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Executive Summary

The Education for Children and Youth Experiencing Homelessness (ECYEH) Program exists to ensure that each child or youth experiencing homelessness has equal access to the same free and appropriate public education, including a public preschool education, as provided to other children and youth. As such, the Pennsylvania Department of Education (PDE) created a state plan that outlines Pennsylvania’s implementation of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Education Assistance Improvements Act of 2001 and issued a Basic Education Circular to offer guidance to local education agencies (LEAs) regarding implementation of the McKinney-Vento Act. The current State Plan and Basic Education Circular, as well as other basic education circulars related to homelessness, can be found on PDE’s website at www.education.pa.gov/homeless.

The ECYEH Program structure is designed so that every child or youth identified as experiencing homelessness has an opportunity to receive needed support and services. Pennsylvania is divided into eight regions, each with a regional coordinator. Eight regional coordinators and their site coordinators provide outreach, training, and technical assistance to LEAs and work to link children, youth, families, and LEAs to additional services or resources for individuals experiencing homelessness. The Center for Schools and Communities, a subsidiary of the Central Susquehanna Intermediate Unit, provides statewide technical assistance to regions and LEAs. The statewide technical assistant monitors the regions to ensure compliance with the McKinney-Vento Act and maintains a resource website. The state coordinator, based at PDE, is responsible for program coordination and collaboration at the state level and manages dispute resolutions among LEAs should they occur.

Evaluators collected and analyzed data for the state evaluation from several sources to provide a picture of homelessness as it relates to the McKinney-Vento Act in Pennsylvania. The purpose of the evaluation is to:

- Examine the extent to which regions provide support to LEAs to meet the goals and objectives of the ECYEH Program;
- Examine the extent to which children and youth identified as experiencing homelessness receive services and support;
- Identify the types of services and supports children and youth received;
- Build capacity within each region to examine results and make improvements based on data; and
- Provide recommendations for overall program improvement.
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1 http://homeless.center-school.org/index.cfm
PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION FINDINGS

Evaluators examined the extent to which the ECYEH Program offered outreach, professional development, technical assistance, and/or support to LEAs or other entities that serve the homeless population or on behalf of the families, children, and youth experiencing homelessness. This information was captured in three different ways.

First, evaluators examined who participated in ECYEH-provided training, professional development, and/or workshops. Overall, 6,905 participants representing 592 entities participated in some type of ECYEH-provided events. Participants typically included local homeless liaisons, Title I staff, special education staff, administrative staff, or other school staff. Participating entities included LEAs, shelters, pre-kindergarten programs, and other agencies, organizations, and groups.

Next, evaluators examined the technical assistance ECYEH staff offered. Technical assistance could be child- or family-specific or through the distribution of McKinney-Vento Act-provided materials, resources, or bulk supplies. A total of 1,131 entities received technical assistance from the ECYEH Program. Of these entities, 95 percent received materials or resources, 74 percent received child- or family-specific technical assistance, and 74 percent received technical assistance that was not child/family specific. Additionally, 491 LEAs, shelters, and pre-kindergarten programs received ECYEH-provided bulk supplies. Bulk supply items typically included, but were not limited to, bus passes, backpacks, school supplies, clothing, or personal hygiene items. Some items were funded through regional ECYEH funds while others came from donations or workshops.

Finally, ECYEH staff participated in meetings, on committees or boards, or in consortia, and ECYEH staff reported participating in 142 unique events. Events were, for the most part, county- or regional-level meetings with other entities that work with homelessness such as children and youth agencies, shelters, housing-related organizations or groups, pre-kindergarten programs, runaway and trafficking groups, mental health agencies, social workers, drug and alcohol agencies, or food pantries. In some cases meetings with groups of LEAs were captured here. These events occurred annually (14 events), monthly (37 events), one time (11 events), quarterly (55 events), or other (25 events). Other events were held on an as-needed basis. ECYEH staff’s role was most typically as a collaborating partner (36 events), leader facilitator (15 events), one-time attendee (19 events), regular attendee (66 events), or other or not designated (six events). Event attendees ranged from two to almost 500 people with 33 people being the average number of people at an event.

The ECYEH Program conducts outreach in order to share information about the McKinney-Vento Act and the ECYEH Program with the commonwealth and support the identification of children/youth/families. Increased counts of children and youth experiencing homelessness are a direct result of ECYEH staff outreach and collaboration as agencies, partners, and others become aware of the McKinney-Vento Act definition of homelessness and how it may apply to those the agency serves.
PROGRAM OUTCOME FINDINGS

As a result of the coordinators’ outreach and ongoing collaboration work, 27,724 children or youth were reported as being served during the 2015-16 program year (directly or indirectly),\(^2\) of which 23,164 were also identified as being enrolled in school.\(^3\) Students experiencing homelessness comprised about one percent of the total Pennsylvania population enrolled in public school during the 2015-16 school year.

Key findings about the children/youth identified as experiencing homelessness include:

- Of enrolled children/youth, 62 percent were doubled-up; 30 percent were in shelters, transitional housing, or awaiting foster care placement; 6 percent were in hotels or motels; and 1 percent were unsheltered.
- Of served children/youth, 20 percent were identified as unaccompanied youth.\(^4\)
- Of served children/youth, 25 percent were identified as experiencing homelessness in 2014-15.
- Of served children/youth, 69 percent were classified as economically disadvantaged, though it is likely that many of the balance with unknown status (23 percent) may have been economically disadvantaged as well. For the most part, children/youth included in the 23 percent with unknown economic status were children in the birth to age two category, ages three to five and not enrolled in pre-kindergarten, residing in shelters, or migrant children. Migrant out-of-school youth were also included in the 23 percent with unknown economic status.
- Of served children/youth, 29 percent were White/Caucasian (not Hispanic), 25 percent were Black/African American (not Hispanic), 16 percent were Hispanic (any race), and seven percent were classified as American Indian/Alaska Native, Asian, Multi-Racial, or Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander. Race could not be determined for 23 percent.
- In terms of the state’s public school enrollment, students experiencing homelessness comprised one percent of the state’s White/Caucasian (not Hispanic) population, three percent of each of the state’s Black/African American (not Hispanic) population and the Hispanic (any race) population.
- Close to 10 percent of served children/youth were identified as English language learners.
- Of served children/youth, 5 percent were migrant, which translates to 26 percent of migrant children/youth experiencing homelessness.

---

\(^2\) “Direct services” refers to the 16 authorized activities outlined in the McKinney-Vento Act (Sec. 723).

“Indirect services” are those services provided by a staff member whose position is supported through McKinney-Vento Act funds. Included in indirect services is technical assistance, training, or services ECYEH staff provided to an entity.

\(^3\) The federal age/grade category designation of a child or youth determines if they are considered served or enrolled.

\(^4\) An unaccompanied youth is any person age 21 or younger who is not in the physical custody of a parent or guardian.
Most served students (78 percent) did not have a special education disability. Of those students with a disability, 38 percent were categorized as having a “specific learning disability.”

Based on National Center for Education Statistics school classifications, the majority of students (70 percent) attended LEAs categorized as either “city” (8,864 students) or “suburban” (7,361 students).

Overall, 75 percent of enrolled students (23,164) attended LEAs that had 40 percent or more of the student population classified as coming from low-come families.

The number of LEAs with all schools designated as Title 1 schoolwide schools increased from 213 to 397.

PROGRAM IMPACTS

Program impacts include findings that document the extent to which the anticipated outcomes of the ECYEH Program occur, including reducing or eliminating enrollment or education barriers, remaining in the school of origin, and receiving services aligned with the authorized activities outlined in the McKinney-Vento Act. Student academic outcomes are also included.

Barriers are defined as situations that interfere with children/youth’s school enrollment, attendance, and/or educational success. Overall, 12 percent of enrolled students (2,619) were reported as having one or more barriers to enrollment, attendance, and/or academic success. The most common barrier was determining if a student was eligible for homeless services followed closely by transportation. Transportation issues remain high especially in light of LEA financial constraints or logistical challenges in arranging transportation.

One of the rights of eligible students is to remain in their school of origin if it is in the best interest of the student. Of the 23,164 students identified as being enrolled in school, LEA-school mobility could be determined for 20,568 students (89 percent). Almost two thirds of enrolled students remained in their LEA-school combination during the program year and 20 percent had two LEA-school combinations.

Students experiencing homelessness have the right to support services that promote academic success. Overall, 89 percent of the 27,724 children and youth were documented as receiving service at the individual child/youth level. Tutoring or other instructional support was, by far, the most prevalent service children/youth received. State academic assessment data for 2015-16 includes the Pennsylvania System of School Assessment (PSSA), the Pennsylvania Alternative State Assessment (PASA), and the Keystone Exams. State assessment data were available for approximately 80 percent of students experiencing homelessness in grades where the assessments are given. Overall, 33 percent scored in the proficient or advanced levels in

---

5 http://www.education.pa.gov/Data-and-Statistics/Pages/School-Locale.aspx#Vv0qvZwrK70
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reading/literature, 18 percent scored in the proficient or advanced levels in math/Algebra I, and 38 percent of students scored in the proficient or advanced levels in science/biology.

Evaluators also compared results for students experiencing homelessness to national homeless results. Pennsylvania results for students experiencing homelessness are similar to national results in reading and science, but lower in mathematics.

**Reflections and Considerations**

Reporting accuracy increases each year. Most notably, in 2015-16, reporting by non-LEA entities increased, especially for the under-five age/grade categories, which has contributed to the overall increase of children/youth identified and reported. Also noteworthy is the depth and breadth of ECYEH outreach, which has also improved the identification and reporting rates of children and youth experiencing homelessness. As reporting has become more complete and accurate, several themes emerge.

- Most students (almost two thirds for the past two years) remain in their LEA-school of origin.
- Most children/youth (89 percent for 2015-16) receive individual support and services.
- Transportation remains one of the top two most common barriers statewide.
- Children/youth experiencing homelessness are predominately economically disadvantaged.
- Three quarters of students experiencing homelessness attend LEAs that have high levels of poverty.
- Children/youth being reported as experiencing homelessness in more than one year is increasing slightly each year.
- Despite some consistency for a large portion of children/youth, there are students who experience extreme mobility, are homeless for more than two years, or experience barriers to enrollment.
- Site visits and technical assistance to the regions continue to reveal that families’ homeless situations (and those of unaccompanied youth) are becoming more complicated, with examples provided in the Findings section of this report. As such, these situations take more of the coordinators’ time, resources, and collaboration efforts to resolve.

Given the relative similarities between 2015-16 findings and prior year findings, evaluators suggest that PDE consider ECYEH Program adjustments in order to optimize program implementation at the regional and local levels in the areas of transportation and determining eligibility, and continued collaboration with other state, local, or national initiatives to support academic needs. Given the increase in the non-enrolled population as a result of homeless management information systems’ (HMIS) reporting for shelters in some regions, consider a statewide or county-wide approach to such reporting.
Introduction

McKinney-Vento Homeless Education Assistance Act Overview

The Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Act was signed into federal law in 1987, requiring states to review and revise residency requirements for the enrollment of children and youth experiencing homelessness. The McKinney Act was amended in 1990, requiring states to eliminate all enrollment barriers and provide school access and support for academic success for students experiencing homelessness; McKinney Act funds could then be used to provide direct educational services to eligible students. In 1994, the education portion of the McKinney Act was included in the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), adding preschool services, greater parental input, and emphasis on interagency collaboration. The latest revision occurred in 2001 when the law was reauthorized as the McKinney-Vento Homeless Education Assistance Act (McKinney-Vento Act)(Title X, Part C of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act), strengthening legislative requirements and requiring all local education agencies (LEAs) to appoint a local liaison to ensure the law is implemented effectively at the local level. The McKinney-Vento Act was again amended by the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) in December 2015 with changes beginning to take effect in October 2016. This report covers programming between July 1, 2015-June 30, 2016; therefore, it reflects the legal requirements outlined in the latest revision that occurred in 2001.

The McKinney-Vento Act outlines how state educational agencies must ensure that each child of an individual experiencing homelessness and each youth experiencing homelessness have equal access to the same free and appropriate public education as other children and youth, including a public preschool education. The McKinney-Vento Act uses the following definition for “children and youth experiencing homelessness.”

“Homeless children and youth:
   (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: children and youth living in motels, hotels, trailer parks, or camping grounds due to the lack of alternative adequate accommodations.
      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 youth 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)."

