

## State Coordinators' Handbook

### Section F. The McKinney-Vento Subgrant Process

- F.1 Requirements in the McKinney-Vento Act related to subgrants
- F.2 State policies
- F.3 Planning the process
  - F.3.1 How long should the subgrant cycle be?
  - F.3.2 How many and what size subgrants should be awarded?
  - F.3.3 What are some considerations for developing a timeline to conduct the subgrant process?
- F.4 Developing or revising the RFP
  - F.4.1 Purpose of the RFP
  - F.4.2 Program perspective reflected in the RFP
  - F.4.3 Critical components of the RFP
  - F.4.4 Announcing the availability of the RFP
  - F.4.5 Providing training and technical assistance to LEAs on developing their subgrant proposals
- F.5 The proposal review process
  - F.5.1 Review your state requirements
  - F.5.2 Develop a rubric
  - F.5.3 Train reviewers
- F.6 Award selection
- F.7 Subgrantee oversight
  - F.7.1 Training and technical assistance
  - F.7.2 End-of-year reports
  - F.7.3 Budget oversight
  - F.7.4 Monitoring
- F.8 Links to helpful documents

Appendix F-1. McKinney-Vento Section 723 – Allowable Uses of Funds

Appendix F-2. List of States with Number of LEAs with and without Subgrants 2008-2009

Appendix F-3. List of States with numbers of LEAs with and without subgrants based on  
2008-2009 CSPR Federal Data

## **Section F. The McKinney-Vento Subgrant Process**

Each year, the SEA must make subgrants to LEAs for the purpose of facilitating the enrollment, attendance, and success in school of homeless children and youth. These subgrants are competitive, awarded on the basis of need and quality of the application. Included in this section is a review of the requirements of the subgrant program described in Section 723 of the McKinney-Vento Act. Additionally, this section summarizes many years of good practice on the part of states that can guide both new and experienced state coordinators through a process of reviewing their program's current subgrant process against accepted good practice and enable them to make refinements as necessary.

An LEA's McKinney-Vento program is likely to be only as good as the process by which subgrants are awarded. As the state coordinator, you play a vital role in developing a process that enables subgrantees to link needs, goals, activities, and expenses and holds subgrantees accountable for implementing strong programs. This section includes discussions of appropriate lengths for the subgrant cycle, the size and number of awards, strategies for conducting the process and making awards, and subgrant oversight. An additional web link is provided to the NCHE Forum that features sample McKinney-Vento subgrant applications and other documents that states have shared, such as proposal review rubrics and training materials to prepare LEAs for the subgrant process.

### **F.1 Requirements in the McKinney-Vento Act related to subgrants**

Section 723 of the McKinney-Vento Act details the intent and requirements for the McKinney-Vento subgrant program. Following is a summary of the main provisions. Each year, the SEA must award subgrants to LEAs for the purpose of facilitating the enrollment, attendance, and success in school of homeless children and youth. While awards should be finalized annually, states have the option to extend the award cycle for up to three years. The full competitive process and identification of LEAs to fund can be done once every two or three years with confirmation of annual funding made on a yearly basis.

Subgrants are designed to expand or improve upon educational services that a school district provides to all students. The services may be provided through programs on school

grounds or other facilities, and should be provided through existing programs that integrate homeless children and youth with nonhomeless children and youth as much as possible.

If services are provided on school grounds, recipients of services may include other children and youth who are at risk of failing in or dropping out of school. However, the main purpose of the subgrant is to meet the needs of homeless children and youth. In addition, services provided through the subgrants in schools should not segregate homeless children and youth except for short periods of time when addressing health or safety emergencies or providing temporary, special, and supplementary services to meet the unique needs of homeless children and youth.

LEAs must submit an application to the SEA for a subgrant that includes the following:

1. An assessment of the educational and related needs of homeless children and youth
2. A description of services and programs
3. An assurance that the LEA's combined fiscal effort per student, or aggregate expenditure of the LEA and State with respect to the provision of free public education by the agency for the fiscal year preceding the fiscal year for which the determination is made, was not less than 90 percent 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 complies with, or will use requested funds to comply with, the Act
5. A description of policies and procedures to ensure that activities will not isolate or stigmatize homeless children and youth

The SEA must make competitive subgrants to LEAs. Subgrants are awarded on the basis of need and quality of the application submitted. The application must include data on homeless children and youth. The SEA also may require the application to address the extent to which the proposed use of funds will facilitate the enrollment, retention, and educational success of homeless children and youth; coordinate with other programs and agencies; and demonstrate a commitment to serving homeless children and youth.

