

STATE PERFORMANCE PLAN / ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REPORT: PART B

for STATE FORMULA GRANT PROGRAMS under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act

**For reporting on
FFY 2019**

Hawaii



**PART B DUE
February 1, 2021**

**U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
WASHINGTON, DC 20202**

Introduction

Instructions

Provide sufficient detail to ensure that the Secretary and the public are informed of and understand the State's systems designed to drive improved results for students with disabilities and to ensure that the State Educational Agency (SEA) and Local Educational Agencies (LEAs) meet the requirements of IDEA Part B. This introduction must include descriptions of the State's General Supervision System, Technical Assistance System, Professional Development System, Stakeholder Involvement, and Reporting to the Public.

Intro - Indicator Data

Executive Summary

In accordance with 20 U.S.C 1416(b)(2)(C)(ii)(II) of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act (IDEA), each February, the Hawaii State Department of Education (HIDOE) is required to submit an Annual Performance Report (APR) to the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) in Washington, D.C. regarding the State's overall performance in relation to the 16 State Performance Plan (SPP) indicators. The SPP includes both results (outcomes) indicators and compliance indicators. Each SPP indicator incorporates a measurable and rigorous target for each year of the SPP. These targets are used as a basis for analyzing the State's data for students with disabilities.

The Hawaii State Department of Education's (HIDOE) primary monitoring activities focus on:

- a) Improving educational results and functional outcomes for all students with disabilities; and
- b) Ensuring that the school system meets the program requirements under this part, with a particular emphasis on those requirements that are most closely related to improving educational results and functional outcomes for students with disabilities.

The Hawaii State Department of Education is a single statewide public school district that includes 15 Complex Areas (CA) and over 250 schools. Each of the 15 CA is comprised of two to four school complexes, consisting of a high school and the elementary and middle/intermediate schools that feed into it. Deputy Superintendent Phyllis Unebasami serves as the line officer over the fifteen (15) Complex Area Superintendents as well as the Monitoring and Compliance Branch (MAC) and the Office of Hawaiian Education. Each Complex Area Superintendent has direct oversight and monitoring responsibilities over principals who in turn have direct supervision over teachers and their classrooms. As a unitary system, Superintendent Dr. Christina M. Kishimoto inspires and supports her leadership team to collectively focus on those requirements and improvement strategies that are most closely related to improving educational results and functional outcomes for children with disabilities.

Under the direct supervision of the Deputy Superintendent, MAC monitors complex areas and schools to ensure compliance with the Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act (2004) and the Hawaii Administrative Rules (HAR), Chapter 60. Under the direction of the Superintendent, the Office of Student Support Services, Exceptional Support Branch (ESB) provides leadership, professional development (PD), and technical assistance (TA) to complexes and schools in planning and implementing programs to increase academic achievement for students with disabilities.

Through a collaborative effort with state partners and education stakeholders statewide, HIDOE is committed to all students being college and career-ready when they exit public school. HIDOE ensures that:

- All students with disabilities have available a free appropriate public education (FAPE);
- The rights of students with disabilities and their parents/legal guardians are protected; and
- Federal and state special education requirements are implemented, monitored, enforced, and reported.

HIDOE is committed to establishing systems to promote equity towards ensuring children with disabilities have the supports they need and an equal opportunity to be successful. HIDOE has selected targeted areas of priority that include:

- Providing ongoing coaching and mentoring to CA staff to support schools with training opportunities of self-paced online coursework and how to scale-up inclusive practices efforts (indicator 5 and 6);
- Establishing a system of support with resources, and tools for CA staff and schools to develop appropriate secondary transition plans for positive post-high school outcomes (indicators 1,2, 13, and 14); and
- Increasing early language and literacy skills for early childhood children with disabilities in developing a strong foundation in literacy that will benefit them throughout their education (indicators 3B, 3C, and 7).

Additional information related to data collection and reporting

COVID-19: Return to Learn Guidance for Students with Disabilities

As a result of the pandemic, the HIDOE quickly began to provide additional support and guidance to the field. To support schools and staff during the COVID-19 pandemic, HIDOE provided schools with step by step guidance to ensure compliance with all IDEA regulatory requirements that can be accessed on HIDOE's website <https://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/TeachingAndLearning/SpecializedPrograms/SpecialEducation/Pages/home.aspx>. This guidance included the school requirement to address any disruption in learning through Individualized Education Program (IEP) reviews and revisions. The guidance also provided detailed operational steps and tools on determining learning loss and how to compensate for learning loss. Also included was guidance on contingency planning for students with IEPs in preparation for any unforeseen schools and/or community closure. These plans help prepare teachers and parents to implement plans to the greatest extent possible via distance learning.

Number of Districts in your State/Territory during reporting year

1

General Supervision System

The systems that are in place to ensure that IDEA Part B requirements are met, e.g., monitoring, dispute resolution, etc.

HIDOE monitors all public schools, including public charter schools. IDEA requirements are implemented by state-level offices, complex- level offices, and schools. HIDOE's GSS is comprised of the following components:

- Policies, Procedures, and Effective Implementation
- Integrated Monitoring Activities
- Data on Processes and Results
- Improvement, Correction, Incentives, and Sanctions
- Effective Dispute Resolution
- Fiscal and Resource Management
- Targeted Technical Assistance and Professional Development

Policies, Procedures, and Effective Implementation

HIDOE's policies and procedures are established through the Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act of 2004 (IDEA), which is available at <http://idea.ed.gov> and Hawaii's Administrative Rules (HAR), Chapter 60, which is available on the State of Hawaii Board of Education website <http://boe.hawaii.gov/policies/AdminRules/Pages/AdminRule60.aspx>. Effective implementation of the HAR and IDEA is ensured through the entire GSS as well as through annual assurances regarding policies, procedures, and implementation of IDEA and HAR requirements.

Integrated Monitoring Activities

HIDOE's General Supervision System provides comprehensive monitoring and oversight in the implementation of IDEA requirements, related requirements, and performance on the State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR) at the local level. Hawaii's monitoring system is designed to:

- Determine risk for noncompliance in the areas of fiscal management, IDEA requirements, and performance;
- Identify non-compliance from a variety of sources;
- Ensure correction in a timely manner;
- Verify that data reported reflecting actual practice; and
- Provide technical support and assistance to improve outcomes for students with disabilities.

Multiple data sources are used to monitor special education programs for the continuous examination of performance for compliance and improvement. Annual desk audits and cross-complex area data analysis are conducted through SPP/APR compliance and results indicators. The Monitoring and Compliance Branch (MAC) annually reviews and analyzes each of the indicators to identify areas of improvement and non-compliance. Implementation of IDEA requirements and interventions to improve student performance is monitored using various monitoring tools and activities.

Data on Processes and Results

Child Count data of all students receiving special education and related services is collected electronically through the Electronic Comprehensive Student Support System (eCSSS) on December 1, and software tools are used to search for duplicates, perform error checks, and prepare for data submission to EDFacts. Electronic submissions are provided by the State for Exiting, Discipline, Personnel, Dispute Resolution, and Maintenance of Effort (MOE)/Coordinated Early Intervening Services (CEIS) data. The data are cleaned and prepared for submission to EDFacts or to EMAPS. HIDOE ensures that data is collected and reported in a timely manner that is consistent with the federal requirements.

Improvement and Corrections

If HIDOE issues a finding of noncompliance for a Complex Area (CA), the CA must correct the noncompliance, as soon as possible, but no later than one year from the date of notification. Any findings of noncompliance are issued to the appropriate Complex Area Superintendent. Once informed of noncompliance, CA must correct or resolve all instances of noncompliance, verify the correction process, and provide evidence that subsequent processes will be appropriately implemented in accordance with the OSEP MEMO 09-02 Reporting on Correction of Noncompliance in the Annual Performance Report Required under Sections 616 and 642 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act of 2004. Noncompliance not addressed within one (1) year from identification will result in the Complex Area Superintendent being informed through a formal notification from the Deputy Superintendent for immediate action.

CA identified as non-compliant work collaboratively with MAC and Exceptional Support Branch (ESB) to ensure the correction is completed in a timely manner. During SY 2019-2020, data-driven professional learning communities were established to support the CA and their teams in identifying areas of strengths and in need of improvement, as well as discussions on various strategies and activities for improvement. In addition, each CA is required to write an action plan to address their areas of improvement detailing actions, steps, strategies, staff responsibilities, and how they will utilize their IDEA monies towards improving student outcomes.

Incentives

In appreciation for the hard work and efforts of CAs and schools, a 100% Award for Child Count is provided. The purpose of the award is to recognize the diligence of schools in updating and maintaining accurate special education records in the eCSSS. The amount of money is awarded to each school that has 100% of its students' records current and accurately updated in the Child Count Verification – Frozen as of December 1 of each year report posted in eCSSS. The award amount is based on the number of special education students in each of the qualified schools.

Sanctions

As a means of ensuring a timely correction of noncompliance, MAC has developed a system of progressive sanctions for CAs that do not complete corrective activities within the required timelines. HIDOE has established procedures that communicate how and when sanctions can be imposed and outlines HIDOE's authority to impose these sanctions. CAs identified as non-compliant receive written notification from MAC describing the noncompliance and the requirement to create and implement corrective actions, including due dates for completion, as well as the method for documenting the completion and evidence of these actions.

Components of corrective action plans may include any of the following:

- Review of educational records;
- Student-specific corrective actions;
- Professional development and technical assistance;
- Fiscal records review and implementation or correction of fiscal processes to align with federal requirements; and/or
- Recovery of funds or redirection of funds by HIDOE to address misappropriation of either state or federal funds.

Effective Dispute Resolution System

Several mechanisms are available through HIDOE to assist in resolving disputes:

Mediation: A voluntary dispute resolution process conducted by a trained, independent, mediator who assists the parties in resolving their disputes informally or through a formal mediation agreement enforceable by a court of law.

Impartial Due Process Hearing Request: A formal administrative hearing process conducted by a trained impartial hearing officer who is not an employee of HIDOE to resolve disagreements about the implementation of IDEA.

Resolution Session: This is conducted when an impartial due process hearing request is filed by a parent.

State Written Complaint, a formal written complaint filed by anyone in the public alleging noncompliance of IDEA.

Fiscal and Resource Management

The monitoring of IDEA funds focuses on allowable costs, fixed assets, and payroll certification. ESB utilizes the fiscal review (e.g., allowable costs, fixed assets, and payroll certification) process to focus on how complex areas and schools use their special education funds to improve results for children and youth with disabilities. Project Proposals, various documents, and financial reports are used to monitor the appropriate use of IDEA funds.

Refining of HIDOE's GSS

During SY2019-2020, HIDOE engaged the National Center for System Improvement (NCSI) to refine the components of its GSS to ensure that Hawaii continues to improve educational results and functional outcomes for our students and maintain compliance with requirements under IDEA.

Technical Assistance System

The mechanisms that the State has in place to ensure the timely delivery of high quality, evidenced based technical assistance and support to LEAs.

HIDOE provides ongoing guidance and Technical Assistance (TA) to CAs, schools, and parent communities in the areas of compliance and program improvements. These efforts are supported through cross-office collaboration within HIDOE along with community partners and stakeholders. Targeted assistance and professional learning provided to complex area resource staff and school-level personnel as appropriate. All technical assistance and professional learning opportunities are informed by data and are targeted to address the HIDOE's prioritized special education needs. Universal supports such as professional learning opportunities and collaboration are available to all complex areas. More targeted supports such as goal setting through improvement plans may be required of some complex area when the data shows a need. This level of support may include analysis of root causes, identification and implementation of appropriate evidence-based interventions, and alignment of resources. This support includes strategies such as:

- One-on-one support for Complex Areas in problem-solving challenges,
- Collaboration opportunities across Complex Areas,
- Communities of practice around evidence and best practices,
- Interisland working groups addressing relevant issues such as Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC) in providing updates and receiving feedback on SPP/APR.

Data-Driven Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) with Complex Area Staff

HIDOE is focusing on increasing the performance of compliance indicators by aligning professional development and technical assistance to improve student outcomes. In order to empower Complex Areas and build their capacity in using data to plan and address areas of needs, the MAC and ESB established data-driven PLCs with each individual Complex Area team. The rich discussions of the PLCs, will assist Complex Areas in using high-quality SPP/APR data to identify areas for improvement, study data trends, discuss root causes on low-performance indicators, examine programs, and explore strategies to improve outcomes for students with disabilities.

Guidelines and Handbooks

Guidelines and Handbooks were developed by HIDOE in collaboration with external stakeholders and updated to inform and clarify compliance requirements and/or programs. Each guideline has a plan of action for the distribution and implementation of the information. These documents are soon to be published and available to HIDOE employees via the intranet.

- Secondary Transition (completed November 2020)
- Transportation for Students with Disabilities (soon to be released)
- Po'okela (Special Day Program Center) (soon to be released)
- Public Charter School (completed December 2020)
- Work-Study Programs (soon to be released)
- Deaf and Hard of Hearing (soon to be released)

Brief Informational Documents

In the spring of 2020, one-pagers were created to provide the field with condensed information on statewide programs supported by the Exceptional Support Branch. These one-pagers include a program overview, resources, and contact information. These documents are available to the HIDOE employees via the intranet. The following are a list of one-pagers:

- Assistive Technology Devices and Resources
- Deaf and Hard of Hearing
- Evaluation and Assessments
- Incarcerated Adult Students
- Inclusive Practices
- Occupational Therapy
- Physical Therapy
- Po'okela (Special Day Program Center)
- Post-Secondary Transition Program
- Preschool
- Residential Facilities Programs
- School-Based Related Services
- Speech-Language Pathology
- Visual Disabilities Including Blindness

Memos

Memos function in the same manner as guidelines but target specific topics or situations. Memos are developed to create/clarify procedures and policies. HIDOE keeps a repository of State memos to be accessed as needed.

TA with Complex Areas

District Educational Specialists (DES) are located in each Complex Area throughout the State. The DESs, supervise and support the implementation of IDEA in their respective areas. Beginning April 2, 2020, the Exceptional Support Branch assigned educational specialist teams to each Complex Area to provide weekly support sessions. These ongoing TA sessions provide DESs with the opportunity to communicate and clarify any questions regarding the new information on guidance documents, resources, contracts, funding, and memos as well as troubleshooting on various topics that are unique to each Complex Area.

Monthly Meetings with Public Agencies and Community Stakeholders

HIDOE utilizes the Leading by Convening framework to engage all stakeholders and utilizes these meetings as a part of the TA system. The involved stakeholders are the Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC), Special Parent Information Network, Leadership in Disabilities and Achievement of Hawaii (LDAH), Community Children's Council (CCC), and Hawaii's State Council on Developmental Disabilities (DD Council). The meetings are designed to provide opportunities for sharing information, exchanging ideas, understanding various perspectives, and supporting effective communication.

Data Systems

HIDOE has several data systems in place that assist the state, complexes, districts, schools, and teachers in managing and tracking student data, and ensuring state and federal regulations are being met. The data systems include but are not limited to:

Infinite Campus and PowerSchool:

- Provides student biographical data, attendance, class lists, schoolmaster schedules, grades, enrollment, parent information, student health information, and homelessness;

Electronic Comprehensive Student Support System (eCSSS):

- Provides student information relating to special education, English Language Learners, assessments, disciplinary data, and an early warning system;

Longitudinal Data System (LDS):

- Provides reports and dashboards where teachers and administrators can access data about student academic progress and performance;

Financial Management System (FMS):

- Provides a repository for service verification and budget data;

Special Education Compliance Action Table (SPED CAT) Excel Database:

- Provides a compliance monitoring database for Hawaii's System of general supervision.

Professional Development System

The mechanisms the State has in place to ensure that service providers have the skills to effectively provide services that improve results for students with disabilities.

Quality Professional Development (PD)

HIDOE's design principles of quality PD emphasizes the application of innovative curricular, instructional, and educational designs in the learning environments for students and adults transforms instructional practices and provides evidence for reflection on the impact of student learning. HIDOE provides targeted and sustained PD opportunities to strengthen teacher practice and improve student outcomes. PD is guided by the principles of adult learning theory research on effective professional learning for teachers. With the goal of improving academic and functional outcomes for all students with disabilities, HIDOE's capacity-building efforts include implementation training, guidance documents, tools, and other various resources. HIDOE's PD offerings are guided by Learning Forward's 7 Standards for Professional Learning: learning communities, leadership, resources, data, learning designs, implementation, and outcomes. This is in keeping with HIDOE's three (3) Strategic Plan Goals:

- 1) Student Success;
- 2) Staff Success; and
- 3) Successful Systems of Supports (the building blocks within Complex Areas' academic and IDEA Project Proposals).

Mandatory Special Education Training Modules

Beginning in School Year 2019-2020, the following Special Education Training Modules are mandatory for all special education teachers (e.g., full-time, part-time, and long-term substitutes). Staff throughout each Complex Area were trained using the trainer of trainers model in order to build capacity within each school throughout the State. To alleviate the training responsibilities of the Complex Area personnel and allow them to focus on support related to the impact of COVID-19, these mandatory modules were turned into self-paced courses. A benefit to this method allows HIDOE employees to access, reference, and return the information at their own convenience.

- IEP 101
- Present Levels of Academic and Functional Performance (PLEP)
- Goals and Objectives
- Extended School Year (ESY)
- Prior Written Notice (PWN)

Inclusive Practices

Through this initiative, HIDOE established a clear vision and expectations for inclusive practices. Over the past three school years, the HIDOE in collaboration with Stetson and Associates conducted inclusive practices implementation training and consultation to schools statewide known as Hui Pu Project. The Hui Pu Project has been rolled out in two phases:

- Phase I began in SY 2017-18 to SY 2019-20 and included intensive support provided by Stetson and Associates for 50 targeted schools and their CA partners.
- Phase II, a scale-up effort began in SY 2019-20 and will continue through SY 2020-21 is intended to scale-up practices across all schools in the HIDOE.

Scale-up efforts focus on:

- The current status of tier-one practices in classrooms.
- Strategies for increasing principal and teacher knowledge of and implementation of tier-one practices.
- Assist in creating train-the-trainer modules for tier-one strategies for all learners that Complex Area staff will execute with their respective schools.
- Connect tier-one implementation and modules to the current multi-tiered system of support.
- Training and support to new administrators in the Hawaii Certification for School Leaders programs on the responsibilities of principals for inclusive schools.
- Design a parent(s)/community training module providing an overview of inclusive practices and HIDOE's work for improvement.
- Develop online resources for parent(s)/legal guardians(s).
- Support Complex Area personnel in becoming certified to provide inclusive training to their schools and assisting them with their plans for scaling up and sustaining change.

Oral Language Development for Literacy

In SY 2019-2020, the Exceptional Support Branch (ESB) continued to sponsor PD activities for preschool 619 coordinators/district resource teachers and speech-language pathologist coordinators across the state. The purpose of bringing these two groups together was to foster collaborative learning and delve deeper into the foundational language skills needed to advance literacy (reading and writing) skills. The focus of PD activities was understanding preschool assessments and then using these findings to guide instructional practices and the provision of services. Recognizing challenges with the understanding of the connection between assessment findings and interventions, ESB analyzed data specific to each geographic area pertaining to lack of growth in the acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language communication). Preliminary analysis revealed that the majority of the HIDOE early learners (approximately 90%) have speech, language, and communication issues, which put them at high risk for future academic failure. ESB continues to work with district/complex area leaders to identify needs in their specific geographic areas and develop evidence-based instructional practices that are matched to the needs of their instructional staff and parent(s)/legal guardian(s).

Specially-Designed Reading Instruction for Students with Disabilities (K-3)

ESB provided an ongoing intensive professional learning opportunity for Complex Area and classroom teachers to address foundational literacy instruction. The objectives of the training were to increase participants' understanding and implementation of 1) foundational literacy instruction, 2) specially-designed instruction, and 3) explicit instruction to improve language and literacy outcomes. The training consisted of five workshops spread out over two months coupled with asynchronous supports and classroom applications.

Establishment of Workgroups with DESs

Reviewing OSEP's annual analysis and results of HIDEO's FFY 2018 SSP/APR, the ESB established workgroups with the DESs to support professional growth and systemic improvement. The following workgroups meet on a monthly basis to identify potential and existing barriers, create viable solutions, and create action plans to support the direct improvement of student outcomes.

- Fiscal Management and Accountability
- Evidence-Based Practices (Assessment and Programming) High Incidence Populations
- Evidence-Based Practices (Assessment and Programming) Low Incidence Populations
- Preschool/Early Learners
- Post-Secondary Transition Planning and Supports

Quarterly Transition PD

HIDEO in partnership with the external stakeholders (Department of Human Services (DHS), Division of Vocational Rehabilitation (DVR), Developmental Disabilities Division (DDD), State Council on Developmental Disabilities (DD Council), Center on Disability Studies (CDS), and Self-Advocacy Advisory Council (SAAC)) continues to sponsor a day of PD every quarter in each island to support and assist the development of post-secondary transition plans. The content of the PD is designed to update practitioners: transition teachers/coordinators who plan and assist in the development of postsecondary transition plans for students with disabilities, and State coordinators and counselors who provide services to students with disabilities about designing effective transition plans.

DES Monthly Meetings

The DES meetings are ongoing monthly meetings used as an avenue to disseminate information, provide professional development, build the capacity of Complex Area staff, and discuss special education issues. This learning community time is used to facilitate the dialogue needed to effectively operationalize system procedures. During SY 2019-2020, the ESB focused on parent engagement, transition planning, induction and mentoring special education teachers, legislative updates, planning and management of general and federal funds, inclusive education efforts and vision, COVID-19 updates, and discussion, national guidelines, and special education teacher resources.

Stakeholder Involvement

The mechanism for soliciting broad stakeholder input on targets in the SPP, including revisions to targets.

HIDEO provided internal and external stakeholders with professional learning opportunities to provide input on the implementation of IDEA. The stakeholders included: Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC), Community Children's Councils (CCCs), Leadership in Disabilities & Achievement of Hawaii (LDAH), Special Parent Information Network (SPIN), Hawaii State Council on Developmental Disabilities (DD Council), State offices, Complex Areas, and schools.

FFY 2019 SPP/APR Input and Feedback

HIDEO, the Monitoring and Compliance Branch (MAC) met with SEAC members on December 11, 2020, and January 8, 2021, to share the longitudinal data for each of the indicators and received feedback on possible reasons for slippage as well as strategies for improvement regarding the FFY 2019 data. In addition, MAC engaged the District Educational Specialists in an activity where they provided their input and suggestions for areas of improvement at the complex area and systemic level based on FFY 2019 current and longitudinal data.