Children or youth who meet the McKinney-Vento Act definition of homeless may also be identified as an “unaccompanied homeless youth,” meaning they are not in the physical custody of their parent or guardian. There is no age range specified for an unaccompanied youth in the federal law. The upper age range is determined by what a state defines as school age, unless the child is in special education, in which case the upper age range is 21 years old. There is no lower age range.

The McKinney-Vento Act also outlines the rights of students experiencing homelessness, including:
- Immediate enrollment even when records are not present;
- Remaining in the school of origin, if in the student’s best interest;
- Transportation to the school of origin; and
- Provision of support services that promote academic success.

**EDUCATION FOR CHILDREN AND YOUTH EXPERIENCING HOMELESSNESS PROGRAM**

The Pennsylvania Department of Education (PDE) implements the McKinney-Vento Act through its Education for Children and Youth Experiencing Homelessness (ECYEH) Program. As such, PDE created a state plan that outlines Pennsylvania’s implementation of the McKinney-Vento Act and a Basic Education Circular to offer guidance to LEAs regarding implementation of the McKinney-Vento Act. Information regarding homelessness and the ECYEH Program can be found on PDE’s website at www.education.pa.gov/homeless. Updates, as they occur to align with ESSA, are posted there as well.

Instead of providing federal McKinney-Vento Act funds directly to LEAs, Pennsylvania employs a regional model for dispersing funds. Pennsylvania is divided into eight regions with each region having one regional coordinator whose primary responsibility is to implement the goals and objectives of the program. The regional coordinator position is filled by competitive bid on a three-year cycle. In some cases the regional coordinators subcontract for additional support (site coordinators) within their region, or identify intermediate unit staff to support student identification and program activities.

The ECYEH state coordinator, based at PDE, is responsible for program coordination and collaboration at the state level and manages dispute resolutions among LEAs should they occur. PDE contracts with the Center for Schools and Communities (CSC), a subsidiary of the Central Susquehanna Intermediate Unit, to provide technical assistance to the regions and LEAs. As part of that technical support the CSC maintains a website that includes statewide directories of the ECYEH Program regional and site coordinators, LEA homeless liaisons, and Pennsylvania shelters for families, domestic violence, and runaway youth, in addition to other relevant resources.
Additionally, the CSC conducts compliance monitoring or technical assistance visits for the regions and prepares a comprehensive report of each region’s results.

The goals of Pennsylvania’s ECYEH Program are to:
- Ensure that all children and youth experiencing homelessness enroll, participate, and have the opportunity to succeed in school;
- Ensure children and youth experiencing homelessness receive a free and appropriate public education on an equal basis with all other children in the state; and
- Eliminate and/or reduce educational barriers through the use of local best practices and the authorized activities of the McKinney-Vento Act.

The main objectives of Pennsylvania’s ECYEH Program are to:
- Reduce the disruption in the educational lives of children and youth experiencing homelessness;
- Increase awareness about the nature and extent of the problems children and youth experiencing homelessness have enrolling in and gaining access to educational programs and services;
- Explain laws and policies already in place that help students overcome these barriers to education;
- Build on laws and policies already in place that help students overcome these barriers to education;
- Build the capacity of others to assist in identifying, enrolling, and ensuring the educational success of children and youth experiencing homelessness; and
- Provide opportunities to collaborate with other statewide initiatives to improve academic achievement of students experiencing homelessness.

The ECYEH coordinators’ primary role is to make sure the McKinney-Vento Act is being followed in every public LEA in Pennsylvania. Coordinators educate, troubleshoot, intervene, support, and collaborate with LEAs, shelters, agencies, and organizations to eliminate and/or reduce educational barriers and ensure that all children and youth experiencing homelessness receive a free and appropriate public education on an equal basis with all other children in the state.
The following map illustrates the eight ECYEH regions in Pennsylvania.

**Pennsylvania’s Education for Children and Youth Experiencing Homelessness Program**

**Regional Map**

---

**EVALUATION DESIGN AND ACTIVITIES**

PDE’s Division of Student Services contracts with the Allegheny Intermediate Unit to conduct a comprehensive external evaluation of the ECYEH Program to fulfill the federal evaluation requirement. Subtitle B of Title VII of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 11431 et seq.) is amended to read as follows:

SEC. 724. SECRETERIAL REPSONSIBILITES. (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.
The 2015-16 program evaluation was the sixth year of program evaluation. The purpose of the evaluation of Pennsylvania’s ECYEH Program is to:

- Examine the extent to which regions are providing support to LEAs to meet the goals and objectives of the program;
- Examine the extent to which those students identified as experiencing homelessness receive services and support;
- Identify the types of services and supports students received;
- Build capacity within each region to examine results and make improvements based on data; and
- Provide recommendations for overall program improvement.

In addition to program evaluation, evaluators worked with PDE to prepare the portions of required annual federal reporting related to children and youth experiencing homelessness.

Evaluators used the EDFacts file formats and the Comprehensive State Performance Report to identify all the required federal reporting data elements. Evaluators also used the National Center for Homeless Education’s quality standards and evaluation guidance to ensure adequate data was included in the evaluation. Evaluators then worked with PDE to ensure that all data elements needed for federal reporting and program evaluation were identified and no duplication of work was required on the part of LEAs. Accordingly, some data were collected at the program level and some data were collected at the state level; whenever possible, existing data sources were used to reduce the burden on LEAs.

New for 2015-16, evaluators moved to a web-based data collection process to replace the prior Student Information and Service Delivery data instrument. The web-based process, while collecting the same information as the Student Information and Service Delivery data instrument, allowed for easier, more accurate, and more secure reporting and updating of information by reporting entities. The web-based process reduced the data management by ECYEH staff yet provided ECYEH staff continuous access to monitor information reported by entities in their region. The web-based process provided some advanced data management aspects such as linking each child/youth to the person/entity that reported and requiring key data elements – ID, age/grade, nighttime status, and unaccompanied youth status - to be provided before a record could be added.

In addition to the minimum required fields, data collection includes information about identified children/youth, any barriers to enrollment, and the services received in school, in shelters, or from the ECYEH Program. The PAsecureID was a key data element for...
all individuals enrolled in school. The PAsecureID was used to pull data from other data sources or when matching data across multiple data sources.

The homeless liaison in LEAs where students were enrolled, pre-kindergarten program staff, representatives from shelters where children and youth resided, and regional or site coordinators provide the requested information. In some cases, ECYEH staff has worked with shelters in their region to provide information at the county level instead of individual shelters reporting information. Shelters receiving direct or indirect services from the ECYEH Program are required to be included in McKinney-Vento Act reporting.

To adhere to confidentiality in reporting afforded to domestic violence shelters, evaluators used a separate data collection instrument and procedure for children and youth residing in domestic violence shelters. Evaluators developed this instrument and procedure in 2010-11 in cooperation with the Pennsylvania Coalition Against Domestic Violence. The instrument captured some demographic information related to school attendance, data related to student services received at the facility, and information related to working with the ECYEH Program.

In addition to information gathered at the program level through the web-based data process, evaluators also collected individual student information using existing data sources: PIMS, MIS2000 (the state migrant database), and through the state assessment office. Evaluators also collected LEA and school Title I funding and poverty information at the state level.

---

7 PAsecureID is a unique, permanent, anonymous statewide student identification number assigned to all students upon their first entry into Pennsylvania’s public school system. The single, unique PAsecureID remains with an individual student throughout their educational career. The PAsecureID is the key to the Pennsylvania Information Management System (PIMS) longitudinal data system. It does or will in the future:
- Reduce the number of unique reports required by PDE and the effort to produce them,
- Provide districts’ access to longitudinal data to support local instructional decision making,
- Link student records between districts and across years to increase the accuracy and utility of data gathered, and
- Streamline reporting processes from LEA to PDE and United States Department of Education.

8 Shelters have their own reporting requirements and are required to report information in the Housing and Urban Development (HUD) Homeless Management Information System (HMIS). In regions where data sharing agreements are in place, applicable data was extracted from the HMIS and provided to the coordinator or directly to the evaluator depending on the agreement and in lieu of the shelters reporting using the web-based process.

9 Domestic violence shelters are exempt from reporting in the HMIS due to the confidentiality of programs.

10 Migrant Education Program staff receive ongoing training related to ECYEH eligibility to support this process and collaboration. Migrant Education Program staff document, in the state migrant database, homelessness among migrant children/youth who meet the McKinney-Vento Act definition of homelessness. All children/youth eligible for migrant services between July 1 and June 30 are incorporated into the homeless identification and verification process.

11 PDE contracted with Allegheny Intermediate Unit to conduct the statewide evaluation. As such, the evaluation team completed the necessary confidentiality protocols for data collection at the state level.
In addition to the data collected about identified children/youth, evaluators also created instruments to collect information on the work of the ECYEH Program staff. Instruments are reviewed each year and fine-tuned as needed to better capture work of the ECYEH Program staff.

Evaluators also collected each region’s monitoring and technical assistance reports from the CSC or the PDE state coordinator to further examine program implementation.

Ultimately, it is the ECYEH Program’s responsibility to verify children/youth identified as experiencing homelessness. Given this responsibility, PDE, ECYEH Program staff, evaluators, and PIMS staff worked together after the first year of the evaluation to secure permission for the ECYEH evaluation data collection to serve as the official source for flagging students experiencing homelessness in Pennsylvania. To accomplish this, evaluators conduct an extensive cross-referencing and follow-up process by using data collected through the ECYEH Program, PIMS, MIS2000, HMIS, and the state assessment office. After the cross-referencing and follow-up process is complete, evaluators compile a unique, comprehensive list of children/youth and their accompanying information. From this information, evaluators: 1) prepare the EDFacts files and information for the annual federal Comprehensive State Performance Report; 2) provide the homeless flag for the PIMS system for all other PDE reporting that might include this population; and 3) prepare the annual evaluation report.

HOW TO USE THIS REPORT

The state evaluation of the ECYEH Program for 2015-16 examined information about children and youth identified as experiencing homelessness, the services the children and youth received, and the work of the ECYEH Program staff. The Executive Summary provides a condensed representation of the findings explained throughout this report.

The targeted audiences for this report are the program management at PDE, the state technical assistance providers, and ECYEH Program regional staff, though the results can be useful for other groups. The findings and results provided within this report should be used to guide program management and assist the state program team to provide technical assistance and support to regional staff in order to improve implementation, outcomes, and results.

Findings presented in this report are provided overall for the state and by region as the regions are the sub-grantees and the means by which the McKinney-Vento Act is implemented in Pennsylvania. This report provides an overall picture of implementation, outcomes, and impacts of the ECYEH Program and addresses statewide and regional issues. However, detailed information at the county, LEA, or school level, when appropriate, is provided to the regional coordinators and the program staff at PDE to assist with needs assessment, internal program implementation, program improvement, and decision making.
Evaluators have included graphical representations of results along with the supporting data table. Pertinent percentages and counts are provided in the narrative sections. Throughout this report, for ease of reading, percentages may be rounded and as such, may not total 100 percent. Furthermore, evaluators have eliminated any instances of zero in tables (shown as a blank cell) or “0%” in graphs where the result represents no instances. In cases where zero percent is included in a graph, it means less than one percent.

Throughout this report individuals identified as experiencing homelessness are categorized as being enrolled or served based on the federal reporting definitions. “Enrolled” includes any student identified as experiencing homelessness and enrolled in an LEA (public or nonpublic). “Served” is any child/youth identified as experiencing homelessness, regardless of their school enrollment status. Enrolled students are a subset of the served population and are included as part of the child/youth counts. References to relevant prior years’ state results are provided in the narrative where explanations are pertinent. Additionally, references to national results are included as appropriate. Prior year evaluation reports are available on PDE’s website: www.education.pa.gov/homeless.

This report should be used to highlight especially positive and successful implementation, outcomes, and programs as models. Care should be taken to avoid making comparisons across regions, as each region has differing numbers of LEAs, numbers of collaborating entities, reporting practices, ECYEH Program staff, and total child/youth counts. Additionally, regions have differing areas of focus based on regional need within the population experiencing homelessness. However, differences among the regions also can guide program improvement and technical assistance at the state level.

This report highlights findings regarding the ECYEH Program based on available data from the 2015-16 program year.
Findings

Findings are grouped by program implementation, program outcomes, and program impacts including student outcomes. As described in the Evaluation Design and Activities section of this report, data came from several sources pulled together to provide a picture of child/youth homelessness in Pennsylvania as it relates to the McKinney-Vento Act.

