

STATE PLAN
Composite Notes Form
for the McKinney-Vento EHCY Program

State Name: Washington



U.S. Department of Education
September 2017

Background

Peer reviewers will apply their professional judgment and experiences when responding to the questions in response to the criteria below. Consistent with section 1111(a)(4)(C) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, peer reviewers will conduct an objective review of State plans in their totality and out of respect for State and local judgments, with the goal of supporting State- and local-led innovation and providing objective feedback on the technical, educational, and overall quality of a State plan, including the validity and reliability of each element of the plan. Reviewer responses to the questions inform the written determination of the Secretary regarding the State plan.

Role of the Peer Reviewers

- Each peer reviewer will independently review a consolidated State plan in accordance to the criteria for Title VII, Subtitle B of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act's Education for Homeless Children and Youth Program (EHCY). Each reviewer will record their responses to the questions, will note where changes may be necessary for an SEA to fully address statutory and regulatory requirements, and may also present suggestions for improving the plan or to highlight best practices. Each peer will create individual recommendations to guide the remote review. These are submitted to the Department but will not be shared with the State.
- A panel of peer reviewers will meet remotely to discuss each SEA's plan. The panel of peer reviewers will generate one set of peer review notes that reflects their collective review and evaluation of the SEA's State plan, but the panel is not required to reach consensus. The notes should reflect all reviewer perspectives on each item.

After the peer review is completed, each SEA will receive the final peer review notes that include the peer reviewers' responses to the questions and any recommendations to improve the SEA's State plan in the sections that the peers reviewed. The peer review notes serve two purposes: 1) they constitute the official record of the peer review panel's responses to questions regarding how an SEA's State plan addresses the statutory and regulatory requirements; and 2) they provide technical assistance to the SEA on how to improve its plan. The peer review notes also serve as recommendations to the Secretary to determine what, if any, additional information to request from the SEA. Taking into consideration the peer reviewers' recommendations, the Department will provide feedback to each SEA that outlines the areas the SEA must address, if any, prior to the Secretary's approving its State plan. If a plan cannot be approved, the Department will offer the State an opportunity to revise and resubmit its plan and have a hearing, consistent with ESEA section 8451.

Consistent with ESEA section 1111(a)(5), the Department will make publicly available all peer review guidance, training, and final peer panel notes. The names of peer reviewers will be made publicly available at the completion of the review of all State Plans, though the peer reviewers for any individual State will not be made available.

How to Use This Document

The reviewer criteria is intended to 1) support States as they develop their consolidated State plans, and 2) inform peer review teams as they evaluate each State plan. This document outlines required elements in order for an SEA to fully address the applicable statutory and regulatory requirements. If an SEA has provided insufficient information for peer reviewers to determine whether any question is fully addressed, peer

reviewers should indicate that the SEA has not fully addressed that requirement and identify what additional information or clarification may be needed.

Instructions

Each peer reviewer should include individual review notes in the space provided below each State plan requirement. For each State plan requirement, a peer reviewer will provide:

- Peer Analysis: Describe the peer reviewer's justification for why an SEA did or did not meet the requirements;
- Strengths: Summarize strengths of the SEA's response to the State plan requirement;
- Limitations: Summarize the limitations of an SEA's response to the State plan requirement, including issues, lack of clarity, and possible technical assistance suggestions;
- Assessment: Determine if the SEA met the State plan requirement (indicated by Yes/No); and
 - If the peer reviewer indicates 'no' above, the peer must describe the specific information or clarification that a State must provide in order to meet the requirement.

The peer reviewer notes should address all of the required elements of each State plan requirement in this document, but do not need to address each element individually (*i.e.*, the peer notes should holistically look at I.5 the Strategies to Address Other Problems, incorporating each of the five identified items in this element but do not need to individually respond to each item).