Stakeholder Engagement Utilizing Leading by Convening Framework

As one of its core improvement strategies, HIDEO continues to utilize the Leading by Convening Framework (Cashman et al., 2014) to engage internal and external stakeholder groups in improving results for students with disabilities. Stakeholder engagement and involvement through the Leading by Convening framework is designed to provide a safe and productive forum to exchange ideas, share information, and provide constructive criticism.

Infographics for Families and Community Partners

The Leading by Convening framework has allowed SEAC and HIDEO to create a professional learning community where ideas, additional perspectives, support, and advice are provided to co-create infographics to support the implementation of IDEA in Hawaii. The infographics can be found on HIDEO's website at <http://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/TeachingAndLearning/SpecializedPrograms/SpecialEducation/Pages/home.aspx>

SPIN's website at <https://spinhawaii.org/infographics/school-reopening-infographics/>

SEAC's website at <https://seac-hawaii.org/infographics/>

State Advisory Panel – Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC)

SEAC is the State established advisory panel and serves as an advisor to the state-level special education staff regarding the education of all children with disabilities. Membership for SEAC is an appointment by the Superintendent. The membership is representative of the State population and composed of individuals involved in or concerned with the education of children with disabilities. The majority of members shall be individuals with disabilities or parents of children with disabilities (ages birth through 26). The membership includes representatives from the following stakeholder groups:

- Parents of children with disabilities ages birth through 26
- Individuals with disabilities
- Teachers (general and special education) of children with disabilities
- The University of Hawaii and other representatives of other institutions of higher education that prepare special education and related services personnel
- State, district, and school education officials
- Administrators of programs for children with disabilities
- Representatives of other state agencies involved in the financing or delivery of related services to children with disabilities
- Representatives of private schools and public charter schools
- Representative of a vocational, community, or business organization concerned with the provision of transition services to children with disabilities
- Representatives of the State juvenile and adult corrections agencies
- Representative of the Parent Training and Information Center
- Representatives of the community
- Representative of the education office responsible for the coordination of the Education for Homeless Children and Youth Program
- Representative of the state child welfare agency responsible for foster care of children
- Representative of military students and families

Special Parent Information Network (SPIN)

SPIN is co-sponsored by the Disability and Communication Access Board and HIDEO. Services include a phone call line for information and referral support, a quarterly newsletter, an annual conference, and community workshops. The Special Parent Information Network is guided by an advisory committee made up of parents, professionals, and people with disabilities. Additional information can be found on the SPIN webpage at <https://spinhawaii.org/>.

Leadership in Disabilities & Achievement of Hawaii (LDAH)

LDAH is a nonprofit organization working to support and educate parents, families, and professionals to meet the needs of children and youth (ages birth through 26) with any disability. Dedicated to the service of individuals with special needs, LDAH is the Parent Training and Information Center for the State of Hawaii and provides interactive training opportunities, disseminates high-quality educational resources, and offers advocacy assistance at no cost to families. As of 2015, LDAH has developed partnerships with American Samoa, Guam, the Republic of Palau, the Republic of the Marshall Islands, the Federated States of Micronesia, and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands. As a Parent Training and Information Center, LDAH and its partners provide information and referral, mentoring and advocacy, and education and training to parents and family members of children with disabilities and the professionals who serve them. LDAH's goal is to ensure that all children with disabilities receive a proper education. Additional information can be found on the LDAH webpage at <https://ldahawaii.org/>.

Community Children's Councils (CCCs)

CCCs serve children and families including those with disabilities and mental health needs through collaborative partnerships. The CCCs are led by parent and professional co-chairs and include representation from public and private child-serving agencies and other community members such as recreational services, businesses, churches, and others. The CCC office provides technical and administrative support to the seventeen (17) councils, including information gathering and dissemination, logistical assistance for conferences and workshops, training in leadership and facilitation, and providing TA and support. Additional information can be found on the CCCs webpage at <http://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/ParentsAndStudents/SupportForParents/Pages/CCC.aspx>.

Hawaii's State Council on Developmental Disabilities (DD Council)

DD Council engages communities in advocacy, capacity-building, and systemic change activities that are consistent with the policy in the federal law. The DD Council promotes self-determination for individuals with developmental disabilities and their families by contributing to a coordinated and comprehensive service system that is person-centered and family-directed. Additional information can be found on the DD Council webpage at <https://hiddcouncil.org/>.

Apply stakeholder involvement from introduction to all Part B results indicators (y/n)

YES

Reporting to the Public

How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY18 performance of each LEA located in the State on the targets in the SPP/APR as soon as practicable, but no later than 120 days following the State's submission of its FFY 2018 APR, as required by 34 CFR §300.602(b)(1)(i)(A); and a description of where, on its Web site, a complete copy of the State's SPP, including any revision if the State has revised the SPP that it submitted with its FFY 2018 APR in 2020, is available.

The FFY 2018 SPP/APR was posted on the HIDOE website at (<http://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/VisionForSuccess/SchoolDataAndReports/StateReports/Pages/Special-Education-Performance-Report.aspx>) within a week of submission to OSEP of its revised version submitted during the clarification process in April of 2019, which was within the IDEA requirements, no later than 120 days following the submission of HIDOE's APR to OSEP as required by 34 CFR §303.702(b)(1)(i)(A).

Intro - Prior FFY Required Actions

The State's IDEA Part B determination for both 2019 and 2020 is Needs Assistance. In the State's 2020 determination letter, the Department advised the State of available sources of technical assistance, including OSEP-funded technical assistance centers, and required the State to work with appropriate entities. The Department directed the State to determine the results elements and/or compliance indicators, and improvement strategies, on which it will focus its use of available technical assistance, in order to improve its performance.

The State must report, with its FFY 2019 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2021, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance; and (2) the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance.

In the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the State must report FFY 2019 data for the State-identified Measurable Result (SiMR). Additionally, the State must, consistent with its evaluation plan described in Phase II, assess and report on its progress in implementing the SSIP. Specifically, the State must provide: (1) a narrative or graphic representation of the principal activities implemented in Phase III, Year Five; (2) measures and outcomes that were implemented and achieved since the State's last SSIP submission (i.e., April 1, 2020); (3) a summary of the SSIP's coherent improvement strategies, including infrastructure improvement strategies and evidence-based practices that were implemented and progress toward short-term and long-term outcomes that are intended to impact the SiMR; and (4) any supporting data that demonstrates that implementation of these activities is impacting the State's capacity to improve its SiMR data.

Response to actions required in FFY 2018 SPP/APR

TA Sources and Actions:

In the section below, HIDOE has provided the TA assistance sources from which the State received assistance and the action the State took as a result of that technical assistance for SPP/APR for FFY 2019.

Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP)

OSEP provided the following TA:

- Engaged on monthly TA calls with HIDOE's Monitoring and Compliance Branch (MAC) and the Exceptional Support Branch (ESB) to explore the potential barriers that have impacted State's progress toward improving its performance and discuss strategies for improvement.
- Provided HIDOE with a determination letter, results-driven accountability matrix, and a data rubric that assisted HIDOE in prioritizing the required actions/next steps.

As a result, HIDOE:

- Tailored the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) to address key issues shared by the OSEP team.
- Aligned the SSIP with HIDOE's strategic plan and aspects of Consolidated State Plan, as required under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, as amended by the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESEA).

National Center for System Improvement (NCSI)

NCSI provided the following TA:

- Professional development of state staff responsible for the preparation of data and SPP/APR reporting activities.

- Provided opportunities for HIDEOE staff to join and attend the Results-Based Accountability and Supports (RBAS) Collaborative.
- Provided TA, guidance, and support on refining of Hawaii's General Supervision Systems.
- Provided the Special Education Director with access to State Education Agency Leadership (SEAL) collaborative.

As a result, HIDEOE:

- Implemented and submitted a revised FFY 2019 SPP/APR
- Began to draft a tiered General Supervision System that is responsive to CA needs. The MAC/ESB team is drafting a revised system and will be obtaining feedback and input from District Educational Specialists (DES) and community partners.
- Collaborated with community partners on co-creating infographics in several key areas of special education to ensure common messaging and to make resources more accessible to the community
- Drafted changes to the SSIP data discussion and activities implementation as a result of the pandemic impact. More information will be provided in the upcoming indicator 17 (SSIP).
- Special Education Director participated in the SEAL collaborative on a monthly basis to engage in shared learning to deepen capacity in systems coherence and alignment, transformational leadership, and talent management.

IDEA Data Center (IDC)

IDC provided the following TA:

- Suggested revision with detailed suggestions for improvements on SPP/APR and SSIP submissions.
- Collaborated with HIDEOE on the development of a Data Analysis and Use Plan to support HIDEOE teams in gathering, analyzing, and making programmatic decisions based on data.
- Provided support to HIDEOE in modifying the current IEP database to align with the new LRE reporting requirements.
- Sponsored Hawaii State and Complex Area staff to attend the IDC Interactive Institutes 2020.

As a result, HIDEOE:

- Incorporated IDC suggestions in the FFY 2019 APR.
- Implemented the Data Analysis and Use Plan during PLCs with DESs
- Teaching the Data Analysis and Use Plan process to Complex Area teams to use with their schools.
- Modified the current system in the IEP database, sent a memo to the field, and held training for Complex Area teams on how to address the new changes.
- Implemented the new IDEA wizard tool for FFY 2019 SPP/APR data.

Center for IDEA Fiscal Reporting

CIFR provided the following TA:

- To support HIDEOE's planning to meet the maintenance of effort requirements related to supporting students with disabilities during the COVID-10 pandemic.

As a result, HIDEOE:

- Followed guidelines offered by CIFR to meet the maintenance of the state's financial support.

National Technical Assistance Center for Transition (NTACT)

NTACT provided the following TA

- Improvement in the areas of data collection and reporting of indicator 14.

As a result, HIDEOE:

- Utilized the input in the development of the new online dashboard for indicator 14.

National Center for Educational Outcomes (NCEO)

NCEO provided the following TA:

- Assisted HIDEOE in organizing information on student interim assessments to be used in the FFY 2019 SSIP.

As a result, HIDEOE:

- Developed a survey to be used with each Complex Area with respect to what interim assessments they used and how students with disabilities are included.

Early Childhood Technical Assistance Center (ECTA)

ECTA has provided the following TA:

- Provided materials and resources on preschool programs in other states.
- Provided samples from other states for HIDEOE staff to consider in developing new materials.

As a result, HIDEOE:

- Developed preliminary resources to improve practices and outcomes for preschool students with disabilities.
- Used feedback from ECTA in the development of new materials.

Early Childhood Personnel Center (ECPC)

ECPC has provided the following TA:

- Continued to provide coaching and mentoring to develop a coordinated statewide plan to improve personnel systems to support preschool students with disabilities and their families.

As a result, HIDEOE:

- Participated in cross-agency work related to personnel to build more effective systems of services and programs that will improve outcomes for young children with disabilities and families served under Part C and Section 619 and their transition to Part B.
- Several action plans were developed to address evaluation, in-service, personnel, and preservice.

National Association of State Directors of Special Education (NASDSE)

NASDSE offered the following TA:

- National meeting for Special Education Directors, where HIDEOE leadership participated in professional development sessions and collaborated with other state directors and TA providers (NCSI, IDC, etc.).

As a result, HIDEOE:

- Dialogue with other Directors on various programs and practices.
- Gathered information on general supervision systems.
- Learned how other states have responded to the impact of the pandemic.

- Gained access to valuable state and national resources.
- Kept abreast of USDOE OSEP guidance.

Intro - OSEP Response

The State's determinations for both 2019 and 2020 were Needs Assistance. Pursuant to section 616(e)(1) of the IDEA and 34 C.F.R. § 300.604(a), OSEP's June 25, 2020 determination letter informed the State that it must report with its FFY 2019 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2021, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance; and (2) the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance. The State provided the required information.

Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, the State did not provide data for indicator 17. Therefore, OSEP could not determine whether the State met its target.

Intro - Required Actions

Indicator 1: Graduation

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of youth with Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) graduating from high school with a regular high school diploma. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Data Source

Same data as used for reporting to the Department of Education (Department) under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA).

Measurement

States may report data for children with disabilities using either the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate required under the ESEA or an extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rate under the ESEA, if the State has established one.

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, use data from 2018-2019), and compare the results to the target. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Provide a narrative that describes the conditions youth must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma and, if different, the conditions that youth with IEPs must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma. If there is a difference, explain.

Targets should be the same as the annual graduation rate targets for children with disabilities under Title I of the ESEA.

States must continue to report the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate for all students and disaggregated by student subgroups including the children with disabilities subgroup, as required under section 1111(h)(1)(C)(iii)(II) of the ESEA, on State report cards under Title I of the ESEA even if they only report an extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rate for the purpose of SPP/APR reporting.

1 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2011	59.30%

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target >=	84.00%	85.00%	87.00%	88.00%	90.00%
Data	59.31%	60.37%	59.49%	65.29%	64.01%

Targets

FFY	2019
Target >=	83.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

HIDOE provided internal and external stakeholders with professional learning opportunities to provide input on the implementation of IDEA. The stakeholders included: Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC), Community Children's Councils (CCCs), Leadership in Disabilities & Achievement of Hawaii (LDAH), Special Parent Information Network (SPIN), Hawaii State Council on Developmental Disabilities (DD Council), State offices, Complex Areas, and schools.

FFY 2019 SPP/APR Input and Feedback

HIDOE, the Monitoring and Compliance Branch (MAC) met with SEAC members on December 11, 2020, and January 8, 2021, to share the longitudinal data for each of the indicators and received feedback on possible reasons for slippage as well as strategies for improvement regarding the FFY 2019 data. In addition, MAC engaged the District Educational Specialists in an activity where they provided their input and suggestions for areas of improvement at the complex area and systemic level based on FFY 2019 current and longitudinal data.

Stakeholder Engagement Utilizing Leading by Convening Framework

As one of its core improvement strategies, HIDOE continues to utilize the Leading by Convening Framework (Cashman et al., 2014) to engage internal and external stakeholder groups in improving results for students with disabilities. Stakeholder engagement and involvement through the Leading by Convening framework is designed to provide a safe and productive forum to exchange ideas, share information, and provide constructive criticism.

Infographics for Families and Community Partners

The Leading by Convening framework has allowed SEAC and HIDOE to create a professional learning community where ideas, additional perspectives, support, and advice are provided to co-create infographics to support the implementation of IDEA in Hawaii. The infographics can be found on HIDOE's website at <http://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/TeachingAndLearning/SpecializedPrograms/SpecialEducation/Pages/home.aspx>

SPIN's website at <https://spinhawaii.org/infographics/school-reopening-infographics/>

SEAC's website at <https://seac-hawaii.org/infographics/>

State Advisory Panel – Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC)

SEAC is the State established advisory panel and serves as an advisor to the state-level special education staff regarding the education of all children with disabilities. Membership for SEAC is an appointment by the Superintendent. The membership is representative of the State population and composed of individuals involved in or concerned with the education of children with disabilities. The majority of members shall be individuals with disabilities or parents of children with disabilities (ages birth through 26). The membership includes representatives from the following stakeholder

groups:

- Parents of children with disabilities ages birth through 26
- Individuals with disabilities
- Teachers (general and special education) of children with disabilities
- The University of Hawaii and other representatives of other institutions of higher education that prepare special education and related services personnel
- State, district, and school education officials
- Administrators of programs for children with disabilities
- Representatives of other state agencies involved in the financing or delivery of related services to children with disabilities
- Representatives of private schools and public charter schools
- Representative of a vocational, community, or business organization concerned with the provision of transition services to children with disabilities
- Representatives of the State juvenile and adult corrections agencies
- Representative of the Parent Training and Information Center
- Representatives of the community
- Representative of the education office responsible for the coordination of the Education for Homeless Children and Youth Program
- Representative of the state child welfare agency responsible for foster care of children
- Representative of military students and families

Special Parent Information Network (SPIN)

SPIN is co-sponsored by the Disability and Communication Access Board and HIDEO. Services include a phone call line for information and referral support, a quarterly newsletter, an annual conference, and community workshops. The Special Parent Information Network is guided by an advisory committee made up of parents, professionals, and people with disabilities. Additional information can be found on the SPIN webpage at <https://spinhawaii.org/>.

Leadership in Disabilities & Achievement of Hawaii (LDAH)

LDAH is a nonprofit organization working to support and educate parents, families, and professionals to meet the needs of children and youth (ages birth through 26) with any disability. Dedicated to the service of individuals with special needs, LDAH is the Parent Training and Information Center for the State of Hawaii and provides interactive training opportunities, disseminates high-quality educational resources, and offers advocacy assistance at no cost to families. As of 2015, LDAH has developed partnerships with American Samoa, Guam, the Republic of Palau, the Republic of the Marshall Islands, the Federated States of Micronesia, and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands. As a Parent Training and Information Center, LDAH and its partners provide information and referral, mentoring and advocacy, and education and training to parents and family members of children with disabilities and the professionals who serve them. LDAH's goal is to ensure that all children with disabilities receive a proper education. Additional information can be found on the LDAH webpage at <https://ldahawaii.org/>.

Community Children's Councils (CCCs)

CCCs serve children and families including those with disabilities and mental health needs through collaborative partnerships. The CCCs are led by parent and professional co-chairs and include representation from public and private child-serving agencies and other community members such as recreational services, businesses, churches, and others. The CCC office provides technical and administrative support to the seventeen (17) councils, including information gathering and dissemination, logistical assistance for conferences and workshops, training in leadership and facilitation, and providing TA and support. Additional information can be found on the CCCs webpage at <http://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/ParentsAndStudents/SupportForParents/Pages/CCC.aspx>.

Hawaii's State Council on Developmental Disabilities (DD Council)

DD Council engages communities in advocacy, capacity-building, and systemic change activities that are consistent with the policy in the federal law. The DD Council promotes self-determination for individuals with developmental disabilities and their families by contributing to a coordinated and comprehensive service system that is person-centered and family-directed. Additional information can be found on the DD Council webpage at <https://hiddcouncil.org/>.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2018-19 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec FS151; Data group 696)	07/27/2020	Number of youth with IEPs graduating with a regular diploma	875
SY 2018-19 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec FS151; Data group 696)	07/27/2020	Number of youth with IEPs eligible to graduate	1,380
SY 2018-19 Regulatory Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec FS150; Data group 695)	07/27/2020	Regulatory four-year adjusted-cohort graduation rate table	63.41%

FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth with IEPs in the current year's adjusted cohort graduating with a regular diploma	Number of youth with IEPs in the current year's adjusted cohort eligible to graduate	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
875	1,380	64.01%	83.00%	63.41%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

Graduation Conditions

Choose the length of Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate your state is using:

4-year ACGR

Provide a narrative that describes the conditions youth must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma and, if different, the conditions that youth with IEPs must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma. If there is a difference, explain.

In accordance with Board Policy 102-15, High School Graduation Requirements and Commencement, Hawaii has one set of standards for all youth with and without disabilities in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma.

All Hawaii public school graduates will:

- Realize their individual goals and aspirations;
- Possess the attitudes, knowledge, and skills necessary to contribute positively and compete in a global society;
- Exercise the rights and responsibilities of citizenship; and
- Pursue post-secondary education and/or careers.

To receive a regular high school diploma, all youth must meet the following course requirements and standards for a total of 24 credits: English = 4 credits; Social Studies = 4 credits; Mathematics = 3 credits; Science = 3 credits; World Language or Fine Arts or Career & Technical Education/JROTC = 2 credits; Physical Education = 1 credit; Health = 0.5 credits; Personal Transition Plan = 0.5 credit; Electives = 6 credits

For FFY 2019, there were 1380 youth with IEPs in the current year's adjusted cohort eligible to graduate. In the current year's adjusted cohort, 875 youth with IEPs graduated with a regular diploma (63.41%). With 63.41% of youth with IEPs in the adjusted cohort graduating with a regular diploma, Hawaii does not meet the State target of 83.00%. While there was a slight decrease in the graduation rate from FFY 2018 (64.01%) to FFY 2019 (63.41%), this slight change is not considered slippage. HIDOE is committed to increasing the graduation rate for students with disabilities and is working with complex areas and schools to address this slight decrease.

Are the conditions that youth with IEPs must meet to graduate with a regular high school diploma different from the conditions noted above? (yes/no)

NO

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The indicator 1 data is complete, valid, and reliable as the collection of data is "lag" and not affected by the national pandemic of COVID-19 for SY 2019-2020.

1 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

1 - OSEP Response

1 - Required Actions

Indicator 2: Drop Out

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Data Source

OPTION 1:

Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), using the definitions in EDFacts file specification FS009.

OPTION 2:

Use same data source and measurement that the State used to report in its FFY 2010 SPP/APR that was submitted on February 1, 2012.

Measurement

OPTION 1:

States must report a percentage using the number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out in the numerator and the number of all youth with IEPs who left high school (ages 14-21) in the denominator.

OPTION 2:

Use same data source and measurement that the State used to report in its FFY 2010 SPP/APR that was submitted on February 1, 2012.

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

OPTION 1:

Use 618 exiting data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, use data from 2018-2019). Include in the denominator the following exiting categories: (a) graduated with a regular high school diploma; (b) received a certificate; (c) reached maximum age; (d) dropped out; or (e) died.

Do not include in the denominator the number of youths with IEPs who exited special education due to: (a) transferring to regular education; or (b) who moved, but are known to be continuing in an educational program.

OPTION 2:

Use the annual event school dropout rate for students leaving a school in a single year determined in accordance with the National Center for Education Statistic's Common Core of Data.

If the State has made or proposes to make changes to the data source or measurement under Option 2, when compared to the information reported in its FFY 2010 SPP/APR submitted on February 1, 2012, the State should include a justification as to why such changes are warranted.

Options 1 and 2:

Data for this indicator are "lag" data. Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, use data from 2018-2019), and compare the results to the target.

Provide a narrative that describes what counts as dropping out for all youth and, if different, what counts as dropping out for youth with IEPs. If there is a difference, explain.

2 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2015	16.64%

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target <=	5.00%	4.50%	16.64%	14.00%	11.00%
Data	6.59%	16.64%	14.53%	14.89%	16.82%

Targets

FFY	2019
Target <=	11.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

HIDOE provided internal and external stakeholders with professional learning opportunities to provide input on the implementation of IDEA. The stakeholders included: Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC), Community Children's Councils (CCCs), Leadership in Disabilities & Achievement of Hawaii (LDAH), Special Parent Information Network (SPIN), Hawaii State Council on Developmental Disabilities (DD Council), State offices, Complex Areas, and schools.