Program implementation findings reveal the extent to which the ECYEH Program offered professional development, technical assistance, or support to LEAs, other entities that serve the homeless population, or on behalf of the families, children, and youth experiencing homelessness. This information is collected via the Formal Training, Workshops, and Presentations; Technical Assistance and Bulk Supplies; and Meetings, Consortiums, and Boards reporting instruments. This information and the instruments used to collect it have been refined each year to better capture the work of the ECYEH staff. Information in this section is also gleaned from the region’s monitoring or technical assistance reports.

Program outcomes findings reveal information about the children/youth identified and served through the ECYEH Program and information about LEAs and schools identified students attended. Children/youth information is collected through the ECYEH Program data collection, PIMS, MIS2000, and shelter reporting. LEA and school information comes from PDE public data, PDE’s Division of Federal Programs for Title I, the National Center for Education Statistics, and LEAs.

Program impact findings reveal the extent to which the anticipated outcomes for children/youth of the ECYEH Program are occurring. Anticipated child/youth outcomes include reducing or eliminating enrollment or education barriers, remaining in the school of origin, and receiving services aligned with the authorized activities outlined in the McKinney-Vento Act. Student academic outcomes are also included in this section. This information comes from the service delivery portions of the ECYEH data collection, the bulk supplies portion of the Technical Assistance and Bulk Supplies instrument, PIMS, MIS2000, shelter reporting, and the PDE assessment office.

Program Implementation

Coordinators train, troubleshoot, intervene, support, and collaborate with LEAs, shelters, agencies, and organizations to eliminate and/or reduce educational barriers and ensure that all children and youth experiencing homelessness receive a free and appropriate public education on an equal basis with all other children in the state.
ECYEH Professional Development and Technical Assistance Services

Professional development and technical assistance to LEAs, parents, shelters, and organizations serving the homeless population command a large portion of the ECYEH Program’s staff time and play an important role in implementing the McKinney-Vento Act as outlined in the state plan.

Outreach to LEAs and shelters has been a longstanding priority for the ECYEH Program. In recent years, there has been increased focus on outreach to pre-kindergarten programs. Likewise, there has been a more systemic focus on ECYEH collaboration with agencies/organizations that work directly with homelessness or with organizations in the community to increase awareness of the McKinney-Vento Act.

Evaluators have worked each year with coordinators to improve data collection to more precisely capture the work that coordinators and their staff do as well as improve the consistency of reporting across regions. As a result, each year, evaluators are better able to capture and report on professional development and technical assistance that the ECYEH staff offered or where the staff was an active collaborator. That said, there are still differences among the regions in how events are documented. As such, caution should be used when interpreting the graphs that follow.

Recipients of ECYEH Services

First, evaluators examined ECYEH-offered trainings, professional development, and/or workshops.

There were 592 unique entities that participated in some type of ECYEH-provided training, professional development, or workshops in 2015-16. The first graph that follows shows attendance by entity type: LEAs (including LEAs with pre-kindergarten programs) (38), pre-kindergarten programs (non-LEA), shelters, and agencies/organizations/groups.

The second graph shows entity participation by participant type: liaison, Title I, special education, administrators, or other staff. More than one participant type per entity may have attended an event.

The third graph shows participation by participant count and type. Overall, 5,905 participants participated. However, some participants may have attended one or more events. A unique participant count is not available.

Overall, LEAs and liaisons were the most represented group and participant type though this varied by region. This is not surprising since LEAs represent the largest entity group and are the first priority of ECYEH Program, with LEA liaisons being directly involved with this population.
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The next set of graphs illustrates technical assistance or bulk supplies ECYEH staff provided to entities. This information was collected at the entity level in order to gauge the extent to which the ECYEH Program provided technical assistance or bulk supplies to entities in a region.

The ECYEH Program provided technical assistance to LEAs, shelters, pre-kindergarten programs, agencies and organizations, and other groups. A particular entity may have received all three kinds of technical assistance over the course of the program year. As such, an individual entity may be counted in more than one of the technical assistance categories.

Technical assistance categories included: child/family-specific, child/family non-specific, or McKinney-Vento Act-related materials or resources. Child/family-specific and child/family non-specific technical assistance typically occurred through phone calls or emails. Technical assistance frequency to an entity was captured as once, occasionally, or often. McKinney-Vento Act-related materials or resources were documented as ‘yes’ or ‘no.’ If applicable, child/family-specific technical assistance resulting in services provided to an individual child/youth was documented through the web-based data collection process.

A total of 1,131 unique LEAs, shelters, pre-kindergarten programs, and agencies were identified in the master listing of entities of which 962, or 85 percent, where reported as receiving support through one or more of the technical assistance categories. As can be seen in the graph below, of the 962 entities, 95 percent of those receiving technical assistance received McKinney-Vento Act-related materials or resources, 74 percent received child-specific technical assistance, and 74 percent received technical assistance that was not child/family-specific.
Of the 962 entities receiving technical assistance, 712 entities received child/family technical assistance with 104 entities receiving such technical assistance ‘once,’ 319 entities receiving such technical assistance ‘occasionally,’ and 289 entities receiving such technical assistance ‘often.’

Of the 962 entities receiving technical assistance, 713 entities received technical assistance that was not child/family-specific, with 67 entities receiving such technical assistance ‘once,’ 455 entities receiving such technical assistance ‘occasionally,’ and 191 entities receiving such technical assistance ‘often.’

Of the 962 entities receiving technical assistance, 915 entities received materials or resources from the ECYEH program.

Bulk supplies were provided to entities for children and families through the ECYEH Program and typically included, but were not limited to, bus passes, backpacks, school supplies, clothing, or personal hygiene items. Some items were funded through regional ECYEH funds while others came from donations or workshops.

The graph below shows how ECYEH-provided bulk supplies were distributed among the 491 receiving entities. LEAs, shelters, and pre-kindergarten programs were the recipients of such supplies. As might be expected, LEAs were the largest group of entities, overall, to receive bulk supplies. As a reminder, supply provision to a known individual is documented through the service delivery portion of the web-based data collection process and is reported on page 42 of this report.

Meetings, Boards, Consortia, or Committees

In addition to conducting trainings, presentations, and workshops or providing technical assistance, ECYEH staff members also spend a portion of their time collaborating with other agencies, organizations, or groups as part of committees, boards, meetings, or consortia.
For 2015-16, ECYEH staff reported participating in 142 unique events. These events occurred annually (14 events), monthly (37 events), one time (11 events), quarterly (55 events), or other (25 events). Other events were most often bi-monthly, seasonal, or on an as-needed basis.

ECYEH staff members’ role was most typically regular attendee (66 events), collaborating partner (36 events), one time attendee (19 events), leader facilitator (15 events), or other or not designated (six events). The table below shows the number and type of attendee of ECYEH staff.

Table 1. Boards, Committees, and Meetings by Number of Events and ECYEH Staff Attendee Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attendee Type</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Region 1</th>
<th>Region 2</th>
<th>Region 3</th>
<th>Region 4</th>
<th>Region 5</th>
<th>Region 6</th>
<th>Region 7</th>
<th>Region 8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regular attendee</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborating partner</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One time attendee</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader/facilitator</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of events</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Event attendees ranged from one to almost 500 people with 33 people being the average number of people at an event.

For the most part, events were county- or regional-level meetings with other entities that work with homelessness, such as children and youth agencies, shelters, housing-related organizations or groups, pre-kindergarten programs, runaway and trafficking groups, mental health agencies, social workers, drug and alcohol agencies, or food pantries.

In summary, ECYEH Program efforts for outreach through training, technical assistance, or collaboration not only spread the word about the McKinney-Vento Act and the ECYEH Program, but also assisted in the identification of children/youth and families. Increasing counts of children and youth experiencing homelessness are a direct result of the outreach and collaboration conducted by the ECYEH staff.

Regional Monitoring

Historically, coordinators maintain a plethora of information to document their work within the region and are monitored regularly on their performance. During 2015-16 the CSC, the contracted technical assistance provider, conducted comprehensive formal monitoring of each region through the Interim Site Visit Checklist.

The monitor examined materials and activities that supported services for children and youth experiencing homelessness in the region and recorded detailed documentation on the checklist to verify that sufficient information was reviewed to determine if the region was meeting a requirement. The program requirements monitored included the following:
• Homeless children and youth receive educational services for which they are eligible, including access to Head Start and Even Start programs and preschool programs.

• The region/site’s protocols ensure prompt/accurate identification of McKinney-Vento Act eligible students.

• The region/site’s protocols ensure immediate enrollment of homeless children and youth in school (as applicable).

• The region/site’s protocols ensure “school of origin” rights for homeless children/youth.

• The region/site’s protocols ensure appropriate educational services for eligible students, including transportation.

• Homeless children and youth receive K-12 after-school or supplemental instruction in LEA or shelter locations.

• The region ensures that homeless children and youth receive free meals through the National School Lunch Program.

• The region appropriately provides homeless families, children, and youth referrals to health care services, dental services, mental health services, and other appropriate services.

• The regional office reviews/monitors LEA policies and practices (such as those regarding immunization and health records, residency requirements, birth certificates, school records, and guardianship) to ensure they do not act as barriers when enrolling homeless students.

• Each LEA has designated a liaison for homeless children and youth to carry out the duties described in Title X, Part C, Section 722(g)(6)(A).

• The region/site’s protocols, training, and technical assistance ensure the appropriate use of Title I monies, including the Title I set-aside, for eligible students.
  - An appropriate homeless set-aside is determined (where required).
  - Homeless children and youth with academic needs in targeted and non-Title I schools receive appropriate academic support.
  - The regional office reviews the academic assistance provided to homeless children and youth in any LEA with Title I priority/focus school buildings.

• The region ensures that there is public notice of the educational rights of homeless children and youth disseminated where such children and youth receive services under the McKinney-Vento Act such as schools, family shelters, and soup kitchens.

• The regional office complies with all ECYEH data collection/submission requirements and other reporting requirements.

• Enrollment disputes are mediated in accordance with Pennsylvania’s dispute resolution process.

• The regional/site office effectively facilitates community collaboration and interagency coordination to support the education of McKinney-Vento Act eligible students.

• The regional/site office effectively facilitates inter-region collaboration and coordination.
The regional office used grant funds, and other funds as appropriate, to meet the needs of homeless children and youth.

The regional office effectively facilitates site management (for regions with paid or unpaid site coordinators).

Monitoring reports prepared by the regional monitor revealed that most regions received a 'yes' in each of the above requirements, with ample supporting evidence. Even when requirements were met and supporting evidence provided, the monitor often provided additional comments or recommendations to promote continuous improvement in areas such as program development, collaboration, documentation, and data collection.

Highlights of activities occurring in the regions were also included as part of the documentation in the monitoring reports. Common or typical activities included such things as serving on the board of local community agencies or groups, collaborating with other agencies that serve the homeless population, making presentations to community or school groups in order to increase awareness about the McKinney-Vento Act and the ECYEH Program, facilitating student access to or LEA provision of transportation to and from school, providing referrals for families and children to other community or government agencies, providing or collaborating on supplemental academic programs or tutoring for students experiencing homelessness, providing LEA homeless liaisons with training and technical assistance related to their role as a liaison, developing and maintaining informational websites, summer programs and activities for mobile families and youth, a targeted focus on outreach to early childhood providers to ensure identification of younger children experiencing homelessness, and facilitating donations of goods and money to serve the needs of children and youth experiencing homelessness. These activities are most often also captured in the previous section that highlighted training, technical assistance, and collaborations through meetings, committees, consortia, etc.

Unique or innovative strategies being used in the regions were gleaned from the monitoring reports and the monitor’s anecdotal notes and are included in the pages that follow. In some cases, variations of these highlighted activities may also occur in other regions, though they may not be as comprehensive as the highlighted examples. Please refer to the regional map on page 9.

Region 1: The regional office continues to increase its capacity to identify the younger population of children experiencing homelessness through coordination with the district’s Office of Early Childhood Education and outreach to the other early childhood programs in the city. The regional office now cross-checks the ECYEH data with a list of school-age and preschool-age residents provided by the city’s Office of Supportive Housing to ensure that all children are identified and provided with appropriate services. The regional office has entered into a partnership with the Valley Youth House Synergy Project to facilitate activities at the district’s high schools and to distribute project materials at various school sites so that students can access services, including an independent living program.

Region 2: The regional staff provide ECYEH information to guidance counselors in all 76 LEAs in the region and encourage them to contact their homeless liaison when
homelessness is suspected or confirmed. The regional office provided county-specific training for LEAs regarding determination of an appropriate Title I set-aside amount and stressed that an appropriate funding level should be determined through a needs assessment process. The regional office now partners with the Berks Coalition to End Homelessness to provide a Homeless Youth Conference, attended by school personnel and community agency professionals, focused on the educational rights of homeless children under the federal McKinney-Vento Act and challenges, solutions, and best practices for serving this population.