SECTION I: EDUCATION FOR HOMELESS CHILDREN AND YOUTH PROGRAM, MCKINNEY-VENTO HOMELESS ASSISTANCE ACT, TITLE VII, SUBTITLE B

I.1: Student Identification (722(g)(1)(B) of the McKinney-Vento Act)

- **Does the SEA describe the procedures it will use to identify homeless children and youth in the State and to assess their needs?**

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	The peer reviewers observed that the State plan outlined several strategies to help identify and determine eligibility of homeless students and addressed education and training from the Washing State Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI) to all LEAs regarding McKinney-Vento requirements.
<i>Strengths</i>	The peer reviewers saw strengths in the State plan’s description of the SEA’s use of a universal housing questionnaire that is provided to LEAs and is translated into several languages to allow for consistency in the identification process. The reviewers also observed that the SEA offers training on a routine basis.
<i>Limitations</i>	It was noted that the State plan did not describe how often monitoring of the LEAs occurs, and the specific tools for assessing the needs of homeless children and youths were not identified. The peer review panel recommended that the SEA include additional methods for identifying homeless students such as readily available, easy to use referral forms that are placed in multiple locations and interagency collaboration.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (3) Reviewers
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

I.2: Dispute Resolution (722(g)(1)(C) of the McKinney-Vento Act)

- **Does the SEA describe procedures for the prompt resolution of disputes regarding the educational placement of homeless children and youth?**

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	The peer reviewers observed that the State plan’s dispute resolution process is utilized across school districts.
<i>Strengths</i>	The peer reviewers identified strengths in the State plan’s description of the SEA’s dispute resolution process and its use across all the school districts across the State.
<i>Limitations</i>	Peer reviewers indicated that the State’s plan did not provide detail regarding how parents, guardians, and unaccompanied youths are informed of their rights to dispute, the provision of transportation, or specific timelines for each segment of the process. It was also noted that the State’s plan did not provide details related to the specific step that is needed to initiate the dispute process nor are any details regarding documentation requirements provided.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (3) Reviewers
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

I.3: Support for School Personnel (722(g)(1)(D) of the McKinney-Vento Act)

- **Does the SEA describe programs for school personnel (including the LEA liaisons for homeless children and youth, principals and other school leaders, attendance officers, teachers, enrollment personnel, and specialized instructional support personnel) to heighten the awareness of such school personnel of the specific needs of homeless children and youth, including such children and youth who are runaway and homeless youths?**

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	The peer reviewers observed that the State plan outlined a thorough approach to provide programs to McKinney-Vento liaisons as well as other school district personnel which includes other State and federal programs. The plan also described onsite regional trainings and online learning opportunities.
<i>Strengths</i>	The peer reviewers identified strengths in the State plan’s description of the trainings that are offered on a routine basis for liaisons and other school district personnel. The peer reviewers saw strengths in the various modalities that the SEA uses to provide trainings, and that the SEA is able to monitor LEA participation in training opportunities to ensure compliance.
<i>Limitations</i>	It was noted that the State’s plan did not clarify whether additional district staff are required to attend the trainings or not. The plan did not specify the frequency of the trainings provided and did not provide detail as to whether all trainings were offered at the local level or at the State level.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (3) Reviewers
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

I.4: Access to Services (722(g)(1)(F) of the McKinney-Vento Act)

- **Does the SEA describe procedures that ensure that homeless children have access to public preschool programs, administered by the SEA or LEA, as provided to other children?**

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	The peer reviewers observed that the State plan provided detail on the training provided to liaisons including cross agency collaboration to ensure that procedures are in place to allow children experiencing homelessness access to preschool programs.
<i>Strengths</i>	The peer reviewers identified strengths in the State plan’s description of their cross-agency collaboration.
<i>Limitations</i>	It was noted that the State’s plan description of the program was not entirely clear to all reviewers.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (3) Reviewers
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

- **Does the SEA describe procedures that ensure that homeless youth and youth separated from public schools are identified and accorded equal access to appropriate secondary education and support services, including by identifying and removing barriers that prevent youth described in this clause from receiving appropriate credit for full or partial coursework satisfactorily completed while attending a prior school, in accordance with State, local, and school policies?**

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	The peer reviewers observed that the plan detailed the State-wide practices that are in place and supported by legislation to ensure that homeless students are identified and barriers are removed that might prevent such youth from receiving appropriate credits.
<i>Strengths</i>	The peer reviewers identified strengths in the State plan’s description of the Washington State law which specifically addresses the potential barrier of credit accrual.
<i>Limitations</i>	It was noted that the State’s plan would be strengthened if the plan included details on the specific steps followed by school staff to ensure the application of full or partial credit.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (3) Reviewers
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

