all data would be confidential, and under no circumstance would identifying data be made known during publication of the results.

This study was conducted in several phases. First, surveys were sent to the 30 school superintendents in the Abbott districts only. The participants were asked to respond within several weeks, and just prior to the survey due date, a mailing of reminder letters
were sent to participants (see Appendix F). The deadline for data collection was six
weeks, but this date was extended later when response rates were slow. The
superintendents were asked for permission to solicit participation from the district
homeless liaison. Over several weeks, as the district superintendents granted consent, the
homeless liaison survey was then mailed in the Abbott districts. Permission for some
districts was granted by telephone call to the secretary in each superintendent’s office.
These participants were also asked to respond within several weeks, and were also sent a
reminder letter. The extension of the participation deadline was also granted to the
homeless liaisons. When all data were received from the Abbott districts, the second
phase of data gathering solicited participation from the non-Abbott DFG A and B
districts, using the same procedures. The following table details the mailing schedule and
response due dates used in this study.

Table 9

Mailing Schedule and Response Due Dates (All 2002)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE OF CORRESPONDENCE</th>
<th>DATES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jury-of-experts</td>
<td>3/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbott Superintendent Survey</td>
<td>3/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbott Superintendent Reminder</td>
<td>4/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbott Liaison Survey</td>
<td>4/15, 22, 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendent Survey Participation Extension</td>
<td>5/6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liaison Reminder / Participation Extension</td>
<td>5/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Abbott Superintendent Survey</td>
<td>5/28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Abbott Liaison Survey</td>
<td>5/28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Abbott Superintendent / Liaison Reminder / Participation Extension</td>
<td>7/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thank You Postcard</td>
<td>June</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggregate Results (upon request)</td>
<td>July</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When all raw data were received, letters were sent to thank all participants, including
jury members (see Appendix F). After the data were analyzed, the participants who indicated an interest in the results were sent an aggregate summary of the research findings. The materials needed to conduct this research include copies of the letters of correspondence (Solicitation and Informed Consent, the Jury-of-Experts Feedback Form, the Superintendent and Liaison Surveys, the Reminder, Participation Extension, and Thank You). Materials also included envelopes, postcards, and stamps.

Hypotheses

Hypotheses are not usually a part of grounded research or descriptive survey research methodology. However, based on the information presented in the review of related literature on national studies of homelessness, this author has several predictions related to the many independent variables surrounding the education of homeless youths in NJ. The researcher anticipated that certain trends as evinced in national data would emerge from the local data collected. As a descriptive survey following grounded research method, inferences were made based on the data collected in this study. This research assessed the degree to which McKinney was being implemented at the local level of education in NJ.

Data Analysis

The researcher investigated the implementation of EHCY as mandated in McKinney at the local level of education. Specific questions on the research instruments related to the subsidiary research questions posed for this study. Data from the surveys were used to answer the following subsidiary research questions:
1. To what degree are the federally mandated education provisions of McKinney being implemented in the high poverty districts of NJ?

2. What barriers impact on successful implementation of these programs?

3. What policy recommendations can be made to strengthen federal, state, and local compliance with McKinney?

For each question, responses were computed, analyzed, and reported for the entire sample for superintendents and homeless liaisons. The responses from the superintendents of the Abbott districts were presented separately due to the current interest in these districts. The overall rates of response to the entire survey among the 115 superintendents and the 115 district homeless liaisons solicited were analyzed. The response rate per question was analyzed in order to determine problem areas for the two groups of respondents. It might be assumed that certain questions frequently go unanswered due to a lack of available data on some issues related to the education of homeless students.

Results were analyzed by various statistical measures as appropriate to each type of question. Measures of central tendency (mean, median, and mode) and measures of variability (range and standard deviation) are reported. Some results were presented as rates, percentages, and frequencies, and other results were presented in narrative form where appropriate. All results were accompanied by narrative text, and graphic or visual representations of the data were also included.

The data were analyzed and results were presented using the following computer software programs: Statistical Package for the Social Sciences for Windows (SPSS) (Microsoft); Quattro (Corel); and Excel (Microsoft). MS Word (Microsoft) word
processing was used to prepare the text and some tables and Math Type was used for mathematical signs. The findings of this analysis are presented in Chapter IV of this dissertation, and implications of the results are discussed in Chapter V.

Limitations

In the course of this research, several weaknesses in design were ascertained that may have presented limitations to the success of this study. These weaknesses are presented in the following paragraphs.

Given the proliferation of federal guidelines in education, school personnel in high poverty areas are inundated with paperwork related to reporting performance and accountability measures. As participation was voluntary, school personnel in high poverty areas might have been too busy to be able to respond, even if they did want to participate.

The season of the year is also a variable when soliciting participation from school personnel. This research was conducted in the spring, a time when superintendents are especially busy with budgets, grant applications, and other requests for the following school year. Administrators observe and evaluate staff in the second half of the school year, which may also put constraints on time.

The Abbott district practices are under great federal scrutiny and it would seem logical that they might choose to not participate in this study if doing so would mean having to admit their shortcomings.

In many survey research studies, incomplete surveys are discounted. The surveys should have included specific directions that incomplete surveys would be acceptable,
and perhaps it should have included the directive that it be completed to the best of the respondent's ability. It was possible that respondents were not able to answer every question, and therefore decided not to answer any.

It is not known whether the superintendents completed the survey intended for them, or if they delegated the task to the homeless liaison. It is also possible that districts thought that submitting one survey was sufficient for participation in the study. The goals of this study were difficult to achieve because of low response rates. The total population of DFG A and B school districts was 115 at the time of this study.

There is also the possibility that homeless liaisons (who were delegated the task of completing the superintendent survey) recognized the return address when they received the homeless liaison survey intended for them. Thinking they had already responded, the homeless liaison survey might have been discarded. Also, the homeless liaison survey may have been perceived as too long and time consuming.

Another limitation is the possibility that respondents did not understand the wording on several questions. For example, one of the superintendent survey questions asked the respondent to estimate the number of homeless youths in the district, yet in some cases their responses to a different superintendent survey question were synonymous with their estimate of the number of homeless youths enrolled in the district schools. The use of ordinal scales of measurement also invited some degree of ambiguity. For example, one of the liaison questions had a central neutral choice, which may have decreased the impact of response.
Summary

This chapter has presented the data needed to conduct this research and how the data were obtained. It described the methods and procedures used to collect and prepare the data for analysis and interpretation. It has outlined the research questions, and has presented predictions regarding the anticipated direction of the results, based on the current consensus of experts, as presented in the review of related literature.

This research design can be expanded into a longitudinal study of McKinney implementation in high-poverty districts of NJ. Descriptive survey research allows for the analysis of relationships between nonmanipulated variables, the development of generalizations, and conclusions beyond the sample observed. The next chapter presents the data and the findings of this research.
Chapter IV

ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

Introduction

This chapter presents the survey response rates, of all DFG A and B (Abbott and non-Abbott) superintendent survey question response data (n=33) (Superintendents), of all DFG A and B (Abbott and non-Abbott) homeless liaison survey question response data (n=20) (Liaisons), and Abbott superintendent survey question response data (n=16) (Abbott superintendents), and a chapter summary. The primary research question regarding the degree to which McKinney is being implemented at the local-levels of education in NJ is addressed.

Presentation of the findings is organized by subsidiary research question and by respondent characteristics (superintendents, liaisons and Abbott superintendents). The McKinney legislation is presented in Appendix A. The relevant section of McKinney, for the convenience of the reader, precedes the survey response data. The survey instruments are presented in Appendix G. The conclusions drawn from this descriptive data, and the concomitant policy recommendations, are presented in Chapter V.

Data from the superintendent survey and liaison survey responses were used to answer the following subsidiary research questions:

1. To what degree are the federally mandated educational provisions of McKinney being implemented in the high poverty districts of NJ?
2. What barriers impact on successful implementation of these programs?

3. What policy recommendations can be made to strengthen federal, state, and local compliance with McKinney?

Survey Response Rates

Table 10 Survey Response Rates represents the survey response rates in this study. The 53 total responses represented 47 NJ school districts, or 41% of all DFG A and B school districts. The greatest response rate (53%) was from the Abbott superintendents where of the 30 districts surveyed, 16 responded. The overall response rate was 23%. In NJ there are approximately 619 school districts; therefore, the 47 school districts represent approximately 7.6% of all NJ school districts. In only 6 districts of the 115 solicited (5.2%) did the superintendent and homeless liaison in that district both respond.

Table 10

Survey Response Rates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Information</th>
<th>Superintendents</th>
<th>Liaisons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Abbott</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responses*</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-responses</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solicited (N)</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(N = Population; n = responses of N)
Research Subsidiary Question 1

To What Degree are the Federally Mandated Educational Provisions of the McKinney-Vento Act Being Implemented in the High Poverty Districts of New Jersey?

McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act, Subtitle VII-B, SEC 722(e)(3). The following data deal with that part of the McKinney legislation that addresses the issue of appropriate educational settings, specifically the prohibition on segregating homeless students.

Figure 1 represents the responses of the superintendents regarding the educational settings most suited for the education of homeless youths. Although superintendents could check as many as apply, 30 of the 33 superintendents (91%) responded that the educational needs of homeless students should be addressed solely in the public schools.

![Graph showing responses of superintendents regarding educational settings for homeless students.](image)

Figure 1. Best Educational Settings for Homeless Students – Superintendents (n=33)

Figure 2 shows the responses of the Abbott superintendents regarding the educational settings most suited for the education of homeless youths. Although superintendents could check as many as apply, 15 of the 16 superintendents (91%) responded that the
educational needs of homeless students should be addressed solely in the public schools.

![Bar chart showing number of respondents by type of school setting]

*Figure 2. Best Educational Settings for Homeless Students – Abbott Superintendents (n=16)*

**McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act, Subtitle VII-B, SEC 722(g)(1)(D).** The following data deal with that part of the McKinney legislation that addresses the issue of how States' programs make appropriate school personnel aware of the specific needs of homeless youths.

Figure 3 shows the ratings of the responses of 33 superintendents regarding specific issues surrounding homelessness in this sample. There is agreement with the idea that more proactive measures should be taken to educate homeless youths ($\bar{X} = 3.7$), office staff needing more information on the legalities concerning homelessness ($\bar{X} = 3.7$), and that central office staff needs more legal knowledge ($\bar{X} = 3.5$).

Figure 4 shows the ratings of the responses of 16 Abbott Superintendents regarding specific issues surrounding homelessness in this sample. There is agreement with the idea that more proactive measures should be taken to educate homeless youths ($\bar{X} = 3.9$) and that school level staff needs more information on homelessness ($\bar{X} = 3.8$). Regarding
the issue of central office staff needing more information on the legalities concerning
homeless, their rating was more neutral ($\bar{X}=3.3$).

*McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act, Subtitle VII-B, SEC 722(g)(1)(J)(ii).* The
following data deal with that part of the McKinney legislation that addresses the issue of
the States' having local educational agencies designate a local liaison to administer the
duties described elsewhere in McKinney.

Table 11 shows data on the homeless liaison position as reported by the liaisons in this sample. Liaisons of 5 of the responding districts (25%) did not respond to question 8 although they did respond to subsequent questions 9 and 10 regarding the homeless liaison position. The mean among the 15 respondents (75%) is 7.2 years, with a standard deviation of 4.1.

Table 11

*Length of Time District Liaison Position Has Been Established – Liaisons*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Liaison Responses</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Years</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 12 shows more detailed data on the homeless liaison position as reported by the liaisons in this sample, specifically, the number of years the current liaison has worked at the position. Liaisons of 3 districts (15%) did not respond to question 9. For the liaisons of the 17 districts (85%) that did respond the overall mean was 5.9 years, with a standard deviation of 3.8.

Table 12

*Length of Time District Liaison Position Held By Current Staff – Liaisons*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Liaison Responses</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Years</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 5 shows more detailed data on the number of hours per week liaisons devote to administrative and support tasks, specifically, how that time is spent as reported by liaisons. Respondents were given a list of activities and asked to indicate the number of hours per week spent on each. The greatest amount of time ($\bar{X}=5.0$ hours) is spent interacting with youths. Most of their time is spent interacting with parents ($\bar{X}=4.0$ hours), and collecting data ($\bar{X}=3.4$ hours). The least amount of time is spent conducting workshops ($\bar{X}=0.8$ hours) and testifying at hearings ($\bar{X}=0.1$ hours), and estimating the number of homeless ($\bar{X}=1.9$). Also, very little time is spent in communication with the USDOE ($\bar{X}=1.0$), NJDOE ($\bar{X}=1.2$), or shelters ($\bar{X}=1.9$).

![Figure 5. Time Devoted to Tasks Per Week by Liaisons – Liaisons (n=20)](image)

Figure 6 shows data as reported by the liaisons in this sample currently working in this position, specifically, the number of hours per week devoted to the challenge of educating homeless youths. Liaisons of 2 two districts (10%) did not respond to question 10. Of the liaisons of the 15 districts (90%) that did respond, only one liaison (7%) devoted a full 40-hour week to the liaison position; liaisons of 14 of the districts (70%) devote less
than 20 hours per week to this position.

*McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act, Subtitle VII-B, SEC 722(g)(2)(B).* The following data deal with that part of the McKinney legislation that addresses the issue of the States’ coordination of technical assistance and compliance efforts at the local educational agencies level.

Figure 7 shows the responses of the superintendents in this sample on the amount of information received from the state coordinator (SC) of homeless youths. The superintendent of one district (3%) did not respond to question 15. Superintendents of 2 districts (6%) reported the amount to be extremely lacking while superintendents of 7 districts (21%) reported the amount to be not enough. Superintendents of 21 of the districts (64%) reported that the amount of information received from the SC is enough while superintendents of 2 districts (6%) reported the amount of information to be more than enough.
Figure 7. Amounts of Information from State Coordinator –Superintendents

Figure 8 shows the responses of Abbott superintendents on the amount of information received from the state coordinator (SC) of homeless youths. The superintendent of 1 district (3%) did not respond to question 15. No superintendent reported the amount to be extremely lacking and by contrast, no superintendent reported the amount to be more than enough. Superintendents of 10 of the districts (63%) reported that the amount of information received from the SC is enough and superintendents of 5 of the districts (31%) reported that the information provided is not enough.

*McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act, Subtitle VII-B, SEC 722(g)(3)(B)(iii).* The following data deal with that part of the McKinney legislation that addresses the issue of the local educational agencies determining what is in the best interests of the homeless youths including the concerns of unaccompanied homeless youths.

Table 13 depicts the data on high school dropouts and homeless high school dropouts in this sample as reported by liaisons. Data on total high school populations and total homeless high school populations reported elsewhere is repeated here for convenience to
the reader. No respondent provided information on the number of homeless high school dropouts. The surveys were returned with the notations such as “unknown” and “not available.” Concerning survey question 14 on the number of high school dropouts, liaisons of 14 districts (70%) did not respond to this question while the liaisons of the remaining 6 districts (30%) reported the number of high school dropouts in their district at 851 students with a mean of 141.8 high school student dropouts.

*McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act, Subtitle VII-B, SEC 722(g)(5)(A)(i).* The following data deal with that part of the McKinney legislation that addresses the issue of coordination of services and programs among and between the local educational agencies concerning the needs of the homeless youths.

Figure 9 shows the types and mean number of support staff available to liaisons. Liaisons of 3 districts (15%) did not respond. Liaison of the 17 districts (85%) that did respond indicated that the greatest support systems exist with guidance counselors.
Table 13

High School Dropout Data -- Liaisons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Liaison Responses</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High school population</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>5384.0</td>
<td>1408.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeless high school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>population</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school dropouts</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>511.0</td>
<td>141.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeless high school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dropouts</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

($\bar{X} = 5.6$), nurses ($\bar{X} = 3.3$) and special education teachers ($\bar{X} = 3.2$). The liaison of one Abbott district reported 70 counselors and 38 nurses. Excluding the effects of this one district on the mean, of the remaining 16 districts, the greatest support system exists with special education teachers ($\bar{X} = 3.3$) while guidance counselors drop to a mean of 1.6, nurses drop to a mean of 1.1.

Figure 9. Mean Number of Support Staff Available to Homeless Liaison – Liaisons ($n=20$)
Figure 10 shows the mean number of social workers assigned to the central office in this sample as reported by superintendents. The superintendents reported a mean of 0.2 part-time and 0.8 full-time social workers assigned to each central office.

![Graph](image1)

**Figure 10.** Mean Number of Central Office Social Workers – Superintendents \((n=33)\)

Figure 11 shows the mean number of social workers assigned to the central office in this sample as reported by Abbott superintendents. The Abbott superintendents reported a mean of 0.1 part-time and 0.8 full-time social workers assigned to each central office.
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**Figure 11.** Mean Number of Central Office Social Workers – Abbott Superintendents \((n=16)\)
Figure 12 shows the mean number of social workers assigned to the schools as reported by superintendents in this sample. The 33 superintendents reported a mean of 0.1 part-time and 10.7 full-time social workers assigned to the schools.

![Chart showing mean number of social workers]

*Figure 12. Mean Number of School Social Workers – Superintendents (n=33)*

Figure 13 shows the mean number of social workers assigned to the schools in Abbott districts as reported by superintendents in this sample. The 16 superintendents reported a mean of no part-time and 20.3 full-time social workers assigned to the schools.

![Chart showing mean number of social workers]

*Figure 13. Mean Number of School Social Workers – Abbott Superintendents (n=16)*

*McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act, Subtitle VII-B, SEC 722(g)(5)(B).* The following data deal with that part of the McKinney legislation that addresses the issue of
the State and local coordination of housing assistance.

Table 14 shows the mean number of homeless shelters as reported by liaisons in this sample. The liaisons of 3 districts (15%) did not respond to question 20. For the 17 liaisons (85%) that did respond, there was a range of 0 to 6 and a mean of 1.5 homeless shelters in each district.