Region 3: The regional office has been coordinating activities to better capture the number of pre-school children experiencing homelessness, such as providing McKinney-Vento Act training to the Capital Area Intermediate Unit early childhood program group and visiting early childhood program sites in the region. The regional office has been instrumental in securing cooperation from local, regional, and state government agencies to heighten awareness of and support for students and families experiencing homelessness. The regional coordinator assists the Cumberland County and York County Continuum of Care with their annual Point in Time counts.

Region 4: Through feedback garnered by online surveys, the regional office has determined that the region’s school districts want more training opportunities regarding homelessness and the McKinney-Vento Act. The county-wide meetings and spring regional training events are providing greater outreach to the counties within the region. In June 2016 the region provided specialized training for shelters and housing providers regarding student transitions and school attendance to encourage school stability and success. The regional staff participate in the Allegheny County Service Access for Youth group, which focuses on reconnecting school-age youth to their educational options.

Region 5: The regional staff conduct onsite technical assistance visits with any LEA in the region that identifies 10 or fewer students experiencing homelessness annually to ensure they are accurately assessing families’ situations. The regional office expands and improves program services through partnerships with a wide variety of agencies and programs, media groups, service groups, businesses, advocacy groups, colleges/universities, and faith-based organizations. The regional staff distribute questionnaires to shelter staff to assess and ameliorate any existing barriers to students’ educational success.

Region 6: The regional coordinator presented program information to the Local Interagency Coordinating Council to ensure collaboration with the region’s Head Start programs, services for children from birth through three years old, and the preschool program directors. The regional coordinator facilitates excellent community partnerships and awareness activities throughout the year to expand and improve identification of and services for families and students experiencing homelessness.

Region 7: The regional coordinator makes connections with the English as a Second Language programs and staff to ensure that those services are available to children and families experiencing homelessness. The regional office continues to publish a comprehensive resource directory that is provided to LEAs and agencies in the region.
and online as well, so that parents and program partners can easily access resource information. The regional coordinator provides an annual McKinney-Vento Act presentation for the Lackawanna County Continuum of Care education committee to ensure all entities are aware of the definitions and requirements.

Region 8: The regional staff participate in the Continuum of Care Point in Time counts in Bucks, Lehigh, and Montgomery counties. The regional coordinator is a member of the Bucks County Truancy Task Force to reinforce the attendance challenges of students experiencing homelessness. The regional coordinator continues to co-chair the Bucks County Direct Service Coalition and is now involved in Your Way Home Montgomery County, a partnership among government, philanthropy, nonprofits, and community partners to address the problem of homelessness. The regional coordinator participated in the development of a video interview with the Bucks County Intermediate Unit executive director, which was then shared with the intermediate unit’s 1,200 employees to increase awareness and garner donations to support the program.

Formal regional monitoring and technical assistance with the regional staff of the ECYEH Program has been conducted for the past several years. Evaluators asked the monitor to comment on trends that appeared across the state, new issues that are emerging, other issues that are resolving, and challenges coordinators are experiencing. This information is useful when evaluators consider program implementation recommendations at the state or program level. The observations of the monitor included:

- The ECYEH program regional staff continue to report that the doubled-up population is difficult to identify, necessitating the development and implementation of new strategies to better reach this population to ensure appropriate services are provided.
- The ECYEH program continues to experience barriers to appropriate transportation options for students experiencing homelessness; facilitating appropriate transportation for students experiencing homelessness is especially difficult to resolve in Allegheny County and the rural areas of the state.
- The ECYEH Program regional staff determine homeless eligibility on a case-by-case basis and there are still some LEAs that are resistant to full and accurate identification of students experiencing homelessness, as the McKinney-Vento Act requirements often necessitate a greater burden on their budgets.
- The lack of shelter options for families experiencing homelessness, as well as unaccompanied homeless youth, creates significant barriers to locating appropriate housing and contributes to the increasing number of unsheltered and doubled-up homeless situations.

Evaluators and monitors continue to work in tandem to keep abreast of any documentation or program implementation issues that arise during monitoring or as a part of the ongoing data submissions. A part of that work includes a monthly phone conference with the PDE program officer, bi-monthly regional coordinator meetings with site coordinators attending in the fall and spring, and conference calls with all parties as needed throughout the year.
Outreach and increased awareness regarding the McKinney-Vento Act and the rights of children and youth experiencing homelessness are addressed in the objectives of the ECYEH Program and are the primary focus of program implementation. The program’s success in meeting these objectives is reflected in the number of entities represented in reporting and also the number of children/youth who were identified, served, and reported. Program outcomes include findings about the reporting entities and also demographic and homeless information about the children/youth identified and served through the ECYEH Program.

Per federal reporting requirements, all public LEAs are required to report on students attending their schools who are experiencing homelessness. Additionally, all entities that receive training, professional development, technical assistance, or resources from the ECYEH Program are required to report on children/youth experiencing homelessness who reside in the facility or attend their pre-kindergarten programs.

Public LEAs include school districts, charter schools, intermediate unit-operated pre-kindergarten programs, and full-time (comprehensive) career and technical centers. In Pennsylvania, there were 499 school districts, 174 charter and cyber charter schools, and 10 career and technical centers in the 2015-16 academic year.

Based on the unique, comprehensive list of identified students from across Pennsylvania, nearly all LEAs were represented. There were 21 school districts, 46 charter or cyber charter schools, and two full-time (comprehensive) career and technical centers for which no students meeting the McKinney-Vento Act definition of homelessness were reported.

Further exploration of the 69 LEAs with no identified students revealed that many of the LEAs were small (35 LEAs had fewer than 500 students), they served a subset of the total K-12 population (44 LEAs), the LEA (12) had very low free or reduced lunch percentages, or had some combination of these conditions. That said, each year

---

12 Not all intermediate units offer all pre-kindergarten programs (Early Intervention, Early Head Start, Head Start, Pre-K Counts). Additionally, Pittsburgh-Mt. Oliver IU2 and Philadelphia IU26 are incorporated into Pittsburgh and Philadelphia school districts, respectively. School-age students who attend intermediate unit schools or classrooms for instruction are attributed and reported by their home district, even if the student receives instruction in another school in the district or in another school district.

13 Students who attend part-time career and technical centers are attributed to their home school for data and reporting purposes. Students who attend full-time career and technical centers are attributed to the career and technical center.

14 Pennsylvania technically has 500 school districts; however, one very small district in suburban Philadelphia enrolls no students: Bryn Athyn School District, http://www.brynathynschooldistrict.org/.

15 It is important to note that even if an LEA did not identify any students, students experiencing homelessness may have attended that LEA at some point during the program year either before a precipitating event or after becoming housed. Likewise, students identified in a shelter with no identifying LEA and students in domestic violence shelters may have also attended a non-reporting LEA.

16 National trends indicate that there is a relationship between higher percentages of students eligible for free or reduced lunch and greater likelihood of homelessness.
regional coordinators make it a priority to reach out to LEAs where no students are being identified. It should also be noted that outreach to charter schools is relatively new and new charter schools are established each year, making outreach to these LEAs especially challenging.

In addition to LEA reporting, 4,332 children/youth, almost 16% of identified children/youth, were only identified by a non-LEA facility. This is up from the prior year where 3,394 children/youth were identified in this fashion. Most of the children/youth (2,990) reported by these facilities were birth to age two, ages three to five (not enrolled in pre-kindergarten), or attending non-LEA pre-kindergarten programs. Non-LEA facilities reporting has increased each year due to ongoing coordinator outreach and increased awareness of reporting responsibilities of these entities.

Children and Youth Characteristics

Children and youth experiencing homelessness are identified by their nighttime status (fixed, regular, adequate) and are reported based on their age or grade category, which determines if they are ‘served’ by the program and/or ‘enrolled’ in school. The sections that follow provide homeless information and demographics for identified children/youth experiencing homelessness based on all reported children/youth included in the unique, comprehensive list of individuals identified as experiencing homelessness at any point during the ECYEH Program year (July 1, 2015 through June 30, 2016).

In 2015-16, 27,724 individual (unique) children or youth were identified and reported as experiencing homelessness and receiving direct or indirect services from the ECYEH Program, of which 23,164 were also identified as enrolled in school. For the most part, the numbers of identified children and youth have increased with each year the state evaluation has been implemented and coordinated reporting occurred. However, caution should be used in comparing counts of children/youth across years, as fluctuation among years may be due to increasing outreach and better reporting of children and youth, not necessarily an increase in the number of children and youth experiencing homelessness. While it is not yet possible to determine the extent to which increased awareness or homelessness contribute to change over time, increases being attributed to increased awareness can especially be seen with the non-enrolled population, as outreach in the early years primarily focused on school-age students. From 2010-11 to 2015-16, the reported non-enrolled population grew from 9.4 percent of all served children and youth to 18.9 percent of all served children and youth, which is most likely attributed to increased outreach to and reporting from the organizations serving the non-enrolled populations. In 2010-11, 20,556 were identified as served and 18,621 were identified as enrolled in school. In 2011-12, 19,914 were identified as served and 18,231 were identified as enrolled in school. In 2012-13, 22,618 were identified as served and 19,459 were identified as enrolled in school. In 2013-14, 24,504 children or youth were identified as served and 20,785 were identified as enrolled in school. In 2014-15, 26,273 children or youth were identified as served and 22,014 were also identified as enrolled in school.
Pennsylvania public school enrollment, based on third-day enrollment for the 2015-16 academic year, was 1,774,361 students. Enrolled students experiencing homelessness made up about 1 percent of the total public school enrolled population. Even though the numbers of identified students has increased, students experiencing homelessness have consistently been about 1 percent of the total public school population.

**Served and Enrolled Children and Youth**

The term 'served' includes all children and youth identified as meeting the McKinney-Vento Act definition of homeless and include the following age/grade categories: birth to age two, ages three to five (not enrolled in pre-kindergarten), pre-kindergarten (LEA or non-LEA pre-kindergarten programs), kindergarten through 12th grade (including ungraded), and out-of-school youth. Pre-kindergarten (LEA only) through 12th grade (including ungraded) students make up the 'enrolled' category, which is a subset of the served population. Homeless information and demographics in this section are required federal reporting elements: age/grade categories, nighttime status, unaccompanied youth status, migrant status, English language learner (ELL), and disability. Demographic information is not available for every individual identified. What exists is based upon the data system from which the information was collected. Each section that follows will indicate the population included in the demographic data element. Each data element has a served or enrolled designation for federal reporting.

The graphs that follow show the age/grade breakdowns for both the served and enrolled populations.

As non-LEA reporting has increased, the under-five (not kindergarten) population has also increased each year. The under-five population includes the age/grade categories of children birth to age two, children ages three to five and not enrolled in pre-kindergarten, and pre-kindergarten children. This grouping of children increased from 4,211 in 2014-15 to 4,695 in 2015-16.

Differences among regions in the pre-kindergarten categories are most likely reflective of differing migrant populations, differing numbers of pre-kindergarten programs, differing numbers of shelters among regions and the reporting choices of those shelters, and the extent to which each of these reporting entities reported on children in the under-five categories.

Differences in the pre-kindergarten counts between the served (787 children) and enrolled (603 children) graphs are reflective of non-LEA pre-kindergarten programs that are counted in the served population. As a reminder, only LEA-operated pre-kindergarten programs are counted in the enrolled in school population.

The large number of out-of-school youth in Region 2 is directly related to the migrant out-of-school population in this area.
### 2015-16 Served Children/Youth by Age/Grade Category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Region 1</th>
<th>Region 2</th>
<th>Region 3</th>
<th>Region 4</th>
<th>Region 5</th>
<th>Region 6</th>
<th>Region 7</th>
<th>Region 8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Out-of-school youth</td>
<td>468</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 12</td>
<td>1,720</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>419</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 11</td>
<td>1,228</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 10</td>
<td>1,298</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 9</td>
<td>1,626</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 8</td>
<td>1,397</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 7</td>
<td>1,565</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 6</td>
<td>1,649</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 5</td>
<td>1,702</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 4</td>
<td>1,836</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 3</td>
<td>1,999</td>
<td>433</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 2</td>
<td>2,192</td>
<td>483</td>
<td>455</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 1</td>
<td>2,270</td>
<td>515</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kindergarten</td>
<td>2,072</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-kindergarten</td>
<td>787</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 3-5, not pre-kindergarten</td>
<td>1,447</td>
<td>605</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birth to age 2</td>
<td>2,461</td>
<td>681</td>
<td>875</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Nighttime status is what determines if a child or youth is identified as eligible for services under the McKinney-Vento Act. Nighttime status is a required federal reporting category for the enrolled population. Nighttime status reporting categories include doubled-up; hotels/motels; shelters, transitional housing, or awaiting foster care; and unsheltered. The graph that follows shows the nighttime status for the 23,164 enrolled students.