FFY 2019 SPP/APR Input and Feedback

HIDOE, the Monitoring and Compliance Branch (MAC) met with SEAC members on December 11, 2020, and January 8, 2021, to share the longitudinal data for each of the indicators and received feedback on possible reasons for slippage as well as strategies for improvement regarding the FFY 2019 data. In addition, MAC engaged the District Educational Specialists in an activity where they provided their input and suggestions for areas of improvement at the complex area and systemic level based on FFY 2019 current and longitudinal data.

Stakeholder Engagement Utilizing Leading by Convening Framework

As one of its core improvement strategies, HIDOE continues to utilize the Leading by Convening Framework (Cashman et al., 2014) to engage internal and external stakeholder groups in improving results for students with disabilities. Stakeholder engagement and involvement through the Leading by Convening framework is designed to provide a safe and productive forum to exchange ideas, share information, and provide constructive criticism.

Infographics for Families and Community Partners

The Leading by Convening framework has allowed SEAC and HIDOE to create a professional learning community where ideas, additional perspectives, support, and advice are provided to co-create infographics to support the implementation of IDEA in Hawaii. The infographics can be found on HIDOE's website at <http://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/TeachingAndLearning/SpecializedPrograms/SpecialEducation/Pages/home.aspx>

SPIN's website at <https://spinhawaii.org/infographics/school-reopening-infographics/>

SEAC's website at <https://seac-hawaii.org/infographics/>

State Advisory Panel – Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC)

SEAC is the State established advisory panel and serves as an advisor to the state-level special education staff regarding the education of all children with disabilities. Membership for SEAC is an appointment by the Superintendent. The membership is representative of the State population and composed of individuals involved in or concerned with the education of children with disabilities. The majority of members shall be individuals with disabilities or parents of children with disabilities (ages birth through 26). The membership includes representatives from the following stakeholder groups:

- Parents of children with disabilities ages birth through 26
- Individuals with disabilities
- Teachers (general and special education) of children with disabilities
- The University of Hawaii and other representatives of other institutions of higher education that prepare special education and related services personnel
- State, district, and school education officials
- Administrators of programs for children with disabilities
- Representatives of other state agencies involved in the financing or delivery of related services to children with disabilities
- Representatives of private schools and public charter schools
- Representative of a vocational, community, or business organization concerned with the provision of transition services to children with disabilities
- Representatives of the State juvenile and adult corrections agencies
- Representative of the Parent Training and Information Center
- Representatives of the community
- Representative of the education office responsible for the coordination of the Education for Homeless Children and Youth Program
- Representative of the state child welfare agency responsible for foster care of children
- Representative of military students and families

Special Parent Information Network (SPIN)

SPIN is co-sponsored by the Disability and Communication Access Board and HIDOE. Services include a phone call line for information and referral support, a quarterly newsletter, an annual conference, and community workshops. The Special Parent Information Network is guided by an advisory committee made up of parents, professionals, and people with disabilities. Additional information can be found on the SPIN webpage at <https://spinhawaii.org/>.

Leadership in Disabilities & Achievement of Hawaii (LDAH)

LDAH is a nonprofit organization working to support and educate parents, families, and professionals to meet the needs of children and youth (ages birth through 26) with any disability. Dedicated to the service of individuals with special needs, LDAH is the Parent Training and Information Center for the State of Hawaii and provides interactive training opportunities, disseminates high-quality educational resources, and offers advocacy assistance at no cost to families. As of 2015, LDAH has developed partnerships with American Samoa, Guam, the Republic of Palau, the Republic of the Marshall Islands, the Federated States of Micronesia, and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands. As a Parent Training and Information Center, LDAH and its partners provide information and referral, mentoring and advocacy, and education and training to parents and family members of children with disabilities and the professionals who serve them. LDAH's goal is to ensure that all children with disabilities receive a proper education. Additional information can be found on the LDAH webpage at <https://ldahawaii.org/>.

Community Children's Councils (CCCs)

CCCs serve children and families including those with disabilities and mental health needs through collaborative partnerships. The CCCs are led by parent and professional co-chairs and include representation from public and private child-serving agencies and other community members such as recreational services, businesses, churches, and others. The CCC office provides technical and administrative support to the seventeen (17) councils, including information gathering and dissemination, logistical assistance for conferences and workshops, training in leadership and facilitation, and providing TA and support. Additional information can be found on the CCCs webpage at <http://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/ParentsAndStudents/SupportForParents/Pages/CCC.aspx>.

Hawaii's State Council on Developmental Disabilities (DD Council)

DD Council engages communities in advocacy, capacity-building, and systemic change activities that are consistent with the policy in the federal law. The DD Council promotes self-determination for individuals with developmental disabilities and their families by contributing to a coordinated and comprehensive service system that is person-centered and family-directed. Additional information can be found on the DD Council webpage at <https://hiddcouncil.org/>.

Please indicate the reporting option used on this indicator

Option 1

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2018-19 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/27/2020	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a)	806

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2018-19 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/27/2020	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (b)	106
SY 2018-19 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/27/2020	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (c)	48
SY 2018-19 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/27/2020	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (d)	137
SY 2018-19 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/27/2020	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education as a result of death (e)	10

FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth with IEPs who exited special education due to dropping out	Total number of High School Students with IEPs by Cohort	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
137	1,107	16.82%	11.00%	12.38%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

Provide a narrative that describes what counts as dropping out for all youth

The HIDOE utilizes the statewide Student Information System (SIS) to track student enrollment, transfers, and exits. The dropout definition is the same for youth with and without Individualized Education Programs (IEPs). Students who dropout of school are classified as those who:

- Leave school between the ages of 15-18 years old (or age out) without earning a diploma;
- Withdraw from school to work or attend work readiness programs;
- Enroll in non-HIDOE alternative educational programs;
- Join the Armed Services;
- Are court-ordered to a youth correctional facility;
- Are excluded from school due to zero-tolerance policies (for possession of guns, drugs);
- Are in-flight and the school had no information on whereabouts;
- Has left the state to reside on the mainland (unable to verify);
- Are married and not returning to school;
- Do not return/show up for school as expected; and
- Leave for "other" reasons.

Is there a difference in what counts as dropping out for youth with IEPs? (yes/no)

NO

If yes, explain the difference in what counts as dropping out for youth with IEPs below.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The indicator 2 drop-out data is complete, valid, and reliable as the collection of data is "lag" and not affected by the national pandemic of COVID-19 for SY 2019-2020.

2 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

2 - OSEP Response

2 - Required Actions

Indicator 3B: Participation for Students with IEPs

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments:

- A. Indicator 3A – Reserved
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level and alternate academic achievement standards.

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

Data Source

3B. Same data as used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the ESEA, using EDFacts file specifications FS185 and 188.

Measurement

B. Participation rate percent = [(# of children with IEPs participating in an assessment) divided by the (total # of children with IEPs enrolled during the testing window)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. The participation rate is based on all children with IEPs, including both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

Instructions

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Include information regarding where to find public reports of assessment participation and performance results, as required by 34 CFR §300.160(f), i.e., a link to the Web site where these data are reported.

Indicator 3B: Provide separate reading/language arts and mathematics participation rates, inclusive of all ESEA grades assessed (3-8 and high school), for children with IEPs. Account for ALL children with IEPs, in all grades assessed, including children not participating in assessments and those not enrolled for a full academic year. Only include children with disabilities who had an IEP at the time of testing.

3B - Indicator Data

Reporting Group Selection

Based on previously reported data, these are the grade groups defined for this indicator.

Group	Group Name	Grade 3	Grade 4	Grade 5	Grade 6	Grade 7	Grade 8	Grade 9	Grade 10	Grade 11	Grade 12	HS
A	Overall	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X

Historical Data: Reading

Group	Group Name	Baseline	FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
A	Overall	2005	Target >=	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
A	Overall	96.61%	Actual	93.98%	94.82%	94.80%	95.69%	95.23%

Historical Data: Math

Group	Group Name	Baseline	FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
A	Overall	2005	Target >=	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
A	Overall	96.45%	Actual	93.50%	94.55%	94.76%	95.83%	95.53%

Targets

Subject	Group	Group Name	2019
Reading	A >=	Overall	95.00%
Math	A >=	Overall	95.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

HIDOE provided internal and external stakeholders with professional learning opportunities to provide input on the implementation of IDEA. The stakeholders included: Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC), Community Children's Councils (CCCs), Leadership in Disabilities & Achievement of Hawaii (LDAH), Special Parent Information Network (SPIN), Hawaii State Council on Developmental Disabilities (DD Council), State offices, Complex Areas, and schools.

FFY 2019 SPP/APR Input and Feedback

HIDOE, the Monitoring and Compliance Branch (MAC) met with SEAC members on December 11, 2020, and January 8, 2021, to share the longitudinal data for each of the indicators and received feedback on possible reasons for slippage as well as strategies for improvement regarding the FFY 2019 data. In addition, MAC engaged the District Educational Specialists in an activity where they provided their input and suggestions for areas of improvement at the complex area and systemic level based on FFY 2019 current and longitudinal data.

Stakeholder Engagement Utilizing Leading by Convening Framework

As one of its core improvement strategies, HIDOE continues to utilize the Leading by Convening Framework (Cashman et al., 2014) to engage internal and external stakeholder groups in improving results for students with disabilities. Stakeholder engagement and involvement through the Leading by Convening framework is designed to provide a safe and productive forum to exchange ideas, share information, and provide constructive criticism.

Infographics for Families and Community Partners

The Leading by Convening framework has allowed SEAC and HIDOE to create a professional learning community where ideas, additional perspectives, support, and advice are provided to co-create infographics to support the implementation of IDEA in Hawaii. The infographics can be found on HIDOE's website at <http://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/TeachingAndLearning/SpecializedPrograms/SpecialEducation/Pages/home.aspx> SPIN's website at <https://spinhawaii.org/infographics/school-reopening-infographics/> SEAC's website at <https://seac-hawaii.org/infographics/>

State Advisory Panel – Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC)

SEAC is the State established advisory panel and serves as an advisor to the state-level special education staff regarding the education of all children with disabilities. Membership for SEAC is an appointment by the Superintendent. The membership is representative of the State population and composed of individuals involved in or concerned with the education of children with disabilities. The majority of members shall be individuals with disabilities or parents of children with disabilities (ages birth through 26). The membership includes representatives from the following stakeholder groups:

- Parents of children with disabilities ages birth through 26
- Individuals with disabilities
- Teachers (general and special education) of children with disabilities
- The University of Hawaii and other representatives of other institutions of higher education that prepare special education and related services personnel
- State, district, and school education officials
- Administrators of programs for children with disabilities
- Representatives of other state agencies involved in the financing or delivery of related services to children with disabilities
- Representatives of private schools and public charter schools
- Representative of a vocational, community, or business organization concerned with the provision of transition services to children with disabilities
- Representatives of the State juvenile and adult corrections agencies
- Representative of the Parent Training and Information Center
- Representatives of the community
- Representative of the education office responsible for the coordination of the Education for Homeless Children and Youth Program
- Representative of the state child welfare agency responsible for foster care of children
- Representative of military students and families

Special Parent Information Network (SPIN)

SPIN is co-sponsored by the Disability and Communication Access Board and HIDOE. Services include a phone call line for information and referral support, a quarterly newsletter, an annual conference, and community workshops. The Special Parent Information Network is guided by an advisory committee made up of parents, professionals, and people with disabilities. Additional information can be found on the SPIN webpage at <https://spinhawaii.org/>.

Leadership in Disabilities & Achievement of Hawaii (LDAH)

LDAH is a nonprofit organization working to support and educate parents, families, and professionals to meet the needs of children and youth (ages birth through 26) with any disability. Dedicated to the service of individuals with special needs, LDAH is the Parent Training and Information Center for the State of Hawaii and provides interactive training opportunities, disseminates high-quality educational resources, and offers advocacy assistance at no cost to families. As of 2015, LDAH has developed partnerships with American Samoa, Guam, the Republic of Palau, the Republic of the Marshall Islands, the Federated States of Micronesia, and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands. As a Parent Training and Information Center, LDAH and its partners provide information and referral, mentoring and advocacy, and education and training to parents and family members of children with disabilities and the professionals who serve them. LDAH's goal is to ensure that all children with disabilities receive a proper education. Additional information can be found on the LDAH webpage at <https://ldahawaii.org/>.

Community Children's Councils (CCCs)

CCCs serve children and families including those with disabilities and mental health needs through collaborative partnerships. The CCCs are led by parent and professional co-chairs and include representation from public and private child-serving agencies and other community members such as recreational services, businesses, churches, and others. The CCC office provides technical and administrative support to the seventeen (17) councils, including information gathering and dissemination, logistical assistance for conferences and workshops, training in leadership and facilitation, and providing TA and support. Additional information can be found on the CCCs webpage at <http://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/ParentsAndStudents/SupportForParents/Pages/CCC.aspx>.

Hawaii's State Council on Developmental Disabilities (DD Council)

DD Council engages communities in advocacy, capacity-building, and systemic change activities that are consistent with the policy in the federal law. The DD Council promotes self-determination for individuals with developmental disabilities and their families by contributing to a coordinated and comprehensive service system that is person-centered and family-directed. Additional information can be found on the DD Council webpage at <https://hiddcouncil.org/>.

FFY 2019 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Include the disaggregated data in your final SPP/APR. (yes/no)

NO

Data Source:

SY 2019-20 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS188; Data Group: 589)

Date:

Reading Assessment Participation Data by Grade

Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
a. Children with IEPs											
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations											
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations											
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards											

Data Source:

SY 2019-20 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS185; Data Group: 588)

Date:

Math Assessment Participation Data by Grade

Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
a. Children with IEPs											
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations											
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations											
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards											

FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Overall			95.23%	95.00%		N/A	N/A

FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Overall			95.53%	95.00%		N/A	N/A

Regulatory Information

The SEA, (or, in the case of a district-wide assessment, LEA) must make available to the public, and report to the public with the same frequency and in the same detail as it reports on the assessment of nondisabled children: (1) the number of children with disabilities participating in: (a) regular assessments, and the number of those children who were provided accommodations in order to participate in those assessments; and (b) alternate assessments aligned with alternate achievement standards; and (2) the performance of children with disabilities on regular assessments and on alternate assessments, compared with the achievement of all children, including children with disabilities, on those assessments. [20 U.S.C. 1412 (a)(16)(D); 34 CFR §300.160(f)]

Public Reporting Information

Provide links to the page(s) where you provide public reports of assessment results.

As required by 34 CFR §303.702(b)(1)(i)(A), HIDOE has posted FFY 2018 SPP/APR data at <http://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/VisionForSuccess/SchoolDataAndReports/StateReports/Pages/Special-Education-Performance-Report.aspx>

See also assessment data at <https://adc.hidoe.us/#/participation>

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

No data is available for SY 2019-2020 for indicator 3B. In the spring of 2020, HIDOE applied for and was granted a waiver for SY 2019-2020 for the assessment requirements in section 1111(c)(4) of the Elementary and Secondary Act of 1965 (ESEA), 111(d)(2)(C)-(D) and section 1111(h) due to the COVID-19 pandemic.

3B - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3B - OSEP Response

The State was not required to provide any data for this indicator. Due to the circumstances created by the COVID-19 pandemic, and resulting school closures, the State received a waiver of the assessment requirements in section 1111(b)(2) of the ESEA, and, as a result, does not have any FFY 2019 data for this indicator.

3B - Required Actions

Indicator 3C: Proficiency for Students with IEPs

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments:

- A. Indicator 3A – Reserved
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level and alternate academic achievement standards.

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

Data Source

3C. Same data as used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the ESEA, using EDFacts file specifications FS175 and 178.

Measurement

C. Proficiency rate percent = [(# of children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level and alternate academic achievement standards) divided by the (total # of children with IEPs who received a valid score and for whom a proficiency level was assigned)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. The proficiency rate includes both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

Instructions

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Include information regarding where to find public reports of assessment participation and performance results, as required by 34 CFR §300.160(f), i.e., a link to the Web site where these data are reported.

Indicator 3C: Proficiency calculations in this SPP/APR must result in proficiency rates for reading/language arts and mathematics assessments (combining regular and alternate) for children with IEPs, in all grades assessed (3-8 and high school), including both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year. Only include children with disabilities who had an IEP at the time of testing.

3C - Indicator Data

Reporting Group Selection

Based on previously reported data, these are the grade groups defined for this indicator.

Group	Group Name	Grade 3	Grade 4	Grade 5	Grade 6	Grade 7	Grade 8	Grade 9	Grade 10	Grade 11	Grade 12	HS
A	Overall	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X

Historical Data: Reading

Group	Group Name	Baseline	FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
A	Overall	2014	Target >=	74.00%	48.00%	53.00%	57.00%	61.00%
A	Overall	11.93%	Actual	11.93%	13.30%	14.50%	16.39%	12.54%

Historical Data: Math

Group	Group Name	Baseline	FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
A	Overall	2014	Target >=	64.00%	41.00%	46.00%	51.00%	56.00%
A	Overall	9.94%	Actual	9.94%	10.90%	11.62%	12.09%	10.71%

Targets

Subject	Group	Group Name	2019
Reading	A >=	Overall	61.00%
Math	A >=	Overall	56.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

HIDOE provided internal and external stakeholders with professional learning opportunities to provide input on the implementation of IDEA. The stakeholders included: Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC), Community Children's Councils (CCCs), Leadership in Disabilities & Achievement of Hawaii (LDAH), Special Parent Information Network (SPIN), Hawaii State Council on Developmental Disabilities (DD Council), State offices, Complex Areas, and schools.

FFY 2019 SPP/APR Input and Feedback

HIDOE, the Monitoring and Compliance Branch (MAC) met with SEAC members on December 11, 2020, and January 8, 2021, to share the longitudinal data for each of the indicators and received feedback on possible reasons for slippage as well as strategies for improvement regarding the FFY 2019 data. In addition, MAC engaged the District Educational Specialists in an activity where they provided their input and suggestions for areas of improvement at the complex area and systemic level based on FFY 2019 current and longitudinal data.

Stakeholder Engagement Utilizing Leading by Convening Framework

As one of its core improvement strategies, HIDOE continues to utilize the Leading by Convening Framework (Cashman et al., 2014) to engage internal and external stakeholder groups in improving results for students with disabilities. Stakeholder engagement and involvement through the Leading by

Convening framework is designed to provide a safe and productive forum to exchange ideas, share information, and provide constructive criticism.

Infographics for Families and Community Partners

The Leading by Convening framework has allowed SEAC and HIDOE to create a professional learning community where ideas, additional perspectives, support, and advice are provided to co-create infographics to support the implementation of IDEA in Hawaii. The infographics can be found on HIDOE's website at <http://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/TeachingAndLearning/SpecializedPrograms/SpecialEducation/Pages/home.aspx> SPIN's website at <https://spinhawaii.org/infographics/school-reopening-infographics/> SEAC's website at <https://seac-hawaii.org/infographics/>

State Advisory Panel – Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC)

SEAC is the State established advisory panel and serves as an advisor to the state-level special education staff regarding the education of all children with disabilities. Membership for SEAC is an appointment by the Superintendent. The membership is representative of the State population and composed of individuals involved in or concerned with the education of children with disabilities. The majority of members shall be individuals with disabilities or parents of children with disabilities (ages birth through 26). The membership includes representatives from the following stakeholder groups:

- Parents of children with disabilities ages birth through 26
- Individuals with disabilities
- Teachers (general and special education) of children with disabilities
- The University of Hawaii and other representatives of other institutions of higher education that prepare special education and related services personnel
- State, district, and school education officials
- Administrators of programs for children with disabilities
- Representatives of other state agencies involved in the financing or delivery of related services to children with disabilities
- Representatives of private schools and public charter schools
- Representative of a vocational, community, or business organization concerned with the provision of transition services to children with disabilities
- Representatives of the State juvenile and adult corrections agencies
- Representative of the Parent Training and Information Center
- Representatives of the community
- Representative of the education office responsible for the coordination of the Education for Homeless Children and Youth Program
- Representative of the state child welfare agency responsible for foster care of children
- Representative of military students and families

Special Parent Information Network (SPIN)

SPIN is co-sponsored by the Disability and Communication Access Board and HIDOE. Services include a phone call line for information and referral support, a quarterly newsletter, an annual conference, and community workshops. The Special Parent Information Network is guided by an advisory committee made up of parents, professionals, and people with disabilities. Additional information can be found on the SPIN webpage at <https://spinhawaii.org/>.

Leadership in Disabilities & Achievement of Hawaii (LDAH)

LDAH is a nonprofit organization working to support and educate parents, families, and professionals to meet the needs of children and youth (ages birth through 26) with any disability. Dedicated to the service of individuals with special needs, LDAH is the Parent Training and Information Center for the State of Hawaii and provides interactive training opportunities, disseminates high-quality educational resources, and offers advocacy assistance at no cost to families. As of 2015, LDAH has developed partnerships with American Samoa, Guam, the Republic of Palau, the Republic of the Marshall Islands, the Federated States of Micronesia, and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands. As a Parent Training and Information Center, LDAH and its partners provide information and referral, mentoring and advocacy, and education and training to parents and family members of children with disabilities and the professionals who serve them. LDAH's goal is to ensure that all children with disabilities receive a proper education. Additional information can be found on the LDAH webpage at <https://ldahawaii.org/>.

Community Children's Councils (CCCs)

CCCs serve children and families including those with disabilities and mental health needs through collaborative partnerships. The CCCs are led by parent and professional co-chairs and include representation from public and private child-serving agencies and other community members such as recreational services, businesses, churches, and others. The CCC office provides technical and administrative support to the seventeen (17) councils, including information gathering and dissemination, logistical assistance for conferences and workshops, training in leadership and facilitation, and providing TA and support. Additional information can be found on the CCCs webpage at <http://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/ParentsAndStudents/SupportForParents/Pages/CCC.aspx>.

Hawaii's State Council on Developmental Disabilities (DD Council)

DD Council engages communities in advocacy, capacity-building, and systemic change activities that are consistent with the policy in the federal law. The DD Council promotes self-determination for individuals with developmental disabilities and their families by contributing to a coordinated and comprehensive service system that is person-centered and family-directed. Additional information can be found on the DD Council webpage at <https://hiddcouncil.org/>.

FFY 2019 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Include the disaggregated data in your final SPP/APR. (yes/no)

NO

Data Source:

SY 2019-20 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

Date:

Reading Proficiency Data by Grade

Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned											
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level											
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level											
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient against grade level											

Data Source:

SY 2019-20 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

Date:

Math Proficiency Data by Grade

Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned											
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level											
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level											
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient against grade level											

FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	Number of Children with IEPs Proficient	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Overall			12.54%	61.00%		N/A	N/A

FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	Number of Children with IEPs Proficient	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Overall			10.71%	56.00%		N/A	N/A

Regulatory Information

The SEA, (or, in the case of a district-wide assessment, LEA) must make available to the public, and report to the public with the same frequency and in the same detail as it reports on the assessment of nondisabled children: (1) the number of children with disabilities participating in: (a) regular assessments, and the number of those children who were provided accommodations in order to participate in those assessments; and (b) alternate assessments aligned with alternate achievement standards; and (2) the performance of children with disabilities on regular assessments and on alternate assessments, compared with the achievement of all children, including children with disabilities, on those assessments. [20 U.S.C. 1412 (a)(16)(D); 34 CFR §300.160(f)]

Public Reporting Information

Provide links to the page(s) where you provide public reports of assessment results.