In determining the quality of the application, the SEA must consider the following:

1. The applicant's needs assessment and the likelihood that the proposed program will meet the needs of homeless children and youth in the LEA
2. The types, intensity, and coordination of the services to be provided
3. The involvement of parents or guardians of homeless children and youth
4. The extent to which homeless children and youth will be integrated into the regular education program
5. The quality of the applicant's evaluation plan for the program
6. The extent to which services provided by the subgrant will be coordinated with other services
7. Other measures the SEA considers indicative of high-quality programming

The law includes a list of authorized LEA activities that may be funded to carry out the purpose of the subgrant program. [Click here to review Appendix F-1, McKinney-Vento Act Section 723, Allowable Use of Funds.](#) [Click here for a further explanation of allowable uses of funds in Section G: Fiscal Oversight.](#)

## **F.2 State policies**

You should be familiar with your SEA's policies regarding awarding funds and grants to LEAs. States may have specific requirements related to the process by which funds are allocated, state board involvement, proposal review, etc. Moreover, it is important to ensure that the SEA administration and budget office understand the intent and legislative requirements for the McKinney-Vento subgrant program.

## **F.3 Planning the process**

State coordinators must decide the answers to a number of questions before preparing the subgrant process.

### **F.3.1 How long should the subgrant cycle be?**

The McKinney-Vento Act states that subgrants can be awarded for terms not to exceed three years. Most states implement a three-year cycle; in monitoring visits, federal monitors

have recommended that states with a cycle less than three years change to a three-year cycle. The longer cycle allows for greater program continuity and enables state coordinators to monitor and assist subgrantees in strengthening their program during the implementation phase. In addition, the application and award process requires significant time and effort both at the state and local levels. Any benefits in conducting the process more frequently than three years do not outweigh the time and effort taken away from providing programmatic activities and services.

### **F.3.2 How many and what size subgrants should be awarded?**

The size and number of subgrants awarded in a state varies widely. The 2009 survey of state coordinators indicated that the average number of subgrants awarded in a state was 16, with the lowest number being two and the highest number being 92. The 2009 survey also showed that the average low range for awards was \$29,000 and the average high range for awards was \$114,776. [Click here to review Appendix F-2, List of States with Numbers of LEAs with and without Subgrants.](#) The determination of the number and size of subgrants should be based on the demographics and needs of each state. The following table illustrates benefits and concerns related to how subgrant funds should be disbursed.

**Table F-1. Determining amount and number of subgrant awards**

Amount	Benefits	Concerns
Small subgrants/many awards	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Good for states that have small to moderate numbers of homeless students in most districts</li> <li>– Good for states that have districts that could benefit from start up funds to build their MV program</li> <li>– Provides broad coverage of LEAs</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– May spread the funds too thin for significant program impact</li> <li>– Not the best choice if some LEAs have large numbers of homeless students, such as urban areas, that have need for greater amounts of funding</li> </ul>
Large subgrants/few awards	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Most beneficial in states with a few high need districts and most districts with lower numbers of homeless students and needs</li> <li>– Enables funds to be concentrated where the needs are greatest</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Districts with smaller numbers would not receive funding but could benefit from award funds and a program plan to help identify homeless students and build a program</li> </ul>

Some states, such as Texas and North Carolina, use a tiered approach to making subgrant awards. In these states, districts are categorized according to the number of homeless students identified, and each category is eligible for a certain range of funding, with lower amounts available to those with lower numbers of homeless students and higher amounts available to those with higher numbers. The tiered approach enables the greatest amount of the subgrant funds to target the districts with the greatest need while enabling districts with lower numbers to have funding to build their program. (See the [NCHE web state and local resources page](#) to review requests for subgrant proposals from various states, including Texas and North Carolina.)