Overall, 62 percent of enrolled students had a nighttime status of doubled-up and 30 percent of enrolled students had a nighttime status of shelter, transitional housing, or awaiting foster care. This differs from the 2014-15 national percentages of 76 percent for doubled-up and 14 percent for sheltered, but this may be reflective of ECYEH Program’s outreach to shelters. Students identified through shelter visits or shelter reporting may otherwise go unreported as a student’s homeless status may be unknown to a student’s LEA.

Region 1, though still lower than the other regions with regard to doubled-up numbers, continues to implement specific strategies to better identify the doubled-up population.

---

and their efforts are showing in the steady increase in the reporting of that population. Since 2010-11, Region 1 child/youth double-up counts have increased from 402 students to 1,616 students in 2015-16. Prior to 2010-11 the focus of programming in this region had been with the shelter, transitional housing, or awaiting foster care population. Consequently, this region had not been systematically collecting information on children/youth having doubled-up status.

Unaccompanied youth is a federally-defined term and is reported for the served population. Children or youth who meet the McKinney-Vento Act definition of homelessness may also be identified as an “unaccompanied homeless youth,” meaning the child is not in the physical custody of a parent or guardian. An unaccompanied youth can be any age, birth to 21 years old.\(^\text{18}\)

Overall, 5,607 (20%) of the 27,724 served children and youth were identified as being an unaccompanied youth, which has increased substantially over the past three years (12 percent in 2014-15, 10 percent in 2013-14, and 13 percent in 2012-13).

The increase can be attributed to multiple reasons. The web-based data entry process required a yes or no answer; previously, it could be left blank or marked unknown. Homeless unaccompanied youth was a data field added into the PIMS system for the first time so that students only identified in PIMS now included that designation. Shelters that reported through an HMIS extract captured this information for some of its residents. Each of these along with a focus on this population in training and outreach has contributed to the 2015-16 increase.
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The national percentage of unaccompanied youth is reported approximately 7 percent of the enrolled population, though 23 states reported 10 percent or more unaccompanied youth in 2014-15.\textsuperscript{19}

Specific special education status information was collected from the PIMS extract for students enrolled in school. Additionally, children identified in early intervention programs were documented as receiving special education services and included in the developmental delay designation. Therefore, special education status information is based on the served population. Of the 27,724 served children and youth, 5,969 (22 percent) were identified as having a disability, 15,624 (56 percent) were identified as not having a disability. There were 6,131 (22 percent) children and youth for which this information was not available; these were children and youth who were identified in shelters and did not have a PASecureID by which special education information could be requested.

Nationally, the portion of served children and youth with disabilities was 17 percent in 2014-15.\textsuperscript{20} Pennsylvania’s numbers may be higher than the national average because early intervention data is provided at the state level for the under-five population.

Of the 5,969 students designated as having a disability, the largest percentage of individuals (38 percent) was categorized as having a "specific learning disability." The table that follows shows the breakdown of the disability categories. Because of small numbers in several of the categories, for confidentiality, regional findings are not included. Evaluators used federal reporting categories in the table below.

Table 2. Disability by Category Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disability Category</th>
<th>Number of students</th>
<th>Percent of students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Specific learning disability</td>
<td>2,252</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional disturbance</td>
<td>896</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other health impairment</td>
<td>703</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech or language impairment</td>
<td>683</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developmental delay</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual disability</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autistic/ autism</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple disabilities</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearing impairment including deafness</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual impairment including blindness</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>&lt; 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability type unknown</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>&lt; 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traumatic brain injury</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>&lt; 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orthopedic impairment</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>&lt; 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

English language learner information was collected through PIMS for all enrolled students and through MIS2000 for migrant children/youth identified as experiencing homelessness. Therefore, English language learner findings are provided for the

\textsuperscript{19} \url{http://center.serve.org/nche/downloads/data-comp-1213-1415.pdf}
\textsuperscript{20} \url{http://center.serve.org/nche/downloads/data-comp-1213-1415.pdf}
served population. English language learner information was not collected for non-enrolled age/grade categories with the exception of the migrant population. Consistent with prior years, English language learners comprise close to 10 percent of the children/youth experiencing homelessness. Children/youth in Region 2 had the greatest percentage of English language learners, followed by Region 7 and then Region 3. Each of these regions reflects migrant patterns, which are reported next. Nationally, children and youth experiencing homeless who are English language learners make up about 14 percent of the homeless population.

Migrant status can be determined for all children/youth identified as experiencing homelessness. MIS2000, the state migrant education database, captures homeless eligibility information.

Of the 27,724 individuals in the served population, 5 percent (1,282 children and youth) were also identified as eligible for services through the Pennsylvania Migrant Education Program. This has remained relatively consistent each year.

Looking at homelessness within the migrant population, there were 4,990 migrant children and youth between July 1, 2015 and June 30, 2016 (the ECYEH Program year); 26 percent of the migrant population was identified as homeless during this time period. This percentage has remained stable from the prior year, which reflects ongoing training and collaboration between the Migrant Education Program and the ECYEH Program. Early on in the ECYEH evaluation, this percentage increased each year.

The numbers of migrant children/youth vary considerably across Pennsylvania depending on where migrant work is located. While migrant children and youth only make up 5 percent of the total homeless served population it is important to note the differences among the homeless regions. Migrant status may also influence other demographics such as English language learner status, mobility, or economic status, especially in the regions where there is a larger migrant population.
As can be seen in the graph that follows, ECYEH Program Region 2 has the largest numbers of migrant children/youth. It is important to note that the migrant population is greater in the eastern half of Pennsylvania (Regions 2, 7, 3, and 8). As such, the numbers of migrant youth experiencing homelessness are greater in these regions than the rest of the state.

Nationally, children and youth experiencing homeless who are also eligible for migrant services make up about 1 percent of the homeless population. Pennsylvania’s higher percentage of migrant youth experiencing homelessness may be directly related to the increased collaboration of the two programs and also that homeless status is documented and reported for the most part by the Migrant Education Program. Additionally, due to this collaboration and reporting, migrant out-of-school youth homeless status is being captured and reported.

![2015-16 Children/Youth Served by Migrant Status](image)

Additional child/youth or LEA demographic information provides context to the evaluation findings to the extent that it further describes the population that is being identified and served as a result of ECYEH Program outreach and education and the community in which the identified children/youth live and attend school.

Child/youth demographics presented here includes race, economic status, and history of homelessness of identified children/youth. LEA demographics include percent of LEA enrollment from low-income families and urban-centric locale of the LEA.

Information about race and ethnicity was collected through the PIMS extract for all enrolled students and through the MIS2000 extract for migrant children/youth also identified as experiencing homelessness. In some cases, HMIS extract also provided race/ethnicity information. As such, race and ethnicity information is available for the served population, though for 23 percent of the children/youth, race/ethnicity information was not available. It is likely that the unknown population would reflect the ethnic/racial composition of the regional, though it cannot be assumed.

Pennsylvania’s Education for Children and Youth Experiencing Homelessness Program
State Evaluation Report
Originated February 16, 2017
Evaluators used federal race reporting categories in the graph that follows. The proportions of children and youth experiencing homelessness in the federal race categories have remained relatively consistent each year. White/Caucasian (not Hispanic) children and youth comprise 29 percent of the identified children/youth, Black/African American (not Hispanic) children and youth comprise 25 percent, and Hispanic (any race) individuals comprise 16 percent of children/youth experiencing homelessness. Race varies by region, reflecting the populations of the regions. For example, regions 1 (Philadelphia) and 4 (Pittsburgh) have large urban areas with greater diversity; regions 5 and 6 (northwest and north central PA) are more rural and homogeneous; and Region 2 (southeastern PA) has large Hispanic communities.

As stated earlier, students experiencing homelessness comprise approximately 1 percent of Pennsylvania’s population enrolled in public school. Almost 70 percent of the public school population is White/Caucasian (not Hispanic), 15 percent is Black/African American (not Hispanic), and 10 percent is Hispanic (any race). This breakdown is consistent with prior years.

When looking at the race of students experiencing homelessness compared with state race findings, White/Caucasian (not Hispanic) students experiencing homelessness comprised approximately 1 percent of the state White/Caucasian (not Hispanic) public school population. Black/African American (not Hispanic), Multiracial (not Hispanic), and the Hispanic population of students experiencing homelessness each comprised approximately 3 percent of that designation in the statewide population. The percentage of Hispanic students (any race) experiencing homelessness increased from 1 percent of the state Hispanic population to 2 percent in 2014-15 to 3 percent in 2015-16. This increase may be a result of better reporting and collaboration with the Migrant Education Program as well as increased shelter reporting in Region 2 which has the largest Hispanic population.
Economic disadvantage information was collected from PIMS for all enrolled students. It is also an eligibility criterion for all children who attend Early Head Start or Head Start programs. As such, evaluators were able to code pre-kindergarten children who attended Head Start or Early Head Start programs as being economically disadvantaged. Because many of the pre-kindergarten programs are not operated by LEAs, economically disadvantaged status is provided for the served population. Of the 27,724 served children and youth, 69 percent were designated as economically disadvantaged.

The 23 percent of children/youth whose economic status is unknown includes children/youth in the birth-to-age-two category, ages three to five and not enrolled in a pre-kindergarten program, or out-of-school youth populations. These individuals, for the most part, would have been identified in shelters. While some portion, or even a majority, of such children/youth may be economically disadvantaged, because the information is not collected for these populations, it cannot be assumed.

![2015-16 Served Children/Youth by Economic Disadvantaged Status](image)

Almost 25 percent of children and youth identified as experiencing homelessness in 2015-16 were also identified as such in 2014-15. The percentage of children and youth identified as experiencing homeless in the prior year has stabilized at about 25 percent after steadily increasing from 20 percent in 2012-13, the first year this analysis was conducted. It is important to note that with the exception of the migrant population, there is no consistent coding of children and youth not enrolled in school across program years. As such, history of homelessness could not be determined for approximately 23 percent of the 27,724 served children/youth.

**LEA Demographics**

Enrollment from low-income families and urban-centric locale of the LEA provides further information regarding the communities of the schools that identified students attended.
PDE produces a public report that provides the percentage of students who come from low-income families. This report is based on LEA third-day enrollment of economically disadvantaged students and shows the percentage of the enrollment from low-income families in each LEA.

Evaluators examined the percentage of low-income families in the LEAs enrolled students attended to determine what percentage of the identified students attended higher poverty schools. The graph that follows shows percentage categories of low-income families in an LEA and the number of students attending LEAs within each low-income category.

Overall, 75 percent of enrolled students (23,164) attended LEAs that had 40 percent or more of the student population classified as coming from low-income families. Typically, LEAs with an economically disadvantaged identification rate of 40 percent or more are considered high poverty LEAs. Region 1 had almost all of identified students attending high poverty LEAs with Region 7 having about 90 percent of identified youth attending high poverty LEAs. Regions 4, 5, and 6 had slightly more than 80 percent of identified students attending high poverty schools.

What is important to glean from these findings is that poverty is a factor for the student body and the community at large where students identified as experiencing homelessness attended school.

In 2009-10, public LEAs were coded using an urban-centric locale code system from the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) Common Core of Data (CCD). The urban-centric locale code system uses 12 categories to designate region type and

21http://www.education.state.pa.us/portal/server.pt/community/data_and_statistics/7202/school_locale/509783
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population size and replaced the previously used eight metro-centric locale codes. The 12 category descriptions can be found on the NCES website. These 12 categories were further collapsed by the evaluator to gain a better picture of the key categories - city, suburban, town, rural, LEA opened after 2007-08, and unknown.

The graph that follows shows the student population by public school’s locale code. The ‘could not be determined’ category includes 212 students who attended an LEA that served multiple LEAs, most typically intermediate unit pre-kindergarten programs and regional or cyber charter schools. There were 1,352 students who were reported as attending school, but were identified in a shelter and the LEA was unknown.