- **Does the SEA describe procedures that ensure that homeless children and youth who meet the relevant eligibility criteria do not face barriers to accessing academic and extracurricular activities, including magnet school, summer school, career and technical education, advanced placement, online learning, and charter school programs, if such programs are available at the State and local levels?**

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	The peer reviewers observed that the State plan included descriptions of ongoing training in relation to procedures to remove barriers to accessing magnet schools, charter schools, and online learning. The peer reviewers also observed that there is collaboration with athletic staff to ensure barriers are removed and students are fully engaged in the school community.
<i>Strengths</i>	The peer reviewers saw strengths in the State plan's description of the cross-agency collaboration and training in relation to this requirement.
<i>Limitations</i>	The peer reviewers noted that the State plan addressed this requirement fully and did not identify any limitations in the SEA response to this requirement.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (3) Reviewers
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

I.5: Strategies to Address Other Problems (722(g)(1)(H) of the McKinney-Vento Act)

- **Does the SEA provide strategies to address other problems with respect to the education of homeless children and youth, including problems resulting from enrollment delays that are caused by—(i) requirements of immunization and other required health records; (ii) residency requirements; (iii) lack of birth certificates, school records, or other documentation; (iv) guardianship issues; or (v) uniform or dress code requirements?**

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	The peer reviewers observed that the State plan provided information related to existing State laws and/or local policies which require compliance and remove barriers to enrollment and full participation in school.
<i>Strengths</i>	The peer reviewers saw strengths in the State plan’s collaboration and positive relationships with healthcare professionals who can assist in addressing the healthcare needs of students. The peer reviewers also identified strengths in the State plan’s ongoing training and involvement of all professionals involved in the overall well-being of children.
<i>Limitations</i>	The peer reviewers noted that the State plan addressed this requirement fully and did not identify any limitations in the SEA response to this requirement.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (3) Reviewers
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

I.6: Policies to Remove Barriers (722(g)(1)(I) of the McKinney-Vento Act)

- **Does the SEA demonstrate that the SEA and LEAs in the State have developed, and shall review and revise, policies to remove barriers to the identification of homeless children and youth, and the enrollment and retention of homeless children and youth in schools in the State, including barriers to enrollment and retention due to outstanding fees or fines, or absences?**

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	The peer reviewers observed that the State plan addressed and supported the removal of barriers related to outstanding fees or fines, or absences. The reviewers also observed that the State plan included clear expectations and continued monitoring by the SEA.
<i>Strengths</i>	The peer reviewers identified strengths in the State plan’s description of the WSSDA 3115 policy that specifically addresses the removal of barriers to enrollment and retention of students due to outstanding fees, fines or absences.
<i>Limitations</i>	It was noted that the State’s plan would be strengthened if the plan included additional detail on how barriers are addressed through WSSDA 3115 regarding fees, fines, and absences.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (3) Reviewers
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	

I.7: Assistance from Counselors (722(g)(1)(K))

- **Does the SEA include how youths described in section 725(2) will receive assistance from counselors to advise such youths and prepare and improve the readiness of such youths for college?**

	<i>Peer Response</i>
<i>Peer Analysis</i>	The peer reviewers observed that the State plan described routine training and technical assistance for local liaisons and for school district counselors. It was also noted that a description of individual meetings between counselors and students experiencing homelessness to assist, advise, prepare, and improve college readiness was not provided.
<i>Strengths</i>	The peer reviewers identified strengths in the State plan’s description of the Washington State law RCW 28A.320.142 which requires school districts with over ten unaccompanied youth reported to designate a building-level contact in all middle and high schools to ensure the identification of unaccompanied youth and connect them with resources to ensure access to services and supports. The peer reviewers also saw strengths in the State plan’s collaboration with dropout prevention, intervention, and retrieval programs.
<i>Limitations</i>	It was noted that while the State’s plan indicated that students can work directly with counselors regarding issues related to transitioning to college, the plan did not indicate if counselors encourage individual meetings. It was also noted that the State’s plan would be strengthened if the plan included additional information relative to the frequency of intentional and direct outreach by the counselors to students experiencing homelessness in relation to the requirement.
<i>Did the SEA meet all requirements?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (3) Reviewers
<i>If no, describe the specific information or clarification that an SEA must provide to fully meet this requirement</i>	