### **F.3.3 Can subgrants be awarded to regional entities?**

Some states award subgrants to regional entities or consortia of LEAs. Michigan, with over 800 LEAs, is an example of a state that awards subgrants in this way. In 2009, the state coordinator explained that regional subgrants enabled the state to maximize the distribution of the subgrant funds and include more LEAs. Smaller districts with lower numbers that had not participated in the competitive subgrant process were able to increase services for their homeless students through the regional consortium approach. The regional approach decreased administrative costs and fostered greater collaboration among LEAs. Moreover, the state coordinator reported that she was able to more effectively oversee the work of and train 30 regional consortia coordinators, instead of coordinators in each participating LEA. In turn, the regional grant coordinator feels that she is more easily accessible to participating district homeless liaisons for consultation and assistance than SEA staff.

However, federal monitoring of some states utilizing the regional approach has raised concerns related to compromising the competitive process and divesting tasks, authority, and oversight that should rest with the office of the state coordinator. Procedures and safeguards must be implemented such that a regional approach to awarding subgrants ensures that (1) the state coordinator retains sufficient authority and oversight of the local level implementation of the McKinney-Vento Act, and (2) local capacity is sufficient to carry out the required tasks. In addition, the regional approach should ensure that LEAs with the greatest need are provided

funds to meet the needs of homeless students and that funds are not spread too thin to have significant impact. States that disseminate McKinney-Vento funds in regional grants should evaluate the effectiveness of this approach on an ongoing basis.

NCHE will examine the regional approach to awarding subgrants and develop a publication detailing its effectiveness in 2011.

#### **F.3.4 What are some considerations for developing a timeline to conduct the subgrant process?**

McKinney-Vento subgrants must be awarded to LEAs in a timely way, namely, at the beginning of each school year for optimal program implementation. In planning the subgrant process, be sure to allow sufficient time for LEAs to develop their proposals and avoid times of the year when they are likely to be extraordinarily busy, such as during state assessments. Also, you should be aware of other discretionary grant processes taking place at the same time and select another time for the McKinney-Vento subgrant process. Small LEAs frequently have staff available on a nine-month contract, so they would not be able to effectively complete an application during the summer break.

Other considerations for the timeline include:

- Technical assistance activities to familiarize LEAs with the application and proposal development process
- Announcing the availability of the request for proposals (RFP)
- Training for proposal reviewers
- The proposal review process
- State processes for grant approval
- State processes for disbursing funds to awardees
- The award notification process

The state plan, which is on file with ED, should include a description of the state's subgrant process. If a state significantly changes the subgrant process, the state coordinator must notify the federal coordinator for the EHCY Program.

#### **F.4 Developing or revising the RFP**

Well in advance of the McKinney-Vento subgrant process, state coordinators should review the RFP for the past cycle and determine if and/or how it should be revised. Recommendations in the following section along with a review of examples of subgrant RFPs from other states will provide you with the guidance you need to ensure that your RFP meets the requirements of the law and helps applicants envision and describe competitive proposals.

##### **F.4.1 Purpose of the RFP**

The RFP should be viewed as a blueprint for the subgrant program and a contractual agreement for how the LEA will spend the funds. It should be detailed enough to lead the LEA through a process to link its needs for homeless children and youth with goals, objectives, activities, and expenditures. However, it should not require so much detail that it will create a barrier for LEAs that need the funds to apply, especially for ones that do not have grant writers. The application must require sufficient detail, nevertheless, for reviewers to evaluate the quality of the proposal for the competitive process.

After each subgrant application process, you should review the submitted applications to determine the strengths and weaknesses of the RFP and make any needed revisions for the next cycle. Many state's subgrant RFPs are posted on the [NCHE subgrant resource page](#) and provide a wide range of approaches to developing the RFP.

##### **F.4.2 Program perspective reflected in the RFP**

LEAs should view the subgrant as a program, not a set of activities. The program should be an integrated and comprehensive approach to providing services for homeless children and youth that shows a direct connection between needs, goals, objectives, activities, and expenses. The strength of the proposal should derive from the linkages between program

elements and ultimately illustrate that the funding will address the specific needs and goals. Therefore, a LEA that proposes to spend the funds only on a limited set of activities or on one type of activity such as transportation would most likely not be competitive. The RFP should be designed in a way to allow the LEA to show how all program elements are linked.

#### **F.4.3 Critical components of the RFP**

In reviewing the RFP, make sure the following components are clearly addressed:

**Eligibility requirements for application.** Grants must be awarded to LEAs as the fiscal agent. Some states limit eligibility to LEAs that have identified a certain number of homeless children and youth to ensure that funds target LEAs with the greatest need.