Overall, 70 percent of enrolled students (23,164) attended LEAs categorized as city (8,864 students) or suburban (7,361 students). However, distinct variations can be seen across the regions, with Region 1 being almost exclusively city; regions 2, 4, and 8 having large suburban populations; and regions 3, 5, 6, and 7 having more town or rural designations. The variations across the regions contribute to differences in the numbers and types of agencies and resources that exist to support children, youth, or families experiencing homelessness.

PROGRAM IMPACT

As a result of coordinators’ work, LEAs should increase their capacity to ensure that students enroll in a timely fashion, remain in the school of origin if it is in the best interest of the student, and receive the services to which they are entitled based on need.

Pennsylvania’s Education for Children and Youth Experiencing Homelessness Program
State Evaluation Report
Originated February 16, 2017
This section of the report examines the extent to which the anticipated outcomes of the ECYEH Program occurred for the program year. Included here are reducing or eliminating enrollment or education barriers, remaining in the school of origin, and receiving services aligned with the authorized activities outlined in the McKinney-Vento Act offered through the ECYEH Program, the LEA they attended, the Migrant Education Program, and/or the shelter in which they resided.

Barriers

Barriers are situations that interfere with children/youth’s enrollment, attendance, and/or educational success. Barrier information is only collected through the ECYEH program. Of the 23,164 enrolled children and youth, 95 percent (21,815) were included in barrier analysis, of which 12 percent (2,619) were reported as having barriers to enrollment, attendance, and/or academic success.

The table that follows shows the prevalence of barriers as reported by LEAs or ECYEH Program staff. The most common barrier was determining if a student was eligible for ECYEH program services followed closely by transportation, and then other barriers. Other barriers reported included school breaks/holidays, hospitalization between identification and attendance, securing childcare, incomplete disclosure of information during enrollment, or family-initiated delays in attendance. The percentage of students experiencing barriers has been relatively stable ranging between 12 and 14 percent the past few years. However, determining if a student is eligible and transportation remain the top two barriers.

Ongoing clarification of barrier documentation by coordinators and data collection training for reporting entities has most likely contributed to a better understanding of this element. The percentages of students experiencing barriers have decreased substantially from 35 percent since the 2010-11 analysis when it was revealed that there was a misunderstanding of the ‘determining eligibility for homelessness services’ barrier.

Transportation in Region 4 remains a huge issue for students even though steps to address transportation began in the 2013-14 program year and continue.

Most notable is the variation of barriers across the state, with regions 3 and 4 reporting the highest percentage of barriers, and regions 1, 5, and 8 reporting the lowest. Such variances warrant further explanation.
### Table 3. Barriers to School Enrollment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Barriers</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Region 1</th>
<th>Region 2</th>
<th>Region 3</th>
<th>Region 4</th>
<th>Region 5</th>
<th>Region 6</th>
<th>Region 7</th>
<th>Region 8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Determining eligibility for homelessness services</td>
<td>2,008</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>1,133</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>1,531</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>964</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obtaining other medical records</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immunization records</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School records</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School selection</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any barriers</td>
<td>2,619</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>473</td>
<td>1,290</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total youth for whom data was available</td>
<td>21,815</td>
<td>3,863</td>
<td>4,411</td>
<td>1,782</td>
<td>3,941</td>
<td>1,858</td>
<td>985</td>
<td>1,510</td>
<td>3,465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of youth with any barrier</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Barriers were examined separately for the pre-kindergarten population (attending both LEA and non-LEA pre-kindergarten programs), regardless of if they were enrolled or served. There were 787 children identified as experiencing homelessness who attended a pre-kindergarten program. Of those 787 children, 48 children (6 percent) were identified as having one or more barriers. Determining eligibility for services and transportation were the primary barriers indicated.

### Student Mobility

One of the rights of eligible students is to remain in their school of origin if it is in the best interest of the student. To examine student mobility, evaluators identified every school in which a student attended during the program year, July 1 through June 30, even if the student was not identified as being homeless by that particular LEA.

Of the 23,164 students identified as being enrolled in school, LEA-school mobility could be determined for 20,568 students (89 percent). The ‘unable to determine’ group (2,596 students) is comprised of students who were reported as being enrolled in schools, but did not have enough information to determine mobility within schools in the same LEA.

Table 4 shows LEA-school moves and includes the number of LEA-school combinations a student had and the number and percentage of students associated with each move. Almost two thirds (65 percent) of enrolled students remained in their LEA-school combination during the program year. This is the same percentage as 2014-15 and similar to prior years with the exception 2013-14 where 75 percent were reported as having one LEA-school combination. Twenty percent of students had two LEA-school combinations in 2015-16; and 4 percent have more than two moves. This is similar to prior years as well.

While many students remained in one LEA-school combination, there are still many students (5,577) who experienced two or more moves during the program year and 2,596 students for which moves cannot be determined.

---

24 A considerable portion (83 percent) of the under-five age group (4,695 children) are children birth to age two (2,461 children) and children ages three to five not enrolled in pre-kindergarten (1,447 children).
Table 4. Students Enrolled in Multiple LEA-School Combinations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>1 LEA-school</th>
<th>2 LEA-schools</th>
<th>&gt; 2 LEA-schools</th>
<th>Unable to Determine</th>
<th>%1 LEA-school</th>
<th>%2 LEA-schools</th>
<th>%&gt; 2 LEA-schools</th>
<th>%Unable to Determine</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Region 1</td>
<td>4,155</td>
<td>2,853</td>
<td>574</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>663</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region 2</td>
<td>4,798</td>
<td>3,048</td>
<td>981</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>528</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region 3</td>
<td>1,782</td>
<td>1,193</td>
<td>439</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region 4</td>
<td>4,126</td>
<td>2,368</td>
<td>903</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>611</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region 5</td>
<td>2,195</td>
<td>1,291</td>
<td>424</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region 6</td>
<td>1,085</td>
<td>610</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region 7</td>
<td>1,557</td>
<td>1,073</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region 8</td>
<td>3,466</td>
<td>2,555</td>
<td>683</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Total</td>
<td>23,164</td>
<td>14,991</td>
<td>4,578</td>
<td>999</td>
<td>2,596</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Service Delivery

One of the rights of students experiencing homelessness is the right to support services that promote academic success. As such, the McKinney-Vento Act outlines authorized activities for which funds can be used. This section of the report addresses services provided to eligible children or youth. Services reported in this section may have been provided through multiple sources including the ECYEH Program directly or through use of McKinney-Vento Act funds, LEAs, pre-kindergarten programs, the Migrant Education Program, or shelters. Documentation of these services was reported through the service delivery section of the ECYEH data collection process, PIMS Program Fact Template, MIS2000, and the domestic violence shelter spreadsheet.

All information was pulled together for each child/youth and categorized under the McKinney-Vento Act authorized activities categories. Those categories include: tutoring or other instructional support; expedited evaluations; referrals for medical, dental, and other health services; transportation; early childhood programs; assistance with participation in school programs; before-school, after-school, mentoring, and summer programs; obtaining or transferring records necessary for enrollment; coordination between schools and agencies; counseling; addressing needs related to domestic violence; clothing to meet school requirements; school supplies; referrals to other programs and services; emergency assistance related to school attendance; and other services not previously listed.

Additionally, many children and youth were designated as receiving instructional support services. These included children who were identified as attending federal, state, or locally funded pre-kindergarten programs, receiving services from the Pennsylvania Office of Child Development Early Intervention, or identified as receiving special education or Title III services. Likewise, any student attending a Title I schoolwide school was treated as having received instructional support since schoolwide schools may use Title I funds to upgrade curriculum of the school and all students in a schoolwide building benefit from Title I funds and services.
Services in each category were documented by the funding source for the service: McKinney-Vento Act, Title I, or other funds. Other funds included services or programming offered by the LEA, pre-kindergarten programs, the Migrant Education Program, shelters, collaborating agency/organization, or donations.

Tables 5 and 6 on pages 43-44 show the services received and the funding source with which the service was affiliated. All services documented here were reported at the child/youth level. Although service delivery documentation has improved, the table should be read with caution as there is no way to assure that individuals completing the spreadsheets report all services provided or selected the correct funding option. However, the table demonstrates what types of services identified children/youth received.

Overall, 89 percent of the 27,724 children and youth are documented as receiving service at the individual level. Region 4 showed the largest percentages of children and youth receiving services at 94 percent with several regions in the low 90 percent range. The overall percentage of children/youth receiving services has increased from being relatively stable in the low 80 percent range since 2012-13. This is most likely due to the web-based process being less cumbersome to report this information and increase in the number of Title 1 school-wide schools, as well as the ability to designate children/youth who received an array of different educational services.

Tutoring or other instructional support was by far the most prevalent service children/youth received. This is influenced by the number of students attending schoolwide Title I schools and the number of children and youth who received additional educational services such a pre-kindergarten program, special education, or Title III services. ‘Other services’ was the next largest category. This was influenced by children/youth receiving in-home or other services through the Migrant Education Program or services as a result of residing in a shelter or transitional housing.

Coordination between schools and agencies, transportation, school supplies, and clothing to meet a school requirement were the next largest cluster of services children/youth received when all funding categories are examined. When examining individual funding sources, coordination between schools and agencies was the most frequent service provided with McKinney-Vento Act (MV) funds. Given the role of the coordinators, it is not surprising that coordination between schools and agencies is the most frequent service. Tutoring and instructional support are the most frequent services provided with both Title I (TI) funds and other (O) funds. Again, this is not surprising given that other sources of data that captured tutoring and instructional support activities were included in the analysis.
Table 5. Service Delivery by Funding Type at the State Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Description</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>TI</th>
<th>MV</th>
<th>O</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tutoring or other instructional support</td>
<td></td>
<td>17,520</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>8,198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clothing to meet a school requirement</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,787</td>
<td>661</td>
<td>1,885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td></td>
<td>593</td>
<td>621</td>
<td>3,812</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School supplies</td>
<td></td>
<td>406</td>
<td>1,251</td>
<td>2,013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Services</td>
<td></td>
<td>390</td>
<td>447</td>
<td>5,135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expedited evaluations</td>
<td></td>
<td>385</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistance with participation in school programs</td>
<td></td>
<td>326</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling</td>
<td></td>
<td>314</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>1,454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordination between schools and agencies</td>
<td></td>
<td>309</td>
<td>2,646</td>
<td>1,266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referral to other programs and services</td>
<td></td>
<td>291</td>
<td>609</td>
<td>1,897</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Before-, after-school, mentoring, summer programs</td>
<td></td>
<td>227</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1,760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referrals for medical, dental, and other health services</td>
<td></td>
<td>222</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>1,544</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early childhood programs</td>
<td></td>
<td>204</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>729</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obtaining or transferring records necessary for enrollment</td>
<td></td>
<td>177</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency assistance related to school attendance</td>
<td></td>
<td>174</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addressing needs related to domestic violence</td>
<td></td>
<td>169</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>2,318</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unique count of children/youth receiving Title I services       | 17,722|
Unique count of children/youth receiving MV services            | 3,699 |
Unique count of children/youth receiving Other services         | 16,463|