Table 14

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number of Liaison Responses</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shelters</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act, Subtitle VII-B, SEC 722(g)(6)(A)(i).* The following data deal with that part of the McKinney legislation that addresses the responsibility of the local educational agencies in identifying homeless youths.

Table 15 shows the estimate of the total number of homeless school-age youths in each of the 33 districts in this sample as reported by superintendents. The superintendents reported a total of 1,373 homeless school-age youths. The mean is 41.6 homeless school-age youths per district, with a range of none to 606 homeless school-age youths. The large standard deviation (109.8) is due to several districts with an especially large number (several hundred) of homeless school-age youths. Without the two highest districts (203 and 606), the mean is 18 identified homeless school-age youths.

Table 16 shows the estimate of the Abbott superintendents of the number of homeless school-age youths in this sample. The superintendents reported a total of 1,324 homeless
Table 15

*Estimates of Homeless Youths - Superintendents*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Superintendent Responses</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Estimate</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>606.0</td>
<td>41.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

school-age youths. The mean is 82.8 homeless school-age youths per district, with a range of 6 to 606 homeless school-age youths. The large standard deviation (148.9) is due to several districts with an especially large number (several hundred) of homeless school-age youths. Without the two highest districts (203 and 606), the mean is 37 homeless school-age youths.

Table 16

*Estimates of Homeless Youths in Abbott Districts - Abbott Superintendents*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Abbott Superintendent Responses</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Estimate</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>606.0</td>
<td>82.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 17 shows the sources used by superintendents to identify and count the number of homeless school-age youths in each of the districts in this sample. Respondents were asked to state the source used to identify and count the number of homeless school-age youths as an open-ended question. Their responses were then categorized as Existing Reports, Parent/Registration, Transportation Requests, Social Services, or Other. The sources least likely to be used to provide counts of homeless school-age youths were
Social Service agencies (n=9) and Transportation Requests (n=7). In most cases (n=12), school districts are informed about homeless school-age youths through the use of Reports and at the last minute when parents register their children (n=10). One superintendent did not respond.

Table 17

Sources Used to Identify and Count Homeless School-Aged Youths - Superintendents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Existing Reports</th>
<th>Parent Registration</th>
<th>Transportation Requests</th>
<th>Social Services</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N Valid</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 18 shows the sources used by Abbott superintendents to identify and count the number of homeless school-age youths in each of the districts in this sample. Respondents were asked to state the source used to identify and count the number of homeless school-age youths as an open-ended question. Their responses were then categorized as Existing Reports, Parent/Registration, Transportation Requests, Social Services, or Other. The source least likely to be used to provide counts of homeless school-age youths was Social Service agencies where (n=4). In most cases (n=11), school districts are informed about homeless school-age youths at the last minute when parents either register their children or when a Transportation Request is received. Some districts used reports as an information source to enroll homeless youths (n=7). One district did not respond to question 2 at all.

Figure 14 shows the degree to which the superintendents of the school districts in this sample stated that their estimate of the number of homeless school-age youths is correct.
Table 18

Sources Used to Identify and Count Homeless School-Aged Youths - Abbott Superintendents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Existing Reports</th>
<th>Parent Registration</th>
<th>Transport Requests</th>
<th>Social Services</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N Valid</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All of the respondents are confident in the belief that they have accounted for all of the homeless school-age youths in their respective school districts, including districts \((n=23)\) that reported a 100% confidence level and districts \((n=9)\) that reported a 75% confidence level, that they are correct.

![Figure 14. Degree to Which Districts Respond That Estimate is Correct – Superintendents](image)

Figure 14 shows the degree to which the Abbott superintendents in this sample stated that their estimate of the number of homeless school-age youths is correct. All of the respondents are confident in the belief that they have accounted for all of the homeless school-age youths in their respective school districts, including districts \((n=9)\) that
reported a 100% confidence level and districts (n=7) that reported a 75% confidence level, that they are correct.

![Bar chart showing degree of belief that estimate is correct]

**Figure 15.** Degree to Which Districts Respond That Their Estimate is Correct – Abbott Superintendents

*McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act, Subtitle VII-B, SEC 722(g)(6)(A)(ii).* The following data deal with that part of the McKinney legislation that addresses the responsibility of the local educational agencies in enrolling homeless youths.

Table 19 and figure 16 show the average total number of students enrolled in the 33 districts in this sample as reported by the superintendents. There is a total of 185,403 students in this sample and a mean of 5,618 students per district. All but three respondents disaggregated enrollment data by school level. In the 30 districts that superintendents provided such a breakdown, the majority of students enrolled are at the elementary level. At the elementary level, there is a total of 91,512 students and a mean of 3,050 students.

Table 20 and figure 17 show the average total number of students enrolled as reported by Abbott superintendents in this sample. There is a total of 157,048 students in this sample and a mean of 9,815 students per Abbott district. All but one respondent broke down their enrollment by school level. In the 15 Abbott districts that provided such a
Table 19

Mean Total Enrollment by School Level – Superintendents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Superintendent Responses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-school</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1500</td>
<td>368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>20,420</td>
<td>3,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9,663</td>
<td>1,323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8,913</td>
<td>1,317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>38,981</td>
<td>5,618</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 16. Mean Total Enrollment by School Level – Superintendents (n=33)

breakdown, the majority of students enrolled are at the elementary level. At the elementary level, there is a total of 74,268 students and a mean of 4,951 students.

Table 21 and figure 18 show the mean number of homeless students enrolled in the 33 districts in this sample as reported by the superintendents. There is a total of 1,292 students in this sample and a mean of 39.2 homeless students per district. In this sample, the homeless students comprise less than one percent (0.7%) of the total school population. The majority of homeless students (59%) are at the elementary level.
Table 20

**Mean Total Enrollment by School Level – Abbott Superintendents**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Abbott Superintendent Responses</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-school</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>649</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>617</td>
<td>20,420</td>
<td>4,951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>9,663</td>
<td>2,402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>8,913</td>
<td>2,247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1,525</td>
<td>38,981</td>
<td>9,816</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 17. Mean Total Enrollment by School Level – Abbott Superintendents (n=16)

Table 21

**Mean Homeless Enrollment by School Level – Superintendents**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Superintendent Responses</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-school</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>274.0</td>
<td>21.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>118.0</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>102.0</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>494.0</td>
<td>39.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 18. Mean Homeless Enrollment by School Level -- Superintendents (n=33)

Table 22 and figure 19 show the mean number of homeless students enrolled in the 16 districts in this sample as reported by Abbott superintendents. There is a total of 1,166 students in this sample and a mean of 72.9 homeless students per district. In this sample, the homeless students comprise less than one percent (0.74%) of the total school population. The majority of homeless students (53%) are at the elementary level.

Table 22

Mean Homeless Enrollment by School Level – Abbott Superintendents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Abbott Superintendent Responses</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-school</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>274.0</td>
<td>41.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>118.0</td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>102.0</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>494.0</td>
<td>72.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 19. Mean Homeless Enrollment by School Level – Abbott Superintendents (n=16).

Figure 20 shows self-assessment ratings reported by the superintendents in this sample. Superintendents of 4 districts (12%) did not respond to question 7. Of the 29 superintendents that did respond, 20 of the respondents (69%) rated themselves as superior and 7 (24%) rated themselves as very good in their ability to serve the homeless youths in their district. Only 2 of the superintendents (7%) rated themselves as only adequate.

Figure 20. District Self-Assessment – Superintendents
Figure 21 shows self-assessment ratings reported by the liaisons in this sample. Liaisons of 7 of the 20 responding districts (35%) did not respond to question 7. Of the liaisons that responded, 8 (62%) rated themselves as superior and 5 (38%) rated themselves as very good in their ability to serve the homeless youths in their district.

![Figure 21. District Self-Assessment – Liaisons](image)

Figure 22 shows self-assessment ratings reported by Abbott superintendents in this sample. The superintendent of 1 district (6%) did not respond to question 7. Of the 15 superintendents that did respond, 8 of the respondents (53%) rated themselves as superior and approximately 5 (33%) rated themselves as very good in their ability to serve the homeless youths in their district. Superintendents of only 2 of the districts (14%) rated themselves as only adequate.

![Figure 22. District Self-Assessment – Abbott Superintendents](image)
Figure 23 shows the trend in homelessness in each of the districts as reported by the superintendents in this sample. Eight of the respondents (24%) reported that homelessness is increasing in their school district. Five respondents (15%) reported a decrease in homelessness in their school district and 20 respondents (61%) reported that the trend in homelessness is remaining the same. The respondents did not indicate the change in percentage of homeless youths therefore no data is presented regarding that part of survey question 6.

![Graph showing trend in homelessness](image)

*Figure 23. Trend in Homelessness – Superintendents*

Figure 24 shows the trend in homelessness as reported by the liaisons in this sample. Liaisons of 2 districts (10%) did not respond. Of the remaining 18 respondents, liaisons of 6 districts (33%) reported that homelessness is increasing in their school district. Liaisons of 12 districts (67%) reported a decrease in homelessness in their school district and none reported that the trend in homelessness is remaining the same. The respondents did not indicate the change in percentage of homeless youths therefore no data is presented regarding that part of survey question 4.

Figure 25 shows the trend in homelessness as reported by the Abbott superintendents in this sample. Seven of the respondents (44%) reported that homelessness is increasing
in their school district. Two (12%) reported a decrease in homelessness in their school
district and seven respondents (44%) reported that the trend in homelessness is remaining
the same. The respondents did not indicate the change in percentage of homeless youths
therefore no data is presented regarding that part of survey question 6.

Subsidiary Research Question 2

What Barriers Impact on Successful Implementation of These Programs?

McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act, Subtitle VII-B, SEC 722(g)(6)(A)(iii). The
following data deal with that part of the McKinney legislation that addresses the
responsibility of the local educational agencies in providing educational and other
appropriate services.

The numerical coding system used in Figure 26 assigned the number 1 to indicated Strongly Disagree, the number 2 to indicated Disagree, the number 3 to indicate Uncertain, the number 4 to indicate Agree and the number 5 to indicate Strongly Agree.

Figure 26 shows the degree of agreement among liaisons in this sample that each experiences the same national concerns and barriers pertaining to the education of homeless students. There was no strong agreement expressed by the liaisons on any of the barriers in this sample. There was agreement that the funding for the education of homeless youths is inadequate (\( \bar{X} = 4.2 \)), that there is a low level of parental involvement (\( \bar{X} = 4.2 \)), and parental literacy (\( \bar{X} = 3.8 \)), that family mobility is a problem (\( \bar{X} = 4.1 \)), guardianship issues for adolescences are a barrier (\( \bar{X} = 3.5 \)) and that there is a need for adequate health care (\( \bar{X} = 3.6 \)). There was uncertainty pertaining to difficulty in obtaining academic records (\( \bar{X} = 2.9 \)), irregular attendance (\( \bar{X} = 3.3 \)), case management difficulty (\( \bar{X} = 3.1 \)), access to child care (\( \bar{X} = 2.9 \)), clothing (\( \bar{X} = 2.9 \)), community involvement (\( \bar{X} = 3.1 \)), counting the homeless youths (\( \bar{X} = 3.3 \)), special services evaluation difficulties (\( \bar{X} = 2.7 \)), guardianship issues (\( \bar{X} = 3.3 \)), immunization (\( \bar{X} = 2.7 \)), psychological counseling (\( \bar{X} = 3.1 \)), negative public perception (\( \bar{X} = 3.3 \)), residency requirements (\( \bar{X} = 3.2 \)), negative student self-perception (\( \bar{X} = 3.1 \)), teacher sensitivity (\( \bar{X} = 3.4 \)), computer literacy (\( \bar{X} = 2.8 \)), specialized curriculum (\( \bar{X} = 2.6 \)), negative peer perception (\( \bar{X} = 2.9 \)), lack of pre-school programs (\( \bar{X} = 2.8 \)), lack of special programs (\( \bar{X} = 2.6 \)), tutoring programs (\( \bar{X} = 3.3 \)) and low academic achievement (\( \bar{X} = 3.0 \)). Of the 33 concerns presented, the combined liaisons disagreed with only 5: lack of access to extracurricular
activities (\(\bar{X} = 2.4\)), lack of after school programs (\(\bar{X} = 2.1\)), class size (\(\bar{X} = 2.4\)), difficulty in grade level placement (\(\bar{X} = 2.4\)) and lack of school supplies (\(\bar{X} = 2.3\)).

Figure 26. Mean Agreement with Concerns and Problems – Liaisons (n=20)

Table 23 shows responses from the combined liaisons in this sample regarding their
single greatest concern in the education of homeless youths. Responses included family mobility, transportation issues, lack of support personnel, low levels of parent involvement, and problems identifying and counting homeless youths.

Table 23

*Single Greatest Concern – Liaisons*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identify and count</th>
<th>Mobility</th>
<th>Transportation</th>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Parents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N Valid</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act, Subtitle VII-B, SEC 722(g)(7)(A).* The following data deal with that part of the McKinney legislation that addresses the responsibility of the state and local educational agencies in reviewing and revising policies.

Figure 27 shows the status of homeless policies as reported by superintendents in this sample. Superintendents of 16 districts (48%) reported having their own local policies concerning the education of homeless youths.

*Figure 27. Existence of District Level Homeless Policies – Superintendents (n=33)*
Figure 28 shows the status of homeless policies as reported by the Abbott superintendents in this sample. Superintendents of 9 districts (56%) reported having their own local policies concerning the education of homeless youths.

![Existence of District Level Homeless Policies](image)

**Figure 28.** Existence of District Level Homeless Policies – Abbott Superintendents (n=16)

Table 24 shows data on the number of special programs as reported by the liaisons in this sample. Liaisons of 3 districts (15%) did not respond to question 17 and of the 11 districts liaisons (55%) that did respond nine of the districts (82%) had no special programs. Others indicated programs such as free transportation, free or reduced lunches, childcare, clinical health, and social service programs.

Table 24

**Number of Special Programs – Liaisons**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Liaison Responses</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Programs</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No programs</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act, Subtitle VII-B, SEC 723(a)(2)(A). The following data deal with that part of the McKinney legislation that addresses the responsibility of the state in making subgrants to local educational agencies of funds received under McKinney.

Table 25 shows the amounts of special funding received as reported by superintendents in the sample. Superintendents of 8 school districts (24%) did not respond to question 16. Of the superintendents of the 25 districts (76%) responding, only 2 district superintendents (8%) reported receiving McKinney funds; the amounts were $80,000 and $66,000. Superintendents of three districts (12%) reported receiving Title I funds in the amounts of $163,453, $40,000 and $2,200. Superintendents of two districts (8%) reported receiving funds from other sources of $40,000 and $44,970. Superintendents of 18 districts (72%) reported receiving no funds.

Table 25.

Mean Amounts of Special Funding – Superintendents (n=33)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number of Superintendent Responses</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>McKinney</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td>5,840</td>
<td>20,314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title One</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>163,453</td>
<td>8,226</td>
<td>33,310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>44,970</td>
<td>3,398</td>
<td>11,785</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 26 shows the amounts of special funding received as reported by liaisons in this sample. Liaisons of 9 districts (45%) did not respond. Liaisons of the 11 districts that did respond, liaisons of 7 districts (64%) did not receive any funds. The liaison of 1 district (9%) reported receiving McKinney funds in the amount of $66,000. Liaisons of 3
districts (27%) indicated $217,969, $40,000 and $15,000 under Other but failed to specify the source of funding.

Table 26

*Mean Amounts of Special Funding – Liaisons (n=20)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>McKinney</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>66,000</td>
<td>7,333</td>
<td>22,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title One</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>217,969</td>
<td>24,815</td>
<td>65,239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 27 shows the amounts of special funding received in by Abbott superintendents in this sample. Superintendents of 5 school districts (31%) did not respond to question 16. Of the 11 superintendents responding, superintendents of only 2 districts (18%) reported receiving McKinney funds; the amounts were $80,000 and $66,000.

Superintendents of 1 district (9%) reported receiving Title I funds in the amount of $163,453. Superintendents of 2 districts (18%) reported receiving funds from other sources of $40,000 and $44,970. Superintendents of 6 districts (55%) reported receiving no funds.

Table 27.

*Mean Amounts of Special Funding – Abbott Superintendents (n=16)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>McKinney</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td>13,273</td>
<td>29,695</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title One</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>163,453</td>
<td>14,859</td>
<td>49,283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>44,970</td>
<td>7,725</td>
<td>17,222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 29 shows opinions of superintendents on the amounts of special funding received. Superintendents of 11 districts (33%) did not respond to question 17. Superintendents of the 22 districts that voiced an opinion, superintendents of 12 districts (55%) respond that the amounts are extremely lacking or not enough. Superintendents of 10 districts (45%) respond that the amounts are enough.

![Figure 29. Responses on McKinney Funding Amounts – Superintendents](image)

Figure 29. Responses on McKinney Funding Amounts – Superintendents

Figure 30 shows opinions of the liaisons on the amounts of special funding received. Liaisons of 14 districts (70%) did not respond to question 16. Liaisons of the 6 districts that voiced an opinion, liaisons of 5 districts (84%) respond that the amounts are extremely lacking or not enough. The liaison of 1 district (16%) responds that the amounts are enough.

Figure 31 shows opinions on the amounts of special funding by Abbott superintendents in this sample. Superintendents of 7 districts (44%) did not respond to question 17. Superintendents of the 9 districts that voiced an opinion, superintendents of 7 districts (78%) respond that the amounts are extremely lacking or not enough. Superintendents of 2 districts (22%) respond that the amounts are enough.
Figure 30. Responses on McKinney Funding Amounts – Liaisons

Figure 31. Responses on McKinney Funding Amounts – Abbott Superintendents

Subsidiary Research Question 3

What Policy Recommendations Can Be Made to Strengthen Federal, State and Local Compliance With the McKinney-Vento Act?