**Instructions for completing the application.** The application should include information on the following:

- Deadline for submission and method of submission
- Length of the application, line spacing, margins
- Signatures required
- Proposal components to be completed by the applicant

Following are the most common components of McKinney-Vento subgrant applications:

**Statement of need.** Applicants should provide information on number of homeless students identified, socio-economic and demographic data and trends, data from a needs assessment, status of the current program, and community resources.

**Program description.** The proposal should include prioritized needs, goals, objectives, activities, outcomes with a clear depiction of the linkages between each. Staffing and program management should be included as well. The application should provide a timeline for program implementation and address any changes that will occur from year to year in the multiple year award.

**Collaborations.** The proposal should include a description of collaborations in place both within the LEA and within the community. Some state coordinators require evidence of input from collaborators such as signatures or memoranda of agreement. The application

should require evidence of collaboration with Title I, Part A and should require applicants to include the amount of the Title I set aside for homeless students and an explanation for how the funds will be spent.

**Staff.** Applicants should include a staffing plan for the program with duties that link clearly to the activities, goals, and needs.

**Budget.** The budget should be detailed and link clearly to the program activities and expenses. Moreover, the budget should reflect only allowable expenses. The budget should also show cost and resource sharing with the LEA, other federal programs, and external agencies. A budget should be included for each year of the program if the program activities will differ from year to year.

**Program evaluation.** With an increasing emphasis on accountability and effectiveness for all federal programs, the proposal should include a strong evaluation plan with strategies for collecting data on measurable objectives that will demonstrate progress toward goals.

**Signatures and assurances.** The proposal should provide evidence that the LEA is committed to carrying out the subgrant program in the form of signatures from administrators for assurances that reflect the requirements of the subgrant program. See Section 723(b) of the McKinney-Vento Act lists the following assurances that subgrant applications should include:

- (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 complies with, or will use requested funds to comply with, paragraphs (3) through (7) of section 722(g).

**Supporting information.** State coordinators should make supporting information available to subgrant applicants as appendices to the RFP or web links. The objective of providing this information is to clarify requirements and expectations for the subgrant program so that applicants can develop a quality application and program coordinators can be clear on

the expectations for the subgrant program. Following are items that would be useful as supporting information:

- Background on McKinney-Vento and legislative requirements for subgrants (excerpts from McKinney-Vento, including 16 allowable activities)
- Criteria for review and scoring rubric
- [Standards and Indicators for Quality McKinney-Vento Programs](#)
- [Educating Homeless Children and Youth: Conducting Needs Assessments and Evaluating Services - A Guide for SEAs, LEAs, and Local Schools](#)
- Subgrantee monitoring indicators developed by the state coordinator
- Forms (budget, program components chart, program evaluation template, staffing chart)

#### **F.4.4 Announcing the availability of the RFP**

State coordinators should announce the availability of the RFP foremost to local homeless liaisons. In addition, local superintendents, budget offices, Title I coordinators, and development offices should be aware of the process. State coordinators should coordinate with SEA administrators for a statewide dissemination of the announcement through multiple venues so that several people in each LEA will be aware.

#### **F.4.5 Providing training and technical assistance to LEAs on developing their subgrant proposal**

The time spent helping LEAs understand the expectations of the subgrant program and develop quality applications will pay off when applications reflect an understanding of the program and provide a clear picture of what the LEA plans to do with the funding. Moreover, training and technical assistance levels the playing field among LEAs, some of whom have grant writers available but most of whom do not. An example of a Power Point presentation provided to prospective applicants in Michigan can be found [here](#).

The RFP packet should include detailed instructions for how to complete the application, including forms and checklists. In addition, the state coordinator should be available to answer questions from specific LEAs during the proposal writing process.

## **F.5 Application review process**

A carefully planned application review process will ensure that decisions for subgrant awards are objective and fair. Ultimately, the process should result in reviewer consensus on the most well-conceived proposals and ones that are the most responsive to the RFP.

### **F.5.1 Review your state requirements**

Many states have requirements for the review process for discretionary grants, such as requirements for the number and types of reviewers, the type of rubric or criteria, and documentation of the review process. State coordinators should be familiar with their state's policies for grant review.

### **F.5.2 Develop a rubric**

A strong rubric will assist reviewers in determining the quality of the subgrant applications. The rubric, provided as supporting material, will assist applicants in writing to specific criteria. A rubric is a scoring or rating guide that can help standardize the evaluation of proposals. It is more than a checklist in that it provides a way to identify various levels of quality. It is often presented in matrix form with the levels of quality described in detail.