Total children/youth receiving services                         | 24,702|
Total children/youth                                           | 27,724|
Proportion of children/youth with any services                  | 89%   |
## Table 6. Service Delivery by Funding Type at the Regional Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Region 1</th>
<th>Region 2</th>
<th>Region 3</th>
<th>Region 4</th>
<th>Region 5</th>
<th>Region 6</th>
<th>Region 7</th>
<th>Region 8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>TI</strong></td>
<td>3,859</td>
<td>1,244</td>
<td>3,211</td>
<td>1,193</td>
<td>1,408</td>
<td>1,492</td>
<td>814</td>
<td>689</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MV</strong></td>
<td>1,115</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>948</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>O</strong></td>
<td>1,155</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>734</td>
<td>521</td>
<td>453</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>453</td>
<td>475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TI</strong></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>921</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>3,233</td>
<td>3,233</td>
<td>3,233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MV</strong></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>O</strong></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TI</strong></td>
<td>38</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MV</strong></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1,455</td>
<td>1,455</td>
<td>1,455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>O</strong></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1,455</td>
<td>1,455</td>
<td>1,455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TI</strong></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MV</strong></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>O</strong></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TI</strong></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MV</strong></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>O</strong></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TI</strong></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MV</strong></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>O</strong></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TI</strong></td>
<td>47</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MV</strong></td>
<td>47</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>O</strong></td>
<td>47</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TI</strong></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MV</strong></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>O</strong></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TI</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MV</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>O</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TI</strong></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MV</strong></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>O</strong></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TI</strong></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MV</strong></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>O</strong></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TI</strong></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>661</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MV</strong></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>661</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>O</strong></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>661</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Unique count of children/youth receiving Title I services**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region 1</th>
<th>Region 2</th>
<th>Region 3</th>
<th>Region 4</th>
<th>Region 5</th>
<th>Region 6</th>
<th>Region 7</th>
<th>Region 8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>3,863</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,238</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,221</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,323</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,504</strong></td>
<td><strong>727</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,143</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,703</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Unique count of children/youth receiving MV services**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region 1</th>
<th>Region 2</th>
<th>Region 3</th>
<th>Region 4</th>
<th>Region 5</th>
<th>Region 6</th>
<th>Region 7</th>
<th>Region 8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>327</strong></td>
<td><strong>418</strong></td>
<td><strong>68</strong></td>
<td><strong>203</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,775</strong></td>
<td><strong>161</strong></td>
<td><strong>57</strong></td>
<td><strong>692</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Unique count of children/youth receiving Other services**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region 1</th>
<th>Region 2</th>
<th>Region 3</th>
<th>Region 4</th>
<th>Region 5</th>
<th>Region 6</th>
<th>Region 7</th>
<th>Region 8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2,438</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,214</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,184</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,768</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,761</strong></td>
<td><strong>882</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,149</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,067</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total children/youth receiving services**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region 1</th>
<th>Region 2</th>
<th>Region 3</th>
<th>Region 4</th>
<th>Region 5</th>
<th>Region 6</th>
<th>Region 7</th>
<th>Region 8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>4,756</strong></td>
<td><strong>5,202</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,734</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,435</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,519</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,146</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,048</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,262</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total children/youth**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region 1</th>
<th>Region 2</th>
<th>Region 3</th>
<th>Region 4</th>
<th>Region 5</th>
<th>Region 6</th>
<th>Region 7</th>
<th>Region 8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>5,518</strong></td>
<td><strong>6,041</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,954</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,716</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,798</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,290</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,802</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,606</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Proportion of children/youth with any services**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region 1</th>
<th>Region 2</th>
<th>Region 3</th>
<th>Region 4</th>
<th>Region 5</th>
<th>Region 6</th>
<th>Region 7</th>
<th>Region 8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>86%</strong></td>
<td><strong>86%</strong></td>
<td><strong>89%</strong></td>
<td><strong>94%</strong></td>
<td><strong>90%</strong></td>
<td><strong>86%</strong></td>
<td><strong>91%</strong></td>
<td><strong>90%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Some services provided to children/youth by the ECYEH Program are not captured at the individual student level. The distribution of bus passes, clothing, school supplies (backpacks, college preparation materials, curriculum materials, hygiene items), fees for school activities, or recreational, social, or holiday activities and events were the types of services that were typically provided in bulk, where the recipient was unknown. This information is captured in the Technical Assistance and Bulk Supply instrument. Details regarding technical assistance and bulk supplies provided by the ECYEH Program are detailed earlier in the report (page 16).

**Title I Services**

All students identified as experiencing homelessness are automatically eligible for Title I services, regardless of whether his or her school is a Title I school. LEAs must reserve (or set aside) the funds necessary to serve children and youth experiencing homelessness who do not attend Title I schools, including educational-related support services. However, if all schools in an LEA receive Title I funds then LEAs are not required to set aside funds.

In 2014-15, 213 LEAs had all of their schools designated as schoolwide; in 2015-16 this increased to 397 LEAs. This increase directly influenced the number of students experiencing homelessness who received Title I services.

Of the 23,164 enrolled students, 80 percent attended Title I schools with 70 of the enrolled students attending a schoolwide school and 10 percent attending a targeted assistance school.

As indicated in the service delivery table, 77 percent of enrolled students (17,722 of 23,164 students) were documented as receiving Title I services and those services were most often instructional support services.

**STUDENT OUTCOMES**

Academic outcomes and examples of positive student outcomes are highlighted in this section. Examples of positive outcomes highlight situations where positive outcomes for students occurred as a result of the ECYEH Program.

School attendance, graduation, and drop-out results at the state level are not available at the time of this report. These results are provided to the PDE state homeless staff upon request when the data is finalized, which typically occurs in the spring following

---

25 When a school has a 40 percent or higher of the school’s enrollment comprised of low-income families the school is eligible to apply for schoolwide Title I funds. In buildings with poverty rates of less than 40 percent, programs are designed to help specific children and are targeted assisted programs. Specific grade bands or students with academic need within those grade bands may be targeted for services.
the program year. Academic outcomes include state assessment results for students experiencing homelessness.

State academic assessment data for 2015-16 includes the Pennsylvania System of School Assessment (PSSA), the Pennsylvania Alternative State Assessment (PASA), and the Keystone Exams. The PSSA is given in reading, mathematics, science, and writing. The reading and math assessments are given in grades three through eight; the science assessment is given in grades four and eight; and the writing assessment is administered in grades five and eight. The PASA assesses students with the most severe cognitive disabilities in four grade level spans (third/fourth, fifth/sixth, seventh/eighth, and 11th). The 2015-16 Keystone Exams were offered in literature, Algebra I, and biology for grades seven through 11 in the fall, spring, and summer. Students can re-take the Keystone Exams until they demonstrate proficiency. Once they score at the proficient level, their scores are banked and used for 11th grade state and federal assessment and accountability reporting. All students enrolled in public school in these grades should participate in the appropriate state assessments unless they meet one of the exemption criteria. For the purposes of this program, evaluators analyzed reading, math, and science PSSA data; reading, math, and science PASA data; and literature, Algebra I, and biology Keystone Exam data.

Reading PSSA/PASA and Literature Keystone Exam

During the 2015-16 school year, there were 11,374 students experiencing homelessness and enrolled in grade levels eligible to take the reading PSSA (grades 3-8), the literature Keystone Exam (grade 11), or the reading PASA (grades 3, 8, or 11), of which PSSA, PASA, or Keystone Exam results were available for 8,909 students (78 percent). The graph that follows shows student results in reading/literature by the performance level categories: below basic, basic, proficient, and advanced, overall and by grade level.

Overall, 33 percent of students scored in the proficient or advanced levels. This percentage varied by grade with 11th grade having the greatest percentage of students (50 percent) scoring proficient or advanced, and 4th grade having the smallest percentage of students (28 percent) scoring proficient or advanced.
During the 2015-16 school year, there were 11,374 students experiencing homelessness and enrolled in grade levels eligible to take the math PSSA (grades 3-8), the Algebra I Keystone Exam (grade 11), or the math PASA (grades 3, 8, or 11), of which PSSA, PASA, or Keystone Exam results were available for 9,128 students (80 percent). The graph that follows shows student results in math/Algebra I by the performance level categories: below basic, basic, proficient, and advanced, overall and by grade level.

Overall, 18 percent of students assessed scored in the proficient or advanced levels. This percentage varied by grade with 11th grade having the greatest percentage of students (39 percent) scoring in the proficient or advanced levels and 8th grade having the smallest percentage of students (9 percent) scoring proficient or advanced.
Science PSSA/PASA and Biology Keystone Exam

During the 2015-16 school year, there were 4,459 students experiencing homelessness who were enrolled in a grade level eligible to take the science PSSA (grades 4 and 8), the science PASA (grades 4, 8, and 11), or the biology Keystone Exam (11th grade), of which results were available for 3,506 students (79 percent). The graph that follows shows student results in science/biology by the performance level categories: below basic, basic, proficient, and advanced, overall and by grade level.

Overall, 38 percent of students scored in the proficient or advanced levels, with 4th grade having the largest percentage of students who scored proficient or advanced (47 percent) and 8th grade having the smallest percentage of students who scored proficient or advanced (29 percent).

Overall the percentage of students scoring proficient or advanced increased slightly from 2014-15. In 2014-15, 32 percent of students experiencing homelessness scored proficient or advanced in reading/language arts, 16 percent in math/Algebra I, and 37 percent in science/biology.

Students experiencing homelessness in Pennsylvanian are similar to national data with the exception of mathematics where they scored much lower than the national numbers.

Nationally, the most recent assessment data for students experiencing homelessness is from 2014-15. The national percentages show 30 percent of students scored proficient or above in reading. In mathematics, 24 percent of students scored proficient or above, and in science, 38 percent scored proficient or above.
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Examples of Positive ECYEH Program Impact

Behind the numbers and all of the efforts of the ECYEH Program across the state there are children, youth, and families struggling to survive in the face of homelessness and the situations that precipitated their homelessness. During the bi-monthly state coordinator meetings, coordinators often share exceptional stories about children/youth or families with which they were involved or whom they assisted through a crisis. Evaluators asked coordinators to share a story resulting in a positive outcome in their region. What follows are examples that were provided by regional staff.

Region 1: An unaccompanied 12th grade student was having problems at the high school she attended. Based on her transient history, poor school attendance, and limited family support, she was not going to be allowed to graduate with her class in 2016. The student sought assistance from her school district’s administration, where she was connected with the Office of Family and Community Engagement (FACE). The FACE office identified her as an unaccompanied youth, referred her to the ECYEH Program, and signed her up for tutoring and the TEEN program. ECYEH staff were also able to move the student from the school she was attending and enroll her in another high school closer to the ECYEH office.

Since ECYEH also has a computer lab set up in the office for students eligible for assistance under the McKinney-Vento Act, the student was able to come in after school, do her homework, attend the programs available, and complete the class projects and assignments required for her to graduate on time. She was also paired with college interns/mentors to support her. The interns critiqued, made suggestions, read, reread, and reread the report she prepared for her class project.

The student also did not have money to attend the prom. ECYEH worked with the high school she was attending to obtain two free tickets so she could attend the prom. She also received money for her hair, nails, and several other items she needed to make her feel special on prom night. She received a couture gown and evening shoes through donations at no charge.

The student applied for and was accepted at a culinary school in New York. The ECYEH program is very proud of her and she has since moved on the great things.

Region 2: The ECYEH regional staff was helping an unaccompanied youth in a local school district apply for college admission and financial aid. The admission counselor at the college he applied to referred him to our office for assistance because she was previously an unaccompanied youth herself who was helped by the ECYEH program. As she was helped by ECYEH, she knew from the description of this student’s situation that he may also benefit from our services. We assisted the student through the application and financial aid process and thanked the admissions counselor for her referral.
Region 3: A female student came to the attention of the regional coordinator in the fall at the request of the student’s guidance counselor. Outreach to teens is not uncommon in the region. The student was living with her family in a motel. She was working, going to school, and involved in many extra-curricular activities. She was overwhelmed and it was reflecting in her school work.

The student, her mother, and two siblings were evicted during the prior summer from their long-time home when the city condemned the property. The family moved in with friends at first, then with other family members further away. That did not work out and the student’s family returned to her home school district in time to start the school year.

As the oldest, the student felt it was her responsibility to keep her siblings hopeful and to contribute. Her mom was working hard to get them out of the motel where they were staying. In meeting with the student, her counselor and the regional coordinator discussed ways to meet her needs. Food was not a problem, gift cards were given. Backpacks, school supplies, school uniforms, and shoes were taken care of with program money and donations. They worked together to figure out how she could successfully maintain her course load in order to finish the year and stay on track for graduation.

The regional coordinator checked in with the student throughout the fall. After months of struggle, she was able to get into a routine of normalcy, to the extent that they could. The student still took care of her siblings, her mom was continuing to work hard, and through the collaborative efforts of the community, the school, and the ECYEH program, the family did not feel alone.

The reason this student stands out as a success story is that she had been writing poetry as an outlet. She was participating in several student organizations and performance activities. Through a connection, she attended a poetry performance that changed her. She started to let people know that she was in this situation and it wasn’t a shameful thing, it was only the current situation. People who complained about cleaning their room, she would tell them, “at least you have a room.” She started to perform her poetry. She started making a difference in her school. She then performed in the community. She wanted her story to be told to inspire other students who may be experiencing homelessness. She made a difference by being a voice. She finished the school year on honor roll and began looking at colleges.

The student thanked us by saying, “Thank you for believing in me, until I believed in me. I couldn’t have finished the school year without help and you both made it safe to ask for help.” Her counselor and I had told her we would always believe in her right from the beginning. ECYEH cannot do this job alone. Having a great contact within a district who works for a student helps keep the student inspired and hopeful.