As required by 34 CFR §303.702(b)(1)(i)(A), the FFY 2018 SPP/APR data can be found at <http://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/VisionForSuccess/SchoolDataAndReports/StateReports/Pages/Special-Education-Performance-Report.aspx>

See also assessment data at <https://adc.hidoe.us/#/proficiency>

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

No data is available for SY 2019-2020 for indicator 3C. In the spring of 2020, HIDOE applied for and was granted a waiver for SY 2019-2020 for the assessment requirements in section 1111(c)(4) of the Elementary and Secondary Act of 1965 (ESEA), 111(d)(2)(C)-(D) and section 1111(h) due to the COVID-19 pandemic.

3C - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3C - OSEP Response

The State was not required to provide any data for this indicator. Due to the circumstances created by the COVID-19 pandemic, and resulting school closures, the State received a waiver of the assessment requirements in section 1111(b)(2) of the ESEA, and, as a result, does not have any FFY 2019 data for this indicator.

3C - Required Actions

Indicator 4A: Suspension/Expulsion

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results Indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

A. Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A); 1412(a)(22))

Data Source

State discipline data, including State's analysis of State's Discipline data collected under IDEA Section 618, where applicable. Discrepancy can be computed by either comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to rates for nondisabled children within the LEA or by comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State.

Measurement

Percent = [(# of districts that meet the State-established n size (if applicable) that have a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions for greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs) divided by the (# of districts in the State that meet the State-established n size (if applicable))] times 100.

Include State's definition of "significant discrepancy."

Instructions

If the State has established a minimum n size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met that State-established n size. If the State used a minimum n size requirement, report the number of districts excluded from the calculation as a result of this requirement.

Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, use data from 2018-2019), including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity to determine if significant discrepancies are occurring in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions of children with IEPs, as required at 20 U.S.C. 1412(a)(22). The State's examination must include one of the following comparisons:

- The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State; or
- The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to nondisabled children within the LEAs

In the description, specify which method the State used to determine possible discrepancies and explain what constitutes those discrepancies.

Indicator 4A: Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation (based upon districts that met the minimum n size requirement, if applicable). If significant discrepancies occurred, describe how the State educational agency reviewed and, if appropriate, revised (or required the affected local educational agency to revise) its policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, to ensure that such policies, procedures, and practices comply with applicable requirements.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If discrepancies occurred and the district with discrepancies had policies, procedures or practices that contributed to the significant discrepancy and that do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, describe how the State ensured that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the data for 2018-2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

4A - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	1.00%

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target <=	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Targets

FFY	2019
Target <=	0.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

HIDOE provided internal and external stakeholders with professional learning opportunities to provide input on the implementation of IDEA. The stakeholders included: Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC), Community Children's Councils (CCCs), Leadership in Disabilities & Achievement of Hawaii (LDAH), Special Parent Information Network (SPIN), Hawaii State Council on Developmental Disabilities (DD Council), State offices, Complex Areas, and schools.

FFY 2019 SPP/APR Input and Feedback

HIDOE, the Monitoring and Compliance Branch (MAC) met with SEAC members on December 11, 2020, and January 8, 2021, to share the longitudinal data for each of the indicators and received feedback on possible reasons for slippage as well as strategies for improvement regarding the FFY 2019 data. In addition, MAC engaged the District Educational Specialists in an activity where they provided their input and suggestions for areas of improvement at the complex area and systemic level based on FFY 2019 current and longitudinal data.

Stakeholder Engagement Utilizing Leading by Convening Framework

As one of its core improvement strategies, HIDOE continues to utilize the Leading by Convening Framework (Cashman et al., 2014) to engage internal and external stakeholder groups in improving results for students with disabilities. Stakeholder engagement and involvement through the Leading by Convening framework is designed to provide a safe and productive forum to exchange ideas, share information, and provide constructive criticism.

Infographics for Families and Community Partners

The Leading by Convening framework has allowed SEAC and HIDOE to create a professional learning community where ideas, additional perspectives, support, and advice are provided to co-create infographics to support the implementation of IDEA in Hawaii. The infographics can be found on HIDOE's website at <http://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/TeachingAndLearning/SpecializedPrograms/SpecialEducation/Pages/home.aspx>
SPIN's website at <https://spinhawaii.org/infographics/school-reopening-infographics/>
SEAC's website at <https://seac-hawaii.org/infographics/>

State Advisory Panel – Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC)

SEAC is the State established advisory panel and serves as an advisor to the state-level special education staff regarding the education of all children with disabilities. Membership for SEAC is an appointment by the Superintendent. The membership is representative of the State population and composed of individuals involved in or concerned with the education of children with disabilities. The majority of members shall be individuals with disabilities or parents of children with disabilities (ages birth through 26). The membership includes representatives from the following stakeholder groups:

- Parents of children with disabilities ages birth through 26
- Individuals with disabilities
- Teachers (general and special education) of children with disabilities
- The University of Hawaii and other representatives of other institutions of higher education that prepare special education and related services personnel
- State, district, and school education officials
- Administrators of programs for children with disabilities
- Representatives of other state agencies involved in the financing or delivery of related services to children with disabilities
- Representatives of private schools and public charter schools
- Representative of a vocational, community, or business organization concerned with the provision of transition services to children with disabilities
- Representatives of the State juvenile and adult corrections agencies
- Representative of the Parent Training and Information Center
- Representatives of the community
- Representative of the education office responsible for the coordination of the Education for Homeless Children and Youth Program
- Representative of the state child welfare agency responsible for foster care of children
- Representative of military students and families

Special Parent Information Network (SPIN)

SPIN is co-sponsored by the Disability and Communication Access Board and HIDOE. Services include a phone call line for information and referral support, a quarterly newsletter, an annual conference, and community workshops. The Special Parent Information Network is guided by an advisory committee made up of parents, professionals, and people with disabilities. Additional information can be found on the SPIN webpage at <https://spinhawaii.org/>.

Leadership in Disabilities & Achievement of Hawaii (LDAH)

LDAH is a nonprofit organization working to support and educate parents, families, and professionals to meet the needs of children and youth (ages birth through 26) with any disability. Dedicated to the service of individuals with special needs, LDAH is the Parent Training and Information Center for the State of Hawaii and provides interactive training opportunities, disseminates high-quality educational resources, and offers advocacy assistance at no cost to families. As of 2015, LDAH has developed partnerships with American Samoa, Guam, the Republic of Palau, the Republic of the Marshall Islands, the Federated States of Micronesia, and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands. As a Parent Training and Information Center, LDAH and its partners provide information and referral, mentoring and advocacy, and education and training to parents and family members of children with disabilities and the professionals who serve them. LDAH's goal is to ensure that all children with disabilities receive a proper education. Additional information can be found on the LDAH webpage at <https://ldahawaii.org/>.

Community Children's Councils (CCCs)

CCCs serve children and families including those with disabilities and mental health needs through collaborative partnerships. The CCCs are led by parent and professional co-chairs and include representation from public and private child-serving agencies and other community members such as recreational services, businesses, churches, and others. The CCC office provides technical and administrative support to the seventeen (17) councils, including information gathering and dissemination, logistical assistance for conferences and workshops, training in leadership and facilitation, and providing TA and support. Additional information can be found on the CCCs webpage at <http://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/ParentsAndStudents/SupportForParents/Pages/CCC.aspx>.

Hawaii's State Council on Developmental Disabilities (DD Council)

DD Council engages communities in advocacy, capacity-building, and systemic change activities that are consistent with the policy in the federal law. The DD Council promotes self-determination for individuals with developmental disabilities and their families by contributing to a coordinated and comprehensive service system that is person-centered and family-directed. Additional information can be found on the DD Council webpage at <https://hiddcouncil.org/>.

FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data

Has the state established a minimum n-size requirement? (yes/no)

YES

If yes, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met the State-established n size. Report the number of districts excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement.

0

Number of districts that have a significant discrepancy	Number of Districts that met the State's minimum n-size	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
0	1	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	Met Target	No Slippage

Choose one of the following comparison methodologies to determine whether significant discrepancies are occurring (34 CFR §300.170(a))

The rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs in each LEA compared to the rates for nondisabled children in the same LEA

State's definition of "significant discrepancy" and methodology

The discrepancy is computed by comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) to rates for children without disabilities within the Local Education Agency (LEA)/State Education Agency (SEA). Hawaii is a unitary system, one LEA/SEA.

Data are collected under section 618 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), Report of Children with Disabilities Subject to Disciplinary Removal. Data on the number of unduplicated student suspensions for greater than ten (10) days are analyzed to determine whether there are significant discrepancies in the rates of suspension between children with and without disabilities.

HIDOE uses a rate difference methodology to compare the statewide suspension/expulsion rate for children with disabilities with the suspension/expulsion rate for children without disabilities in the analysis of data. This is one of the OSEP approved comparison methodologies that are used to determine whether significant discrepancies in the rates of long-term suspension and expulsion are occurring between children with and without disabilities [34 CFR §300.170(a)].

The equation for the rate difference is Rate difference = state suspension/expulsion (S/E) rate for children with disabilities minus (-) the state S/E rate for children without disabilities. Therefore, there is one rate difference comparing children with and without disabilities. State definition of significant discrepancy HIDOE defines "significant discrepancy" when the suspension/expulsion rate for children with disabilities is at least three (3) percentage points more than the State's suspension/expulsion rate for all children without disabilities.

In analyzing the FFY 2019 data, HIDOE used the data from EdFacts Report 088 submitted in November 2019 (Children with Disabilities Disciplinary Removals Suspended/Expelled for More than 10 Days) for SY 2018- 2019. No sampling for this indicator was involved.

FFY 2019

Hawaii (rate difference) percentages comparing regular education/special education

Special Education:

175 (Total number of special education students removed for greater than 10 days) divided by 19592 (Total number of special education students) = 0.89%

Actual Target Data for FFY 2019

0% (Results Indicator)

Regular Education:

493 (Total number of regular education students removed for greater than 10 days) divided by 162107 (Total number of regular education students) = 0.30%

Rate Difference

0.89% - 0.30%= 0.59%

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The indicator 4A data is complete, valid, and reliable as the collection of data is "lag" and not affected by the COVID-19 pandemic for SY 2019-2020.

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2019 using 2018-2019 data)

Provide a description of the review of policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

No review of procedures, policies, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards was warranted because the State DID NOT have a significant discrepancy for FFY 2019.

The State DID NOT identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2018

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
0	0	0	0

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2018

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2018 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

4A - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

4A - OSEP Response

4A - Required Actions

Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Compliance Indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

B. Percent of districts that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A); 1412(a)(22))

Data Source

State discipline data, including State's analysis of State's Discipline data collected under IDEA Section 618, where applicable. Discrepancy can be computed by either comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to rates for nondisabled children within the LEA or by comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State.

Measurement

Percent = [(# of districts that meet the State-established n size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards) divided by the (# of districts in the State that meet the State-established n size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups)] times 100.

Include State's definition of "significant discrepancy."

Instructions

If the State has established a minimum n size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met that State-established n size. If the State used a minimum n size requirement, report the number of districts excluded from the calculation as a result of this requirement.

Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, use data from 2018-2019), including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity to determine if significant discrepancies are occurring in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions of children with IEPs, as required at 20 U.S.C. 1412(a)(22). The State's examination must include one of the following comparisons

- The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State; or
- The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to nondisabled children within the LEAs

In the description, specify which method the State used to determine possible discrepancies and explain what constitutes those discrepancies.

Indicator 4B: Provide the following: (a) the number of districts that met the State-established n size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups that have a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and (b) the number of those districts in which policies, procedures or practices contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If discrepancies occurred and the district with discrepancies had policies, procedures or practices that contributed to the significant discrepancy and that do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, describe how the State ensured that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the data for 2018-2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

Targets must be 0% for 4B.

4B - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2009	0.00%

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Targets

FFY	2019
Target	0%

FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data

Has the state established a minimum n-size requirement? (yes/no)

YES

If yes, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met the State-established n size. Report the number of districts excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement.

0

Number of districts that have a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity	Number of those districts that have policies procedure, or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements	Number of Districts that met the State's minimum n-size	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
0	0	1	0.00%	0%	0.00%	Met Target	No Slippage

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?

YES

State's definition of "significant discrepancy" and methodology

Definition of significant discrepancy

HIDOE defines "significant discrepancy" when the suspension/expulsion rate for children with disabilities from any of the seven (7) racial/ethnic categories is at least three (3) percentage points more than the State's suspension/expulsion rate for all children without disabilities. HIDOE used a minimum N-cell size of five (5) children in each race/ethnicity category in order for the data to be included for analysis.

In analyzing the FFY 2019 data, HIDOE used the data from EdFacts Report 088 submitted in November 2019 (Children with Disabilities Disciplinary Removals Suspended/Expelled for More than 10 Days) for the SY 2018- 2019. No sampling for this indicator was involved.

Methodology

For the FFY 2019 State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR), HIDOE used a rate difference methodology to compare the statewide suspension/expulsion rate for children with disabilities in each racial/ethnic category to the statewide suspension/expulsion rate for children without disabilities in the analysis of the SY 2018-2019 data. This is one of the OSEP-approved comparison methodologies that is used to determine whether significant discrepancies in the rates of suspension and expulsion by race/ethnicity are occurring between children with disabilities and children without disabilities [34 CFR §300.170(a)].

Hawaii Rate Difference Percentages by Race/Ethnicity Category for FFY 2019

The rate difference is calculated by the State rate of each race/ethnicity of children with disabilities minus the State rate of each race/ethnicity of children without disabilities.

The state rate for children without disabilities is $(493/162107) * 100 = 0.30\%$.

For significant discrepancy, the rate difference must be at least 3%.

American Indian

- Suspension/Expulsion rate (more than 10 days) for children with disabilities is N/A as the cell size in this category is less than five (5)
- The state rate for children without disabilities is $(493/162107) * 100 = 0.30\%$
- Rate difference is N/A as the cell size in this category is less than five (5)

Asian

- Suspension/Expulsion rate (more than 10 days) for children with disabilities is $(10/3494) * 100 = 0.29\%$
- The state rate for children without disabilities is $(493/162107) * 100 = 0.30\%$
- Rate difference is $0.29 - 0.30 = -0.01\%$

Black

- Suspension/Expulsion rate (more than 10 days) for children with disabilities is N/A as the cell size in this category is less than five (5)
- The state rate for children without disabilities is $(493/162107) * 100 = 0.30\%$
- Rate difference is N/A as the cell size in this category is less than five (5)

Hispanic/Latino

- Suspension/Expulsion rate (more than 10 days) for children with disabilities is $(17/3454) * 100 = 0.49\%$
- The state rate for children without disabilities is $(493/162107) * 100 = 0.30\%$
- Rate difference is $0.49 - 0.30 = 0.19\%$

Multiple Races

- Suspension/Expulsion rate (more than 10 days) for children with disabilities is $(10/2761) * 100 = 0.36\%$
- The state rate for children without disabilities is $(493/162107) * 100 = 0.30\%$
- Rate difference is $0.36 - 0.30 = 0.06\%$

Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander

- Suspension/Expulsion rate (more than 10 days) for children with disabilities is $(115/6914) * 100 = 1.66\%$

- The state rate for children without disabilities is $(493/162107)*100 = 0.30\%$
- Rate difference is $1.66-0.30 = 1.36\%$

White

- Suspension/Expulsion rate (more than 10 days) for children with disabilities is $(21/2531)*100 = 0.83\%$
- The state rate for children without disabilities is $(493/162107)*100 = 0.30\%$
- Rate difference is $0.83-0.30 = 0.53\%$

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The indicator 4B data is complete, valid, and reliable as the collection of data is "lag" and not affected by the COVID-19 pandemic for SY 2019-2020.

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2019 using 2018-2019 data)

Provide a description of the review of policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

No review of procedures, policies, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards were warranted because the State DID NOT have a significant discrepancy for FFY 2019.

The State DID NOT identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2018

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
0	0	0	0

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2018

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2018 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements*

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

4B - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

4B - OSEP Response

4B- Required Actions

Indicator 5: Education Environments (children 6-21)

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Education environments (children 6-21): Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served:

- A. Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day;
- B. Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day; and
- C. In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements.

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

Data Source

Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the IDEA, using the definitions in EDFacts file specification FS002.

Measurement

Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day) divided by the (total # of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.

Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day) divided by the (total # of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.

Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements) divided by the (total # of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.

Instructions

Sampling from the State's 618 data is not allowed.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under section 618 of the IDEA, explain.

5 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Part	Baseline	FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
A	2005	Target >=	39.00%	41.00%	47.00%	52.00%	57.00%
A	23.00%	Data	36.90%	36.83%	37.33%	40.63%	43.86%
B	2005	Target <=	18.00%	17.00%	16.00%	15.00%	14.00%
B	34.00%	Data	20.09%	20.24%	20.40%	18.94%	17.15%
C	2005	Target <=	2.00%	1.50%	1.50%	1.50%	1.50%
C	3.00%	Data	1.08%	1.17%	1.15%	1.11%	1.21%

Targets

FFY	2019
Target A >=	57.00%
Target B <=	14.00%
Target C <=	1.50%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

HIDOE provided internal and external stakeholders with professional learning opportunities to provide input on the implementation of IDEA. The stakeholders included: Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC), Community Children's Councils (CCCs), Leadership in Disabilities & Achievement of Hawaii (LDAH), Special Parent Information Network (SPIN), Hawaii State Council on Developmental Disabilities (DD Council), State offices, Complex Areas, and schools.

FFY 2019 SPP/APR Input and Feedback

HIDOE, the Monitoring and Compliance Branch (MAC) met with SEAC members on December 11, 2020, and January 8, 2021, to share the longitudinal data for each of the indicators and received feedback on possible reasons for slippage as well as strategies for improvement regarding the FFY 2019 data. In addition, MAC engaged the District Educational Specialists in an activity where they provided their input and suggestions for areas of improvement at the complex area and systemic level based on FFY 2019 current and longitudinal data.

Stakeholder Engagement Utilizing Leading by Convening Framework

As one of its core improvement strategies, HIDOE continues to utilize the Leading by Convening Framework (Cashman et al., 2014) to engage internal and external stakeholder groups in improving results for students with disabilities. Stakeholder engagement and involvement through the Leading by Convening framework is designed to provide a safe and productive forum to exchange ideas, share information, and provide constructive criticism.

Infographics for Families and Community Partners

The Leading by Convening framework has allowed SEAC and HIDOE to create a professional learning community where ideas, additional perspectives, support, and advice are provided to co-create infographics to support the implementation of IDEA in Hawaii. The infographics can be found on HIDOE's website at <http://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/TeachingAndLearning/SpecializedPrograms/SpecialEducation/Pages/home.aspx>

SPIN's website at <https://spinhawaii.org/infographics/school-reopening-infographics/>
 SEAC's website at <https://seac-hawaii.org/infographics/>

State Advisory Panel – Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC)

SEAC is the State established advisory panel and serves as an advisor to the state-level special education staff regarding the education of all children with disabilities. Membership for SEAC is an appointment by the Superintendent. The membership is representative of the State population and composed of individuals involved in or concerned with the education of children with disabilities. The majority of members shall be individuals with disabilities or parents of children with disabilities (ages birth through 26). The membership includes representatives from the following stakeholder groups:

- Parents of children with disabilities ages birth through 26
- Individuals with disabilities
- Teachers (general and special education) of children with disabilities
- The University of Hawaii and other representatives of other institutions of higher education that prepare special education and related services personnel
- State, district, and school education officials
- Administrators of programs for children with disabilities
- Representatives of other state agencies involved in the financing or delivery of related services to children with disabilities
- Representatives of private schools and public charter schools
- Representative of a vocational, community, or business organization concerned with the provision of transition services to children with disabilities
- Representatives of the State juvenile and adult corrections agencies
- Representative of the Parent Training and Information Center
- Representatives of the community
- Representative of the education office responsible for the coordination of the Education for Homeless Children and Youth Program
- Representative of the state child welfare agency responsible for foster care of children
- Representative of military students and families

Special Parent Information Network (SPIN)

SPIN is co-sponsored by the Disability and Communication Access Board and HIDEOE. Services include a phone call line for information and referral support, a quarterly newsletter, an annual conference, and community workshops. The Special Parent Information Network is guided by an advisory committee made up of parents, professionals, and people with disabilities. Additional information can be found on the SPIN webpage at <https://spinhawaii.org/>.

Leadership in Disabilities & Achievement of Hawaii (LDAH)

LDAH is a nonprofit organization working to support and educate parents, families, and professionals to meet the needs of children and youth (ages birth through 26) with any disability. Dedicated to the service of individuals with special needs, LDAH is the Parent Training and Information Center for the State of Hawaii and provides interactive training opportunities, disseminates high-quality educational resources, and offers advocacy assistance at no cost to families. As of 2015, LDAH has developed partnerships with American Samoa, Guam, the Republic of Palau, the Republic of the Marshall Islands, the Federated States of Micronesia, and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands. As a Parent Training and Information Center, LDAH and its partners provide information and referral, mentoring and advocacy, and education and training to parents and family members of children with disabilities and the professionals who serve them. LDAH's goal is to ensure that all children with disabilities receive a proper education. Additional information can be found on the LDAH webpage at <https://ldahawaii.org/>.

Community Children's Councils (CCCs)

CCCs serve children and families including those with disabilities and mental health needs through collaborative partnerships. The CCCs are led by parent and professional co-chairs and include representation from public and private child-serving agencies and other community members such as recreational services, businesses, churches, and others. The CCC office provides technical and administrative support to the seventeen (17) councils, including information gathering and dissemination, logistical assistance for conferences and workshops, training in leadership and facilitation, and providing TA and support. Additional information can be found on the CCCs webpage at <http://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/ParentsAndStudents/SupportForParents/Pages/CCC.aspx>.