Here are some tips on creating a rubric for subgrant proposals:

Identify the elements or criteria that will be used to evaluate the proposal. Keep the list manageable (8-10 items) and focus on the most important qualities you would like to see in the proposal. You may identify these from the requirements in the law, elements that generally comprise strong grant proposals, and/or qualities that you've identified from strong subgrant proposals you have received in the past.

Assign values, either numeric or descriptive, to varying levels of proposal quality, such as a 5-0 rating or categories such as excellent, adequate, fair, and unacceptable.

Develop a clear description for these values for each of the proposal elements. One strategy is to describe the characteristics of the best case and the worst case, and then develop

intermediate examples that feature the most frequent short comings in the proposals which make these elements fall short of the ideal or of the redeeming qualities that make an element better than the worst case. Another strategy is to review proposals from an earlier subgrant cycle and divide them into best, adequate, fair, and unacceptable groups and describe the qualities that characterize these groups. Then use these descriptions for the values for the rubric.

An alternative to starting from scratch is to review the scoring guide or rubric from an earlier subgrant cycle and to revise and build on it. Or, state coordinators may want to adapt a scoring guide from another state's subgrant review process. State coordinators should test the rubric by scoring a few grant proposals and identifying parts that need clarification or revision. For an example of a McKinney-Vento subgrant application rubric, view the rubric for the [North Carolina Homeless Education Program](#).

### **F.5.3 Train reviewers**

Each proposal should be read by at least two reviewers, preferably three. Reviewers with a background in the McKinney-Vento program will be familiar with the intent of the subgrants. However, a reviewer from another program who has proposal writing experience could provide an objective perspective on the quality of the subgrant proposals.

Reviewers should receive training on the review process to become familiar with federal and state requirements for the subgrants and to become familiar with the rubric. An opportunity for the reviewers to meet and review several proposals together using the rubric will establish inter-rater reliability and decrease the likelihood of wide discrepancies in individual scoring. This meeting will also serve as a pilot test for the rubric so that any needed revisions can be made before it is used for all the applications.

After reviews and score sheets are submitted, the state coordinator should convene a meeting of reviewers to discuss proposals with divergent scores.

## **F.6 Award selection**

The state coordinator should review the recommendations of the reviewers against the amount of funds available for subgrants, and decide how to award the funds. In some instances, the state coordinator will fully award as many of the top scoring proposals as the funds will allow. In other instances, the state coordinator will spread the funds over more LEAs by awarding a percentage of the amount requested by the LEAs recommended for funding. In all cases, the funds awarded must be at least 75 per cent of the state's annual McKinney-Vento allocation (unless the state is a minimum funded state in which at least 50 per cent must be awarded).

The state coordinator should develop an award letter and determine who should receive and be copied on the letter. Award letters should include:

- The amount of the award for the first year of the subgrant cycle (with an explanation of the multi-year award)
- A disclaimer that the amount is contingent upon the annual McKinney-Vento allocation provided to the state
- Duration of the grant
- Date of availability of the funds
- Statement that the award is contingent upon the LEA implementing the program as described in the proposal and meeting state requirements for reporting and monitoring

## **F.7 Subgrantee oversight**

State coordinators should have several means to ensure that subgrant program coordinators serve homeless students effectively and spend funds in allowable and strategic ways. Grantees should maintain documentation of program activities and impact so that it may be periodically reviewed by their state coordinator.

### **F.7.1 Training and technical assistance**

All LEAs should receive training and technical assistance on implementing the McKinney-Vento Act. Subgrantees should receive additional support in implementing their program,

spending funds appropriately, and evaluating their program. See **Section G: Fiscal Oversight** (link) for information on subgrant use of funds.

### **F.7.2 End-of-year reports**

Requiring an end-of-year report from each subgrantee is an effective way to desk monitor the implementation of the program. Additionally, developing the report enables the program coordinator to review the year's activities against the proposed activities and reinforces grant accountability. The report should include the activities undertaken, barriers, successes, and evaluation data to show progress toward attaining goals listed in the proposal. The report format should strike a balance between including enough detail to depict the status of the program without burdening the program coordinator to unduly detract from providing services. Sample end-of-year report formats are included in the [NCHE state and local resources page](#).

