

**Appendix B-4. McKinney-Vento State Plan Panel Reviewer Guide (Abbreviated Version
Adapted for State Coordinator Review at the Annual State Coordinators' Meeting February
2008)**

GENERAL QUESTIONS FOR REVIEW

Yes No Don't Know 1. I have (or my predecessor has) used my state's plan as a framework to implement the McKinney-Vento Act.

Yes No Don't Know 2. I have (or my predecessor has) reviewed my state's plan since its original development in 2002.

Yes No Don't Know 3. I have (or my predecessor has) revised my state's plan since its original development in 2002.

REVIEWING PLANS USING REQUIRED CRITERIA

The Department's criteria for state plans are identified in the statute under Section 722(g). While the statute reflects what needs to be included in an effective state plan, states are free to organize their plans in ways that respond to their own needs, and ways to best implement the McKinney-Vento statute. At a minimum, however, the state plan must include all the stated elements required in the McKinney-Vento state plan that is consistent with the stated purposes and requirements of the statute and internally consistent with a state's identified needs.

Item #1: Does the state plan adequately describe the state's procedures for ensuring that homeless children and youth are given the opportunity to meet the same challenging state academic achievement standards that all students in the state are expected to meet?

Yes Somewhat Not at all Don't Know

What have we learned since the 2002 reauthorization that could be used to strengthen the part of the plan that addresses this criterion?

What information should be included regarding this criterion to make the state plan a more useful document?

Item #2: Does the state plan adequately describe procedures the state will use to identify homeless children and youth in the state and to assess their special needs?

Yes Somewhat Not at all Don't Know

What have we learned since the 2002 reauthorization that could be used to strengthen the part of the plan that addresses this criterion?

What information should be included regarding this criterion to make the state plan a more useful document?

Item #3: Does the state plan adequately describe procedure for the prompt resolution of disputes regarding the educational placement of homeless children and youths?

Yes Somewhat Not at all Don't Know

What have we learned since the 2002 reauthorization that could be used to strengthen the part of the plan that addresses this criterion?

What information should be included regarding this criterion to make the state plan a more useful document?

Item #4: Does the state plan adequately describe the state's programs for school personnel (including principals, attendance officers, teachers, enrollment personnel, and pupil services personnel) to heighten their awareness of the specific needs of runaway and homeless youths?

Yes Somewhat Not at all Don't Know

What have we learned since the 2002 reauthorization that could be used to strengthen the part of the plan that addresses this criterion?

What information should be included regarding this criterion to make the state plan a more useful document?

Item #5: Does the state plan adequately describe the state’s procedures for ensuring that homeless children and youths who meet the relevant eligibility criteria are able to participate in Federal, State, or local food programs?

___ Yes ___ Somewhat ___ Not at all ___ Don’t Know

What have we learned since the 2002 reauthorization that could be used to strengthen the part of the plan that addresses this criterion?

What information should be included regarding this criterion to make the state plan a more useful document?

Item #6: Does the state plan adequately describe the state’s procedures for ensuring that: homeless children have equal access to the same public preschool programs, administered by the state agency, as provided to other children in the state; homeless youths and youths separated from the public schools are identified and accorded equal access to appropriate secondary education and support services; 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?

___ Yes ___ Somewhat ___ Not at all ___ Don’t Know

What have we learned since the 2002 reauthorization that could be used to strengthen the part of the plan that addresses this criterion?

What information should be included regarding this criterion to make the state plan a more useful document?

Item #7: Does the state plan adequately describe the state’s strategies for addressing problems identified through a review of the annual CSPR and technical assistance requests?

Yes Somewhat Not at all Don’t Know

What have we learned since the 2002 reauthorization that could be used to strengthen the part of the plan that addresses this criterion?

What information should be included regarding this criterion to make the state plan a more useful document?

Item #8: Does the state plan adequately describe the state’s strategies for addressing problems with respect to the education of homeless children and youths, including problems resulting from enrollment delays that are caused by immunization and medical records requirements; residency requirements; lack of birth certificates, school records, or other documentation; guardianship issues; or uniform or dress code requirements?

Yes Somewhat Not at all Don’t Know

What have we learned since the 2002 reauthorization that could be used to strengthen the part of the plan that addresses this criterion?

What information should be included regarding this criterion to make the state plan a more useful document?

Item #9: Does the state plan adequately demonstrate that the state and local educational agencies (LEAs) in the state have developed, and will review and as necessary revise, policies to remove barriers to the enrollment and retention of homeless children and youths in schools in the state?

___ Yes ___ Somewhat ___ Not at all ___ Don't Know

What have we learned since the 2002 reauthorization that could be used to strengthen the part of the plan that addresses this criterion?

What information should be included regarding this criterion to make the state plan a more useful document?

Item #10: Does the state plan include the state's assurance that LEA's will comply with the requirements of paragraphs in Section 722(g)(3) through (g)(7) of the Act?

___ Yes ___ Somewhat ___ Not at all ___ Don't Know

What have we learned since the 2002 reauthorization that could be used to strengthen the part of the plan that addresses this criterion?

What information should be included regarding this criterion to make the state plan a more useful document?

Item #11: Does the state plan adequately describe the state’s technical assistance that the state will furnish to LEAs and how the SEA will coordinate its compliance efforts with the local educational agency liaisons designated under paragraph (1)(J)(ii) in Section 722 of the Act?

____ Yes ____ Somewhat ____ Not at all ____ Don’t Know

What have we learned since the 2002 reauthorization that could be used to strengthen the part of the plan that addresses this criterion?

What information should be included regarding this criterion to make the state plan a more useful document?

Item #12: Does the state plan adequately describe how the state will use the funds it receives under this program to carry out state-level activities and to make subgrants to LEAs?

____ Yes ____ Somewhat ____ Not at all ____ Don’t Know

What have we learned since the 2002 reauthorization that could be used to strengthen the part of the plan that addresses this criterion?

What information should be included regarding this criterion to make the state plan a more useful document?

GENERAL QUESTIONS FOR REVIEW

1. What are the strengths of your state plan?
2. What are the weaknesses?
3. What could be done to increase the usefulness of the plan?
4. What would you like to know from your peers to help you strengthen your state plan?