Hawaii's State Council on Developmental Disabilities (DD Council)

DD Council engages communities in advocacy, capacity-building, and systemic change activities that are consistent with the policy in the federal law. The DD Council promotes self-determination for individuals with developmental disabilities and their families by contributing to a coordinated and comprehensive service system that is person-centered and family-directed. Additional information can be found on the DD Council webpage at <https://hiddcouncil.org/>.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/08/2020	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	17,421
SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/08/2020	A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	8,353
SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/08/2020	B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	2,859

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/08/2020	c1. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in separate schools	117
SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/08/2020	c2. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in residential facilities	25
SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/08/2020	c3. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in homebound/hospital placements	44

Select yes if the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under section 618 of the IDEA.

NO

FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data

Education Environments	Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	8,353	17,421	43.86%	57.00%	47.95%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage
B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	2,859	17,421	17.15%	14.00%	16.41%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage
C. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements [c1+c2+c3]	186	17,421	1.21%	1.50%	1.07%	Met Target	No Slippage

Use a different calculation methodology (yes/no)

NO

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

HIDOE improved its inclusion rate showing an increase of 4.09% from 43.86% in FFY 2018 to 47.95% in FFY 2019.

The indicator 5 data is complete, valid, and reliable as the collection of data was taken from Child Count, December 1, 2019, and not affected by the COVID-19 pandemic for SY 2019-2020.

5 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

5 - OSEP Response

5 - Required Actions

Indicator 6: Preschool Environments

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Preschool environments: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a:

- A. Regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and
- B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.

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

Data Source

Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the IDEA, using the definitions in EDFacts file specification FS089.

Measurement

Percent = [(# of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program) divided by the (total # of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs)] times 100.

Percent = [(# of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility) divided by the (total # of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs)] times 100.

Instructions

Sampling from the State's 618 data is not allowed.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under section 618 of the IDEA, explain.

6 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

Part	Baseline	FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
A	2011	Target >=	33.50%	34.00%	34.50%	35.00%	35.50%
A	33.90%	Data	28.72%	27.58%	27.54%	27.34%	26.93%
B	2011	Target <=	23.60%	23.50%	23.40%	23.30%	23.20%
B	24.20%	Data	28.38%	29.58%	24.53%	27.99%	21.76%

Targets

FFY	2019
Target A >=	35.50%
Target B <=	23.20%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

HIDOE provided internal and external stakeholders with professional learning opportunities to provide input on the implementation of IDEA. The stakeholders included: Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC), Community Children's Councils (CCCs), Leadership in Disabilities & Achievement of Hawaii (LDAH), Special Parent Information Network (SPIN), Hawaii State Council on Developmental Disabilities (DD Council), State offices, Complex Areas, and schools.

FFY 2019 SPP/APR Input and Feedback

HIDOE, the Monitoring and Compliance Branch (MAC) met with SEAC members on December 11, 2020, and January 8, 2021, to share the longitudinal data for each of the indicators and received feedback on possible reasons for slippage as well as strategies for improvement regarding the FFY 2019 data. In addition, MAC engaged the District Educational Specialists in an activity where they provided their input and suggestions for areas of improvement at the complex area and systemic level based on FFY 2019 current and longitudinal data.

Stakeholder Engagement Utilizing Leading by Convening Framework

As one of its core improvement strategies, HIDOE continues to utilize the Leading by Convening Framework (Cashman et al., 2014) to engage internal and external stakeholder groups in improving results for students with disabilities. Stakeholder engagement and involvement through the Leading by Convening framework is designed to provide a safe and productive forum to exchange ideas, share information, and provide constructive criticism.

Infographics for Families and Community Partners

The Leading by Convening framework has allowed SEAC and HIDOE to create a professional learning community where ideas, additional perspectives, support, and advice are provided to co-create infographics to support the implementation of IDEA in Hawaii. The infographics can be found on HIDOE's website at <http://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/TeachingAndLearning/SpecializedPrograms/SpecialEducation/Pages/home.aspx>

SPIN's website at <https://spinhawaii.org/infographics/school-reopening-infographics/>

SEAC's website at <https://seac-hawaii.org/infographics/>

State Advisory Panel – Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC)

SEAC is the State established advisory panel and serves as an advisor to the state-level special education staff regarding the education of all children with disabilities. Membership for SEAC is an appointment by the Superintendent. The membership is representative of the State population and composed of individuals involved in or concerned with the education of children with disabilities. The majority of members shall be individuals with disabilities or parents of children with disabilities (ages birth through 26). The membership includes representatives from the following stakeholder groups:

- Parents of children with disabilities ages birth through 26
- Individuals with disabilities
- Teachers (general and special education) of children with disabilities
- The University of Hawaii and other representatives of other institutions of higher education that prepare special education and related services personnel
- State, district, and school education officials
- Administrators of programs for children with disabilities
- Representatives of other state agencies involved in the financing or delivery of related services to children with disabilities
- Representatives of private schools and public charter schools
- Representative of a vocational, community, or business organization concerned with the provision of transition services to children with disabilities
- Representatives of the State juvenile and adult corrections agencies
- Representative of the Parent Training and Information Center
- Representatives of the community
- Representative of the education office responsible for the coordination of the Education for Homeless Children and Youth Program
- Representative of the state child welfare agency responsible for foster care of children
- Representative of military students and families

Special Parent Information Network (SPIN)

SPIN is co-sponsored by the Disability and Communication Access Board and HIDEOE. Services include a phone call line for information and referral support, a quarterly newsletter, an annual conference, and community workshops. The Special Parent Information Network is guided by an advisory committee made up of parents, professionals, and people with disabilities. Additional information can be found on the SPIN webpage at <https://spinhawaii.org/>.

Leadership in Disabilities & Achievement of Hawaii (LDAH)

LDAH is a nonprofit organization working to support and educate parents, families, and professionals to meet the needs of children and youth (ages birth through 26) with any disability. Dedicated to the service of individuals with special needs, LDAH is the Parent Training and Information Center for the State of Hawaii and provides interactive training opportunities, disseminates high-quality educational resources, and offers advocacy assistance at no cost to families. As of 2015, LDAH has developed partnerships with American Samoa, Guam, the Republic of Palau, the Republic of the Marshall Islands, the Federated States of Micronesia, and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands. As a Parent Training and Information Center, LDAH and its partners provide information and referral, mentoring and advocacy, and education and training to parents and family members of children with disabilities and the professionals who serve them. LDAH's goal is to ensure that all children with disabilities receive a proper education. Additional information can be found on the LDAH webpage at <https://ldahawaii.org/>.

Community Children’s Councils (CCCs)

CCCs serve children and families including those with disabilities and mental health needs through collaborative partnerships. The CCCs are led by parent and professional co-chairs and include representation from public and private child-serving agencies and other community members such as recreational services, businesses, churches, and others. The CCC office provides technical and administrative support to the seventeen (17) councils, including information gathering and dissemination, logistical assistance for conferences and workshops, training in leadership and facilitation, and providing TA and support. Additional information can be found on the CCCs webpage at <http://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/ParentsAndStudents/SupportForParents/Pages/CCC.aspx>.

Hawaii’s State Council on Developmental Disabilities (DD Council)

DD Council engages communities in advocacy, capacity-building, and systemic change activities that are consistent with the policy in the federal law. The DD Council promotes self-determination for individuals with developmental disabilities and their families by contributing to a coordinated and comprehensive service system that is person-centered and family-directed. Additional information can be found on the DD Council webpage at <https://hiddcouncil.org/>.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)	07/08/2020	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	2,704
SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)	07/08/2020	a1. Number of children attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program	769
SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)	07/08/2020	b1. Number of children attending separate special education class	629
SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)	07/08/2020	b2. Number of children attending separate school	13

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)	07/08/2020	b3. Number of children attending residential facility	2

Select yes if the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under section 618 of the IDEA.

NO

FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data

Preschool Environments	Number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
A. A regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program	769	2,704	26.93%	35.50%	28.44%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage
B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility	644	2,704	21.76%	23.20%	23.82%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

Use a different calculation methodology (yes/no)

NO

Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
B	Slippage in SY 2019-2020 may have been impacted due to changes in the enrollment requirements in public preschool programs. Up to SY 2018-2019, public charter schools had the flexibility to include preschool students beginning at age three (3) into their preschool program. In SY 2019-2020 the Preschool Develop Grant, which established preschool classrooms in selected public charter schools ended. Public charter preschools were then absorbed under the Executive Office on Early Learning Public (EOEL) Pre-K Program. With this change, the enrollment requirement was limited to four-year-old children, as specified in the Hawaii Revised Statutes for the EOEL program. With charter school preschool programs transitioning to the EOEL Pre-K Program, there was a closure of four (4) public charter preschool classrooms. In efforts to support early childhood education in the state, in SY 2020-2021, ten (10) additional sites were added to the public pre-k program.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The indicator 6 data is complete, valid, and reliable as the collection of data was taken from Child Count, December 1, 2019, and not affected by the COVID-19 pandemic for SY 2019-2020.

6 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

6 - OSEP Response

6 - Required Actions

Indicator 7: Preschool Outcomes

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved:

- A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);
- B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication and early literacy); and
- C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.

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

Data Source

State selected data source.

Measurement

Outcomes:

- A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);
- B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy); and
- C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.

Progress categories for A, B and C:

- a. Percent of preschool children who did not improve functioning = [(# of preschool children who did not improve functioning) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.
- b. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.
- c. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it = [(# of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.
- d. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.
- e. Percent of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.

Summary Statements for Each of the Three Outcomes:

Summary Statement 1: Of those preschool children who entered the preschool program below age expectations in each Outcome, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.

Measurement for Summary Statement 1: Percent = [(# of preschool children reported in progress category (c) plus # of preschool children reported in category (d)) divided by (# of preschool children reported in progress category (a) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (b) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (c) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (d))] times 100.

Summary Statement 2: The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in each Outcome by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.

Measurement for Summary Statement 2: Percent = [(# of preschool children reported in progress category (d) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (e)) divided by (the total # of preschool children reported in progress categories (a) + (b) + (c) + (d) + (e))] times 100.

Instructions

Sampling of **children for assessment** is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates. (See [General Instructions](#) on page 2 for additional instructions on sampling.)

In the measurement include, in the numerator and denominator, only children who received special education and related services for at least six months during the age span of three through five years.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. States will use the progress categories for each of the three Outcomes to calculate and report the two Summary Statements. States have provided targets for the two Summary Statements for the three Outcomes (six numbers for targets for each FFY).

Report progress data and calculate Summary Statements to compare against the six targets. Provide the actual numbers and percentages for the five reporting categories for each of the three outcomes.

In presenting results, provide the criteria for defining "comparable to same-aged peers." If a State is using the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary (COS), then the criteria for defining "comparable to same-aged peers" has been defined as a child who has been assigned a score of 6 or 7 on the COS.

In addition, list the instruments and procedures used to gather data for this indicator, including if the State is using the ECO COS.

7 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

Part	Baseline	FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
A1	2018	Target >=	91.50%	71.41%	72.00%	73.00%	74.00%
A1	62.01%	Data	95.82%	71.41%	76.70%	63.59%	62.01%
A2	2018	Target >=	52.50%	49.79%	50.00%	51.00%	52.00%

A2	44.28%	Data	55.34%	49.79%	58.74%	47.99%	44.28%
B1	2018	Target >=	91.00%	73.53%	74.00%	75.00%	76.00%
B1	65.56%	Data	96.96%	73.53%	79.89%	67.37%	65.56%
B2	2018	Target >=	54.00%	53.22%	54.00%	55.00%	56.00%
B2	49.53%	Data	56.03%	53.22%	59.21%	53.82%	49.53%
C1	2018	Target >=	92.50%	73.28%	74.00%	75.00%	76.00%
C1	63.90%	Data	97.58%	73.28%	87.18%	93.16%	63.90%
C2	2018	Target >=	65.50%	55.83%	57.00%	58.00%	59.00%
C2	40.11%	Data	62.93%	55.83%	78.74%	91.33%	40.11%

Targets

FFY	2019
Target A1 >=	74.00%
Target A2 >=	52.00%
Target B1 >=	76.00%
Target B2 >=	56.00%
Target C1 >=	76.00%
Target C2 >=	59.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

HIDOE provided internal and external stakeholders with professional learning opportunities to provide input on the implementation of IDEA. The stakeholders included: Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC), Community Children's Councils (CCCs), Leadership in Disabilities & Achievement of Hawaii (LDAH), Special Parent Information Network (SPIN), Hawaii State Council on Developmental Disabilities (DD Council), State offices, Complex Areas, and schools.

FFY 2019 SPP/APR Input and Feedback

HIDOE, the Monitoring and Compliance Branch (MAC) met with SEAC members on December 11, 2020, and January 8, 2021, to share the longitudinal data for each of the indicators and received feedback on possible reasons for slippage as well as strategies for improvement regarding the FFY 2019 data. In addition, MAC engaged the District Educational Specialists in an activity where they provided their input and suggestions for areas of improvement at the complex area and systemic level based on FFY 2019 current and longitudinal data.

Stakeholder Engagement Utilizing Leading by Convening Framework

As one of its core improvement strategies, HIDOE continues to utilize the Leading by Convening Framework (Cashman et al., 2014) to engage internal and external stakeholder groups in improving results for students with disabilities. Stakeholder engagement and involvement through the Leading by Convening framework is designed to provide a safe and productive forum to exchange ideas, share information, and provide constructive criticism.

Infographics for Families and Community Partners

The Leading by Convening framework has allowed SEAC and HIDOE to create a professional learning community where ideas, additional perspectives, support, and advice are provided to co-create infographics to support the implementation of IDEA in Hawaii. The infographics can be found on HIDOE's website at <http://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/TeachingAndLearning/SpecializedPrograms/SpecialEducation/Pages/home.aspx>
 SPIN's website at <https://spinhawaii.org/infographics/school-reopening-infographics/>
 SEAC's website at <https://seac-hawaii.org/infographics/>

State Advisory Panel – Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC)

SEAC is the State established advisory panel and serves as an advisor to the state-level special education staff regarding the education of all children with disabilities. Membership for SEAC is an appointment by the Superintendent. The membership is representative of the State population and composed of individuals involved in or concerned with the education of children with disabilities. The majority of members shall be individuals with disabilities or parents of children with disabilities (ages birth through 26). The membership includes representatives from the following stakeholder groups:

- Parents of children with disabilities ages birth through 26
- Individuals with disabilities
- Teachers (general and special education) of children with disabilities
- The University of Hawaii and other representatives of other institutions of higher education that prepare special education and related services personnel
- State, district, and school education officials
- Administrators of programs for children with disabilities
- Representatives of other state agencies involved in the financing or delivery of related services to children with disabilities
- Representatives of private schools and public charter schools
- Representative of a vocational, community, or business organization concerned with the provision of transition services to children with disabilities
- Representatives of the State juvenile and adult corrections agencies
- Representative of the Parent Training and Information Center
- Representatives of the community
- Representative of the education office responsible for the coordination of the Education for Homeless Children and Youth Program
- Representative of the state child welfare agency responsible for foster care of children

- Representative of military students and families

Special Parent Information Network (SPIN)

SPIN is co-sponsored by the Disability and Communication Access Board and HIDOE. Services include a phone call line for information and referral support, a quarterly newsletter, an annual conference, and community workshops. The Special Parent Information Network is guided by an advisory committee made up of parents, professionals, and people with disabilities. Additional information can be found on the SPIN webpage at <https://spinhawaii.org/>.

Leadership in Disabilities & Achievement of Hawaii (LDAH)

LDAH is a nonprofit organization working to support and educate parents, families, and professionals to meet the needs of children and youth (ages birth through 26) with any disability. Dedicated to the service of individuals with special needs, LDAH is the Parent Training and Information Center for the State of Hawaii and provides interactive training opportunities, disseminates high-quality educational resources, and offers advocacy assistance at no cost to families. As of 2015, LDAH has developed partnerships with American Samoa, Guam, the Republic of Palau, the Republic of the Marshall Islands, the Federated States of Micronesia, and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands. As a Parent Training and Information Center, LDAH and its partners provide information and referral, mentoring and advocacy, and education and training to parents and family members of children with disabilities and the professionals who serve them. LDAH's goal is to ensure that all children with disabilities receive a proper education. Additional information can be found on the LDAH webpage at <https://ldahawaii.org/>.

Community Children's Councils (CCCs)

CCCs serve children and families including those with disabilities and mental health needs through collaborative partnerships. The CCCs are led by parent and professional co-chairs and include representation from public and private child-serving agencies and other community members such as recreational services, businesses, churches, and others. The CCC office provides technical and administrative support to the seventeen (17) councils, including information gathering and dissemination, logistical assistance for conferences and workshops, training in leadership and facilitation, and providing TA and support. Additional information can be found on the CCCs webpage at <http://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/ParentsAndStudents/SupportForParents/Pages/CCC.aspx>.

Hawaii's State Council on Developmental Disabilities (DD Council)

DD Council engages communities in advocacy, capacity-building, and systemic change activities that are consistent with the policy in the federal law. The DD Council promotes self-determination for individuals with developmental disabilities and their families by contributing to a coordinated and comprehensive service system that is person-centered and family-directed. Additional information can be found on the DD Council webpage at <https://hiddcouncil.org/>.

FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data

Number of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs assessed

582

Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)

Outcome A Progress Category	Number of children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	67	11.51%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	92	15.81%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	172	29.55%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	193	33.16%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	58	9.97%

Outcome A	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
A1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)</i>	365	524	62.01%	74.00%	69.66%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage
A2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the	251	582	44.28%	52.00%	43.13%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

Outcome A	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
program. Calculation: $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$							

Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication)

Outcome B Progress Category	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	63	10.82%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	95	16.32%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	162	27.84%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	203	34.88%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	59	10.14%

Outcome B	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
B1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome B, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. Calculation: $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$	365	523	65.56%	76.00%	69.79%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage
B2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. Calculation: $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$	262	582	49.53%	56.00%	45.02%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs

Outcome C Progress Category	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	66	11.34%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	85	14.60%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	204	35.05%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	176	30.24%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	51	8.76%

Outcome C	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
C1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome C, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. Calculation: $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$	380	531	63.90%	76.00%	71.56%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

Outcome C	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
C2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation:</i> $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$	227	582	40.11%	59.00%	39.00%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
A2	To address health and safety protocols related to the COVID-19 pandemic, HIDOE shifted from a face-to-face instructional delivery model to online and paper packet educational opportunities and enrichment activities. This change in instructional delivery likely impacted student performance with preschool students having to adjust to learning at home and via electronic instruction. To facilitate changes to the delivery model and improve student outcomes, technological support was provided to families, teacher professional development activities were conducted, and professional learning communities were established.
B2	To address health and safety protocols related to the COVID-19 pandemic, HIDOE shifted from a face-to-face instructional delivery model to online and paper packet educational opportunities and enrichment activities. This change in instructional delivery likely impacted student performance with preschool students having to adjust to learning at home and via electronic instruction. To facilitate changes to the delivery model and improve student outcomes, technological support was provided to families, teacher professional development activities were conducted, and professional learning communities were established.
C2	To address health and safety protocols related to the COVID-19 pandemic, HIDOE shifted from a face-to-face instructional delivery model to online and paper packet educational opportunities and enrichment activities. This change in instructional delivery likely impacted student performance with preschool students having to adjust to learning at home and via electronic instruction. To facilitate changes to the delivery model and improve student outcomes, technological support was provided to families, teacher professional development activities were conducted, and professional learning communities were established.

Does the State include in the numerator and denominator only children who received special education and related services for at least six months during the age span of three through five years? (yes/no)

YES

Sampling Question	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	NO

Did you use the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary Form (COS) process? (yes/no)

YES

List the instruments and procedures used to gather data for this indicator.

In SY 2015-2016, in efforts to align with the Executive Office of Early Learning (EOEL) Pre-Kindergarten Program, applicable Kindergarten classes, and Head Start Programs, HIDOE adopted GOLD by Teaching Strategies (TS GOLD) and discontinued using the BRIGANCE Diagnostic Inventory of Early Development - II (Brigance II) as the primary data collection tool in the federal reporting of outcomes for preschool children with disabilities.

In Fall 2018, a consensus was reached among large-scale TS GOLD users with OSEP reporting that the process for converting raw scores to scale scores for Outcome 3C was not classifying children into useful categories according to their developmental progress. The specific consensus was that the cut scores in use appeared to be too generous in that too many children were being classified as meeting expectations or exceeding expectations. Based on the consensus noted above, since the methodology for scoring data was changed, the FFY 2018 became the new baseline for indicator 7.

TS GOLD is an online assessment tool, aligned with OSEP preschool outcomes and the Hawaii Early Learning and Development Standards (HELDS), and converts student progress information into the seven (7) point scale on the Child Outcomes Summary Form (COSF). Children with ratings of six (6) or seven (7) are considered to be functioning at a level "comparable to same-aged peers."

Early childhood special education (ECSE) teachers were provided training on the use and collection of student data to generate student outcome ratings in TS GOLD with technical assistance available throughout the year from 619 preschool resource teachers. To obtain outcome scores, student developmental level data is collected by the ECSE teacher within two (2) months of entry as well as prior to exiting the ECSE program.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The indicator 7 data is complete, valid, and reliable as the collection of data and analysis of this indicator was not affected by the COVID-19 pandemic for SY 2019-2020. However, the performance for Outcomes A2, B2, and C2 was impacted by the COVID-19 pandemic.

HIDOE's mission is to build capacity with each Complex Area team to collect, analyze, and use the data to take a deeper dive into root cause analysis to improve student outcomes. In SY 2019-2020, HIDOE established monthly professional learning communities with complex area teams to engage in data-driven discussions to identify areas for improvement, study data trends, discuss root causes on low-performance indicators, examine programs, and explore strategies to improve outcomes for children with disabilities. In reviewing statewide data and in efforts to increase early literacy, HIDOE has identified indicator 7 as a priority area to build children's foundational knowledge of reading and writing skills.

As speech and communication impact a student's ability to develop social relationships (Outcome A) and a means to express their needs appropriately, (Outcome C) HIDOE continues to target oral language development and the integration of literacy. In SY 2019-2020, professional development activities were provided to 619 preschool resource teachers and speech-language pathologists to strengthen foundational language skills. This focus is targeted to improve communication skills, impacting Outcomes A and C, and promote literacy (pre-reading and pre-writing skills) of Outcome B. In addition, to address COVID-19, HIDOE conducted professional development to build teacher capacity with virtual instruction.

Additionally, to increase family engagement in the virtual learning environment, HIDOE developed a device loan program as a result of COVID-19 to provide families with devices and internet access to support their children with accessing learning opportunities. Lastly, the Ohana Help Desk was established to provide self-service and chat support for families for connectivity and other related issues.

7 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

7 - OSEP Response

7 - Required Actions

Indicator 8: Parent involvement

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities.

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

Data Source

State selected data source.