Data analysis of Subsidiary Research Question 3 is presented as a part of the
summary conclusions of the findings discussed in Chapter V. As addressed in Chapter I of this study, the educational policy that guides practice should have a sound research base. The ultimate purpose of this study is to increase compliance with McKinney and to aid educators in better serving homeless youths within the NJ system of public education.

Summary

This chapter presents the descriptive statistics derived from the data gathered in this study. The next chapter presents summary conclusions of this research, a discussion of the implications of these findings, recommendations for legislators and policy makers, a research theory, suggestions for future research, and a chapter summary.
Chapter V

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

This chapter presents a summary of findings and summary conclusions based on the findings of this research study. Conclusions are drawn regarding the primary research question concerning the adequacy of education provided for homeless students. The subsidiary research questions regarding the current degree of McKinney implementation in the high poverty districts of NJ (DFG A and B), barriers that impede upon its implementation, and policy recommendations to further facilitate its implementation are addressed. Based on these findings and conclusions, recommendations are presented, and policy implications for schools, government, shelters, and the general public are made. A research theory is concluded, and suggestions for future research on the adequacy of education for homeless students are addressed. Conclusions regarding the degree of McKinney implementation are drawn from several areas of this data. Results of this study show significant findings pertaining to the grants for McKinney funding, the existence and nature of the homeless liaison position, the inability of local districts to identify homeless youths for school enrollment, and continued barriers to educational access and success for homeless youth. The conclusions section of this chapter is
organized according to these areas. Collectively, the findings for NJ support the general consensus of the theories presented in Chapter II that McKinney is not being fully implemented at the local level of education (O'Leary, 2001; Rafferty, 1999; Robertson & Toro, 1998; Stronge & Popp, 1998).

Summary of Findings by Major Categories

Funding

Local districts are not accessing the McKinney fund subgrants that are available. In the 47 high poverty school districts represented in this study, only 2 (Abbott districts) reported receiving McKinney funding in the 2000 – 2001 school year. The federal government and state coordinators of McKinney should facilitate subgrant applications by the local school districts. This could be accomplished by assisting local school districts in the application process and make local school districts aware that grants are available. Program funding is necessary, especially when it might be used as seed monies, to establish the much needed practices and services for homeless youths.

In the 47 high poverty school districts in this study, only three report receiving Title I funding and only two reports receiving other funding to support the education of homeless youths. This low level of Title I access eliminates the possibility that local school districts are funding homeless programs as a part of consolidated plans. McKinney stipulates that homeless students are eligible for Title I funds, even when they are attending a non-Title I school. None of the respondents in this sample reported exercising this option. When asked their opinion on McKinney funding amounts, none of the respondents in this study reported the amount to be more than enough. Under the
most recent reauthorization, the level of McKinney education funding was increased, but this change will only be effective towards implementation progress if the local school districts access the money that is available. It is nonsensical that some districts in this study reported having enough money.

McKinney imposes complex requirements in the subgrant application process, which may present an obstacle to local education agencies. At the present time, LEAs do not have the data or resources to present themselves as eligible for funding. For example, the amount awarded in subgrants is partially based on the number of homeless students enrolled in the district. This process is flawed, as without funds to identify homeless youths in the district, they would not be enrolled in the local schools, and therefore the amount awarded will be minimal or denied.

As discussed in the Review of Related Literature, homeless youths are a highly specialized educational population that requires unique school and social services. Individual attention to special needs may be sacrificed if funding for homeless students is included in consolidated plans for all at-risk students. Advocates of consolidated plans suggest that financial resources can be more effectively accessed and better utilized by eliminating some of the paperwork associated with receiving special education funds.

**Local Homeless Liaison Position**

The appointment of local liaisons and their responsibilities are important variables of McKinney success, yet this research suggests a slowness to appoint such school personnel. This is highly undesirable for homeless youths, as they require many special services, including stability of human contact in their school environment. Consider the
especially low response rates to the homeless liaison survey; only 20 of the 115 school districts (17%) solicited responded. This suggests the possible non-existence of the homeless liaison position or school persons who are over-worked, under-trained, or not in a full-time position. Of the districts that did respond, the average length of time that the district employed a homeless liaison was just seven years. Considering that McKinney was passed 16 years ago, implementation progress is slow.

To pay a full-time salary, and establish consistent personnel responsible for identifying and educating homeless youths, local school districts should be using the available funding allocations previously discussed. As McKinney was re-authorized under the No Child Left Behind Act, effective for the 2002-2003 school year, homeless liaisons in all local school districts are now mandated (McKinney Section 722(g)(j)(ii)). This research can serve as a baseline study to monitor progress and compliance with this strict new mandate; as is the case with any federal education mandate, implementation field studies and survey research should be conducted.

Results of this research show that the homeless liaisons spent very few hours per week performing the duties of this position. The least amount of time was spent on the most needed duties, such as, providing workshops, estimating the number of homeless youths, engaging in field visits to local shelters, or resolving disputes. Very little time is spent communicating with federal and state agencies, increasing awareness and collaborating with outside organizations in a case management approach.

Homeless liaisons need time and flexibility to perform outreach programs adequately for the unaccompanied adolescent and doubled-up homeless school-age youths in their districts. The literature supports that this is best done at the local level of education.
Simplistic measures, such as posting signs at food stores and shelters, can be very beneficial to the identification and education of homeless youths. This research supports the fact that the activities of the homeless liaison as mandated by McKinney are not being conducted at the local levels of education. Sixty-percent reported spending less than 10 hours per week at their position.

It should be noted that there was some incongruence in several areas of the raw data reported in this study, including data regarding the liaison position. On some responses, the homeless liaisons did not answer survey question 8 concerning the length of time their school district has had a homeless liaison. Yet, the respondent went on to answer the questions about their own current employment as posed in subsequent survey questions 9 and 10. Therefore, the data on the length of time that the district liaison positions have been established in this sample may not be accurate. The homeless liaisons that responded to this descriptive survey research have been employed in their position for a mean of 6 years.

Identification and Enrollment

The ability to identify, count, and enroll the homeless youths within a local school district is a major focus of this study. Despite formal solicitation for participation, reminders, and extensions, the overall response rate in this study was only 23% of the school personnel solicited. One might view the lack of response as an indicator of McKinney implementation, and conclude from the low response rates that the data requested for this research was not readily available. Those superintendents and homeless liaisons that did not respond possibly could not respond, as they may not have
the accurate counts of homeless youths required to answer the survey questions.

Given the high poverty status of this research sample, one might assume a greater presence of homeless youths in the districts in this sample. Given that the current rates of homelessness estimated in the general population are at the highest levels since the depression, as presented in the Review of Related Literature, the low levels reported in this research suggests the presence of unidentified school-age homeless youths. This sample represents urban and rural areas, both of which are known to contain homeless youths. Burt and Aron (2000) estimated that 39% of the homeless population, or 1,365,000, are children. According to the NJDOE report to Congress in 2000, it is estimated that 5,361 homeless youths are enrolled in NJ schools. This sample reflects 41% of all high poverty DFG A and B districts in NJ, and reports a total of 1,232 homeless youths enrolled.

This research examined the exact methods used to count and identify homeless youths for school enrollment. The data in this sample support that there are not uniform systems in place to make a determination of homelessness in proactive ways. Many of the open-ended responses were reactive measures such as transportation requests or parent registration, supporting the possibility that there is still inconsistency and instability in the educational services provided for homeless youths. As is suggested based on the amount of time liaisons spend at their position, local education agencies do not have the resources to independently collect data on homelessness in their school district. In this sample, 70% of homeless liaisons report spending less than 20 hours per week at the liaison position, which is not enough time to conduct outreach programs.

Experts on homelessness all report difficulties and flaws in the methods used to collect
data on homeless populations (Burt, 1992; NCH, 2001b; USDOE, 1992). Yet in this research, respondents reported being highly confident that they have identified all the homeless youths in their districts. This speaks to the naïveté among educators regarding the great numbers of homeless youths in their communities. Without mechanisms to identify and enroll homeless youths in doubled-up situations, or homeless youths in unaccompanied situations that do not utilize shelters, or homeless youths in rural areas where there are no shelters, districts remain convinced that they have identified and enrolled all the homeless school-age youths in their districts. The inflated self-assessments evident in this research also could be the result of defensive attitudes, given the constant performance monitoring of Abbott and other high poverty districts, or “turning the other way” to the problem. According to the NJDOE report to the USDOE in 2000, it is estimated that there are 6,435 homeless youths in shelters, 1,064 homeless youths in doubled-up, and 8,940 homeless youths in other nighttime locations.

Local education agencies self-assessed very positively regarding the school enrollment of homeless youths, yet in this sample, homeless youths represent less than one percent of the total school population. According to the NJDOE report to the USDOE in 2000, in some districts the percent of homeless youths to total youths is a high as 4.8%. As the administrators in these districts reported a total enrollment of 185,403, one might expect as many as 7,500 homeless students to be enrolled, versus the 1,232 as reported. Although the McKinney legislation requires that the USDOE monitor state and local educational agencies beyond receiving reports, 16 years after McKinney there is no evidence that this is being done.

A significant finding of this study involves the inability of local homeless liaisons to
report data on the number of high school drop outs that were homeless. Drop out rates among homeless adolescence are unknown yet such information would be a key indicator to school access and success. This suggests that tracking the academic achievement of homeless youths is not sufficient. None of the homeless liaisons in this sample reported conducting outreach programs to identify unaccompanied homeless adolescents in the local district. By the low numbers enrolled, the lack of outreach programs, and the lack of available dropout data, this study reports low levels of McKinney implementation regarding unaccompanied homeless adolescents. The results for school enrollment by grade level show that homeless high school students represent only 0.5% of all high school students in this study. Robertson and Toro (1998) estimated that 5% of all youths aged 12-17 are homeless.

Another significant finding of this research is how few districts reported homeless students enrolled at the pre-school level of education, and the low-level of homeless pre-school enrollment, less than 1% of the total school population. This is especially surprising given the number of Abbott districts in this sample, as early childhood education is a focus of the Abbott decision. It is possible that homeless pre-school students are in community-day providers, which Abbott allows. It should also be noted that in response to survey question 18, homeless liaisons reported that access to pre-school programs was not a barrier in the education of homeless youths, yet districts did not report pre-school enrollment. The results for school enrollment by grade level in this study show that homeless pre-school students represents only 0.5% of all pre-school students. According to the USDOE report to Congress in 2000, it was estimated that there are approximately 257,076 pre-school-aged homeless youths nationally, and 16% of
homeless pre-school children are enrolled in pre-school programs.

Often times, homeless parents are forced to move around due to temporary housing placements made by social service agencies. Although they would prefer to place their children in the schools of their original district, it is not always possible, and homeless parents tend to register their children in the public school district where the family happened to be placed (Egan, 2002). In survey question 19, homeless liaisons cited family mobility as a great difficulty in the education of homeless youths. More advanced systems of identification, tracking, and an accurate count of homeless youths are greatly needed in order to appropriately plan and finance educational services.

The data collected concerning the trends in homelessness in this sample yielded interesting results. Many of the Non-Abbott high poverty districts reported the trend in homelessness to be remaining the same and often reported that the number of homeless youths in their districts to be zero. In these cases, one might assume same to mean the same high levels of unidentified homeless school-age youths. Many of the Abbott districts also indicated the trend in homelessness to be remaining the same. In these cases, districts with high numbers of homeless youths in their schools also reported the trend in homelessness to be remaining the same. For these districts, same translates into a continuing high number of homeless youths. Again, given that these were high poverty districts, one might assume homeless populations do in fact exist. The large cities in this sample must have hundreds of unidentified homeless school-age youths, and rural areas are known to contain hidden homeless populations (Visser, 1998). As such conditions exist, there will continue to be problems for state and federal education administrators to collect data on local levels of McKinney implementation.
Programs, Practices and Support Personnel

This research examines the practices and programs for homeless youths at the local level of education. All of the superintendents in this sample agree that more proactive measures are needed in the education of homeless youths. They agree that central office and school level staff both need more knowledge and information regarding homelessness. Although approximately half of the districts in this survey reported the existence of district-level homeless policies, there were discrepancies in the data. Several respondents who answered that they did have district policies then went on to qualify their response as following state guidelines. McKinney mandates that local districts revise policies to reduce school barriers for homeless youths (McKinney Section 722(g)(l)).

Few of the districts in this sample reported having any special programs for homeless youths, and in addition, there were incongruities in the data. Several of the districts that reported having programs went on to qualify their response by listing programs which are also available to impoverished housed youths, such as free lunch.

The existence of support staff is critical to implementation of practices and programs for homeless youths. This research finds that the greatest amount of support comes from guidance counselors, nurses, and special education teachers. It would be logical to start staff development programs for these school personnel to increase awareness and understanding of the educational issues surrounding homelessness. Homeless liaisons report little support from psychologists or social workers. The raw data of this research show a drastic difference in the number of school social workers as support staff between Abbott and Non-Abbott respondents. This is because the Abbott decision mandates
school social workers for all Abbott districts. As of this writing, a climate of change is affecting the Abbott districts and due to fiscal problems, many Abbott districts are being forced to downsize the number of social workers that they have.

The ability to collaborate, communicate, and coordinate with outside agencies is critical to effective delivery of educational services for homeless youths. Based on homeless liaison survey question responses on the amount of time on task and barriers, this study suggests minimal use of the case management approach to the education of homeless youths. The future of education must involve a paradigm shift in the concept of schools as separate and isolated entities, and move towards increased cooperation with outside agencies to maximize the delivery of school services.

To this end, the NLCHP has recently launched a training program for educators, service providers, and attorneys (Julianelle, 2002a). The initial training programs were conducted in California and New England and will continue nationwide. The presentation used by the NLCHP includes vignettes that allow participants to apply the law to hypothetical situations, issue briefs about the new law, fact sheets and other resources.

Local school districts should have the capacity to gather the data necessary to cooperate with the state and federal monitoring of compliance. The respondents in this sample report being not well-informed by the state and federal levels of education on how to comply with McKinney. Only two of the respondents reported having more than enough information from the state coordinator. Many superintendents reported that the amount of information from state coordinators was enough, which contradicted their responses to previous survey questions 8, 9 and 10. Being ill informed is incongruent
with the favorable self-assessment of district performance in the enrollment and education of homeless youths. Starting in the early part of 2003, state coordinators for homeless youths are increasing efforts to disseminate information regarding homelessness to local educational agencies. This research can serve as a baseline study to monitor the effectiveness of this campaign.

This research examines the amount of time spent by the homeless liaisons in coordinating programs for homeless youths. This is important given the recent trend in education to consolidate programs for specialized populations of at-risk students. Local districts should also use Title I monies for outreach services and collaboration with other agencies that are in contact with homeless youths. Homeless students with disabilities require even greater attention.

The opinions of the administrators in this sample suggest that staff development courses should be offered to school personnel to increase sensitivity regarding the issues surrounding homelessness. Awareness campaigns, such as dissemination of posters and pamphlets, serves to increase awareness among the general population, and possibly decrease the stigma associated with homelessness. The homeless liaisons in this sample report distorted public perceptions of homeless as a continued barrier to the education of homeless youths.

Maybe more homeless parents in doubled-up situations would come forth for school services or unaccompanied homeless youths would have an idea on their rights to educational services, regardless of their homeless status. Information is available from the federal and state education agencies, and dissemination of such information is now mandated by McKinney. This could serve to lessen social stigma, a continued barrier in
the education of homeless youths as cited by the local homeless liaisons in this study.

*Barriers to School Access and Success*

Local district homeless liaisons were questioned regarding their opinion on a broad array of concerns regarding the education of homeless youths. Many of the concerns reported are problems or barriers that stem from the condition of homelessness as they create administrative challenges to the normal functioning of public schools. Examples of this include family mobility, parental literacy and involvement, inadequate health care, lack of psychological counseling, and lack of sensitivity regarding homelessness.

Liaisons also report barriers to academic success, such as lack of tutoring services, lack of teacher sensitivity, irregular school attendance. As discussed previously, liaisons report the lack of funding and difficulty counting homeless youths as continued barriers to school access. Guardianship issues continue to present a barrier to the enrollment of unaccompanied homeless youths.

The homeless liaisons in this study reported the lack of adequate healthcare as a barrier to education of homeless youths. Physical and mental health affects a student’s attendance and their readiness to learn.

Homeless liaisons also reported that the challenge of interacting with homeless parents presents an obstacle to educating homeless youths. Although it is not within the formal responsibility of the school to educate parents, evening programs could be held to facilitate the ability of homeless parents to contribute positively to the education of their children. This would be very difficult with the parents of homeless youths, given their problems in transportation and child-care. Certainly, schools can attempt to provide the instructional support usually accomplished by parents.
When asked to name their single greatest concern regarding barriers to the education of homeless youths, homeless liaisons in this study reported family mobility and difficulties identifying and counting homeless youths. Perhaps modern technology and computer tracking systems can serve to alleviate these problems. Several homeless liaisons in this study also reported transportation as being very difficult. The most recent reauthorization of McKinney expanded the wording on guidelines for a shared cost of transportation between districts (McKinney Section 722(g)(1)(j)(iii)(II)). Homeless liaisons in this study also reported great difficulty involving homeless parents in their children’s education. According to McKinney (Section 722(g)(6)(A)(iv)) parents should be informed of the rights of their children.

The homeless liaisons in this sample reported some issues surrounding the education of homeless youths to be resolved. For example, access to pre-school programs was rated low as a barrier, yet the pre-school enrollment was minimal. Homeless liaisons also reported that grade level placement was not a concern, yet experts in the field agree that homeless students are very difficult to place in appropriate grade levels. Perhaps evaluations of McKinney implementation should not rely on self-report assessments by local school districts.

