**Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition**

**Historical Data and Targets**

*Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition*

*Compliance indicator: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.*

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

### Historical Data

*Baseline Data: 2005*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FFY</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data</td>
<td>90.90%</td>
<td>99.00%</td>
<td>99.00%</td>
<td>99.00%</td>
<td>98.00%</td>
<td>98.00%</td>
<td>93.00%</td>
<td>97.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Key:***

- Gray – Data Prior to Baseline
- Yellow – Baseline
- Blue – Data Update

### FFY 2013 - FFY 2018 Targets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FFY</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Indicators 12: Early Childhood Transition

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Compliance indicator: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

**FFY 2013 SPP/APR Data**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Numerator (c)</th>
<th>Denominator (a-b-d-e)</th>
<th>FFY 2012 Data*</th>
<th>FFY 2013 Target*</th>
<th>FFY 2013 Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>429</td>
<td>447</td>
<td>97.00%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>95.97315%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Slippage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Did Not Meet Target</td>
<td>Slippage</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* FFY 2012 Data are editable on the Historical Data and Targets page.

**Explanation of Slippage**

The Hawaii Department of Education (HIDOE) did not meet the target of 100%. In 2013, a new process was implemented for the early childhood transition notice from Part C to Part B towards improving results of children who have been served in Part C and found eligible for Part B and who have an individual education program (IEP) developed and implemented by their third birthday. Training was done in 2013, however the slippage in comparison to the 2012 data of 97% may suggest that further training may be necessary.

Account for children included in (a), but not included in b, c, d, or e. Indicate the range of days beyond the third birthday when eligibility was determined and the IEP developed, and the reasons for the delays.

Eighteen (18) children who were included in “a” but not in “b, c, d or e”.

In one (1) case the child was found eligible and did not have the IEP developed as the child was withdrawn from school before the child’s third birthday.

**Range of Days Beyond Age 3**

In seventeen (17) cases, out of 41 complexes, the children’s eligibility had been determined and IEPs developed and implemented, though not by the child’s third birthday. The number of days beyond the 3rd birthday ranged from one (1) to 109.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># Days Eligibility/Services were Delayed Beyond the Child’s Third Birthday</th>
<th># of Cases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

2/10/2015
Reason for Delays for 17 cases:

- In nine (9) of the 18 cases, the reason for delay was late referrals from Part C. There was no non-compliance on the part of the schools. Out of the nine (9) cases, three (3) cases were found ineligible. For the other six (6) cases, the schools were unable to complete the evaluation, eligibility and IEP processes prior to the child’s third birthday.
- In four (4) of the 18 cases, the schools did not act in a timely manner upon receipt of the Part C Transition Notice.
- In three (3) of the 18 cases, the schools decided not to evaluate the child upon referral from Part C, then reconsidered a short time later, evaluated the child and found the child eligible, though after age three.
- In one (1) of the 18 cases, the school did not meet the 60 day timeline for a timely evaluation.

What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?
- State monitoring
- State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State’s monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data.
The data for this indicator is derived from a report in the electronic Comprehensive Student Support System (eCSSS) database, “Preschool Services by Age 3.” This report pulls data from individual student electronic files and includes all children who reached age three and were referred for an initial evaluation during the school year (SY) 2013-2014 (July 1, 2013 - June 30, 2014). For each child, the report includes:

- Birth date
- Date of the child’s third birthday
- Date the school received the referral
- Number of days the referral was received prior to the third birthday
- Date the parent signed consent for the initial evaluation
- Date the evaluation is projected to be completed (In Hawaii, evaluations are considered complete when services are available; 60 days from consent.)
- Evaluation Status (IDEA eligible, Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) ineligible, withdrawn, consent revoked)
- Referral Source (Part C, if applicable)
- Date the initial Individualized Education Program (IEP) was held
- Date services were made available

Schools are able to track their data which is updated daily. Any record that indicates services were not available by a child’s third birthday is “red-flagged,” which enables school, district, or state personnel to investigate the situation to determine the reasons.

The data from the report generated for SY 2013 - 2014 was reviewed by the Special Education Section (SES), regional, and school level personnel to ensure the accuracy of the information about each individual child. In addition, schools collect and maintain Part C Transition Notices which provide information on when children were referred to Part C, and when Part C referred the children to Part B.

Beginning in 2013, both schools and the state office receive the Part C Transition Notice. Schools collect and maintain the Part C Transition Notice and begin the referral process. The state office aggregates the data and distributes to the complexes for monitoring and oversight.
Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition
Required Actions from FFY 2012

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Compliance indicator: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actions required in FFY 2012 response table</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Responses to actions required in FFY 2012 response table, *not including correction of findings*
Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition
Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Compliance indicator: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings of Noncompliance Identified</th>
<th>Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year</th>
<th>Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected</th>
<th>Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2012**

**FFY 2012 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

Describe how the State verified that each LEA with noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements

There were fourteen (14) findings of noncompliance in which a request for an evaluation was not timely or IEPs were not implemented until after a child's third birthday. The state office verified noncompliance reported under Indicator 12 in the FFY 2012 APR by using two verification tests that are consistent with the U.S. Department (USDOE), Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) Memo 09-02.

**OSEP Memo 09-02, Prong 2:** In order to ensure that the complexes were correctly implementing the regulatory requirements, SES reviewed subsequent early childhood transition data (eCSSS Preschool Services by Age 3 Report as well as individual student records) for the identified complexes collected through the eCSSS data system and verified that all complexes were implementing all regulatory requirements relevant to transition from Part C to Part B with 100% compliance within one year of identification of the noncompliance. All complexes were notified in writing that noncompliance had been corrected.

Because the HIDOE passed the two (2) verification test, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02, the SES considered that HIDOE has corrected the noncompliance identified in FFY 2012 for Indicator 12 and is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements in accordance with 34 CFR Section 300.124(b).

Describe how the State verified that each LEA corrected each individual case of noncompliance

**OSEP Memo 09-02, Prong 1:** SES verified the correction/resolution of each individual instance of noncompliance by a review of individual records in the eCSSS data system. All students had an IEP and were receiving special education and related services prior to identification of the noncompliance.

Although all individual instances had been resolved prior to identification of the noncompliance by SES, findings were issued in writing to each school complex with noncompliance. In accordance with the OSEP Memo 09-02, complexes were directed to demonstrate through subsequent data that schools were appropriately implementing the regulatory requirements.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2012**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2012 APR</th>
<th>Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected</th>
<th>Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>