Measurement

Percent = [(# of respondent parents who report schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities) divided by the (total # of respondent parents of children with disabilities)] times 100.

Instructions

Sampling of parents from whom response is requested is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates. (See [General Instructions](#) on page 2 for additional instructions on sampling.)

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

If the State is using a separate data collection methodology for preschool children, the State must provide separate baseline data, targets, and actual target data or discuss the procedures used to combine data from school age and preschool data collection methodologies in a manner that is valid and reliable.

While a survey is not required for this indicator, a State using a survey must submit a copy of any new or revised survey with its SPP/APR.

Report the number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed.

Include the State's analysis of the extent to which the demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services. States should consider categories such as race and ethnicity, age of the student, disability category, and geographic location in the State.

If the analysis shows that the demographics of the parents responding are not representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services in the State, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics. In identifying such strategies, the State should consider factors such as how the State distributed the survey to parents (e.g., by mail, by e-mail, on-line, by telephone, in-person through school personnel), and how responses were collected.

States are encouraged to work in collaboration with their OSEP-funded parent centers in collecting data.

8 - Indicator Data

Question	Yes / No
Do you use a separate data collection methodology for preschool children?	NO

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

HIDOE provided internal and external stakeholders with professional learning opportunities to provide input on the implementation of IDEA. The stakeholders included: Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC), Community Children's Councils (CCCs), Leadership in Disabilities & Achievement of Hawaii (LDAH), Special Parent Information Network (SPIN), Hawaii State Council on Developmental Disabilities (DD Council), State offices, Complex Areas, and schools.

FFY 2019 SPP/APR Input and Feedback

HIDOE, the Monitoring and Compliance Branch (MAC) met with SEAC members on December 11, 2020, and January 8, 2021, to share the longitudinal data for each of the indicators and received feedback on possible reasons for slippage as well as strategies for improvement regarding the FFY 2019 data. In addition, MAC engaged the District Educational Specialists in an activity where they provided their input and suggestions for areas of improvement at the complex area and systemic level based on FFY 2019 current and longitudinal data.

Stakeholder Engagement Utilizing Leading by Convening Framework

As one of its core improvement strategies, HIDOE continues to utilize the Leading by Convening Framework (Cashman et al., 2014) to engage internal and external stakeholder groups in improving results for students with disabilities. Stakeholder engagement and involvement through the Leading by Convening framework is designed to provide a safe and productive forum to exchange ideas, share information, and provide constructive criticism.

Infographics for Families and Community Partners

The Leading by Convening framework has allowed SEAC and HIDOE to create a professional learning community where ideas, additional perspectives, support, and advice are provided to co-create infographics to support the implementation of IDEA in Hawaii. The infographics can be found on HIDOE's website at <http://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/TeachingAndLearning/SpecializedPrograms/SpecialEducation/Pages/home.aspx>

SPIN's website at <https://spinhawaii.org/infographics/school-reopening-infographics/>

SEAC's website at <https://seac-hawaii.org/infographics/>

State Advisory Panel – Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC)

SEAC is the State established advisory panel and serves as an advisor to the state-level special education staff regarding the education of all children with disabilities. Membership for SEAC is an appointment by the Superintendent. The membership is representative of the State population and composed of individuals involved in or concerned with the education of children with disabilities. The majority of members shall be individuals with disabilities or parents of children with disabilities (ages birth through 26). The membership includes representatives from the following stakeholder groups:

- Parents of children with disabilities ages birth through 26
- Individuals with disabilities
- Teachers (general and special education) of children with disabilities
- The University of Hawaii and other representatives of other institutions of higher education that prepare special education and related services personnel
- State, district, and school education officials

- Administrators of programs for children with disabilities
- Representatives of other state agencies involved in the financing or delivery of related services to children with disabilities
- Representatives of private schools and public charter schools
- Representative of a vocational, community, or business organization concerned with the provision of transition services to children with disabilities
- Representatives of the State juvenile and adult corrections agencies
- Representative of the Parent Training and Information Center
- Representatives of the community
- Representative of the education office responsible for the coordination of the Education for Homeless Children and Youth Program
- Representative of the state child welfare agency responsible for foster care of children
- Representative of military students and families

Special Parent Information Network (SPIN)

SPIN is co-sponsored by the Disability and Communication Access Board and HIDEOE. Services include a phone call line for information and referral support, a quarterly newsletter, an annual conference, and community workshops. The Special Parent Information Network is guided by an advisory committee made up of parents, professionals, and people with disabilities. Additional information can be found on the SPIN webpage at <https://spinhawaii.org/>.

Leadership in Disabilities & Achievement of Hawaii (LDAH)

LDAH is a nonprofit organization working to support and educate parents, families, and professionals to meet the needs of children and youth (ages birth through 26) with any disability. Dedicated to the service of individuals with special needs, LDAH is the Parent Training and Information Center for the State of Hawaii and provides interactive training opportunities, disseminates high-quality educational resources, and offers advocacy assistance at no cost to families. As of 2015, LDAH has developed partnerships with American Samoa, Guam, the Republic of Palau, the Republic of the Marshall Islands, the Federated States of Micronesia, and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands. As a Parent Training and Information Center, LDAH and its partners provide information and referral, mentoring and advocacy, and education and training to parents and family members of children with disabilities and the professionals who serve them. LDAH's goal is to ensure that all children with disabilities receive a proper education. Additional information can be found on the LDAH webpage at <https://ldahawaii.org/>.

Community Children's Councils (CCCs)

CCCs serve children and families including those with disabilities and mental health needs through collaborative partnerships. The CCCs are led by parent and professional co-chairs and include representation from public and private child-serving agencies and other community members such as recreational services, businesses, churches, and others. The CCC office provides technical and administrative support to the seventeen (17) councils, including information gathering and dissemination, logistical assistance for conferences and workshops, training in leadership and facilitation, and providing TA and support. Additional information can be found on the CCCs webpage at <http://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/ParentsAndStudents/SupportForParents/Pages/CCC.aspx>.

Hawaii's State Council on Developmental Disabilities (DD Council)

DD Council engages communities in advocacy, capacity-building, and systemic change activities that are consistent with the policy in the federal law. The DD Council promotes self-determination for individuals with developmental disabilities and their families by contributing to a coordinated and comprehensive service system that is person-centered and family-directed. Additional information can be found on the DD Council webpage at <https://hiddcouncil.org/>.

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	34.00%

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target >=	53.00%	53.00%	53.00%	54.00%	54.00%
Data	53.53%	54.33%	56.55%	54.88%	57.42%

Targets

FFY	2019
Target >=	60.00%

FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data

Number of respondent parents who report schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities	Total number of respondent parents of children with disabilities	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
415	713	57.42%	60.00%	58.20%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

The number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed.

21,884

Percentage of respondent parents

3.26%

Since the State did not report preschool children separately, discuss the procedures used to combine data from school age and preschool surveys in a manner that is valid and reliable.

HIDOE uses a parent survey consisting of a 25-item rating scale, the Schools' Efforts to Partner with Parents Scale (SEPPS), developed and validated by the National Center for Special Education and Accountability Monitoring (NCSEAM). Parents, of children (ages 3-21) receiving special education services, were provided a survey through the child's school after the annual IEP meeting. Surveys were collected from August 1, 2019, through June 30, 2020. A total of 21,884 surveys were sent to parents. Overall, 713 completed surveys were returned for a return rate of 3.3% (713/21,884). All returned surveys provided valid responses. The number of returned surveys exceeds the minimum number required for an adequate confidence level based on established survey sample guidelines (e.g., <https://www.surveysystem.com/sscalc.htm>). Cover letters and postage-paid business reply envelopes were included with the surveys. To protect student confidentiality, no child information was tied to the identifiers. Demographic information used in the analyses was taken strictly from responses provided by parents in the last five survey items # 26-30.

In efforts to increase the response rate, HIDOE developed an online survey where parents can respond from any device. In addition, a handout was developed for schools and parents with frequently asked questions. The survey and the handout can be found on the HIDOE website under Parent Involvement Survey: <http://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/TeachingAndLearning/SpecializedPrograms/SpecialEducation/Pages/home.aspx>

In addition, to reach out to parents/families of representative cultures and languages in Hawaii, HIDOE translated the survey into 16 common languages spoken in Hawaii to encourage parents of other cultures and languages to complete the survey. The survey translated into 16 languages is posted on the HIDOE website and at <http://www.hiparentsurvey.com/>

Sampling Question	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	NO

Survey Question	Yes / No
Was a survey used?	YES
If yes, is it a new or revised survey?	NO
The demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services.	YES

Include the State's analyses of the extent to which the demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services.

The Schools' Efforts to Partner with Parents Scale (SEPPS) was developed by the National Center for Special Education Accountability Monitoring (NCSEAM) to provide states with a valid and reliable instrument for measuring the extent to which parents perceive that schools facilitate their involvement.

Data from the rating scales were analyzed through the Rasch measurement framework. The analysis produces a measure for each survey respondent on a scale from 0 to 1,000. Each measure reflects the extent to which the parent indicated that schools facilitated the parent's involvement. The measures of all respondents were averaged to yield a mean measure reflecting the overall performance of the state of Hawaii in regards to schools' facilitation of parent involvement. The percent of parents who report that schools facilitated their involvement was calculated as the percent of parents with a measure of 600 or above on the SEPPS.

Hawaii's mean measure on the SEPPS is 635, with a standard deviation of 163. The standard error of the sample mean is 6.1. The 95% confidence interval for the sample mean is 623.5 – 647.5. This means that there is a 95% likelihood that the true value of the state mean is within the range. The data was also weighed and analyzed by race/ethnicity and primary disability. The weighted data had a mean measure of 635 when weighted by race/ethnicity and primary disability, respectively. The obtained sampled mean value of SEPPS may become a biased estimate of the true population mean if the sample used to compute the mean is not representative of the population as a whole with respect to key demographic variables. For example, if the distribution of race/ethnicity in the sample is not representative of that in the population as a whole, the resulting sample mean may not be representative of the overall population mean. As a result of this effect, it is often of interest to obtain a sample mean that weighs the contribution of each relevant demographic group (e.g., racial/ethnic group) according to the weight attributed to that group in the population. Such a mean is called a weighted mean. To obtain a mean value of SEPPS measures that is weighted with respect to the race/ethnicity of the population, the following procedures are followed. First, the mean SEPPS measure of each race/ethnicity category (i.e., White, Black/African – American, etc.) is obtained for the sample. Then the sample mean for each race/ethnicity category is multiplied by the proportion of the population classified as the particular race/ethnicity category. Finally, the category level products (sample mean for the category multiplied by population for the category) are summed to yield the final weighted mean. A similar procedure would be used to obtain a weighted percentage meeting the criterion of 600 with the exception that the sample mean for each race/ethnicity category would be replaced by the sample percentage meeting the criterion of 600 for each race/ethnicity category. Similarly, a mean that was weighted by primary disability would follow analogous procedures with the exception that the categories would correspond to primary disability rather than race.

The percent of parents who reported that schools facilitated parent involvement, calculated as the percentage of respondents with a SEPPS measure at or above the adopted standard of 600, is 58.20% (unweighted). The standard error of the sample percentage is 1.8%. The 95% confidence interval for the sample percentage is 54.5% – 61.8%. This means that there is a 95% likelihood that the true value of the state percentage is between 54.5% – 61.8%. When weighted by race/ethnicity and primary disability, the percent meeting the standard is also 58.20%, but with a 95% confidence interval of 54.3% – 61.6% and 54.2% – 61.5%, respectively.

Descriptively, a parent with a measure at or above 600 would have a very high likelihood (95% or greater) of having agreed with the item that calibrates at 600. In other words, a parent with a measure of 600 would typically have expressed strong or very strong agreement with all the items having calibrations at or below 600, and would have expressed simple agreement with items having higher calibrations. Fifty-eight percent of parents of students with disabilities in Hawaii had measures high enough to support the claim that schools facilitated parent involvement at the level deemed desirable and appropriate by the HIDOE.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The indicator 8 data is complete, valid, and reliable. However, the return rate of surveys was impacted by the COVID-19 pandemic.

The survey return rate of 3.3% in FFY 2019 shows a decrease of 2.5% from the 5.8% survey return rate in FFY 2018. This decline in responses is likely a result of the reduction of in-person parent/teacher interactions and in-person special education meetings due to the national pandemic of COVID-19. In efforts to promote the distribution and increase the survey response rate, HIDOE developed an online parent survey and handout for release in SY 2020-2021.

The survey and the handout can be found on the HIDOE website under Parent Involvement Survey:

<http://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/TeachingAndLearning/SpecializedPrograms/SpecialEducation/Pages/home.aspx>

In addition, HIDOE translated the survey into 16 common languages spoken in Hawaii to encourage parents of other cultures and languages to complete the survey. The survey translated into 16 languages is posted on the HIDOE website and at <http://www.hiparentsurvey.com/>

8 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

8 - OSEP Response

8 - Required Actions

Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representation

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality

Compliance indicator: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification.

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

Data Source

State's analysis, based on State's Child Count data collected under IDEA section 618, to determine if the disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification.

Measurement

Percent = [(# of districts, that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups, with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification) divided by the (# of districts in the State that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups)] times 100.

Include State's definition of "disproportionate representation." Please specify in your definition: 1) the calculation method(s) being used (i.e., risk ratio, weighted risk ratio, e-formula, etc.); and 2) the threshold at which disproportionate representation is identified. Also include, as appropriate, 3) the number of years of data used in the calculation; and 4) any minimum cell and/or n-sizes (i.e., risk numerator and/or risk denominator).

Based on its review of the 618 data for FFY 2018, describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification as required by 34 CFR §§300.600(d)(3) and 300.602(a), e.g., using monitoring data; reviewing policies, practices and procedures, etc. In determining disproportionate representation, analyze data, for each district, for all racial and ethnic groups in the district, or all racial and ethnic groups in the district that meet a minimum n and/or cell size set by the State. Report on the percent of districts in which disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services is the result of inappropriate identification, even if the determination of inappropriate identification was made after the end of the FFY 2019 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2020).

Instructions

Provide racial/ethnic disproportionality data for all children aged 6 through 21 served under IDEA, aggregated across all disability categories.

States are not required to report on underrepresentation.

If the State has established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met that State-established n and/or cell size. If the State used a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, report the number of districts totally excluded from the calculation as a result of this requirement because the district did not meet the minimum n and/or cell size for any racial/ethnic group.

Consider using multiple methods in calculating disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups to reduce the risk of overlooking potential problems. Describe the method(s) used to calculate disproportionate representation.

Provide the number of districts that met the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services and the number of those districts identified with disproportionate representation that is the result of inappropriate identification.

Targets must be 0%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken. If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2018), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

9 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	0.00%

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Targets

FFY	2019
Target	0%

FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data

Has the state established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement? (yes/no)

YES

If yes, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met the State-established n and/or cell size. Report the number of districts excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement.

0

Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services	Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	Number of Districts that met the State's minimum n-size	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
1	0	1	0.00%	0%	0.00%	Met Target	No Slippage

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?

YES

Define "disproportionate representation." Please specify in your definition: 1) the calculation method(s) being used (i.e., risk ratio, weighted risk ratio, e-formula, etc.); and 2) the threshold at which disproportionate representation is identified. Also include, as appropriate, 3) the number of years of data used in the calculation; and 4) any minimum cell and/or n-sizes (i.e., risk numerator and/or risk denominator).

Measurement:

Percent = [(# of districts, that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups, with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification) divided by the (# of districts in the State that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups)] times 100.

$(0 \text{ districts}/1) \times 100\% = 0\%$

State Definition of Disproportionate Representation (Tier I):

Any group whose risk ratio falls outside a 99% confidence interval for its respective disability and group size signifies disproportionate representation.

State Description of Disproportionality Determination (Tier II):

For over-identification, the state analyzes the identification practices from a representative sampling of students in the racial or ethnic group that is disproportionately over identified by conducting a file review for each student.

HIDOE Methodology:

The first tier is a statistical analysis of disproportionate representation based on racial and ethnic groups. In the statistical analysis of disproportionate representation, risk ratios are calculated based on the racial/ethnic group category concerning all racial and ethnic groups in Hawaii. The risk ratios are then compared to their respective confidence interval based on racial/ethnic group and group size.

For the second tier, HIDOE applies the Analysis of Identified Procedures and Practices (AIPP) to a sample of student files from the groups that were identified with disproportionate representation on Tier I to determine whether the disproportionate representation was the result of inappropriate identification. When disproportionate identification is the result of inappropriate identification, and noncompliance is identified, it is addressed under HIDOE's general supervision process consistent with OSEP's Memo 09-02, Reporting on correction of Noncompliance in the Annual Performance Report Required under Sections 616 and 642 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act.

N-size: A group of students, based on the expected state average rate of a disability for that group, needs to be 10 or more. When expected numbers based on state average for a group is less than 10, the analysis of risk ratios is inappropriate, as variations of one or two cases would cause the risk ratios to fluctuate excessively.

HIDOE Process for Identifying Disproportionality

HIDOE's process for identifying disproportionality involves a two-tier method of analysis applied to 618 data, as reported to U.S. Department of Education (USDOE), Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) on the Report of Children with Disabilities Receiving Special Education under Part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (Child Count) consistent with 34 CFR §300.173. This process of analysis helps to identify disproportionate representation that may be the result of inappropriate identification.

Beginning with School Year (SY) 2010-11, HIDOE disaggregated race/ethnicity data into the seven (7) identified federal ethnic groups: 1) Hispanic/Latino of any race; and for individuals who are non-Hispanic/Latino only; 2) American Indian or Alaska Native; 3) Asian; 4) Black or African American; 5) Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander; 6) White and 7) Two (2) or more races. In SY 2012-13, HIDOE collected three (3) years of data with the seven (7) identified federal ethnic groups, allowing for three (3) years of data that are needed to recalculate the confidence intervals HIDOE uses for Tier I analysis of Disproportionate Representation.

The HIDOE Tier I uses statistical analysis of disproportionate representation based on racial/ethnic group by disability category. Risk ratios are calculated based on each racial/ethnic group in special education concerning the aggregate of the remaining racial/ethnic groups in Hawaii. The risk ratios are then compared to their respective confidence interval based on group size.

The HIDOE Tier II consists of a two (2) part analysis, a review relating to over-identification. From the racial/ethnic groups identified in Tier I, a representative sample of student files are reviewed utilizing the Analysis of Identified Procedures and Practices (AIPP) to determine if students were appropriately identified by 34 CFR §300.173, 300.111, and 300.301 through 300.311. Policies, practices, and procedures are reviewed, as necessary, with identified noncompliance related to inappropriate practices addressed under HIDOE's general supervision process.

Describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification.

State Description of Disproportionality Determination (Tier II):

The state analyzes the identification practices from a representative sampling of students in the racial or ethnic group that is disproportionately over identified by conducting a file review for each student in the sample.

For FFY 2019, HIDOE used a sample size determined by a 95% confidence interval with a tolerated margin of error of 10% for each group identified as having disproportionate representation in the Tier II analysis. In the case for indicator 9, there were two groups over-identified (Hispanic or Latino (HI)) and Native Hawaiian and other Pacific Islander (PI)), with 714 students in the HI group and 684 students in the PI group (students identified in SY 2019-20), and the resulting sample sizes were of 85 (HI) and 84 (PI) students respectively.

All students in the analysis samples for indicator 9 were identified randomly and made available for the review team. Each file for all these students in the analysis sample was reviewed utilizing the Analysis of Identified Procedures and Practices (AIPP) to determine whether each student was appropriately identified based on 34 CFR §300.173, 300.111, and 300.301 through 300.311. None of these files indicated inappropriate identification of students with disabilities in the indicator 9 groups reviewed.

Should a student record indicate inappropriate identification, then policies, practices, and procedures would be reviewed, as necessary, with identified noncompliance related to inappropriate practices addressed under HIDOE's general supervision process. When disproportionate identification is the result of inappropriate identification, and noncompliance is identified, it is addressed under HIDOE's general supervision process consistent with OSEP's Memo 09-02, Reporting on correction of Noncompliance in the Annual Performance Report Required under Sections 616 and 642 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The indicator 9 data is complete, valid, and reliable as the collection of data and analysis for Tier I and II were not affected by the COVID-19 pandemic for SY 2019-2020.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2018

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
0	0	0	0

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2018

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2018 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

9 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

9 - OSEP Response

9 - Required Actions

Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representation in Specific Disability Categories

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality

Compliance indicator: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.

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

Data Source

State's analysis, based on State's Child Count data collected under IDEA section 618, to determine if the disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification.

Measurement

Percent = [(# of districts, that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups, with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification) divided by the (# of districts in the State that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups)] times 100.

Include State's definition of "disproportionate representation." Please specify in your definition: 1) the calculation method(s) being used (i.e., risk ratio, weighted risk ratio, e-formula, etc.); and 2) the threshold at which disproportionate representation is identified. Also include, as appropriate, 3) the number of years of data used in the calculation; and 4) any minimum cell and/or n-sizes (i.e., risk numerator and/or risk denominator).

Based on its review of the 618 data for FFY 2019, describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification as required by 34 CFR §§300.600(d)(3) and 300.602(a), e.g., using monitoring data; reviewing policies, practices and procedures, etc. In determining disproportionate representation, analyze data, for each district, for all racial and ethnic groups in the district, or all racial and ethnic groups in the district that meet a minimum n and/or cell size set by the State. Report on the percent of districts in which disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services is the result of inappropriate identification, even if the determination of inappropriate identification was made after the end of the FFY 2019 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2020).

Instructions

Provide racial/ethnic disproportionality data for all children aged 6 through 21 served under IDEA, aggregated across all disability categories.

States are not required to report on underrepresentation.

If the State has established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met that State-established n and/or cell size. If the State used a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, report the number of districts totally excluded from the calculation as a result of this requirement because the district did not meet the minimum n and/or cell size for any racial/ethnic group.

Consider using multiple methods in calculating disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups to reduce the risk of overlooking potential problems. Describe the method(s) used to calculate disproportionate representation.

Provide the number of districts that met the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services and the number of those districts identified with disproportionate representation that is the result of inappropriate identification.

Targets must be 0%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2018), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

10 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	0.00%

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Targets

FFY	2019
Target	0%

FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data

Has the state established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement? (yes/no)

YES

If yes, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met the State-established n and/or cell size. Report the number of districts excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement.

0

Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories	Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	Number of Districts that met the State's minimum n-size	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
1	0	1	0.00%	0%	0.00%	Met Target	No Slippage

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?