Segregated Educational Settings

This research assesses the attitudes of educators towards segregated educational settings for homeless youths. The results of this study provide strong support for public schools as the most desirable educational setting for homeless youths. The overwhelming majority of education professionals in this sample are not in favor of segregated schools.
This is directly contrary to the recent governmental practice of allowing some segregated schools to exist, as was delineated under the 2001 reauthorization of McKinney (McKinney Section 723(a)(2)(B)). Noncompliance with the original provisions of McKinney prohibiting segregated schools were not enforced, and rather than imposing consequences, Congress amended the legislation to allow several such schools to exist. The McKinney legislation as it currently exists could open the door to allow other districts to attempt to segregate the education of homeless school-age youths. There would not be a need for segregated schools for homeless youth if local education districts provided the necessary human and financial resources needed to provide the broad array of special services mandated by McKinney for homeless youths.

This research examines the presence of shelters to assess their potential impact on proximal school districts. Schools with shelters in their districts did report higher numbers of homeless youth enrolled in the proximal schools. Given that families may need to break up for shelter services, elementary school teachers should keep in mind that their male students might be alone at a shelter separate from their mother or sisters.

This study found a low level of time spent by homeless liaisons interacting with shelters. Homeless families contact shelters to inquire about availability of beds, and although a shelter may be full or unable to accommodate them for some other reason, homeless families should be given school enrollment information at that time. Shelters should have available the name and phone number of a local school district homeless liaison and perhaps be required to report children utilizing the shelter or at least inform homeless parents that they need to register their school-age children with the local school district. These policies will only be possible if school districts reevaluate the necessary
means by which to educate homeless youths, and more towards a more collaborative approach with outside agencies.

Overview of Conclusions

The progress made in transforming McKinney mandates into local practices has been slow and very limited in NJ. Educators and government policy makers in NJ are not doing enough to provide homeless youths with educational opportunities equal to those of housed youths. These statements are supported by the limited number of McKinney subgrants, the low number of homeless youths enrolled in schools, the lack of responses on some survey questions, inconsistencies in the data, and inflated self-assessments in this sample. As identified in this study, several barriers to school access and success for homeless youths exist. This research also establishes that professional educators are not in favor of segregated settings for the education of homeless youths.

The inability of local school districts to identify homeless youths and enroll them in successful school programs appears to be what is described as a rogue problem (Achilles, Reynolds, & Achilles, 1997). This problem is deeply grounded in beliefs about the purpose of schools and also about the nature of homelessness. Therefore, it is very difficult to effect change. At the local levels of education, school administrators do not seem to have control of the problem, and attempts to harness it are political and litigious. The increasing numbers of homeless youths coupled with the apparent inability of schools to serve them make this a problem of the solution whereby the problem is known, and the policy analyst is left to find reasonable solutions (Achilles et al., 1997).

Educational policy is both a vision of where we want to go and recommendations for
getting there (First, 1992). Policy statements require subsequent development of
procedural statements, such as guidelines, rules and regulations. In the case of this
research, the McKinney legislation provides the procedural statements and ways to
enhance implementation becomes the focus of attention. The policy recommendations of
this study reflect the crucial elements of all policy statements in that they are made with
the long-term vision of achieving McKinney compliance; they will involve strong
leadership to accomplish; and they are wide in scope to address all of the complexities of
educating homeless youths.

Recommendations and Policy Implications

All Abbott and high poverty school districts should be receiving financial support for
their homeless student population, as according to homeless experts, there are record
numbers of homeless school-age youths. A policy recommendation for the local school
districts is to establish grant committees to pursue McKinney funds. As the grant
application process may present obstacles to local school districts, it is recommended that
the grant application process be eliminated and appropriated monies be allocated directly
to districts, perhaps based on a combination of total enrollment and poverty status of the
district. Allocation could be accomplished by using similar procedures to the allocation
of Title I funds. This change would involve an amendment to the guidelines in the
current legislation. It is a recommendation of this study to accelerate access to separate
monies for the education of homeless youths as a top priority. Much of the administrative
paperwork associated with grant applications and can be eliminated by immediate
allocation of annual McKinney funds for homeless youths to local school districts. In
summary, utilizing the higher levels of funding by easier access to subgrant monies for local educational agencies is a recommendation of this research.

Each local district should have a homeless liaison who is a full-time employee and with responsibilities in order to be effective and to be in compliance with McKinney. State level funding could be used to expand the responsibilities of state coordinators to monitor the requirement that each district have a full-time employee serving in the homeless liaison position. More state monitoring is needed to study how time is spent and what tasks are performed by local homeless liaisons. It is a recommendation of this study that local school districts review the job description of the district homeless liaison, and provides the time and financial resources to increase efforts towards the identification, enrollment and education of homeless youths.

In rural areas where shelters may not exist, it is recommended that extra special funding be allocated to support the more costly process of community out-reach programs to identify homeless youths. Greater community awareness of homelessness and public assistance is also needed to locate families in doubled-up situations, and to locate the homeless adolescents that may be living outdoors. It is a recommendation of this research that outside monitoring of local school districts be conducted regarding their ability to identify and count homeless youths. Self-report systems of assessing legislation compliance may have a self-serving bias, and consequently are not valid or reliable. Federal and state education agencies should assist and monitor local education agencies in establishing systems for the identification and enrollment of homeless youths.

It is a recommendation of this research that homeless pre-school enrollment be monitored, and it should also be monitored possibly in conjunction with Abbott
implementation studies. Computer tracking systems can be offered as a recommendation to strengthen McKinney implementation. Educators can maintain a database of homeless youths, and thereby track their location and school enrollment. This system would facilitate the movement of records, and would decrease the amount of school time lost during transitional periods. It could also be used to track populations especially at risk of school failure, such as pre-school-aged homeless children, unaccompanied homeless adolescents or students with disabilities. This database could be maintained by the USDOE. It is recommended that state coordinators for the education of homeless youths oversee that effective methods for identifying and enrolling homeless youths in school be established at the local levels of education. It is also suggested that operational definitions of the variables in identification and enrollment study methodology be established.

It is a recommendation of this study that state coordinators for homeless youths monitor McKinney compliance in the local districts that have yet to revise their policies. In order to follow the mandates of McKinney, more flexible local school policies for homeless students need to be devised. Given the complex educational and social needs of homeless students, it is recommended that innovative special programs specifically for homeless youths be developed. Given the special needs of homeless students in this area of expertise, it is recommended that local districts increase the number of psychologists and social workers as support personnel. It is a policy recommendation of this research that all districts retain at least one district social worker, and that collaboration with the state coordinator and local liaison for homeless youth be a major part of their job description. Perhaps McKinney funds could be used to resolve this problem and maintain the current level of Abbott district social workers. It is recommended that local districts
increase collaboration with social service agencies with increased assistance from the state coordinator. Educators, parents, shelter personnel and education attorneys could collaborate as advocates for homeless youths. Policy recommendations of this research include the flow of more information to facilitate implementation of McKinney. It is a recommendation of this research that local districts adjust their special services evaluation process by assuming special services are needed by homeless youths. To shorten or eliminate standard procedures for evaluation would facilitate the immediate start of such services, and reduce the amount of lost time resulting from high levels of family mobility. In order to decrease the social stigma associated with homelessness, it is recommended that future implementation studies focus on the efforts of local districts to conduct awareness campaigns. It is also recommended that local districts infuse the topic of homelessness into the elementary and secondary school curriculum.

It is a recommendation of this study to increase the role of school nurses to include collaboration with outside health organizations and communication with homeless parents. This would maximize the schools’ ability to combat the barrier of inadequate healthcare. It is a recommendation of this study that programs such as tutoring be provided, perhaps through collaboration with shelter personnel. In staff development programs, teachers can gain a greater sensitivity to homework considerations for homeless youths. These practices would maximize the school’s ability to combat the barriers inherent in dealing with homeless adult parents.

It is highly recommended that the USDOE revisit the decision to allow segregated schools for homeless youth. Separate facilities are inherently unequal, and in many cases inferior, to a mainstream public education. It is recommended that extra special funding
be allocated directly to districts that contain homeless shelters as they do in fact have higher numbers of homeless youths. Collaborative programs with shelters could provide adult assistance with homework. Partnerships with shelters may also be effective as a method to identify families living in doubled-up situations.

Research Theory

Granted that this research should be viewed with the caveat of representing only 53 school administrators in NJ, however, the familiarity with the McKinney legislation seems to be minimal. Despite the horrifying evidence that exists regarding the rapid increase in homeless school-aged youths, there seems to be very little consciousness of the problem on the part of local public schools. Thus, the education gap that exists between rich and poor students, which has been well documented for several decades, will continue to exist. Top-down systems of the federal government have failed to effect change in local public schools.

Therefore, it is the theory of this researcher that a different approach is needed. What is needed is a grassroots campaign at the local level of education to increase awareness of the educational issues surrounding homeless students. Recent research conducted for the Citizens for Better Schools (as cited in Gutmore & Walker, 2002) has shown that individual local education agencies can be successful in achieving goals by engaging in sophisticated data analysis and disseminating information to teachers and other appropriate personnel.

By proper direction of staff development activities and support services to students, school leadership personnel can potentially alleviate much of the educational plight of
homeless youth. Hopefully, school administrators will begin to take a more aggressive role as advocates for homeless youths. A proper education is an imperative in today's society. As this dissertation presented the complexities of serving the homeless school-age population in public schools, much needs to be done, and the local levels of education may be an effective place to institute change.

Local school leadership can be sophisticated enough to combat public apathy, and to overcome the limitations that might exist at the state and federal levels of school governance. Shrewd and dedicated education administrators can create a climate of cultural readiness for school reform. As was presented in the Review of Related Literature, unique local policies for homeless youths should be employed, given that conditions will be particular to each local district. This researcher highly recommends more bottom up strategies.

Institutional change can be difficult to effect. Research findings of the Aston Group (as cited in Pugh & Hickson, 1997) isolated two elements of any organization: how far the activities of its personnel are structured, and how far its decision-making authority is concentrated at the top. The Aston Group research examined many types of organizations, and demonstrated that significant comparisons can be made between organizations of any kind, including school systems.

The Aston Group emphasized the role of strategic choice on the part of management. Their findings can be used to support the potential for school administrators to create a climate that is conducive to the education of homeless youths. Through empowerment at the local levels of education, school administrators and teachers can collaborate with other organizations to better serve homeless youths in our current systems of public
schooling. Gutmore and Walker (2002) also support that schools can be highly effective at increasing achievement by engaging the school bureaucracy.

Educational change has an objective reality, and the existing concept of what constitutes reality on any given issue depends on who is defining it (Fullan & Stiegelbauer, 1991). Transforming the research theory of a grassroots campaign for homeless students into practice may present complex challenges to educators. The feasibility of the recommendations presented in this research may be affected by financial, social, and political limitations. Identifying areas of need and implementing school reform is a slow but invaluable process. Recommendations for objective dimensions of change should be open to further transformation, development, and alteration during implementation.

In summary, the results of this research suggest that federal level mandates have done little to ensure educational opportunities for homeless youths. As was presented in the Review of Related Literature, a number of local school level practices, if instituted, have great potential to increase McKinney compliance. As was presented in this section, local level initiatives can be highly effective in bringing about school reform. By combining these ideas, it can be theorized that local level campaigns aimed at implementing McKinney mandates would be the most fruitful avenue of approach.

Implications for Future Research

This author recognizes that there are shortcomings in the descriptive survey research design of this study as some questions were designed to measure quantitative indicators for data that currently may not exist. It is therefore recommended that variations in
research design be conducted, specifically, using on site field study observations and interviews. Such approaches would yield more qualitative data, and given the current difficulties and low levels of McKinney implementation, data that might be more appropriate at this point in time. Field visits to the offices that administer McKinney programs should be conducted. This should include all levels of education administration, such as, the Office of Specialized Populations in Trenton, NJ, and the OESE in Washington, DC. Federal and state review boards should conduct field visits to local education agencies and program sites.

Perhaps in time, as systems for gathering statistics on homeless youths are in place, and as the quantitative data becomes more available, descriptive survey research methods could be more effectively employed. This research examines only district Factor Groups A and B however, homelessness exists virtually everywhere. Future survey research could be more comprehensive by including a study of all the NJ school districts DFGs. It is also recommended that other state coordinators conduct similar self-study models, and assess the degree of McKinney implementation in their state. Many state evaluations of McKinney implementation are conducted by outside organizations.

Field visits by local homeless liaisons could also be made to study conditions at local shelters. The literature strongly supports that positive, collaborative relationships with homeless shelters can greatly enhance the chances for educational achievement among homeless youths. By increasing the availability of print media and providing tutoring services, shelters can be instrumental in facilitating school success for homeless youths. Frequent field visits to shelters would also greatly enhance the chances of identifying homeless youths for school enrollment, especially at the pre-school level. Field visits to
the community would be a viable avenue to establish out-reach services for families in
doubled-up situations and for unaccompanied adolescent homeless youths.

This research was conducted at a time when attitudes towards segregated schools for
homeless youths were disparate. The school administrators in this sample were not in
favor of segregation. Future research should monitor the segregated schools that were
allowed to exist under the most recent reauthorization of McKinney. It would also be
fruitful to monitor the few local public school districts that procured subgrant money.

Future research on the education of homeless youths should target the age groups that
are most at risk of school failure, specifically, pre-school and high school homeless
youths. Based on the findings of low school enrollment for these groups in this study,
policy analysts should focus on increasing school enrollment for these populations as a
priority. School access will precede school success and research methods should be
devised to identify and enroll homeless pre-school and adolescents.

Many states have policies that make it difficult for homeless youths to survive on their
own. The NLCHP is currently working on a guide that contains summaries of laws from
every state and territory that affect the education and general well being of homeless
adolescents (Julianelle, 2002b). When completed, this guide will be useful to educators
and service providers, better enabling LEAs to provide an education to homeless
adolescents.

This research examines the education of homeless youths in the USA, specifically in
the state of NJ. Homelessness exists all over the world, and it is estimated that globally,
there are millions of homeless school-age youths (Harris, 2000). In a global society,
comparative educational practices can help resolve domestic educational problems. A
meta-analysis of the international research on the education of homeless children may be beneficial to the formulation of American school policy for homeless youths.

Chapter Summary

This chapter presents the summary conclusions, recommendations and policy implications derived from this research. Ideas for future studies regarding the education of homeless youth are presented. These are turbulent times in education, with several areas of identified and increasing need, against a tide of limited and reduced resources. It is more important than ever to guide policy and practice by research, and thereby increase the focus and effectiveness of federal education mandates and monies. This is certainly the case regarding the education of homeless youth, an increasing and unique segment of the school population.

The combined results of all areas of analysis provided by this study indicate that all homeless youths are not enrolled in school, and of the few who are, few are being provided any special services as might be funded by McKinney. It seems that homeless youths are not receiving an adequate education, and may be being “left behind”.

The complexities and interdependencies of the issues surrounding the education of homeless youths require an awareness of systems thinking. The discipline of systems thinking requires that problems and goals be viewed as components of larger structures, and not as isolated events (Senge et al., 2000). The elements of the problems and goals for the education of homeless youths continually affect each other over time. The recommendations of this study are drawn from the findings regarding both the short and long term behaviors necessary for the implementation of new strategies to achieve equal
education opportunity for homeless youths. Principles and strategies of an organization should define what it stands for, and what its members wish to create (Senge et al., 2000).

There is a call to educators and policy makers to increase their attention and commit their resources to the education of homeless youths. The data obtained by this research regarding the level of McKinney implementation should be of great interest and use to educators as they seek to provide a FAPE for all homeless youths. In addition to a lack of resources, problems associated with self-report suggest a need for increased role of state and federal education agencies. At the present time, monitoring takes the form of reviewing reports prepared and submitted by the states. There is no penalty for noncompliance with McKinney. Educational practices geared toward the education of homeless youths are only required when made contingent on receiving funds. The logic becomes that by not requesting funds, there is no demand to establish the existence of available services.

Despite several decades of increasing family homelessness, there is little consciousness of the problem among the general population and NJ educators. There also appears to be limited experience or expertise among education professionals concerning the unique academic and social needs of homeless youths. This research can serve as a baseline to study implementation progress regarding the new, more stringent mandates of the McKinney 2001 reauthorization, measures that became effective in July of 2002 to be implemented in the 2002-2003 school year. Hopefully, under the strengthened reauthorization of McKinney, and with a continued focus on compliance, the present conditions in education will change and all homeless youths will have the opportunity for school access and success. Educators should have an increased understanding of the
McKinney mandates, and should become advocates for homeless youths in their districts. Delay in this mission means lifetimes of lost opportunity, as education is critical to well being in life for homeless youths, and ultimately, to the perpetuation of the democratic freedoms enjoyed by all members of our society.
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Appendix A

McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act, Subtitle VII-B
Subtitle B—Education for Homeless Children and Youths

SEC. 721. STATEMENT OF POLICY.

The following is the policy of the Congress:

(1) Each State educational agency shall ensure that each child of a homeless individual and each homeless youth has equal access to the same free, appropriate public education, including a public preschool education, as provided to other children and youths.

(2) In any State that has a compulsory residency requirement as a component of the State's compulsory school attendance laws or other laws, regulations, practices, or policies that may act as a barrier to the enrollment, attendance, or success in school of homeless children and youths, the State will review and undertake steps to revise such laws, regulations, practices, or policies to ensure that homeless children and youths are afforded the same free, appropriate public education as provided to other children and youths.

(3) Homelessness alone is not sufficient reason to separate students from the mainstream school environment.

(4) Homeless children and youths should have access to the education and other services that such children and youths need to ensure that such children and youths have an opportunity to meet the same challenging State student academic achievement standards to which all students are held.