Region 5: A female high school student was referred to ECYEH by her aunt, who shared that the student was not attending school, and although she technically should have been a junior, had almost no credits and her life was in chaos. She was
considering dropping out, was depressed, and did not know where to turn. Her mother and new stepfather had kicked her out of the family home two years earlier, when she was in her freshman year of high school due to domestic violence issues. They have had no contact with her since that time. She lived with friends and moved frequently freshman year, eventually moving in with an older boyfriend. She became pregnant and he abandoned her, moving to another state to find employment. During this time, the student missed school, had unsuccessfully attempted cyber school, and had no support from her family, no medical coverage, and no prenatal care or check-ups. She moved from home to home until her aunt agreed to take her in. When her aunt contacted the ECYEH regional coordinator, the student had missed weeks of school, was seven months pregnant, and only owned one pair of ripped black stretch pants and a few shirts that did not fit correctly due to her pregnancy.

Together with the homeless liaison where the student’s aunt lived, the ECYEH regional coordinator worked to secure her a spot at the local career and technical center. Grant money provided her with a basic wardrobe so that she could attend school, as well as a back pack, school supplies, shoes, a winter coat, and toiletries. She received a referral to the local teen parenting coordinator. The student received a medical card and regular medical and prenatal care. She attended school regularly and was excited to have decent clothing and the support she needed to get back on track to graduation and credit accrual. She is doing well with her aunt, and arrangements have been made for childcare once the baby is born so that she will not need to miss school and can continue to attend after the birth of her child.

The school counselor describes the student as a young woman with "grace and poise" who is on track to do very well in the field she has chosen at the career and technical center. She is mature and focused on her school work and has had almost perfect attendance since starting.

Another female student was also homeless for two years. She lived with her father and stepmother, but this stability fell apart when her stepmother committed suicide in the family home. Her father had an emotional breakdown and abandoned the student, moving to another state and leaving her with a family friend. The student moved between several locations for a year before her father returned and purchased a home, into which he moved the student and her with him. However, in the section of the duplex where the student was staying, there was an unrelated adult male living in the same apartment with her. When she refused his sexual advances, he demanded that she leave the apartment she was forced to share with him. She had no options, as her father and teen brother shared the other part of the duplex, and she would have no bedroom, nowhere to sleep, and no privacy. At this time, she located her estranged biological mother who lived in a neighboring district. The student had never lived with her mother, and her mother had no legal guardianship rights or custody, so the district liaison fought to have her deemed "homeless" under the McKinney-Vento Act, so she could remain in her school of origin.
The student is a junior, but has accelerated her class schedule and doubled her course load so she will graduate at the end of the year. The district is providing supports through Title 1, including tutoring, to assist her with this goal. If they had not supported her status as a homeless unaccompanied youth and had instead forced her to enroll in the district where her mother was residing, she would have lost credits and not been able to graduate a year early. The student is described as incredibly focused and resilient, and as a student who is always a self-advocate. She is still completing high school, but appears to be on track for early graduation and applied to local colleges.

Region 6: A student had been displaced due to domestic abuse in the home. The district believed that bringing him back to his school of origin was important. In an effort to show their commitment to him, the district transported him more than 40 miles one way in order to get him to school. The student had been involved in many support programs while attending school. The school realized that he needed a different program to support his needs. Due to the change, he participated in sports and is currently passing.

A young girl was overcoming family issues. Her parents were both drug and alcohol users working with agency programs and the ECYEH coordinator never knew if, one day, she might be pulled from the home. She was taken from her mother, with whom she had lived most of her life, and her father was parenting her, though technically the homeless grandmother had custody. The girl’s father lived in an apartment loaned to them by a friend. The child had come from out of state, with an angry attitude and refused to come to school often or do work. Her parents did not get her up for school. The district worked with them and the other agencies providing support. The child recently showed gains on assessments in both math and reading, is making friends, is no longer refusing to work, comes to school daily, and is doing homework after school with her teacher before she goes home from school.

An elementary boy’s family moved in with his grandfather after being in a number of schools in the last two years. His mother was unemployed but is now working two jobs and the boy has changed tremendously since October. The ECYEH family helped to provide a wonderful Christmas to the family and the boy knows it was the school that provided his new bike. He was defiant, but now complies with all the rules. He was angry, but now he is happy at school. He still has attention and academic issues, but he is trying hard and learning. He requires a lot of small group and individual learning but he is getting it, and it is making a world of difference.

All of these situations, these students have been successful with the assistance of homeless liaison, the support of the regional coordinator, and school staff collaborating to support children experiencing homelessness.

Region 7: A family with four children became homeless through no fault of their own. They were evicted from their rented home because the city condemned it due to structural issues. The landlord refused to pay for the damage and the family did not have enough money for a deposit on a new home or apartment. They were staying with Pennsylvania’s Education for Children and Youth Experiencing Homelessness Program State Evaluation Report Originated February 16, 2017
various friends and hotels around the city. The children had no school clothing and they kept re-registering every time they moved. At first, they were too embarrassed to reveal their situation, but found the regional coordinator’s number on a poster.

The regional coordinator spoke with the mother and immediately referred her to some agencies. That morning, the regional coordinator met her outside one of the schools she drove her daughter to and gave her clothing and school supplies. She drove her children every morning and they went to three different schools. After finding out where she was staying, the regional coordinator arranged transportation and the students were all able to get back to their schools of origin. The mother did not know much about the McKinney-Vento law.

The mother talked with one of the referred agencies and found out they were eligible for funding. Not only did they secure housing, but they were close enough to walk to school in a good neighborhood. She was very appreciative of the program and life has become much easier for her. The students are doing well and the mother was able to get a better job through the agency.

**Region 8:** Region 8’s regional coordinator was able to assist a family that has a young boy (age 9) in getting out of homelessness and into a program that provided them with an apartment. The regional coordinator ensured that educational stability remained intact while the family was experiencing housing instability. Their case was very challenging and it required ECYEH staff to involve several agencies and individuals, proving that more is accomplished when programs and agencies collaborate.

In another family, the father was unable to work due to physical disabilities and the mother was dealing with serious mental health challenges. They had been in and out of homelessness in the local area for a number of years so ECYEH staff worked hard to find ways to provide assistance such as school supplies, school clothing, food, Christmas presents, as well as counseling and emotional support to prevent ongoing homelessness. The Region 8 team helped the family navigate the social service system in their county, thanks to its managing of the county Resource Directory and facilitation of the social service agency collaborative meetings for the county. While the family had always tried hard to meet their own needs and not lean on others to help them, the father shared his gratitude for the Region 8 ECYEH program’s assistance and that he felt compelled to help others the way we had been helping them. Despite efforts to prevent it, the family became homeless again and moved into a motel, as they could not pay all of the costs associated with moving into another apartment. The family bounced from motel to motel for almost a year and a half and despite their efforts to handle their needs independently, they had to occasionally reach out to the ECYEH program and county agencies/individuals that Region 8 staff had referred them to in order to get all of their basic needs met. The lack of a consistent and stable place to sleep at night, as well as the constant struggle to meet basic needs was very difficult on the elementary-age son. The family applied at multiple shelters and was placed on waiting lists, but was not able to secure housing or shelter. One night, the father called the regional coordinator and said that they were completely out of money, could not pay for more
nights in a motel, no programs would help them (confirmed by the regional coordinator), and they were being thrown out of what was likely the cheapest motel in their county.

As the father unsuccessfully fought back tears, he explained to the regional coordinator that his son has witnessed things at that motel that no child should have to see or hear; there was drug activity, fighting, and intoxicated individuals screaming in the parking lot late at night. The regional coordinator even had to file an anonymous report of human trafficking taking place at the motel just a few doors from where the family had been staying. The father ended the phone call by stating that he wanted to make sure that his family would be taken care of but he didn’t know what else he could do to accomplish that, as his health was failing. The Region 8 ECYEH Program exists to ensure educational stability for students experiencing homelessness; however, coordinators work hard to also help families and students acquire safe places to sleep at night, even if the only available options are hotels or shelters. In this situation, the Regional Coordinator was able to get the family into a safer hotel and was then able to get three local social workers (from two different agencies) to help move the family. Within two more days, the regional coordinator was able to connect the family with a nearby housing program that approved the family to move into an apartment and be provided with case management.

The family had to throw away almost all of their belongings because of cockroach infestation but the Region 8 ECYEH program was able to help the family replace the most important items with community donations. The regional coordinator arranged to have some local volunteers move the family from the hotel to their new apartment, while the ECYEH program worked to ensure that the child was attending his school of origin, that transportation was arranged, and new school supplies, school clothing, donated food, hygienic items, and cleaning supplies were all supplied from a variety of sources. When the regional coordinator visited the family after they moved into their new apartment, the family’s son was playing on a swing set and had a huge smile on his face. The father and coordinator sat in rocking chairs on the porch and talked. The father again fought back tears, but this time his tears came from the knowledge that he and his family were in a safe place and his son was surrounded with excellent educational support.
Evaluator Reflections, Implications, and Recommendations for Improvement

The Pennsylvania regional model to implement the McKinney-Vento Act provides an opportunity for every child or youth identified as experiencing homelessness to access needed resources or services, especially related to school enrollment, including pre-kindergarten, and academic success.

Regional coordinators and their staff train, troubleshoot, intervene, and collaborate on behalf of children and youth and their families, the schools they attend, or the shelters in which they reside. The nature of their work and the differences among the regions provide challenges unique to each region. There are differences in geographic territory and urban-centric locale of communities and schools in their region. There are differences in the numbers of LEAs (including the growing number of charter and cyber charter schools), shelters, pre-kindergarten programs, and kinds of organizations that provide services to children, youth, or families experiencing homelessness. Additionally, there are differences in the numbers and roles of ECYEH Program staff within the regions. These challenges and differences contribute to the recommendations that follow.

Each year reporting is more complete and accurate. As such there has been an increase in the number of children and youth reported. As reporting has become more complete and accurate there are several themes that are emerging.

- The number of children/youth experiencing homelessness for more than one year is increasing slightly each year (page 34).
- Children/youth experiencing homelessness are predominately economically disadvantaged (page 34).
- A majority of students experiencing homelessness attend LEAs that have high levels of poverty (page 35).
- The majority of students remain in their LEA-school of origin (pages 38-39).
- Transportation remains one of the most common barriers statewide (page 37-38).
- Despite some consistency for a large portion of children/youth, there are students who experience extreme mobility, are homeless for more than two years, or experience barriers to enrollment (pages 37-39).

The increase of reporting by non-LEA entities, especially through HMIS reporting and for the pre-kindergarten age/grade categories, is the most notable development in 2015-16 and has contributed to the overall increase of identified children and youth. This increase is also related to increases in ECYEH staff outreach, and new information collection methods are demonstrating the how ECYEH staff engage regional resources to identify and support youth and families experiencing homelessness.

Furthermore, examples of innovative practices, collaborations, and stories of positive student outcomes highlight the creative and compassionate ways in which the ECYEH
Program is influencing the lives of children, youth, and families experiencing homelessness.

Increases in the number of LEAs that have all schools in the LEA as schoolwide Title I schools is positively affecting the number of students experiencing homelessness who receive some type of instructional support.

Changes as a result of ESSA will direct changes in program implementation and the evaluation report for 2016-17 and may identify new areas for program recommendations.

At this time, evaluators offer the following specific recommendations to optimize program implementation at the regional and local levels.

- Transportation for students experiencing homelessness remains a challenge among the regions. Continue to explore a statewide perspective and utilize state office support to identify solutions that may be helpful to LEAs struggling with transportation issues.

- HMIS reporting in some regions directly contributed to an increase in reporting and more accurate representation of non-enrolled populations, especially the pre-kindergarten populations. Explore ways in which HMIS reporting can occur at the state level or consistently among the regions and their local Continuum of Care contemporaries. Consistent reporting of shelters through the HMIS may normalize the differences among identified children/youth especially among the non-enrolled populations.

- Students experiencing homelessness are performing similarly or slightly higher as compared to national results with the exception of mathematics where they are underperforming. Continue to collaborate and explore any options that offer additional instructional support to students experiencing homelessness – such as tutoring in shelters by college students, priority for service in LEA or community after-school or summer programs, or inclusion in other state- or federally-funded programs such as Migrant Education, English as a second language, or 21st Century Community Learning Centers.

The evaluation of the ECYEH Program is intended to provide a statewide and regional picture of program implementation, outcomes, and impacts. These findings, along with detailed information at the county, LEA, or school level, when appropriate, is provided to the regional coordinators and PDE program staff to assist with internal program implementation, improvement, and decision making. Additionally, regions received individual child/youth information from the data collection process. Results are based upon the data available.