YES

Define “disproportionate representation.” Please specify in your definition: 1) the calculation method(s) being used (i.e., risk ratio, weighted risk ratio, e-formula, etc.); and 2) the threshold at which disproportionate representation is identified. Also include, as appropriate, 3) the number of years of data used in the calculation; and 4) any minimum cell and/or n-sizes (i.e., risk numerator and/or risk denominator).

Measurement:

Percent = [(# of districts, that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups, with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification) divided by the (# of districts in the State that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups)] times 100.

$(0 \text{ districts}/1) \times 100\% = 0\%$

State Definition of Disproportionate Representation (Tier I):

Any group whose risk ratio falls outside a 99% confidence interval for its respective disability and group size signifies disproportionate representation.

State Description of Disproportionality Determination (Tier II):

For over-identification, the state analyzes the identification practices from a representative sampling of students in the racial or ethnic group that is disproportionately over identified by conducting a file review for each student.

HIDOE Methodology:

The first tier is a statistical analysis of disproportionate representation based on racial and ethnic groups. In the statistical analysis of disproportionate representation, risk ratios are calculated based on the racial/ethnic group category concerning all racial and ethnic groups in Hawaii. The risk ratios are then compared to their respective confidence interval based on racial/ethnic group and group size.

For the second tier, HIDOE applies the Analysis of Identified Procedures and Practices (AIPP) to a sample of student files from the groups that were identified with disproportionate representation on Tier I to determine whether the disproportionate representation was the result of inappropriate identification. When disproportionate identification is the result of inappropriate identification, and noncompliance is identified, it is addressed under HIDOE’s general supervision process consistent with OSEP’s Memo 09-02, Reporting on correction of Noncompliance in the Annual Performance Report Required under Sections 616 and 642 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act.

N-size: A group of students, based on the expected state average rate of a disability for that group, needs to be 10 or more. When expected numbers based on state average for a group is less than 10, the analysis of risk ratios is inappropriate, as variations of one or two cases would cause the risk ratios to fluctuate excessively.

HIDOE Process for Identifying Disproportionality

The HIDOE’s process for identifying disproportionality involves a two-tier method of analysis applied to 618 data, as reported to the U.S. Department of Education (USDOE), Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) on the Report of Children with Disabilities Receiving Special Education under Part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (Child Count) consistent with 34 CFR §300.173. This process of analysis helps to identify disproportionate representation that may be the result of inappropriate identification.

Beginning with School Year (SY) 2010-11, the HIDOE disaggregated race/ethnicity data into the seven (7) identified federal ethnic groups: 1) Hispanic/Latino of any race; and for individuals who are non-Hispanic/Latino only; 2) American Indian or Alaska Native; 3) Asian; 4) Black or African American; 5) Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander; 6) White and 7) Two (2) or more races. With SY 2012-13, the HIDOE collected three (3) years of data with the seven (7) identified federal ethnic groups, allowing for three (3) years of data that are needed to recalculate the confidence intervals the HIDOE uses for Tier I analysis of Disproportionate Representation.

The HIDOE Tier I uses statistical analysis of disproportionate representation based on racial/ethnic group by disability category. Risk ratios are calculated based on each racial/ethnic group in special education (and in the six specific disability categories for indicator 10) concerning the aggregate of the remaining racial/ethnic groups in Hawaii. The risk ratios are then compared to their respective confidence interval based on the disability categories.

The HIDOE Tier II consists of a two (2) part analysis, a review relating to over-identification. From the racial/ethnic groups (by the six disability categories for indicator 10) identified in Tier I, a representative sample of student files are reviewed utilizing the Analysis of Identified Procedures and Practices (AIPP) to determine if students were appropriately identified by 34 CFR §300.173, 300.111, and 300.301 through 300.311. Policies, practices, and

procedures are reviewed as necessary, with identified noncompliance related to inappropriate practices addressed under the HIDEO's general supervision process.

Describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate overrepresentation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification.

State Description of Disproportionality Determination (Tier II):

The state analyzes the identification practices from a representative sampling of students in the racial or ethnic group that is disproportionately over-identified (by the six (6) disability categories for indicator 10) by conducting a file review for each student in the sample.

For FFY 2019, the HIDEO used a sample size determined by a 95% confidence interval with a tolerated margin of error of 10% for each group identified as having disproportionate representation in the Tier II analysis. For indicator 10, the over-identified groups were: ID, SLD, ED, and OHI for Native Hawaiian and other Pacific Islander, with 38, 248, 33, and 85 students identified in SY 2019-20, and their sample sizes were 27, 69, 25, and 45 respectively; SLD, ED, and OHI for Hispanic/Latino students, with 209, 32 and 96 students with sample sizes of 66, 24, and 48 respectively; and SoL, OHI, and Autism for White students with 96, 92, and 56 students with sample sizes of 48, 47, and 36 respectively. All students in the analysis samples for indicator 10 were identified randomly and made available for the review team.

Each file for all these students in the analysis sample was reviewed utilizing the Analysis of Identified Procedures and Practices (AIPP) to determine whether each student was appropriately identified based on 34 CFR §300.173, 300.111, and 300.301 through 300.311. None of these files indicated inappropriate identification of children with disabilities.

In case a file of one student would indicate inappropriate identification, policies, practices, and procedures would be reviewed as necessary, with identified noncompliance related to inappropriate practices addressed under the HIDEO's general supervision process. When disproportionate identification is the result of inappropriate identification, and noncompliance is identified, it is addressed under the HIDEO's general supervision process consistent with OSEP's Memo 09-02, Reporting on correction of Noncompliance in the Annual Performance Report Required under Sections 616 and 642 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The indicator 10 data is complete, valid, and reliable as the collection of data and analysis for Tier I and II were not affected by the COVID-19 pandemic for SY 2019-2020.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2018

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
0	0	0	0

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2018

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2018 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

10 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

10 - OSEP Response

10 - Required Actions

Indicator 11: Child Find

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Child Find

Compliance indicator: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe.

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

Data Source

Data to be taken from State monitoring or State data system and must be based on actual, not an average, number of days. Indicate if the State has established a timeline and, if so, what is the State's timeline for initial evaluations.

Measurement

- a. # of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received.
- b. # of children whose evaluations were completed within 60 days (or State-established timeline).
Account for children included in (a), but not included in (b). Indicate the range of days beyond the timeline when the evaluation was completed and any reasons for the delays.

Percent = [(b) divided by (a)] times 100.

Instructions

If data are from State monitoring, describe the method used to select LEAs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, include data for the entire reporting year.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. 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. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Note that under 34 CFR §300.301(d), the timeframe set for initial evaluation does not apply to a public agency if: (1) the parent of a child repeatedly fails or refuses to produce the child for the evaluation; or (2) a child enrolls in a school of another public agency after the timeframe for initial evaluations has begun, and prior to a determination by the child's previous public agency as to whether the child is a child with a disability. States should not report these exceptions in either the numerator (b) or denominator (a). If the State-established timeframe provides for exceptions through State regulation or policy, describe cases falling within those exceptions and include in b.

Targets must be 100%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2018), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

11 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	93.77%

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	96.43%	95.60%	95.25%	95.20%	95.39%

Targets

FFY	2019
Target	100%

FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data

(a) Number of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received	(b) Number of children whose evaluations were completed within 60 days (or State-established timeline)	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
3,530	3,266	95.39%	100%	92.52%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage

The primary reason for slippage is due to the COVID-19 pandemic. A total of 264 initial evaluations were completed beyond the 60-day timeline. Of the 264 evaluations, 175 were over the 60-day timeline due to COVID-19; 79 were due to "other" challenges during the transition to distance learning; five (5) were due to the provider not available to conduct the assessment, and five (5) were due to the provider report not available.

As a result of COVID-19, HIDOE conducted professional development at the school level to facilitate implementation by phone, video conferencing, or adherence to social distancing protocols for conducting evaluations, assessments, or individualized education program meetings, as appropriate. To better assist families who did not have the technology or wifi available to communicate with schools, HIDOE established a device loan program, including internet access to facilitate parental involvement as well as student access. In addition, telehealth practices were expanded statewide, as appropriate, to support the provision of services, including evaluations.

Number of children included in (a) but not included in (b)

264

Account for children included in (a) but not included in (b). Indicate the range of days beyond the timeline when the evaluation was completed and any reasons for the delays.

Total Number of Initial Evaluations by Eligibility and 60-Day Timeline in SY 2019-2020:

- A total of 3530 Initial Evaluations were received.
- 264 Initial Evaluations were completed beyond the 60-day timeline.
- 92.52% of Initial Evaluations were completed within less than or equal to the 60-day timeline.

Eligible IDEA:

- A total of 2909 Initial Evaluations were IDEA eligible.
- 220 eligible IDEA Initial Evaluations were completed beyond the 60-day timeline.
- 92.44% of Initial Evaluations were completed within less than or equal to the 60-day timeline.

Not Eligible IDEA:

- A total of 621 Initial Evaluations were IDEA ineligible.
- 44 ineligible IDEA Initial Evaluations were completed beyond the 60-day timeline.
- 92.91% of Initial Evaluations were completed within less than or equal to the 60-day timeline.

Number of Days Beyond 60-Day Timeline:

A total of 220 Eligible Initial Evaluations were completed.

- 62 were completed within 1-10 days beyond the 60-day timeline.
- 60 were completed within 11-30 days beyond the 60-day timeline.
- 61 were completed within 31-60 days beyond the 60-day timeline.
- 37 were completed beyond 60 days beyond the 60-day timeline.

A total of 44 Not Eligible Initial Evaluations were completed.

- 11 were completed within 1-10 days beyond the 60-day timeline
- 14 were completed within 11-30 days beyond the 60-day timeline.
- 11 were completed within 31-60 days beyond the 60-day timeline.
- 8 were completed beyond 60 days beyond the 60-day timeline.

Reasons for Delay Beyond 60-Day Timeline:

A total of 220 Eligible Initial Evaluations were delayed beyond the 60-Day timeline.

- 4 were delayed due to the provider not being available.
- 5 were delayed due to the provider's report not being available.
- 143 were delayed due to COVID.
- 68 were delayed due to other/unknown reasons.

A total of 44 Not Eligible Initial Evaluations were delayed beyond the 60-Day timeline.

- 1 was delayed due to the provider not being available.
- 32 were delayed due to COVID-19.
- 11 were delayed due to other/unknown reasons.

Indicate the evaluation timeline used:

The State used the 60 day timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted

What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?

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.

HIDOE monitors the entire system of individual complexes and individual schools. The data for indicator 11, Child Find, was retrieved through HIDOE's electronic Comprehensive Student Support System (eCSSS) for all students receiving initial evaluations in SY 2019-2020.

60 - Day Timeline

In accordance with HAR Chapter 60, §8-60-33, and 34 C.F.R. § 300.301(c)(1)(i), the initial evaluation shall be conducted within 60 days of receiving parental consent for the evaluation; and shall determine if the student is a student with a disability under sections §8-60-2 and §8-60-39; and the educational needs of the student.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The indicator 11 data is complete, valid, and reliable, as the collection of data and analysis of this indicator was not affected by the national pandemic of COVID-19 for SY 2019-2020. However, the timeliness of evaluations were impacted by the COVID-19 pandemic.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2018

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
36	36	0	0

FFY 2018 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements

HIDOE identified findings in 36 Complexes, based on a total of 224 instances of noncompliance for initial evaluations of eligible and ineligible students who were evaluated beyond 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation (60-day timeline, 34 CFR §300.301(c)).

OSEP Memo 09-02 Prong 2: In order to ensure that these complexes were correctly implementing the 60-day timeline, HIDOE reviewed subsequent 60-day timeline data collected through the electronic Comprehensive Student Support System (eCSSS) database and verified that 100% of these subsequent files were compliant, consistent with 34 CFR §300.301(c).

In accordance with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, HIDOE has verified for indicator 11 each complex area that was notified of noncompliance has demonstrated they have met the two prongs of correction within one year of the finding:

- each individual case of noncompliance is corrected; and
 - each complex area that did not meet the 100% compliance demonstrated evidence of achieving 100% compliance based on a review of updated data.
- HIDOE notified in writing the 36 complexes that noncompliance was verified and corrected.

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

OSEP Memo 09-02 Prong 1: HIDOE identified findings in 36 complexes, based on a total of 224 instances of noncompliance for initial evaluations of eligible and ineligible students who were evaluated beyond 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation (60-day timeline, 34 CFR §300.301(c)). HIDOE's monitoring team reviewed the files of these 224 eligible and ineligible students through the eCSSS database and verified all had their evaluations completed, although late, and all eligible students had an IEP developed. Written notification from the Monitoring and Compliance Branch (MAC) informed the Complex Area Superintendents of the 36 complexes and the District Educational Specialist of the findings and the timeline for submittal and implementation of corrective actions, consistent with the requirements of IDEA and the 09-02 memo. Each individual instance of noncompliance was required to be corrected with a written response of correction with supporting data and submitted to the Monitoring and Compliance Branch (MAC). In addition, utilizing the eCSSS database, MAC conducted a subsequent review of the files of all those students who were still enrolled at the time of correction; they were verified to be in compliance satisfying Prong 2.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2018

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2018 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

11 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

11 - OSEP Response

11 - Required Actions

Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition

Instructions and Measurement

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))

Data Source

Data to be taken from State monitoring or State data system.

Measurement

- a. # of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.
- b. # of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to their third birthdays.
- c. # of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.
- d. # of children for whom parent refusal to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services or to whom exceptions under 34 CFR §300.301(d) applied.
- e. # of children determined to be eligible for early intervention services under Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.
- f. # of children whose parents chose to continue early intervention services beyond the child's third birthday through a State's policy under 34 CFR §303.211 or a similar State option.

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

Percent = [(c) divided by (a - b - d - e - f)] times 100.

Instructions

If data are from State monitoring, describe the method used to select LEAs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, include data for the entire reporting year.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. 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. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Category f is to be used only by States that have an approved policy for providing parents the option of continuing early intervention services beyond the child's third birthday under 34 CFR §303.211 or a similar State option.

Targets must be 100%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2018), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

12 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	90.90%

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	92.48%	96.01%	92.96%	94.98%	93.27%

Targets

FFY	2019
Target	100%

FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data

a. Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.	565
b. Number of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to third birthday.	61

c. Number of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	407
d. Number for whom parent refusals to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services or to whom exceptions under 34 CFR §300.301(d) applied.	25
e. Number of children who were referred to Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.	5
f. Number of children whose parents chose to continue early intervention services beyond the child's third birthday through a State's policy under 34 CFR §303.211 or a similar State option.	0

Measure	Numerator (c)	Denominator (a-b-d-e-f)	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
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.	407	474	93.27%	100%	85.86%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

Slippage in indicator 12 has been due to the COVID-19 pandemic. Collaboration efforts were made between Part B and Part C to focus on timely transitions; however, the challenges to establishing a systemic process and infrastructure from a face-to-face delivery model to a distance/telework model to address the Center for Disease Control (CDC) guidelines for social distancing contributed to delays in IEPs developed and implemented by a child's third birthday. HIDOE and Part C have since established a process for transition notices to be transmitted directly to designated staff at the school and alternate staff at the State to ensure timely transitions. HIDOE continues to collaborate with Part C for timely transitions.

Number of children who served in part C and referred to Part B for eligibility determination that are not included in b, c, d, e, or f

67

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

Reasons for Delays:

The primary factors affecting compliance with the requirement to have services in place by age three are delayed receipt of Part C Transition Notices and school failure to act in a timely manner upon receipt of the Part C Transition Notice.

67 children were included in (a) but not in (b), (c), (d), or (e).

The breakdown is as follows:

- 17 children were referred from Part C to Part B less than the required 90 days. There was no non-compliance on the part of the schools, and schools were unable to complete the evaluation, eligibility, and IEP processes prior to the children's third birthday.
- 46 children were delayed in the evaluation, eligibility, and IEP development process.
- Three (3) children were determined not to be evaluated; however, were found eligible after their 3rd birthday.
- One (1) child's eligibility meeting was extended to include a Licensed Behavior Analyst in the review of assessments.

Range of Days Beyond Age 3

The number of days beyond the third birthday ranged from 1 to 169.

of Days Eligibility/Services were Delayed Beyond the Child's Third Birthday and # of Cases

- 1-10 Days - 19 cases
- 11-30 Days - 9 cases
- 31-60 Days - 13 cases
- > 60 Days - 26 cases

Attach PDF table (optional)

What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?

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 SY 2019-2020. For each child, the report includes:

- Birthdate
- 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)
- Date the initial Individualized Education Program (IEP) was held
- Date services were made available

The data from the report generated for SY 2019 - 2020 was reviewed and analyzed by the Monitoring and Compliance Branch to ensure the accuracy of the information about each individual child.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The indicator 12 data is complete, valid, and reliable, as the collection of data and analysis of this indicator was not affected by the national pandemic of COVID-19 for SY 2019-2020. However, the timeliness of evaluations, eligibility, the development and implementation of the IEP by the child's third birthday was impacted by the COVID-19 pandemic.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2018

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
21	21	0	0

FFY 2018 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements

HIDOE identified findings in 21 Complexes, based on a total of 40 instances of noncompliance for the children who were referred by Part C prior to age 3, who were found eligible for Part B, but did not have an Individualized Education Plan (IEP) developed and implemented by their third birthday. These findings were issued to 21 complexes and the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) Memo 09-02 verification process was utilized. In accordance with the OSEP Memo 09-02, HIDOE reviewed subsequent early childhood transition data collected through the electronic Comprehensive Student Support System (eCSSS) database and verified that 100% of these subsequent files in 21 complexes were compliant, consistent with 34 CFR §300.124(b) satisfying Prong 2.

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

OSEP Memo 09-02 Prong 1: HIDOE issued findings of noncompliance in 21 complexes. HIDOE's monitoring team reviewed the 40 instances in the 21 complexes through the eCSSS database and verified all of those children who were still enrolled at the time of the correction had an IEP developed, although late (past their third birthday), satisfying Prong 1 verification. Written notification from the Monitoring and Compliance Branch informed the 21 Complex Area Superintendents and the District Educational Specialists of the findings and the timeline for submittal and implementation of corrective actions, consistent with the requirements of IDEA and the 09-02 memo.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2018

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2018 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

12 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

12 - OSEP Response

12 - Required Actions

Indicator 13: Secondary Transition

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Compliance indicator: Secondary transition: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs. There also must be evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services are to be discussed and evidence that, if appropriate, a representative of any participating agency was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority.

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

Data Source

Data to be taken from State monitoring or State data system.

Measurement

Percent = [(# of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs. There also must be evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services are to be discussed and evidence that, if appropriate, a representative of any participating agency was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority) divided by the (# of youth with an IEP age 16 and above)] times 100.

If a State's policies and procedures provide that public agencies must meet these requirements at an age younger than 16, the State may, but is not required to, choose to include youth beginning at that younger age in its data for this indicator. If a State chooses to do this, it must state this clearly in its SPP/APR and ensure that its baseline data are based on youth beginning at that younger age.

Instructions

If data are from State monitoring, describe the method used to select LEAs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, include data for the entire reporting year.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. 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. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Targets must be 100%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2018), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

13 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2009	76.00%

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	84.55%	70.32%	74.14%	64.62%	69.21%

Targets

FFY	2019
Target	100%

FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth aged 16 and above with IEPs that contain each of the required components for secondary transition	Number of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
84	619	69.21%	100%	13.57%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

HIDOE reviewed 619 cases of youth with individualized education programs (IEP)s aged 16 and above and found 535 of these instances in 42 complexes whose transition plans did not meet one or more of the requirements under 34 CFR §300.320(b). Thus, HIDOE issued 42 findings of noncompliance statewide.

Based on OSEP’s last data analysis of FFY 2018 and in reviewing the indicator 13 longitudinal data, HIDOE determined that a deeper review of indicator 13 was warranted in order to address areas of concern. During the file reviews, HIDOE scrutinized the evidence in each student file in greater detail using the National Secondary Transition Technical Assistance Center (NSTTAC)/National Technical Assistance Center on Transition (NTACT) Indicator 13 Checklist Form B.

The COVID-19 pandemic additionally contributed to indicator 13 slippage as schools moved to distance learning to address health and safety protocols which impacted requirements including conducting transition assessments, collaborating with students and IEP teams to update transition plans, and implementing appropriate transition services and courses of study.

In response to the magnitude of the slippage, HIDOE has taken the following actions:

- A. Identified secondary transition as a priority for improvement statewide;
- B. Established secondary transition workgroups composed of state and complex area staff to develop a 3-year actionable improvement plan with the focus on the following:
 - Train and support Complex Areas and schools;
 - Develop training on writing effective transition plans;
 - Develop a post-secondary resource webpage dedicated to staff and parents;
 - Integrate existing career and vocational planning across each school;
 - Conduct statewide training on the new Transition Handbook; and
- C. Build training and work-based learning opportunities via cross-agencies and community collaboration.
- D. Provide targeted professional development to school-level staff to ensure each non-compliant student file is corrected promptly;
- E. Continue to facilitate data-driven PLCs with Complex Area teams to focus on a deep review and root cause analysis for the areas of improvement.
- F. HIDOE staff will continue to partner with the following OSEP approved technical assistance centers to address areas of improvement for indicator 13:
 - IDEA Data Center (IDC);
 - National Center for Systemic Improvement (NCSI); and
 - National Technical Assistance Center for Transition (NTACT)

What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?

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.

Data for this indicator are derived from a review of 619 randomly selected IEPs of students aged 16 years and older from all schools, including public charter schools, which serve students of that age group. The Monitoring and Compliance team used a random sample calculator to determine the number of students represented in the sample. These students were selected from SY 2019-2020 special education composition with a confidence level of 99% and an interval of 5%. The sample of students was randomly selected to make sure all of the complexes were included. The Monitoring and Compliance Team reviewed the sample to ensure all of the complexes were included. If a school was not included in the sample, the team randomly selected a student from that school.

National Technical Assistance Center on Transition (NTACT) checklist was used to conduct the review. In order to be considered in compliance with the NSTTAC checklist and Indicator 13, an Individualized Education Program (IEP) must have demonstrated compliance with the eight (8) specific requirements.

1. The IEP must include an appropriate measurable postsecondary goal or goals that cover education or training, employment, and, independent living (as appropriate);
2. The postsecondary goal(s) are updated annually;
3. The measurable postsecondary goal(s) are based on age-appropriate transition assessment;
4. The transition services in the IEP will reasonably enable the student to meet his or her postsecondary goal(s);
5. The transition services include courses of study that will reasonably enable the student to meet his or her postsecondary goal(s);
6. There is/are annual IEP goal(s) related to the student’s transition service needs;
7. There is evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services were discussed; and
8. There is evidence that a representative of any participating agency was invited to the IEP Team meeting (if appropriate) with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority.