SEC. 722. GRANTS FOR STATE AND LOCAL ACTIVITIES FOR THE EDUCATION OF HOMELESS CHILDREN AND YOUTHS.

(a) GENERAL AUTHORITY—The Secretary is authorized to make grants to States in accordance with the provisions of this section to enable such States to carry out the activities described in subsections (d) through (g).

(b) APPLICATION—No State may receive a grant under this section unless the State educational agency submits an application to the Secretary at such time, in such manner, and containing or accompanied by such information as the Secretary may reasonably require.

(c) ALLOCATION AND RESERVATIONS—

(1) ALLOCATION—(A) Subject to subparagraph (B), the Secretary is authorized to allot to each State an amount that bears the same ratio to the amount appropriated for such year under section 726 that remains after the Secretary reserves funds under paragraph (2) and uses funds to carry out section 724(d) and (h), as the amount allocated under section 1122 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to the State for that year bears to the total amount allocated under section 1122 of such Act to all States for that year, except that no State shall receive less than the greater of—

(i) $150,000;

(ii) one-fourth of 1 percent of the amount appropriated under section 726 for that year; or

(iii) the amount such State received under this section for fiscal year 2001.

(B) If there are insufficient funds in a fiscal year to allot to each State the minimum amount under subparagraph (A), the Secretary shall ratably reduce the allotments to all States based on the proportionate share that each State received under this subsection for the preceding fiscal year.

(2) RESERVATIONS—(A) The Secretary is authorized to reserve 0.1 percent of the amount appropriated for each fiscal year under section 726 to be allocated by the Secretary among the United States Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, according to their respective
need for assistance under this subtitle, as determined by the Secretary.

'(B)(i) The Secretary shall transfer 1 percent of the amount appropriated for each fiscal year under section 72 to the Department of the Interior for programs for Indian students served by schools funded by the Secretary of the Interior, as determined under the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 45 et seq.), that are consistent with the purposes of the programs described in this subtitle.

'(ii) The Secretary and the Secretary of the Interior shall enter into an agreement, consistent with the requirements of this subtitle, for the distribution and use of the funds described in clause (i) under terms that the Secretary determines best meet the purposes of the programs described in this subtitle. Such agreement shall set forth the plans of the Secretary of the Interior for the use of the amounts transferred, including appropriate goals, objectives, and milestones.

'(3) STATE DEFINED- For purposes of this subsection, the term 'State' does not include the United States Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, or the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands.

'(d) ACTIVITIES- Grants under this section shall be used for the following:

'(1) To carry out the policies set forth in section 721 in the State.

'(2) To provide activities for, and services to, homeless children, including preschool-aged homeless children, and youths that enable such children and youths to enroll in, attend, and succeed in school, or, if appropriate, in preschool programs.

'(3) To establish or designate an Office of Coordinator for Education of Homeless Children and Youths in the State educational agency in accordance with subsection (f).

'(4) To prepare and carry out the State plan described in subsection (g).

'(5) To develop and implement professional development programs for school personnel to heighten their awareness of, and capacity to respond to, specific problems in the education of homeless children and youths.

'(e) STATE AND LOCAL SUBGRANTS-

'(1) MINIMUM DISBURSEMENTS BY STATES- From the sums made available each year to carry out this subtitle, the State educational agency shall distribute not less than 75 percent in subgrants to local educational agencies for the purposes of carrying out section 723, except that States funded at the minimum level set forth in subsection (c)(1) shall distribute not less than 50 percent in subgrants to local educational agencies for the purposes of carrying out section 723.

'(2) USE BY STATE EDUCATIONAL AGENCY- A State educational agency may use funds made available for State use under this subtitle to conduct activities under subsection (f) directly or through grants or contracts.

'(3) PROHIBITION ON SEGREGATING HOMELESS STUDENTS-

'(A) IN GENERAL- Except as provided in subparagraph (B) and section 723(a)(2)(B)(ii), in providing a free public education to a homeless child or youth, no State receiving funds under this subtitle shall segregate such child or youth in a separate school, or in a separate program within a school, based on such child's or youth's status as homeless.

'(B) EXCEPTION- Notwithstanding subparagraph (A), paragraphs (1)(i)(i) and (3) of subsection (g), section 723(a)(2), and any other provision of this subtitle relating to the placement of homeless children or youths in schools, a State that has a separate school for homeless children or youths that was operated in fiscal year 2000 in a covered county shall be eligible to receive funds under this subtitle for programs carried out in such school if--

'(i) the school meets the requirements of subparagraph (C);

'(ii) any local educational agency serving a school that the homeless children and youths enrolled in the separate school are eligible to attend meets the requirements of subparagraph (E); and
(iii) the State is otherwise eligible to receive funds under this subtitle.

(C) SCHOOL REQUIREMENTS- For the State to be eligible under subparagraph (B) to receive funds under this subtitle, the school described in such subparagraph shall--

(I) provide written notice, at the time any child or youth seeks enrollment in such school, and at least twice annually while the child or youth is enrolled in such school, to the parent or guardian of the child or youth (or, in the case of an unaccompanied youth, the youth) that--

(I) shall be signed by the parent or guardian (or, in the case of an unaccompanied youth, the youth);

(II) sets forth the general rights provided under this subtitle;

(III) specifically states--

(aa) the choice of schools homeless children and youths are eligible to attend, as provided in subsection (g)(3)(A);

(bb) that no homeless child or youth is required to attend a separate school for homeless children or youths;

(cc) that homeless children and youths shall be provided comparable services described in subsection (g)(4), including transportation services, educational services, and meals through school meals programs; and

(dd) that homeless children and youths should not be stigmatized by school personnel; and

(IV) provides contact information for the local liaison for homeless children and youths and the State Coordinator for Education of Homeless Children and Youths;

(ii)(I) provide assistance to the parent or guardian of each homeless child or youth (or, in the case of an unaccompanied youth, the youth) to exercise the right to attend the parent's or guardian's (or youth's) choice of schools, as provided in subsection (g)(3)(A); and

(II) coordinate with the local educational agency with jurisdiction for the school selected by the parent or guardian (or youth), to provide transportation and other necessary services;

(iii) ensure that the parent or guardian (or, in the case of an unaccompanied youth, the youth) shall receive the information required by this subparagraph in a manner and form understandable to such parent or guardian (or youth), including, if necessary and to the extent feasible, in the native language of such parent or guardian (or youth); and

(iv) demonstrate in the school's application for funds under this subtitle that such school--

(I) is complying with clauses (I) and (II); and

(II) is meeting (as of the date of submission of the application) the same Federal and State standards, regulations, and mandates as other public schools in the State (such as complying with sections 1111 and 1116 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 and providing a full range of education and related services, including services applicable to students with disabilities).

(D) SCHOOL INELIGIBILITY- A separate school described in subparagraph (B) that fails to meet the standards, regulations, and mandates described in subparagraph (C)(iv)(II) shall not be eligible to receive funds under this subtitle for programs carried out in such school after the first date of such failure.

(E) LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCY REQUIREMENTS- For the State to be eligible to receive the funds described in subparagraph (B), the local educational agency described in subparagraph (B)(ii) shall--

(I) implement a coordinated system for ensuring that homeless children and youths--
'(I) are advised of the choice of schools provided in subsection (g) (3) (A);

'(II) are immediately enrolled, in accordance with subsection (g) (3) (C), in the school selected under subsection (g) (3) (A); and

'(III) are promptly provided necessary services described in subsection (g) (4), including transportation, to allow homeless children and youths to exercise their choices of schools under subsection (g) (3) (A);

'(ii) document that written notice has been provided--

'(I) in accordance with subparagraph (C) (i) for each child or youth enrolled in a separate school under subparagraph (B); and

'(II) in accordance with subsection (g) (6) (A) (v);

'(iii) prohibit schools within the agency's jurisdiction from referring homeless children or youths to, or requiring homeless children and youths to enroll in or attend, a separate school described in subparagraph (B);

'(iv) identify and remove any barriers that exist in schools within the agency's jurisdiction that may have contributed to the creation or existence of separate schools described in subparagraph (B); and

'(v) not use funds received under this subtitle to establish--

'(I) new or additional separate schools for homeless children or youths; or

'(II) new or additional sites for separate schools for homeless children or youths, other than the sites occupied by the schools described in subparagraph (B) in fiscal year 2000.

'(F) REPORT--

'(I) PREPARATION-- The Secretary shall prepare a report on the separate schools and local educational agencies described in subparagraph (B) that receive funds under this subtitle in accordance with this paragraph. The report shall contain, at a minimum, information on--

'(I) compliance with all requirements of this paragraph;

'(II) barriers to school access in the school districts served by the local educational agencies; and

'(III) the progress the separate schools are making in integrating homeless children and youths into the mainstream school environment, including the average length of student enrollment in such schools.

'(ii) COMPLIANCE WITH INFORMATION REQUESTS-- For purposes of enabling the Secretary to prepare the report, the separate schools and local educational agencies shall cooperate with the Secretary and the State Coordinator for Education of Homeless Children and Youths established in the State under subsection (d) (3), and shall comply with any requests for information by the Secretary and State Coordinator for such State.

'(iii) SUBMISSION-- Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Education Assistance Improvements Act of 2001, the Secretary shall submit the report described in clause (i) to--

'(I) the President;

'(II) the Committee on Education and the Workforce of the House of Representatives; and
(III) the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate.

(G) DEFINITION—For purposes of this paragraph, the term "covered county" means—

(i) San Joaquin County, California;

(ii) Orange County, California;

(iii) San Diego County, California; and

(iv) Maricopa County, Arizona.

(f) FUNCTIONS OF THE OFFICE OF COORDINATOR—The Coordinator for Education of Homeless Children and Youths established in each State shall—

(1) gather reliable, valid, and comprehensive information on the nature and extent of the problems homeless children and youths have in gaining access to public preschool programs and to public elementary schools and secondary schools, the difficulties in identifying the special needs of such children and youths, any progress made by the State educational agency and local educational agencies in the State in addressing such problems and difficulties, and the success of the programs under this subtitle in allowing homeless children and youths to enroll in, attend, and succeed in, school;

(2) develop and carry out the State plan described in subsection (g);

(3) collect and transmit to the Secretary, at such time and in such manner as the Secretary may require, a report containing such information as the Secretary determines is necessary to assess the educational needs of homeless children and youths within the State;

(4) facilitate coordination between the State educational agency, the State social services agency, and other agencies (including agencies providing mental health services) to provide services to homeless children, including preschool-aged homeless children, and youths, and to families of such children and youths;

(5) in order to improve the provision of comprehensive education and related services to homeless children and youths and their families, coordinate and collaborate with—

(A) educators, including child development and preschool program personnel;

(B) providers of services to homeless and runaway children and youths and homeless families (including domestic violence agencies, shelter operators, transitional housing facilities, runaway and homeless youth centers, and transitional living programs for homeless youths);

(C) local educational agency liaisons designated under subsection (g)(1)(J)(ii) for homeless children and youths; and

(D) community organizations and groups representing homeless children and youths and their families; and

(6) provide technical assistance to local educational agencies in coordination with local educational agency liaisons designated under subsection (g)(1)(J)(ii), to ensure that local educational agencies comply with the requirements of section 722(e)(3) and paragraphs (3) through (7) of subsection (g).

(g) STATE PLAN—

(1) IN GENERAL—Each State shall submit to the Secretary a plan to provide for the education of homeless children and youths within the State. Such plan shall include the following:

(A) A description of how such children and youths are (or will be) given the opportunity to meet the same challenging State academic achievement standards all students are expected to meet.

(B) A description of the procedures the State educational agency will use to identify such children and
Youths in the State and to assess their special needs.

'(C) A description of procedures for the prompt resolution of disputes regarding the educational placement of homeless children and youths.

'(D) A description of programs for school personnel (including principals, attendance officers, teachers, enrollment personnel, and pupil services personnel) to heighten the awareness of such personnel of the specific needs of runaway and homeless youths.

'(E) A description of procedures that ensure that homeless children and youths who meet the relevant eligibility criteria are able to participate in Federal, State, or local food programs.

'(F) A description of procedures that ensure that:

'(i) homeless children have equal access to the same public preschool programs, administered by the State agency, as provided to other children in the State;

'(ii) homeless youths and youths separated from the public schools are identified and accorded equal access to appropriate secondary education and support services; and

'(iii) homeless children and youths who meet the relevant eligibility criteria are able to participate in Federal, State, or local before- and after-school care programs.

'(G) Strategies to address problems identified in the report provided to the Secretary under subsection (f)(3).

'(H) Strategies to address other problems with respect to the education of homeless children and youths, including problems resulting from enrollment delays that are caused by:

'(i) immunization and medical records requirements;

'(ii) residency requirements;

'(iii) lack of birth certificates, school records, or other documentation;

'(iv) guardianship issues; or

'(v) uniform or dress code requirements.

'(I) A demonstration that the State educational agency and local educational agencies in the State have developed, and shall review and revise, policies to remove barriers to the enrollment and retention of homeless children and youths in schools in the State.

'(J) Assurances that:

'(I) the State educational agency and local educational agencies in the State will adopt policies and practices to ensure that homeless children and youths are not stigmatized or segregated on the basis of their status as homeless;

'(II) local educational agencies will designate an appropriate staff person, who may also be a coordinator for other Federal programs, as a local educational agency liaison for homeless children and youths, to carry out the duties described in paragraph (G)(A); and

'(III) the State and its local educational agencies will adopt policies and practices to ensure that transportation is provided, at the request of the parent or guardian (or in the case of an unaccompanied youth, the liaison), to and from the school of origin, as determined in paragraph (3)(A), in accordance with the following, as applicable:

'(I) if the homeless child or youth continues to live in the area served by the local educational agency in which the school of origin is located, the child's or youth's
transportation to and from the school of origin shall be provided or arranged by the local educational agency in which the school of origin is located.

(2) COMPLIANCE-

(A) IN GENERAL- Each plan adopted under this subsection shall also describe how the State will ensure that local educational agencies in the State will comply with the requirements of paragraphs (3) through (7).

(B) COORDINATION- Such plan shall indicate what technical assistance the State will furnish to local educational agencies and how compliance efforts will be coordinated with the local educational agency liaisons designated under paragraph (1)(I)(II).

(3) LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCY REQUIREMENTS-

(A) IN GENERAL- The local educational agency serving each child or youth to be assisted under this subtitle shall, according to the child’s or youth’s best interest--

(I) continue the child’s or youth’s education in the school of origin for the duration of homelessness--

(II) in any case in which a family becomes homeless between academic years or during an academic year; or

(III) for the remainder of the academic year, if the child or youth becomes permanently housed during an academic year; or

(II) enroll the child or youth in any public school that nonhomeless students who live in the attendance area in which the child or youth is actually living are eligible to attend.

(B) BEST INTEREST- In determining the best interest of the child or youth under subparagraph (A), the local educational agency shall--

(I) to the extent feasible, keep a homeless child or youth in the school of origin, except when doing so is contrary to the wishes of the child’s or youth’s parent or guardian;

(II) provide a written explanation, including a statement regarding the right to appeal under subparagraph (E), to the homeless child’s or youth’s parent or guardian, if the local educational agency sends such child or youth to a school other than the school of origin or a school requested by the parent or guardian; and

(III) in the case of an unaccompanied youth, ensure that the homeless liaison designated under paragraph (1)(I)(II) assists in placement or enrollment decisions under this subparagraph, considers the views of such unaccompanied youth, and provides notice to such youth of the right to appeal under subparagraph (E).

(C) ENROLLMENT- (i) The school selected in accordance with this paragraph shall immediately enroll the homeless child or youth, even if the child or youth is unable to produce records normally required for enrollment, such as previous academic records, medical records, proof of residency, or other documentation.

(ii) The enrolling school shall immediately contact the school last attended by the child or youth to
obtain relevant academic and other records.

'(iii) If the child or youth needs to obtain immunizations, or immunization or medical records, the
enrolling school shall immediately refer the parent or guardian of the child or youth to the local
educational agency liaison designated under paragraph (1)(J)(ii), who shall assist in obtaining necessary
immunizations, or immunization or medical records, in accordance with subparagraph (D).

'(D) RECORDS—Any record ordinarily kept by the school, including immunization or medical records,
academic records, birth certificates, guardianship records, and evaluations for special services or
programs, regarding each homeless child or youth shall be maintained—

'(i) so that the records are available, in a timely fashion, when a child or youth enters a new
school or school district; and

'(ii) in a manner consistent with section 444 of the General Education Provisions Act (20 U.S.C.
1232g).

'(E) ENROLLMENT DISPUTES—If a dispute arises over school selection or enrollment in a school—

'(i) the child or youth shall be immediately admitted to the school in which enrollment is sought,
pending resolution of the dispute;

'(ii) the parent or guardian of the child or youth shall be provided with a written explanation of
the school's decision regarding school selection or enrollment, including the rights of the parent,
guardian, or youth to appeal the decision;

'(iii) the child, youth, parent, or guardian shall be referred to the local educational agency liaison
designated under paragraph (1)(J)(ii), who shall carry out the dispute resolution process as
described in paragraph (1)(C) as expeditiously as possible after receiving notice of the dispute; and

'(iv) in the case of an unaccompanied youth, the homeless liaison shall ensure that the youth is
immediately enrolled in school pending resolution of the dispute.

'(F) PLACEMENT CHOICE—The choice regarding placement shall be made regardless of whether the child
or youth lives with the homeless parents or has been temporarily placed elsewhere.

'(G) SCHOOL OF ORIGIN DEFINED—In this paragraph, the term 'school of origin' means the school that
the child or youth attended when permanently housed or the school in which the child or youth was last
enrolled.

'(H) CONTACT INFORMATION—Nothing in this subtitle shall prohibit a local educational agency from
requiring a parent or guardian of a homeless child to submit contact information.