### **F.7.3 Budget oversight**

Budget oversight is an important part of the state coordinator's responsibility for subgrantee oversight. See the subgrantee budget oversight section in Section G: Fiscal Oversight.

### **F.7.4 Monitoring**

ED expects that each subgrantee will be monitored on site during the subgrant cycle. For suggestions on monitoring, see Section D: Monitoring.

## **F.8 Links to helpful documents**

Subgrant RFPs from various states on the [NCHE McKinney-Vento Subgrants Page](#)

NCHE's [Standards and Indicators for Quality McKinney-Vento Programs](#)

[Educating Homeless Children and Youth: Conducting Needs Assessments and Evaluating Services - A Guide for SEAs, LEAs, and Local Schools](#)

## Appendix F-1. McKinney-Vento Act Section 723, Allowable Use of Funds

- (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.

## **Appendix F-2. Abbreviated Version of Section 723 - Allowable Use of Funds**

- 1) Supplemental educational services such as tutoring and other academic enrichment programs
- 2) Expedited evaluations for various educational services
- 3) Professional development activities for educators and pupil services personnel working with homeless students
- 4) Health referral services
- 5) Defraying the excess cost of transportation to enable students to attend the school of origin
- 6) Provision of early childhood education programs for pre-school aged homeless children
- 7) Services to retain unaccompanied youths in public school programs
- 8) Before- and after-school, mentoring, and summer programs with educational activities
- 9) Payment of fees and costs associated with tracking, obtaining, and transferring records
- 10) Education and training for parents of homeless children and youth about rights and resources
- 11) Development of coordination between schools and agencies providing services
- 12) Provision of pupil services (including violence prevention counseling) and referrals for such services
- 13) Activities to address needs that may arise from domestic violence
- 14) Adaptation of space and purchase of supplies for non-school facilities to provide services listed above
- 15) Provision of school supplies, including those to be distributed at shelters or other appropriate locations
- 16) Other extraordinary or emergency assistance needed to enable homeless students to attend school.

(Excerpted from the January 2009 *Homeless Education Disaster Assistance FAQ Guidance and April 2009 McKinney-Vento ARRA Guidance*)

**Appendix F-3. List of States with Numbers of LEAs with and without subgrants based on 2008-2009 CSPR Federal Data**

State Name	LEAs without subgrants	LEAs with subgrants	Total LEAs
ALABAMA	97	35	132
ALASKA	50	4	54
ARIZONA	191	24	215
ARKANSAS	231	14	245
BUREAU OF INDIAN EDUCATION	164	9	173
CALIFORNIA	1436	90	1526
COLORADO	146	33	179
CONNECTICUT	184	13	197
DELAWARE	7	12	19
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA	57	1	58
FLORIDA	34	33	67
GEORGIA	150	30	180
HAWAII	0	1	1
IDAHO	125	9	134
ILLINOIS	862	0	862
INDIANA	321	20	341
IOWA	341	10	351
KANSAS	288	7	295
KENTUCKY	155	19	174
LOUISIANA	87	15	102
MAINE	296	3	299
MARYLAND	12	12	24
MASSACHUSETTS	377	16	393
MICHIGAN	333	499	832
MINNESOTA	503	7	510
MISSISSIPPI	135	17	152
MISSOURI	547	9	556
MONTANA	416	5	421
NEBRASKA	245	9	254
NEVADA	14	3	17
NEW HAMPSHIRE	184	5	189
NEW JERSEY	650	8	658
NEW MEXICO	74	15	89
NEW YORK	588	284	872
NORTH CAROLINA	90	25	115
NORTH DAKOTA	187	6	193

State Name	LEAs without subgrants	LEAs with subgrants	Total LEAs
OHIO	1006	51	1057
OKLAHOMA	514	18	532
OREGON	155	41	196
PENNSYLVANIA	0	8	8
PUERTO RICO	0	1	1
RHODE ISLAND	42	5	47
SOUTH CAROLINA	70	16	86
SOUTH DAKOTA	159	2	161
TENNESSEE	124	15	139
TEXAS	1161	120	1281
UTAH	32	8	40
VERMONT	57	4	61
VIRGINIA	103	29	132
WASHINGTON	256	39	295
WEST VIRGINIA	41	14	55
WISCONSIN	430	12	442
WYOMING	4	44	48
Total	13,731	1,729	15,460