'(4) COMPARABLE SERVICES—Each homeless child or youth to be assisted under this subtitle shall be provided
services comparable to services offered to other students in the school selected under paragraph (3), including
the following:

'(A) Transportation services.

'(B) Educational services for which the child or youth meets the eligibility criteria, such as services
provided under title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 or similar State or local
programs, educational programs for children with disabilities, and educational programs for students with
limited English proficiency.

'(C) Programs in vocational and technical education.

'(D) Programs for gifted and talented students.

'(E) School nutrition programs.
(5) COORDINATION-

(A) IN GENERAL- Each local educational agency serving homeless children and youths that receives assistance under this subtitle shall coordinate--

(i) the provision of services under this subtitle with local social services agencies and other agencies or programs providing services to homeless children and youths and their families, including services and programs funded under the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act (42 U.S.C. 5701 et seq.); and

(ii) with other local educational agencies on interdistrict issues, such as transportation or transfer of school records.

(B) HOUSING ASSISTANCE- If applicable, each State educational agency and local educational agency that receives assistance under this subtitle shall coordinate with State and local housing agencies responsible for developing the comprehensive housing affordability strategy described in section 105 of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act (42 U.S.C. 12705) to minimize educational disruption for children and youths who become homeless.

(C) COORDINATION PURPOSE- The coordination required under subparagraphs (A) and (B) shall be designed to--

(i) ensure that homeless children and youths have access and reasonable proximity to available education and related support services; and

(ii) raise the awareness of school personnel and service providers of the effects of short-term stays in a shelter and other challenges associated with homelessness.

(6) LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCY LIAISON-

(A) DUTIES- Each local educational agency liaison for homeless children and youths, designated under paragraph (1)(I)(ii), shall ensure that--

(i) homeless children and youths are identified by school personnel and through coordination activities with other entities and agencies;

(ii) homeless children and youths enroll in, and have a full and equal opportunity to succeed in, schools of that local educational agency;

(iii) homeless families, children, and youths receive educational services for which such families, children, and youths are eligible, including Head Start and Even Start programs and preschool programs administered by the local educational agency, and referrals to health care services, dental services, mental health services, and other appropriate services;

(iv) the parents or guardians of homeless children and youths are informed of the educational and related opportunities available to their children and are provided with meaningful opportunities to participate in the education of their children;

(v) public notice of the educational rights of homeless children and youths is disseminated where such children and youths receive services under this Act, such as schools, family shelters, and soup kitchens;

(vi) enrollment disputes are mediated in accordance with paragraph (3)(E); and

(vii) the parent or guardian of a homeless child or youth, and any unaccompanied youth, is fully informed of all transportation services, including transportation to the school of origin, as described in paragraph (1)(I)(III), and is assisted in accessing transportation to the school that is selected under paragraph (3)(A).

(B) NOTICE- State coordinators established under subsection (d)(3) and local educational agencies shall inform school personnel, service providers, and advocates working with homeless families of the duties
of the local educational agency liaisons.

'(C) LOCAL AND STATE COORDINATION- Local educational agency liaisons for homeless children and youths shall, as a part of their duties, coordinate and collaborate with State coordinators and community and school personnel responsible for the provision of education and related services to homeless children and youths.

'(7) REVIEW AND REVISIONS-

'(A) IN GENERAL- Each State educational agency and local educational agency that receives assistance under this subtitle shall review and revise any policies that may act as barriers to the enrollment of homeless children and youths in schools that are selected under paragraph (3).

'(B) CONSIDERATION- In reviewing and revising such policies, consideration shall be given to issues concerning transportation, immunization, residency, birth certificates, school records and other documentation, and guardianship.

'(C) SPECIAL ATTENTION- Special attention shall be given to ensuring the enrollment and attendance of homeless children and youths who are not currently attending school.

'SEC. 723. LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCY SUBGRANTS FOR THE EDUCATION OF HOMELESS CHILDREN AND YOUTHS.

'(a) GENERAL AUTHORITY-

'(1) IN GENERAL- The State educational agency shall, in accordance with section 722(e), and from amounts made available to such agency under section 726, make subgrants to local educational agencies for the purpose of facilitating the enrollment, attendance, and success in school of homeless children and youths.

'(2) SERVICES-

'(A) IN GENERAL- Services under paragraph (1)--

'(1) may be provided through programs on school grounds or at other facilities;

'(2) shall, to the maximum extent practicable, be provided through existing programs and mechanisms that integrate homeless children and youths with nonhomeless children and youths; and

'(3) shall be designed to expand or improve services provided as part of a school's regular academic program, but not to replace such services provided under such program.

'(B) SERVICES ON SCHOOL GROUNDS- If services under paragraph (1) are provided on school grounds, schools--

'(1) may use funds under this subtitle to provide the same services to other children and youths who are determined by the local educational agency to be at risk of failing in, or dropping out of, school, subject to the requirements of clause (ii); and

'(2) except as otherwise provided in section 722(e)(3)(B), shall not provide services in settings within a school that segregate homeless children and youths from other children and youths, except as necessary for short periods of time--

'(i) for health and safety emergencies; or

'(ii) to provide temporary, special, and supplementary services to meet the unique needs of homeless children and youths.

'(3) REQUIREMENT- Services provided under this section shall not replace the regular academic program and shall be designed to expand upon or improve services provided as part of the school's regular academic
(b) APPLICATION- A local educational agency that desires to receive a subgrant under this section shall submit an application to the State educational agency at such time, in such manner, and containing or accompanied by such information as the State educational agency may reasonably require. Such application shall include the following:

(1) An assessment of the educational and related needs of homeless children and youths in the area served by such agency (which may be undertaken as part of needs assessments for other disadvantaged groups).

(2) A description of the services and programs for which assistance is sought to address the needs identified in paragraph (1).

(3) An assurance that the local educational agency’s combined fiscal effort per student, or the aggregate expenditures of that agency and the State with respect to the provision of free public education by such agency for the fiscal year preceding the fiscal year for which the determination is made, was not less than 90 percent of such combined fiscal effort or aggregate expenditures for the second fiscal year preceding the fiscal year for which the determination is made.

(4) An assurance that the applicant compiles with, or will use requested funds to comply with, paragraphs (3) through (7) of section 722(g).

(5) A description of policies and procedures, consistent with section 722(e)(3), that the agency will implement to ensure that activities carried out by the agency will not isolate or stigmatize homeless children and youths.

(c) AWARDS-

(1) IN GENERAL- The State educational agency shall, in accordance with the requirements of this subtitle and from amounts made available to it under section 726, make competitive subgrants to local educational agencies that submit applications under subsection (b). Such subgrants shall be awarded on the basis of the need of such agencies for assistance under this subtitle and the quality of the applications submitted.

(2) NEED- In determining need under paragraph (1), the State educational agency may consider the number of homeless children and youths enrolled in preschool, elementary, and secondary schools within the area served by the local educational agency, and shall consider the needs of such children and youths and the ability of the local educational agency to meet such needs. The State educational agency may also consider the following:

(A) The extent to which the proposed use of funds will facilitate the enrollment, retention, and educational success of homeless children and youths.

(B) The extent to which the application--

(i) reflects coordination with other local and State agencies that serve homeless children and youths; and

(ii) describes how the applicant will meet the requirements of section 722(g)(3).

(C) The extent to which the applicant exhibits in the application and in current practice a commitment to education for all homeless children and youths.

(D) Such other criteria as the State agency determines appropriate.

(3) QUALITY- In determining the quality of applications under paragraph (1), the State educational agency shall consider the following:

(A) The applicant’s needs assessment under subsection (b)(1) and the likelihood that the program presented in the application will meet such needs.

(B) The types, intensity, and coordination of the services to be provided under the program.
(C) The involvement of parents or guardians of homeless children or youths in the education of their children.

(D) The extent to which homeless children and youths will be integrated within the regular education program.

(E) The quality of the applicant's evaluation plan for the program.

(F) The extent to which services provided under this subtitle will be coordinated with other services available to homeless children and youths and their families.

(G) Such other measures as the State educational agency considers indicative of a high-quality program, such as the extent to which the local educational agency will provide case management or related services to unaccompanied youths.

(4) DURATION OF GRANTS- Grants awarded under this section shall be for terms not to exceed 3 years.

(d) AUTHORIZED ACTIVITIES- A local educational agency may use funds awarded under this section for activities that carry out the purpose of this subtitle, including the following:

(1) The provision of tutoring, supplemental instruction, and enriched educational services that are linked to the achievement of the same challenging State academic content standards and challenging State student academic achievement standards the State establishes for other children and youths.

(2) The provision of expedited evaluations of the strengths and needs of homeless children and youths, including needs and eligibility for programs and services (such as educational programs for gifted and talented students, children with disabilities, and students with limited English proficiency, services provided under title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 or similar State or local programs, programs in vocational and technical education, and school nutrition programs).

(3) Professional development and other activities for educators and pupil services personnel that are designed to heighten the understanding and sensitivity of such personnel to the needs of homeless children and youths, the rights of such children and youths under this subtitle, and the specific educational needs of runaway and homeless youths.

(4) The provision of referral services to homeless children and youths for medical, dental, mental, and other health services.

(5) The provision of assistance to defray the excess cost of transportation for students under section 722(g)(4)(A), not otherwise provided through Federal, State, or local funding, where necessary to enable students to attend the school selected under section 722(g)(3).

(6) The provision of developmentally appropriate early childhood education programs, not otherwise provided through Federal, State, or local funding, for preschool-aged homeless children.

(7) The provision of services and assistance to attract, engage, and retain homeless children and youths, and unaccompanied youths, in public school programs and services provided to nonhomeless children and youths.

(8) The provision for homeless children and youths of before- and after-school, mentoring, and summer programs in which a teacher or other qualified individual provides tutoring, homework assistance, and supervision of educational activities.

(9) If necessary, the payment of fees and other costs associated with tracking, obtaining, and transferring records necessary to enroll homeless children and youths in school, including birth certificates, immunization or medical records, academic records, guardianship records, and evaluations for special programs or services.

(10) The provision of education and training to the parents of homeless children and youths about the rights of, and resources available to, such children and youths.

(11) The development of coordination between schools and agencies providing services to homeless children and youths, as described in section 722(g)(5).
(12) The provision of pupil services (including violence prevention counseling) and referrals for such services.

(13) Activities to address the particular needs of homeless children and youths that may arise from domestic violence.

(14) The adaptation of space and purchase of supplies for any nonschool facilities made available under subsection (a)(2) to provide services under this subsection.

(15) The provision of school supplies, including those supplies to be distributed at shelters or temporary housing facilities, or other appropriate locations.

(16) The provision of other extraordinary or emergency assistance needed to enable homeless children and youths to attend school.

SEC. 724. SECRETARIAL RESPONSIBILITIES.

(a) REVIEW OF STATE PLANS- In reviewing the State plan submitted by a State educational agency under section 722(d), the Secretary shall use a peer review process and shall evaluate whether State laws, policies, and practices described in such plan adequately address the problems of homeless children and youths relating to access to education and placement as described in such plan.

(b) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE- The Secretary shall provide support and technical assistance to a State educational agency to assist such agency in carrying out its responsibilities under this subtitle, if requested by the State educational agency.

(c) NOTICE- The Secretary shall, before the next school year that begins after the date of enactment of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Education Assistance Improvements Act of 2001, create and disseminate nationwide a public notice of the educational rights of homeless children and youths and disseminate such notice to other Federal agencies, programs, and grantees, including Head Start grantees, Health Care for the Homeless grantees, Emergency Food and Shelter grantees, and homeless assistance programs administered by the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

(d) EVALUATION AND DISSEMINATION- The Secretary shall conduct evaluation and dissemination activities of programs designed to meet the educational needs of homeless elementary and secondary school students, and may use funds appropriated under section 726 to conduct such activities.

(e) SUBMISSION AND DISTRIBUTION- The Secretary shall require applications for grants under this subtitle to be submitted to the Secretary not later than the expiration of the 60-day period beginning on the date that funds are available for purposes of making such grants and shall make such grants not later than the expiration of the 120-day period beginning on such date.

(f) DETERMINATION BY SECRETARY- The Secretary, based on the information received from the States and information gathered by the Secretary under subsection (h), shall determine the extent to which State educational agencies are ensuring that each homeless child and homeless youth has access to a free appropriate public education, as described in section 721(1).

(g) GUIDELINES- The Secretary shall develop, issue, and publish in the Federal Register, not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Education Assistance Improvements Act of 2001, school enrollment guidelines for States with respect to homeless children and youths. The guidelines shall describe--

(1) successful ways in which a State may assist local educational agencies to immediately enroll homeless children and youths in school; and

(2) how a State can review the State's requirements regarding immunization and medical or school records and make such revisions to the requirements as are appropriate and necessary in order to enroll homeless children and youths in school immediately.

(h) INFORMATION-

(1) IN GENERAL- From funds appropriated under section 726, the Secretary shall, directly or through grants, contracts, or cooperative agreements, periodically collect and disseminate data and information regarding--
(A) the number and location of homeless children and youths;

(B) the education and related services such children and youths receive;

(C) the extent to which the needs of homeless children and youths are being met; and

(D) such other data and information as the Secretary determines to be necessary and relevant to carry out this subtitle.

(2) COORDINATION- The Secretary shall coordinate such collection and dissemination with other agencies and entities that receive assistance and administer programs under this subtitle.

(1) REPORT- Not later than 4 years after the date of enactment of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Education Assistance Improvements Act of 2001, the Secretary shall prepare and submit to the President and the Committee on Education and the Workforce of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate a report on the status of education of homeless children and youths, which shall include information on--

(1) the education of homeless children and youths; and

(2) the actions of the Secretary and the effectiveness of the programs supported under this subtitle.

SEC. 725. DEFINITIONS.

For purposes of this subtitle:

(1) The terms "enroll" and "enrollment" include attending classes and participating fully in school activities.

(2) The term "homeless children and youths"--

(A) means individuals who lack a fixed, regular, and adequate nighttime residence (within the meaning of section 103(a)(1)); and

(B) includes--

(i) children and youths who are sharing the housing of other persons due to loss of housing, economic hardship, or a similar reason; are living in motels, hotels, trailer parks, or camping grounds due to the lack of alternative adequate accommodations; are living in emergency or transitional shelters; are abandoned in hospitals; or are awaiting foster care placement;

(ii) children and youths who have a primary nighttime residence that is a public or private place not designed for or ordinarily used as a regular sleeping accommodation for human beings (within the meaning of section 103(a)(2)(C));

(iii) children and youths who are living in cars, parks, public spaces, abandoned buildings, substandard housing, bus or train stations, or similar settings; and

(iv) migratory children (as such term is defined in section 1309 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965) who qualify as homeless for the purposes of this subtitle because the children are living in circumstances described in clauses (i) through (iii).

(3) The terms "local educational agency" and "State educational agency" have the meanings given such terms in section 9101 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.

(4) The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of Education.

(5) The term "State" means each of the 50 States, the District of Columbia, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

(6) The term "unaccompanied youth" includes a youth not in the physical custody of a parent or guardian.
SEC. 726. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

'For the purpose of carrying out this subtitle, there are authorized to be appropriated $70,000,000 for fiscal year 2002 and such sums as may be necessary for each of fiscal years 2003 through 2007.'
Appendix B

New Jersey Administrative Code
Chapter 17. Students At Risk of Not Receiving a Public Education
CHAPTER 17. STUDENTS AT RISK OF NOT RECEIVING A PUBLIC EDUCATION

SUBCHAPTER 1. GENERAL PROVISIONS

6A:17-1.1 Purpose

These rules are adopted in order to ensure that homeless children and students placed in state facilities are provided a thorough and efficient education. These rules establish uniform Statewide policies and procedures to ensure the enrollment of homeless children and to respond to appeals made by parents or other parties related to their enrollment. The rules also identify general program requirements related to the operation, administration and approval of educational programs in State facilities.

SUBCHAPTER 2. EDUCATION OF HOMELESS CHILDREN

6A:17-2.1 Scope

These rules apply to district boards of education providing general education services to students in grades preschool through twelve and special education services to students ages three through 21.

6A:17-2.2 Definitions

The following words and terms, when used in this subchapter, will have the following meanings unless the context clearly indicates otherwise:

"District liaison for the education of homeless children" means the person identified in each school district who facilitates all of the activities needed to ensure the enrollment of homeless children.

"District of residence" means the district in which the parent last resided prior to becoming homeless.

"Homeless child" means a child or youth who lacks a fixed, regular and adequate residence, pursuant to N.J.S.A. 18A:7B-12 and N.J.A.C. 6A:17-2.3.

"Parent" means the natural or adoptive parent, legal guardian, foster parent, surrogate parent, and person acting in the place of a parent such as the person with whom the child legally resides or a person legally responsible for the child's welfare.

6A:17-2.3 Determination of homeless status

(a) A district board of education shall determine that a child is homeless for purposes of this subchapter when he or she resides in any of the following:

1. A publicly or privately operated shelter designed to provide temporary living accommodations, including:
   i. Hotels or motels;
   ii. Congregate shelters, including domestic violence and runaway shelters;
   iii. Transitional housing;
   iv. Homes for adolescent mothers.

2. A public or private place not designated for or ordinarily used as a regular sleeping accommodation, including:
   i. Cars or other vehicles excluding mobile homes;
   ii. Tents or other temporary shelters;
   iii. Temporary shelters provided to migrant workers and their children on farm sites.
3. The residence of relatives or friends with whom the homeless child is temporarily residing out of necessity because the family lacks a regular or permanent residence of its own.

6A:17-2.4 Responsibilities of the district of residence

(a) The district of residence for a homeless child shall be responsible for the education of the child and shall:

1. Determine the district in which the child shall be enrolled after consulting with the parent pursuant to N.J.A.C. 6A:17-2.6;
2. Pay the cost of tuition pursuant to N.J.A.C. 6A:23-3.1 when the child attends school in another district; and
3. Provide for transportation for the child pursuant to N.J.A.C. 6A:27-6.2.

(b) The determination of a homeless child's district of residence shall be made by the chief school administrator or designee of the school district(s) involved pursuant to N.J.A.C. 6A:17-2.3 based upon information received from the parent, the Department of Human Services, shelter provider, another school district, an involved agency or a case manager.

(c) The district board of education identified as the district of residence in accordance with N.J.S.A. 18A:7B-12 for a homeless child shall be the district of residence for as long as the parent remains homeless.

6A:17-2.5 Designation of district liaisons and their responsibilities

(a) The chief school administrator of each school district shall identify a district liaison for the education of homeless children. The district liaison shall:

1. Facilitate communication and cooperation between the district of residence and the district where the homeless child is temporarily residing; and
2. Develop procedures to ensure that a homeless child temporarily residing in the district is enrolled and attending school pursuant to N.J.A.C. 6A:17-2.6.

(b) When a homeless child is living temporarily in a school district, the district liaison, upon receiving notification from the parent, the Department of Human Services, a shelter director, an involved agency, or a case manager, shall notify the liaison of the district of residence within 24 hours of the notification.

(c) Upon notification of the need for enrollment of a homeless child, the liaison in the district of residence shall coordinate enrollment procedures immediately based upon the best interest of the child pursuant to N.J.A.C. 6A:17-2.6(b).

6A:17-2.6 District enrollment

(a) The chief school administrator of the district of residence or designee shall decide in which district the homeless child shall be enrolled as follows:

1. To continue the homeless child's education in the school district of last attendance if the district of last attendance is not the district of residence;
2. To enroll the homeless child in the district of residence; or
3. To enroll the homeless child in the school district where the child is temporarily living.

(b) The chief school administrator of the district of residence shall decide the district of enrollment of a homeless child based on what is determined to be in the best interest of the child after considering:

1. The continuity of the child's educational program;
2. The preference of the parent as to where the child should attend school;
3. The eligibility of the child for special instructional programs, including but not limited to bilingual, gifted and talented, special education, early childhood and vocational programs; and
4. The distance, travel time, and safety factors in coordinating transportation services from the temporary residence to the school.

(c) The chief school administrator of the district of residence shall determine the child's district enrollment in a timely manner after consultation with the parent as follows:

1. Enrollment decisions shall be made within three school days of notification of the need for enrollment. When the decision is made, the child shall be enrolled immediately.

2. Consultation with the parent regarding the enrollment decision and the right to appeal that decision shall be documented in writing.

(d) When a decision is made to enroll the child in a district other than the district of residence, the chief school administrator of the district of residence shall forward to the new district all relevant school and health records. When the parent is homeless due to conditions of domestic violence, the transfer of student records shall be subject to the provisions of N.J.A.C. 6A:3-6.

(e) When a homeless child with educational disabilities is enrolled in a district other than the district of residence, the child shall be placed in a program consistent with the goals and objectives of the child's individualized educational program. Within 30 days after placement, the district where the child is placed shall review and revise the individualized educational program pursuant to N.J.A.C. 6A:14.

(f) When the district of residence for a homeless child cannot be determined, the chief school administrator of the district in which the child is temporarily residing shall enroll the child immediately in the district of temporary residence or the district of last attendance.

6A:17-2.7 Parental Rights

Unless parental rights have been terminated by a court of competent jurisdiction, the parent retains all rights under this subchapter.

6A:17-2.8 Disputes and appeals

(a) When a dispute occurs regarding the determination of homelessness, the chief school administrators of the involved district(s) or the parent(s) of the child shall immediately notify the county superintendent of schools, who shall decide the status of the child within two working days. If a dispute remains between the parent and the involved district(s) following the county superintendent's determination, the parent or the involved board(s) of education may appeal to the Commissioner of Education for determination pursuant to N.J.A.C. 6A:3.

(b) When a district designated as the district of residence disputes such designation, or where no designation can be agreed upon by the involved districts, the chief school administrator of the involved district shall immediately notify the county superintendent of schools who shall make a determination within two working days. A district disputing the county superintendent's determination may appeal to the Department of Education pursuant to N.J.A.C. 6A:23-5.2 (d), (e), and (f).

(c) When a dispute occurs regarding the determination of the district of enrollment made by the district of residence, the chief school administrator of the district of residence shall immediately notify the county superintendent of schools. The county superintendent shall determine within two working days where the child shall be enrolled based on the child's best interest pursuant to N.J.A.C. 6A:17-2.6(b).

1. If the county superintendent's decision is disputed, the Department of Education shall provide for mediation as follows:

i. The request shall be made to the Department of Education in writing.

ii. Requests for mediation shall cite the issues in dispute and the relief sought.

iii. A mediation conference shall be conducted within five school days after the request is made at a time and place reasonably convenient to all parties in the dispute.

iv. If the mediation does not result in agreement, appeal may be made to the Commissioner of Education pursuant to N.J.A.C. 6A:3 et seq.

(d) Any dispute or appeal shall not delay the homeless child's immediate entrance into school. The homeless child shall be enrolled in the district designated by the county superintendent pending resolution of the dispute or appeal.

(e) Disputes and appeals involving the services provided to a homeless child with educational disabilities shall be made pursuant to N.J.A.C. 6A:14.
6A:17-3.9 Tuition

(a) When the homeless child is enrolled in a district other than the district of residence, the district of residence shall pay the costs of tuition for the child to that district pursuant to N.J.S.A. 18A:38-19 and N.J.A.C. 6A:23-3.1.

(b) The district of residence shall list the child on its annual Application for State School Aid (ASSA) pursuant to N.J.S.A. 18A:7F-33 for as long as the parent remains homeless and the child is enrolled in another school district.

(c) If the district of residence cannot be determined for a homeless child or if the district of residence is outside of the State, the State shall assume fiscal responsibility for the tuition of the child pursuant to N.J.S.A. 18A:7B-12(d). The State shall pay the tuition to the school district in which the child is currently enrolled for as long as the child and his or her parent remain homeless.

1. When the State assumes fiscal responsibility for the tuition of a homeless child, the State shall pay to the district in which the child is enrolled the appropriate T & E amount, pursuant to N.J.S.A. 18A:7F-3, and any appropriate additional cost factor for special education, pursuant to N.J.S.A. 18A:7F-19.

SUBCHAPTER 3. EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS FOR STUDENTS IN STATE FACILITIES

6A:17-3.1 Scope

These rules shall apply to all educational programs provided by the Department of Corrections and Human Services and the Juvenile Justice Commission in accordance with N.J.S.A. 18A:7B-1. Educational programs and services shall be provided to those students in State facilities ages five through 21 and for students with educational disabilities ages three through 21. Programs and services shall be provided to students in State facilities who do not hold a high school diploma or who are not enrolled in a General Educational Development or adult education program as defined in N.J.A.C. 6:30-2 or a college degree program.

6A:17-3.2 Definitions

The following words and terms, when used in this subchapter, will have the following meanings unless the context clearly indicates otherwise:

"District of residence" means the district in which the parent or guardian with whom the student lived prior to placement in a State facility currently resides pursuant to N.J.S.A. 18A:7B-12.

"State agency" means the New Jersey Department of Human Services, the New Jersey Department of Corrections or the New Jersey Juvenile Justice Commission as identified in N.J.S.A. 18A:7B-1.

"State facility" means residential and day programs operated by or contracted with the Department of Human Services, the Department of Corrections or the Juvenile Justice Commission.

6A:17-3.3 Educational program objectives and requirements

(a) Each State agency shall develop educational programs to complement the primary mission of that State agency and provide educational opportunities that meet the identified needs of students in each State facility. These programs shall be delivered through traditional or individualized education strategies. Individualized programs, which allow high school credit to be awarded through alternative learning experiences, shall be provided in accordance with program completion authorized in N.J.A.C. 6A: 8-5.1(a) 1 i i.

(b) Each State agency shall utilize the following program objectives for achieving the legislative goal as stated in N.J.S.A. 18A:7B-1 et seq. of providing a thorough and efficient education and as the framework for developing educational experiences which meet the specialized needs of all students in each State facility under the State agency's jurisdiction. The educational programs as provided for under the State Facilities Education Act shall:

1. Provide instruction in the Core Curriculum Content Standards and assist students in working toward fulfilling the high school graduation requirements contained in N.J.A.C. 6A: 8-5.1; and

2. Provide relevant job training and enhance occupational competencies through vocational education programs where appropriate, pursuant to N.J.A.C. 643.
(c) Attendance in educational programs is compulsory for all students, except for a student age 16 or above who may explicitly waive the right. For a student between the ages 16 and 18, a waiver is not effective unless accompanied by consent from a student's parent or guardian. Such a waiver may be revoked at any time by the formal student.

(d) All education programs, with the exception of home instruction pursuant to N.J.A.C. 6A:16-9.1, shall be available at least four hours per day, five days a week, 220 days each year.

(e) The actual number of days a student must attend the educational program shall be determined by the individualized program plan under program completion pursuant to N.J.A.C. 6A:8-3.1(l)(11)ii and the individualized education program for students with educational disabilities, according to N.J.A.C. 6A:14-3.7.

(f) Each State agency shall ensure that home instruction is provided pursuant to N.J.A.C. 6A:16-9.1.

(g) Each State agency shall ensure that activities are not scheduled that conflict with educational programs.

(h) Each State agency shall ensure that students are not excused from attending educational programs except for reasons of illness, religious observance, court appearance or other compelling personal circumstances.

(i) Each State agency shall ensure that all students in that agency's State facilities shall comply with all rules established by the facility pursuant to N.J.S.A. 18A:37-1 and 37-2.

(j) Each State agency shall establish procedures for continued education in a different setting in cases where a student is guilty of ongoing defiance of the rules, and the student's continued participation in the program is disruptive to the ongoing educational process.

(k) For a student in a State facility who has an identifiable district of residence as defined by N.J.S.A. 18A:7B-12, the district board of education shall grant a State-endorse diploma in accordance with N.J.A.C. 6A:8-5.1 and 6A:14-4.12.

(l) For a student in a State facility who does not have an identifiable district of residence as defined by N.J.S.A. 18A:7B-12, the applicable State agency must certify that the student has successfully completed all graduation requirements contained in N.J.A.C. 6A:8-5.1 in order that the Commissioner of Education may issue a State-endorse diploma.

6A:17-3.4 Students with educational disabilities

(a) Each State agency shall ensure that all students with educational disabilities in that State agency's State facilities are provided a free and appropriate public education as set forth under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (P.L. 101-476, as amended by P.L. 102-119) and provide special education and related services as stipulated in the individualized education plan (IEP) in accordance with the rules and regulations governing special education at N.J.A.C. 6A:14.

1. The class size of special education programs serving solely students with educational disabilities shall be in accordance with N.J.A.C. 6A:14-4.

6A:17-3.5 Staffing and class size

(a) Each State agency, either independently or through contractual agreements, shall employ the educational personnel required to ensure the provision of programs and services pursuant to this subchapter.

(b) The Office of Education in each State agency shall, with the approval of the Department of Education, ensure that all educational personnel possess the appropriate certification endorsement issued by the State Board of Examiners pursuant to N.J.S.A. 18A:6-38.

(c) Each State agency shall maintain the certification for all educational staff on file at the respective Office of Education and at the appropriate program site.

(d) The Office of Education in each State agency shall prepare and submit a plan for the required professional development for all teachers and educational services personnel employed by that State agency consistent with the requirements of N.J.A.C. 6A:11-13.

(e) Each State agency shall ensure the provision of classes for general education students that shall not exceed 12 students.

1. A State agency may request exceptions to this requirement as part of the annual approval process required by N.J.A.C. 6A:17-3.8(c).
2. The Department of Education shall grant exceptions on a case-by-case basis using the following criteria:

i. The requested exception justifies the need for an alternate program structure;

ii. The requested exception demonstrates that the specialized needs of the students served will continue to be met; and

iii. The requested exception insures the necessary supervision, security, and safety of the students served.

6A:17-3.6 Facilities

(a) Each State agency shall ensure that all buildings and facilities used for educational programs comply with the provisions of N.J.A.C. 6:2; where applicable.

(b) Each State agency shall ensure that all educational programs are provided in locations separate from sleeping areas, except where appropriate for instructional or medical reasons.

6A:17-3.7 Student records and reports

(a) When a student is placed in a State facility, the identified district of residence shall provide the State facility with the student's educational records, district graduation requirements, attendance standards and the name of a contact person within 10 days of notification of admission.

(b) Each State agency shall maintain student records in accordance with N.J.A.C. 6:3-2. All educational records shall be kept in files separate from court and other non-educational records required to be safeguarded from public inspection pursuant to N.J.S.A. 2A:4-65.

(c) Each State agency shall ensure that the district of residence is to be notified of their students' progress toward meeting local and State high school graduation requirements pursuant to N.J.A.C. 6A:8-5.1 at the marking period intervals established in the agency’s school calendar.

(d) Each State agency shall ensure the transfer of educational records and a final progress report for all students exiting a State facility to the district of residence within 10 days, in order to ensure full and appropriate credit for work completed. The report shall include a designated contact person and the following information which is necessary to formulate an appropriate educational program and ensure that credit for work completed is granted:

1. Statewide assessment and diagnostic findings;

2. Credit earned towards high school graduation requirements pursuant to N.J.A.C. 6A:8-5.1;

3. Grade level equivalent;

4. Vocational training experience;

5. Individualized Program Plan (IPP) pursuant to N.J.A.C. 6A:16-8.2; and

6. Individualized Education Program (IEP) for students with educational disabilities pursuant to N.J.A.C. 6A:14-3.7.

6A:17-3.8 Approval process for funding


(b) Each State agency shall submit annually to the Department of Education the resident enrollment of students in that agency’s State facility education programs on the last school day prior to October 16 of the prebudget year.

(c) By December 15 of each prebudget year, pursuant to N.J.S.A. 18A:7I, each State agency shall submit a detailed education program plan and budget to the Department of Education for approval for all programs and services under its jurisdiction on a form prescribed and provided by the Commissioner of Education. The plan shall include, at a minimum, a program description, staffing patterns and facility level budget information.

(d) The Commissioner of Education, prior to March 1 of the prebudget year, shall notify the Commissioner or the Executive Director of each
State agency of the entitlement for educational programs for the following fiscal year.

(e) The entitlement shall be forwarded to each State agency in two payments, 90 percent after July 1, and 10 percent after April 1. This payment schedule may be modified by written agreement(s) between the Commissioner of Education and the Commissioner or the Executive Director of each State agency. These payments may be withheld pursuant to N.J.S.A. 18A:7B-5, as amended by the Comprehensive Educational Improvement and Financing Act of 1996, N.J.S.A. 18A:7F.

(f) Each State agency shall use the entitlement to support their educational programs in accordance with the provisions of N.J.S.A. 18A:7B- and requirements established in this subchapter.

(g) Each State agency shall submit requests for revisions to the approved education program plan and budget, pursuant to N.J.S.A. 18A:7F, to the Commissioner of Education. The following revisions require prior written approval from the Department of Education before implementation:

1. Budget category expenditure variances which exceed $10,000 or 10% of the approved amount in any budget line;

2. Any additions or deletions to approved contracts for services; and

3. Any additions, deletions or substitutions of approved amounts for the purchase of instructional or non-instructional equipment.

(h) Each revision shall be fully documented and contain a certification from the Office of Education in that State agency and the Commissioner or Executive Director of that State agency, that the revision is essential to the education program.

(i) The expenditure of funds shall be available for audit by the Department of Education and fully documented in the following manner:

1. Salary expenditures shall be supported by time and activity reports for each budgeted position, supplemented with a current job description;

2. All expenditures other than salary shall be supported by a vendor’s invoice, a verification of receipt, and evidence that the service or supply is utilized at the program level; and

3. All documentation shall be retained for audit for a minimum of five years after the completion of the fiscal year. If an audit has been started or notice received of an audit to be started, all supporting documentation will be retained until the audit process is concluded.

(j) The Department of Education shall review all educational programs provided by each State agency for compliance with the rules established in this subchapter and adherence to the approved education program plan and budget, pursuant to N.J.S.A. 18A:7B-5.
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The Abbott Districts of New Jersey and their DFG Ranking
## THE ABBOTT DISTRICTS OF NEW JERSEY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTY</th>
<th>ABBOTT DISTRICT</th>
<th>DFG DESIGNATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Atlantic</td>
<td>Pleasantville</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bergen</td>
<td>Garfield</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burlington</td>
<td>Burlington City</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burlington</td>
<td>Pemberton Township</td>
<td>CD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camden</td>
<td>Camden</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camden</td>
<td>Gloucester City</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumberland</td>
<td>Bridgeton</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumberland</td>
<td>Milville</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumberland</td>
<td>Vineland</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essex</td>
<td>East Orange</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essex</td>
<td>Irvington</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essex</td>
<td>Newark</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essex</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hudson</td>
<td>Harrison</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hudson</td>
<td>Hoboken</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hudson</td>
<td>Jersey City</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hudson</td>
<td>Union City</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hudson</td>
<td>West New York</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mercer</td>
<td>Trenton</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middlesex</td>
<td>New Brunswick</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middlesex</td>
<td>Perth Amboy</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monmouth</td>
<td>Asbury Park</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monmouth</td>
<td>Keansburg</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monmouth</td>
<td>Long Branch</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monmouth</td>
<td>Neptune</td>
<td>CD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passaic</td>
<td>Passaic City</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passaic</td>
<td>Paterson</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union</td>
<td>Elizabeth</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union</td>
<td>Plainfield</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warren</td>
<td>Phillipsburg</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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ORGANIZATION OF CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

INTRODUCTION.

HOMELESSNESS.

Definitions
Counting methods
Inherent problems in identifying and counting
Estimates of homeless population
Comparison of reports
Profile of homeless population
Count of school age population
National school enrollment data
New Jersey school enrollment data
Demographic Profiles of Trenton and Newark, NJ

LEGAL FRAMEWORK.

Federal and State Constitutions
McKinney Act and Amendments
Reauthorization of McKinney
Critics of McKinney
Related federal legislation (education)
(EHCA, IDEA, ESEA)
Related federal legislation (poverty status)
New Jersey’s response to McKinney
Judicial law (Brown, Abbott)
Local policy and special programs
Implementation issues

EDUCATIONAL ISSUES.

American culture
Importance of school
Conditions of homelessness
Nutrition and health
Stress and violence
Family structure and break up of nuclear families
Homeless parents
Family mobility
Shelter life
School attendance
School achievement
Progress with enrollment barriers (residency)
Problematic enrollment barriers
(guardianship, records, funding, transportation)
Developmental delays, problems and disabilities
(social, emotional, behavioral, psychological, moral)
Special services and Treatment rates
Preschool access
Tutoring
Role of educators
Class size
Curriculum
Classroom practices
Staff Development
Implementation guides and pamphlets
Collaboration with community
Collaboration with shelters
Role of school counselors and social workers
Segregation controversy
Innovative school programs
Distorted perceptions and stigma
(public, schools, teachers, peers, self)
Digital divide

EVALUATIONS OF MCKINNEY PROGRESS.

Identification and Enrollment
USDOE reports to Congress
State reports to USDOE
1999, NASCEHCY Study
1995, Policy Studies Associates Study
National Law Center on Homelessness and Poverty Studies
Implementation Studies
Doctoral dissertations
Expert Opinions
Funding appropriations and usage
Effects of funding fluctuations
Consolidation of programs
New Jersey funding data
Scholarships

SUMMARY.
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Appendix F

Correspondence Letters
Dear

I am a graduate student at Seton Hall University currently writing a doctoral dissertation entitled "The education of homeless students: McKinney progress in New Jersey". This study will investigate the numbers of homeless children and youth, and assess the services that are provided for them in thirty New Jersey school districts.

I am writing to ask that you participate in this study. I would greatly appreciate your expert opinion on the sufficiency of my survey instruments. Your participation will include completing the enclosed feedback form, and returning it in the addressed, stamped envelope. The feedback form should take less than one hour to complete. The comments that you provide by will be used in constructing a final copy of the survey to be used in my study.

Participation is voluntary and all materials that you complete will remain confidential with this author. Results will be discussed with my dissertation committee, but will not be seen by any other unauthorized individual. All identification on the raw data will be replaced with a numerical coding system, and the data will be kept locked in a secure manner. You have the right to withdraw from the study without prejudice at any time.

This research project has been reviewed and approved by the Seton Hall University Review Board for Human Subjects research. The Institutional Review Board (IRB) believes that the procedures adequately safeguard the subject's privacy, welfare, civil liberties, and human rights. The Chairperson of the IRB may be reached at (973) 275-2974.
I am also an educator, and like you, I am interested in improving the quality of education for all students. Your participation in this study can potentially help make that goal a reality for the special population of students in homeless situations.

By returning the completed feedback form, it will be assumed that you have agreed to participate in this study. After reading the material above, it will be assumed that all of your questions about the study are answered satisfactorily. If you do have any questions, you can contact me through my mentor at Seton Hall University, Dr. Elaine Walker, at (973) 275-2307.

I would appreciate it greatly if you would read the enclosed instruments and comment on their content, clarity, readability, and form. Please return the enclosed feedback form in the addressed, stamped envelope provided by Friday, March 22nd, 2002. I realize that time is very precious and easily consumed fulfilling essential obligations, but the time invested in my research will have great value and benefits for homeless children and youth. Thank you in advance for your cooperation and support.

Sincerely,

Carolyn Rosenfeld
Seton Hall University
Dear Superintendent,

I am a graduate student at Seton Hall University in the College of Education and Human Services. I am currently writing a doctoral dissertation entitled, "The education of homeless students: McKinney progress in New Jersey". This study will investigate the extent of implementation of the Education for Homeless Children and Youth program, which is Subtitle VIIB of the Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Act. This study will investigate the numbers of homeless children and youth, and assess the educational services that are provided for them, in thirty New Jersey school districts. You have been identified as an individual who can provide relevant information for this study regarding the education of homeless youth.

I am writing to ask that you participate in this study, which will consist of answering a survey that I developed; it should take about one hour to complete. The questions pertain to the education of homeless youth in your district, and a second copy is enclosed that you might keep for your records. This study guarantees confidentiality and anonymity. Participation is voluntary and all materials that you complete will remain confidential with this author. Under no circumstance will data be published which identifies the participants. Results will be discussed with my dissertation mentor, but will not be seen by any unauthorized individual. All identification on the raw data will be replaced with a numerical coding system and the data will be kept locked in a secure manner. You have the right to withdraw from the study without prejudice at any time.

This research project has been reviewed and approved by the Seton Hall University Review Board for Human Subjects research. The Institutional Review Board (IRB) believes that the procedures adequately safeguard the subject's privacy, welfare, civil liberties, and rights. The Chairperson of the IRB may be reached at (973) 275-2974.
By returning the completed survey, it will be assumed that you are thoroughly informed about this research and have voluntarily consented to participate in this study. Please keep this letter and the enclosed extra survey for your records. After reading the material above, it will be assumed that all of your questions about the study are answered satisfactorily. If you would like to participate and do have questions, you can contact me by calling my dissertation mentor at Seton Hall University, Dr. Elaine Walker, at (973) 275-2307.

I would greatly appreciate it if you would complete the enclosed survey, and return it in the addressed, stamped envelope provided by Monday, April 22nd, 2002. I intend to send reminder postcards at a later date. The data provided by your school district is greatly needed to assist in this research regarding the implementation of legislation for the education of homeless youth, and your participation would be greatly appreciated. I would also like your permission to contact the person designated as homeless liaison in this district and solicit their participation in this study. Please indicate your decision by responding to Question # 18 on the enclosed survey.

I realize that time is very precious, and easily consumed fulfilling essential obligations, but the time invested in my research will be useful in guiding educational policy and practice, and will have benefits for homeless children and youth. I am also an educator, and like you, I am interested in improving the quality of education for all students. Your participation in this study can potentially help make our goal a reality for the special population of students in homeless situations. Thank you in advance for your cooperation and support.

Sincerely,

Carolyn Rosenfeld
c/o Dr. Elaine Walker
Seton Hall University
400 South Orange Avenue
South Orange, New Jersey 07079
Dear Superintendent,

Recently, I sent you a request to participate in a study on homelessness. Did you receive and return the survey? If it is in the mail, thank you for your response :-) Otherwise, please be reminded of the 4/22/02 response request due date.

If you wish to participate and have misplaced the survey, please call for another copy: (973) 275-2307. May I contact your district’s homeless liaison? The data from your school district would be greatly appreciated, and thank you again for your time.

Sincerely,

Carolyn Rosenfeld
Seton Hall University
c/o Dr. Elaine Walker
Seton Hall University
400 South Orange Ave.
South Orange, NJ 07079
Dear Superintendent,

Recently, I sent you a request to participate in a study on homelessness. Did you receive and return the survey? If it is in the mail, thank you for your response. There is still time to be a part of this study as the deadline for participation has been extended to 5/27/02.

Please complete and return the enclosed survey at your convenience. If you have any questions about this study, you can call Dr. Elaine Walker at (973) 275-2307. The data from your school district would be greatly appreciated, and again, thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Carolyn Rosenfeld
Seton Hall University
c/o Dr. Elaine Walker
Seton Hall University
400 South Orange Ave.
South Orange, NJ 07079
Dear Homeless Liaison,

I am a graduate student at Seton Hall University in the College of Education and Human Services. I am currently writing a doctoral dissertation entitled "The education of homeless students: McKinney progress in New Jersey". This study will investigate the extent of implementation of the Education for Homeless Children and Youth program, which is Subtitle VIIB of the Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Act. This study will investigate the numbers of homeless children and youth, and assess the educational services that are provided for them, in thirty New Jersey school districts. You have been identified as an individual who can provide relevant information for this study regarding the education of homeless youth.

I am writing to ask that you participate in this study, which will consist of answering a survey that I developed; it should take about one hour to complete. The questions pertain to the education of homeless youth in your district, and a second copy is enclosed that you might keep for your records. This study guarantees confidentiality and anonymity. Participation is voluntary and all materials that you complete will remain confidential with this author. Under no circumstance will data be published which identifies the participants. Results will be discussed with my dissertation mentor, but will not be seen by any unauthorized individual. All identification on the raw data will be replaced with a numerical coding system and the data will be kept locked in a secure manner. You have the right to withdraw from the study without prejudice at any time.

This research project has been reviewed and approved by the Seton Hall University Review Board for Human Subjects research. The Institutional Review Board (IRB) believes that the procedures adequately safeguard the subject’s privacy, welfare, civil liberties, and rights. The Chairperson of the IRB may be reached at (973) 275-2974.

By returning the completed survey, it will be assumed that you are thoroughly informed about this research and have voluntarily consented to participate in this study. Please keep this letter for your records. After reading the material above, it will be
assumed that all of your questions about the study are answered satisfactorily. If you would like to participate and do have questions, you can contact me by calling my dissertation mentor at Seton Hall University, Dr. Elaine Walker, at (973) 275-2307.

I would greatly appreciate it if you would complete the enclosed survey, and return it in the addressed, stamped envelope provided by Monday, May 27th, 2002. I intend to send reminder postcards at a later date. The data provided by your school district is greatly needed to assist in this research regarding the implementation of legislation for the education of homeless youth, and your participation would be greatly appreciated.

I realize that time is very precious, and easily consumed fulfilling essential obligations, but the time invested in my research will be useful in guiding educational policy and practice, and will have benefits for homeless children and youth. I am also an educator, and like you, I am interested in improving the quality of education for all students. Your participation in this study can potentially help make our goal a reality for the special population of students in homeless situations. Thank you in advance for your cooperation and support.

Sincerely,

Carolyn Rosenfeld
c/o Dr. Elaine Walker
Seton Hall University
400 South Orange Avenue
South Orange, New Jersey 07079
Dear Homeless Liaison,

Recently, I sent you a request to participate in a study on homelessness. Did you receive and return the survey? If it is in the mail, thank you for your response. Otherwise, please be advised that the 5/27/02 response request due date has been extended to 6/27/02.

If you wish to participate and have misplaced the survey, I have enclosed another copy for your convenience. The data from your school district would be greatly appreciated, and again, thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Carolyn Rosenfeld
Seton Hall University
c/o Dr. Elaine Walker
Seton Hall University
400 South Orange Ave.
South Orange, NJ 07079
Summer 2002

To whom it may concern:

I would like to thank you for participating in my research regarding the education of homeless students. If you would like a copy of the results, or if you have any further comments about this research, please call (973) 275-2307. Once again, thank you again for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Carolyn Rosenfeld

c/o Dr. Elaine Walker
Seton Hall University
400 South Orange Ave.
South Orange, NJ 07079
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Survey Instruments
SUPERINTENDENT SURVEY QUESTIONS

DATE ____________________________

1. Please estimate the total number of homeless school-age youth in this district during the 2000-2001 school year. __________ (Provide a number)

2. What source(s) did you use to identify and count the number of homeless school-age youth for your response to question number 1.

__________________________________________________________

3. What is your confidence level that this estimate is correct? (Check One)

_____ 25%  _____ 50%  _____ 75%  _____ 100% sure it is correct

4. How many students were enrolled in this district during the 2000-2001 school year?

_____ Pre-K  _____ Elementary  _____ Middle  _____ High School

5. How many homeless youth were enrolled in this district during the 2000-2001 school year?

_____ Pre-K  _____ Elementary  _____ Middle  _____ High School

6. What is the trend of homelessness in your school district?

_____ Increasing  _____ Decreasing  _____ Remaining the same: By _____% (Estimate)

7. Based on the estimated number of homeless school-age youth in your community, self assess the status of your district based on the estimated number of homeless school-age youth as compared to the percentage of homeless school-age youth enrolled in your schools. (Check One)

_____ Inadequate  _____ Adequate  _____ Very Good  _____ Superior
(Serving very few)  (Serving some)  (Serving most)  (Serving all)
USE THE FOLLOWING SCALE TO RESPOND FOR QUESTIONS #8 THROUGH #10

1 Strongly disagree  2 Disagree  3 Neutral  4 Agree  5 Strongly agree

_____ 8. More proactive measures should be taken to educate homeless youth.

_____ 9. Central office staff need more knowledge about legal issues related to homelessness.

_____ 10. School level staff need more information on homelessness.

11. How many social workers are assigned to the central office?

_____ None  _____ Part-time  _____ Full-time

12. How many social workers are assigned to the schools?

_____ None  _____ Part-time  _____ Full-time

13. What do you think is the best educational setting for homeless students? (check as many that apply)

_____ Transitional Classrooms (special programs at shelter or school site)

_____ Shelter School (self-contained school services at shelter sites)

_____ Segregated School (separate facilities catering specifically to homeless populations)

_____ Public School (access and success barriers should be addressed)

_____ Other ____________________________ (please specify)

14. Does your district have a separate policy that specifically addresses the educational needs of your homeless students?

_____ Yes  _____ No

15. How would you rate the amount of information that you receive from the state coordinator?

_____ Extremely lacking  _____ Not enough  _____ Enough  _____ More than enough

16. What amount of special funding for the education of homeless youth did you receive for the 2000-2001 school year?

McKinney  _____ Title I  _____ Other  _____ Other (please specify)

17. Rate your opinion on the amount of McKinney funds in your Q#16 response. (Check
one)

_____ Extremely lacking  _____ Not enough  _____ Enough  _____ More than enough

18. ______ Yes, you may contact our district homeless liaison.

_______ No, please do not contact our district homeless liaison.
LIAISON SURVEY QUESTIONS

DATE ____________________________

1. Please estimate the total number of homeless school-age youth residing in this district during the 2000-2001 school year. __________ (Provide a number)

2. What source(s) did you use to identify and count the total number of homeless school-age youth for your response to question number 1?

3. What is your confidence level that this estimate is correct? (Check one)
   ___ 25%  ___ 50%  ___ 75%  ___ 100%  Sure it is correct

4. What is the trend of homelessness in your school district?
   ___ Increasing  ___ Decreasing  ___ Remaining the same: By ___ % (Estimate)

5. How many students were enrolled in this district during the 2000-2001 school year?
   ___ Pre-K  ___ Elementary  ___ Middle  ___ High School

6. How many homeless youth were enrolled in this district during the 2000-2001 school year?
   ___ Pre-K  ___ Elementary  ___ Middle  ___ High School

7. Based on the estimated number of homeless school-age youth in your community, self-assess the status of your district based on the estimated number of homeless school-age youth as compared to the percentage of homeless school-age youth enrolled in your schools. (Check One)

   ___ Inadequate  ___ Adequate  ___ Very Good  ___ Superior
   (Serving very few)  (Serving some)  (Serving most)  (Serving all)

8. How long has your school district had a homeless liaison? ___ Years ___ Months

9. How long have you worked at this position? ___ Years ___ Months

10. How many hours per week are you able to devote to this position?
    ___ 0-10  ___ 11-20  ___ 21-30  ___ 31-40  ___ More than 40
11. Estimate the number of hours per week that you devote to the following tasks:
   ____ conducting workshops
   ____ collecting data
   ____ coordinating programs
   ____ disseminating information / providing awareness
   ____ estimating the number of homeless youth
   ____ interactions with organizations
   ____ interactions with parents
   ____ interactions with shelters
   ____ interactions with youth
   ____ preparing and submitting reports to the U.S. Department of Education
   ____ preparing and submitting reports to the State Department of Education
   ____ resolving disputes
   ____ testifying at hearings

12. Please indicate the number of support staff available to you
   ____ Assistants
   ____ Guidance Counselors
   ____ Nurses
   ____ Psychologists
   ____ Social Workers
   ____ Special Education Teachers
   ____ Volunteers
   ____ Other (Please indicate ________________ )

13. How many high school dropouts were there in this district during the 2000-2001 school year? ________

14. How many of these high school dropouts were also homeless? ________

15. What amount of special funding for the education of homeless youth did you receive for the 2000-2001 school year?

   McKinney ________ Title I ________ Other ________ (please specify)

16. Rate your opinion on the amount of McKinney funds reported in your question 15 response. (Check one)

   ____ Extremely lacking   ____ Not enough   ____ Enough   ____ More than enough

17. What special programs for homeless youth exist in your district?
18. The following are some concerns and problems surrounding the education of homeless students. Please indicate your degree of agreement with each statement as it pertains to the homeless students in your school district.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concern</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Uncertain</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic achievement is low.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic records are difficult to obtain.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to extracurricular activities is limited.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After school programs are not available.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attendance is irregular.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case management is difficult to orchestrate.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child care is needed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class sizes are too large.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clothing supplies are needed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community involvement is limited.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer literacy is low.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counting homeless youth is difficult.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum sensitive to homelessness needs to be developed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation processes for special services should be modified.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family mobility presents problems.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding is inadequate.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade level placement remains difficult.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guardianship issues are an Access barrier.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guardianship issues are problematic for adolescents.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health care is needed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immunization requirements are an access barrier.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parental involvement is low.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parental literacy levels present problems.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer perception is negative.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preschool programs are needed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological counseling is needed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public perception is negative.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residency requirements are an access barrier.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School supplies are needed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special programs are needed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student self-perception is negative.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher staff development is needed to raise awareness.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tutoring programs are needed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19. What is your single greatest concern from among those concerns listed above?

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

20. Please list the homeless shelters in this school district.

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________