Question	Yes / No
Do the State’s policies and procedures provide that public agencies must meet these requirements at an age younger than 16?	NO

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The indicator 13 data is complete, valid, and reliable as the collection of data and analysis of this indicator was not affected by the COVID-19 pandemic for SY 2019-2020.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2018

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
33	33	0	0

FFY 2018 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements

HIDOE identified findings of noncompliance in 33 complexes based on 105 student cases of youth with IEPs aged 16 whose transition plans did not meet one or more of the requirements under 34 CFR §300.320(b). Thus HIDOE issued 33 findings of noncompliance statewide.

Written notification from the Monitoring and Compliance Branch (MAC) informed the Complex Area Superintendents of the 33 complexes and the District

Educational Specialist of the findings and the timeline for submittal and implementation of corrective actions, consistent with the requirements of IDEA and the 09-02 memo. Each individual instance of noncompliance was required to be corrected with a written response of correction with supporting data and submitted to the Monitoring and Compliance Branch (MAC).

OSEP Memo 09-02 Prong 2: In order to ensure that these complexes were correctly implementing transition services, HIDOE reviewed subsequent transition plans in those IEPs of youth aged 16 and above collected through the electronic Comprehensive Student Support System (eCSSS) database and verified all (100 percent) subsequent transition plans in those IEPs of youth aged 16 and above in 33 complexes were compliant within one year of notification consistent with 34 CFR §300.320(b). At the time of this report, all transition plans of students still enrolled in 33 complexes met all indicator13 requirements under 34 CFR §300.320(b).

Satisfying the two (2) verification tests consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, HIDOE has verified the correction of all individual cases of noncompliance identified in FFY 2018 for indicator 13 and the correct implementation of the regulatory requirements in accordance with 34 CFR §300.320(b) at the time of this report. The 33 complexes were notified in writing that noncompliance was verified as corrected.

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

HIDOE's verification of correction of noncompliance is consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.

OSEP Memo 09-02 Prong 1: HIDOE issued 33 of noncompliance for youth with IEPs aged 16 and above whose transition plans did not meet one or more of the indicator 13 requirements under 34 CFR § 300.320(b) in each complex.

HIDOE's monitoring team reviewed the files of the 105 students on the database and verified, within one (1) year of the notification, that all those 105 students in the 33 complexes, who were still enrolled at the time of the review, met all of the indicator 13 requirements under 34 CFR § 300.320(b).

The written notification informed the Complex Area Superintendents, the District Educational Specialists, and their complex area teams of the findings and the timeline for submittal and implementation of corrective actions, consistent with the requirements of IDEA and the 09-02 memo. In addition, the Monitoring and Compliance Branch established Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) where they met with each complex area and their teams to review the current and previous year's performance; conduct a thorough analysis of indicator 13; identify areas of improvement, and discuss solutions and the next steps.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2018

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2018 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

13 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

13 - OSEP Response

13 - Required Actions

Indicator 14: Post-School Outcomes

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Results indicator: Post-school outcomes: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were:

Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.

Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school.

Enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.

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

Data Source

State selected data source.

Measurement

A. Percent enrolled in higher education = [(# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school) divided by the (# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)] times 100.

B. Percent enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school = [(# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school) divided by the (# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)] times 100.

C. Percent enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment = [(# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment) divided by the (# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)] times 100.

Instructions

Sampling of youth who had IEPs and are no longer in secondary school is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates of the target population. (See [General Instructions](#) on page 2 for additional instructions on sampling.)

Collect data by September 2020 on students who left school during 2018-2019, timing the data collection so that at least one year has passed since the students left school. Include students who dropped out during 2018-2019 or who were expected to return but did not return for the current school year. This includes all youth who had an IEP in effect at the time they left school, including those who graduated with a regular diploma or some other credential, dropped out, or aged out.

I. Definitions

Enrolled in higher education as used in measures A, B, and C means youth have been enrolled on a full- or part-time basis in a community college (two-year program) or college/university (four or more year program) for at least one complete term, at any time in the year since leaving high school.

Competitive employment as used in measures B and C: States have two options to report data under “competitive employment” in the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, due February 2021:

Option 1: Use the same definition as used to report in the FFY 2015 SPP/APR, i.e., competitive employment means that youth have worked for pay at or above the minimum wage in a setting with others who are nondisabled for a period of 20 hours a week for at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This includes military employment.

Option 2: States report in alignment with the term “competitive integrated employment” and its definition, in section 7(5) of the Rehabilitation Act, as amended by Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA), and 34 CFR §361.5(c)(9). For the purpose of defining the rate of compensation for students working on a “part-time basis” under this category, OSEP maintains the standard of 20 hours a week for at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This definition applies to military employment.

Enrolled in other postsecondary education or training as used in measure C, means youth have been enrolled on a full- or part-time basis for at least 1 complete term at any time in the year since leaving high school in an education or training program (e.g., Job Corps, adult education, workforce development program, vocational technical school which is less than a two-year program).

Some other employment as used in measure C means youth have worked for pay or been self-employed for a period of at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This includes working in a family business (e.g., farm, store, fishing, ranching, catering services, etc.).

II. Data Reporting

Provide the actual numbers for each of the following mutually exclusive categories. The actual number of “leavers” who are:

1. Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school;
2. Competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education);
3. Enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education or competitively employed);
4. In some other employment within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program, or competitively employed).

“Leavers” should only be counted in one of the above categories, and the categories are organized hierarchically. So, for example, “leavers” who are enrolled in full- or part-time higher education within one year of leaving high school should only be reported in category 1, even if they also happen to be employed. Likewise, “leavers” who are not enrolled in either part- or full-time higher education, but who are competitively employed, should only be reported under category 2, even if they happen to be enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program.

III. Reporting on the Measures/Indicators

Targets must be established for measures A, B, and C.

Measure A: For purposes of reporting on the measures/indicators, please note that any youth enrolled in an institution of higher education (that meets any definition of this term in the Higher Education Act (HEA)) within one year of leaving high school must be reported under measure A. This could include youth who also happen to be competitively employed, or in some other training program; however, the key outcome we are interested in here is enrollment in higher education.

Measure B: All youth reported under measure A should also be reported under measure B, in addition to all youth that obtain competitive employment within one year of leaving high school.

Measure C: All youth reported under measures A and B should also be reported under measure C, in addition to youth that are enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program, or in some other employment.

Include the State's analysis of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school. States should consider categories such as race and ethnicity, disability category, and geographic location in the State.

If the analysis shows that the response data are not representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics. In identifying such strategies, the State should consider factors such as how the State collected the data.

14 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Measure	Baseline	FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
A	2009	Target >=	34.00%	34.00%	35.00%	35.00%	40.00%
A	38.00%	Data	31.45%	35.87%	36.34%	35.17%	34.15%
B	2009	Target >=	75.00%	75.00%	76.00%	77.00%	78.00%
B	69.00%	Data	68.15%	83.37%	85.04%	85.69%	79.95%
C	2009	Target >=	86.00%	86.00%	87.00%	87.00%	88.00%
C	77.00%	Data	73.19%	89.79%	93.11%	93.05%	88.35%

FFY 2019 Targets

FFY	2019
Target A >=	40.00%
Target B >=	80.00%
Target C >=	90.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

HIDOE provided internal and external stakeholders with professional learning opportunities to provide input on the implementation of IDEA. The stakeholders included: Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC), Community Children's Councils (CCCs), Leadership in Disabilities & Achievement of Hawaii (LDAH), Special Parent Information Network (SPIN), Hawaii State Council on Developmental Disabilities (DD Council), State offices, Complex Areas, and schools.

FFY 2019 SPP/APR Input and Feedback

HIDOE, the Monitoring and Compliance Branch (MAC) met with SEAC members on December 11, 2020, and January 8, 2021, to share the longitudinal data for each of the indicators and received feedback on possible reasons for slippage as well as strategies for improvement regarding the FFY 2019 data. In addition, MAC engaged the District Educational Specialists in an activity where they provided their input and suggestions for areas of improvement at the complex area and systemic level based on FFY 2019 current and longitudinal data.

Stakeholder Engagement Utilizing Leading by Convening Framework

As one of its core improvement strategies, HIDOE continues to utilize the Leading by Convening Framework (Cashman et al., 2014) to engage internal and external stakeholder groups in improving results for students with disabilities. Stakeholder engagement and involvement through the Leading by Convening framework is designed to provide a safe and productive forum to exchange ideas, share information, and provide constructive criticism.

Infographics for Families and Community Partners

The Leading by Convening framework has allowed SEAC and HIDOE to create a professional learning community where ideas, additional perspectives, support, and advice are provided to co-create infographics to support the implementation of IDEA in Hawaii. The infographics can be found on HIDOE's website at <http://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/TeachingAndLearning/SpecializedPrograms/SpecialEducation/Pages/home.aspx>

SPIN's website at <https://spinhawaii.org/infographics/school-reopening-infographics/>

SEAC's website at <https://seac-hawaii.org/infographics/>

State Advisory Panel – Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC)

SEAC is the State established advisory panel and serves as an advisor to the state-level special education staff regarding the education of all children with disabilities. Membership for SEAC is an appointment by the Superintendent. The membership is representative of the State population and composed of individuals involved in or concerned with the education of children with disabilities. The majority of members shall be individuals with disabilities or parents of children with disabilities (ages birth through 26). The membership includes representatives from the following stakeholder groups:

- Parents of children with disabilities ages birth through 26
- Individuals with disabilities
- Teachers (general and special education) of children with disabilities
- The University of Hawaii and other representatives of other institutions of higher education that prepare special education and related services personnel
- State, district, and school education officials
- Administrators of programs for children with disabilities
- Representatives of other state agencies involved in the financing or delivery of related services to children with disabilities
- Representatives of private schools and public charter schools
- Representative of a vocational, community, or business organization concerned with the provision of transition services to children with disabilities
- Representatives of the State juvenile and adult corrections agencies
- Representative of the Parent Training and Information Center
- Representatives of the community
- Representative of the education office responsible for the coordination of the Education for Homeless Children and Youth Program
- Representative of the state child welfare agency responsible for foster care of children
- Representative of military students and families

Special Parent Information Network (SPIN)

SPIN is co-sponsored by the Disability and Communication Access Board and HIDEOE. Services include a phone call line for information and referral support, a quarterly newsletter, an annual conference, and community workshops. The Special Parent Information Network is guided by an advisory committee made up of parents, professionals, and people with disabilities. Additional information can be found on the SPIN webpage at <https://spinhawaii.org/>.

Leadership in Disabilities & Achievement of Hawaii (LDAH)

LDAH is a nonprofit organization working to support and educate parents, families, and professionals to meet the needs of children and youth (ages birth through 26) with any disability. Dedicated to the service of individuals with special needs, LDAH is the Parent Training and Information Center for the State of Hawaii and provides interactive training opportunities, disseminates high-quality educational resources, and offers advocacy assistance at no cost to families. As of 2015, LDAH has developed partnerships with American Samoa, Guam, the Republic of Palau, the Republic of the Marshall Islands, the Federated States of Micronesia, and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands. As a Parent Training and Information Center, LDAH and its partners provide information and referral, mentoring and advocacy, and education and training to parents and family members of children with disabilities and the professionals who serve them. LDAH's goal is to ensure that all children with disabilities receive a proper education. Additional information can be found on the LDAH webpage at <https://ldahawaii.org/>.

Community Children's Councils (CCCs)

CCCs serve children and families including those with disabilities and mental health needs through collaborative partnerships. The CCCs are led by parent and professional co-chairs and include representation from public and private child-serving agencies and other community members such as recreational services, businesses, churches, and others. The CCC office provides technical and administrative support to the seventeen (17) councils, including information gathering and dissemination, logistical assistance for conferences and workshops, training in leadership and facilitation, and providing TA and support. Additional information can be found on the CCCs webpage at <http://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/ParentsAndStudents/SupportForParents/Pages/CCC.aspx>.

Hawaii's State Council on Developmental Disabilities (DD Council)

DD Council engages communities in advocacy, capacity-building, and systemic change activities that are consistent with the policy in the federal law. The DD Council promotes self-determination for individuals with developmental disabilities and their families by contributing to a coordinated and comprehensive service system that is person-centered and family-directed. Additional information can be found on the DD Council webpage at <https://hiddcouncil.org/>.

FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data

Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	583
1. Number of respondent youth who enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school	181
2. Number of respondent youth who competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	243
3. Number of respondent youth enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education or competitively employed)	21
4. Number of respondent youth who are in some other employment within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program, or competitively employed).	24

Measure	Number of respondent youth	Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Enrolled in higher education (1)	181	583	34.15%	40.00%	31.05%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage
B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (1 +2)	424	583	79.95%	80.00%	72.73%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage
C. Enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment (1+2+3+4)	469	583	88.35%	90.00%	80.45%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
A	<p>In FFY 2019 HIDEOE implemented a new process for collecting post-school outcomes data. Specifically, HIDEOE has adopted an online survey to distribute to students, making the survey more accessible for exited students. This has resulted in a 19% increase in the number of surveys returned from the previous year (369/1012 = 36.36% in FFY 2018 to 583/1051 = 55.47% in FFY 2019). This large net increase in responses may have impacted result trends. Furthermore, HIDEOE made strong efforts to reach out to all students who exited public school during SY 2019-20, more specifically students who dropped out.</p> <p>Headcount enrollment, which includes high school graduates with disabilities, at the 10-campus University of Hawaii System, decreased by about 2 percent in the fall 2019 semester compared to fall 2018, from 51,063 students to 49,977 students. Nine of the 10 UH campuses saw reductions in enrollment, reflecting the national trend of declining enrollment since peak highs following the 2008 recession. This reduction may have further been impacted by the COVID-19 national pandemic for spring 2020 enrollment. HIDEOE suspects that students may have delayed enrollment in higher education pending the current pandemic. Additionally, even though the University of Hawaii System is among the most affordable in the country, the increasing cost of higher education is another hurdle for current and prospective students and their families.</p>
B	Beyond what we described regarding the impact of student enrollment in higher education in the section above, COVID-19 had a direct impact on competitive employment in Hawaii. The impact that the pandemic had on tourism (which historically makes up over 20% of the state's economy), hiring freezes by local employers, and the temporary shut down of non-essential businesses, may have negatively affected the ability of students to secure competitive employment. In November 2020, there was a reduction of total visitors of 68.3%. This decrease negatively impacted Hawaii's competitive employment opportunities.
C	The cumulative contributing factors described in sections A and B also had a direct impact on other post-secondary education and training programs or in some other employment for students with disabilities in Hawaii. As an example, Vocational rehabilitation (VR) agencies across the islands in Hawaii faced many challenges during the COVID-19 pandemic, as they strived to connect with students, overcome technology issues, and continue to support access to vocational training and employment.

Please select the reporting option your State is using:

Option 1: Use the same definition as used to report in the FFY 2015 SPP/APR, i.e., competitive employment means that youth have worked for pay at or above the minimum wage in a setting with others who are nondisabled for a period of 20 hours a week for at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This includes military employment.

Sampling Question	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	NO

Describe the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates.

Survey Question	Yes / No
Was a survey used?	YES
If yes, is it a new or revised survey?	NO

Include the State's analyses of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.

Analysis of data using a +/-4% range indicates all groups are representative (all seven race-ethnicities, disabilities, and exit reasons). The percentage of responses by ethnicity was as follows: Hispanic/Latino 9.09% with 53 students, American Indian or Alaskan Native 0.69% with 4 students, Asian 26.24% with 153 students, Black or African American 2.40% with 14 students, Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander 43.57% with 254 students, White 11.49% with 67 students, and Two or More Races 6.52% with 38 students. These percentages fall within a 0.04% difference or less for each ethnic group surveyed compared to the representativeness of the ethnic population for the State.

Question	Yes / No
Are the response data representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school?	YES

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The indicator 14 data is complete, valid, and reliable as the collection of data and analysis of this indicator was not affected by the COVID-19 pandemic for SY 2019-2020. However, the performance for this indicator was likely impacted by the COVID-19 pandemic.

In FFY 2019 HDOE implemented a new process for collecting post-school outcomes data. Specifically, the department adopted an online survey to distribute to students, making the survey more accessible for exited students to respond during the COVID-19 pandemic.

14 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

14 - OSEP Response

14 - Required Actions

Indicator 15: Resolution Sessions

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Results Indicator: Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

Data Source

Data collected under section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey in the ED Facts Metadata and Process System (EMAPS)).

Measurement

Percent = (3.1(a) divided by 3.1) times 100.

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

States are not required to establish baseline or targets if the number of resolution sessions is less than 10. In a reporting period when the number of resolution sessions reaches 10 or greater, develop baseline, targets and improvement activities, and report on them in the corresponding SPP/APR.

States may express their targets in a range (e.g., 75-85%).

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data under IDEA section 618, explain.

States are not required to report data at the LEA level.

15 - Indicator Data

Select yes to use target ranges

Target Range not used

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2019-20 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/04/2020	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	50
SY 2019-20 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/04/2020	3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	32

Select yes if the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under section 618 of the IDEA.

NO

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

HIDOE provided internal and external stakeholders with professional learning opportunities to provide input on the implementation of IDEA. The stakeholders included: Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC), Community Children's Councils (CCCs), Leadership in Disabilities & Achievement of Hawaii (LDAH), Special Parent Information Network (SPIN), Hawaii State Council on Developmental Disabilities (DD Council), State offices, Complex Areas, and schools.

FFY 2019 SPP/APR Input and Feedback

HIDOE, the Monitoring and Compliance Branch (MAC) met with SEAC members on December 11, 2020, and January 8, 2021, to share the longitudinal data for each of the indicators and received feedback on possible reasons for slippage as well as strategies for improvement regarding the FFY 2019 data. In addition, MAC engaged the District Educational Specialists in an activity where they provided their input and suggestions for areas of improvement at the complex area and systemic level based on FFY 2019 current and longitudinal data.

Stakeholder Engagement Utilizing Leading by Convening Framework

As one of its core improvement strategies, HIDOE continues to utilize the Leading by Convening Framework (Cashman et al., 2014) to engage internal and external stakeholder groups in improving results for students with disabilities. Stakeholder engagement and involvement through the Leading by Convening framework is designed to provide a safe and productive forum to exchange ideas, share information, and provide constructive criticism.

Infographics for Families and Community Partners

The Leading by Convening framework has allowed SEAC and HIDOE to create a professional learning community where ideas, additional perspectives, support, and advice are provided to co-create infographics to support the implementation of IDEA in Hawaii. The infographics can be found on HIDOE's website at <http://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/TeachingAndLearning/SpecializedPrograms/SpecialEducation/Pages/home.aspx>

SPIN's website at <https://spinhawaii.org/infographics/school-reopening-infographics/>

SEAC's website at <https://seac-hawaii.org/infographics/>

State Advisory Panel – Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC)

SEAC is the State established advisory panel and serves as an advisor to the state-level special education staff regarding the education of all children with disabilities. Membership for SEAC is an appointment by the Superintendent. The membership is representative of the State population and composed of individuals involved in or concerned with the education of children with disabilities. The majority of members shall be individuals with disabilities or parents of children with disabilities (ages birth through 26). The membership includes representatives from the following stakeholder groups:

- Parents of children with disabilities ages birth through 26

- Individuals with disabilities
- Teachers (general and special education) of children with disabilities
- The University of Hawaii and other representatives of other institutions of higher education that prepare special education and related services personnel
- State, district, and school education officials
- Administrators of programs for children with disabilities
- Representatives of other state agencies involved in the financing or delivery of related services to children with disabilities
- Representatives of private schools and public charter schools
- Representative of a vocational, community, or business organization concerned with the provision of transition services to children with disabilities
- Representatives of the State juvenile and adult corrections agencies
- Representative of the Parent Training and Information Center
- Representatives of the community
- Representative of the education office responsible for the coordination of the Education for Homeless Children and Youth Program
- Representative of the state child welfare agency responsible for foster care of children
- Representative of military students and families

Special Parent Information Network (SPIN)

SPIN is co-sponsored by the Disability and Communication Access Board and HIDOE. Services include a phone call line for information and referral support, a quarterly newsletter, an annual conference, and community workshops. The Special Parent Information Network is guided by an advisory committee made up of parents, professionals, and people with disabilities. Additional information can be found on the SPIN webpage at <https://spinhawaii.org/>.

Leadership in Disabilities & Achievement of Hawaii (LDAH)

LDAH is a nonprofit organization working to support and educate parents, families, and professionals to meet the needs of children and youth (ages birth through 26) with any disability. Dedicated to the service of individuals with special needs, LDAH is the Parent Training and Information Center for the State of Hawaii and provides interactive training opportunities, disseminates high-quality educational resources, and offers advocacy assistance at no cost to families. As of 2015, LDAH has developed partnerships with American Samoa, Guam, the Republic of Palau, the Republic of the Marshall Islands, the Federated States of Micronesia, and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands. As a Parent Training and Information Center, LDAH and its partners provide information and referral, mentoring and advocacy, and education and training to parents and family members of children with disabilities and the professionals who serve them. LDAH's goal is to ensure that all children with disabilities receive a proper education. Additional information can be found on the LDAH webpage at <https://ldahawaii.org/>.

Community Children's Councils (CCCs)

CCCs serve children and families including those with disabilities and mental health needs through collaborative partnerships. The CCCs are led by parent and professional co-chairs and include representation from public and private child-serving agencies and other community members such as recreational services, businesses, churches, and others. The CCC office provides technical and administrative support to the seventeen (17) councils, including information gathering and dissemination, logistical assistance for conferences and workshops, training in leadership and facilitation, and providing TA and support. Additional information can be found on the CCCs webpage at <http://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/ParentsAndStudents/SupportForParents/Pages/CCC.aspx>.

Hawaii's State Council on Developmental Disabilities (DD Council)

DD Council engages communities in advocacy, capacity-building, and systemic change activities that are consistent with the policy in the federal law. The DD Council promotes self-determination for individuals with developmental disabilities and their families by contributing to a coordinated and comprehensive service system that is person-centered and family-directed. Additional information can be found on the DD Council webpage at <https://hiddcouncil.org/>.

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	16.00%

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target >=	43.00%	44.00%	44.00%	45.00%	45.00%
Data	51.85%	70.51%	43.59%	89.74%	59.57%

Targets

FFY	2019
Target >=	60.00%

FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data

3.1(a) Number resolutions sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3.1 Number of resolutions sessions	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
32	50	59.57%	60.00%	64.00%	Met Target	No Slippage

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The indicator 15 resolution data is complete, valid, and reliable. While the resolution process required adjustment to an online/virtual model from a face-to-face model, the collection of data was not affected by the COVID-19 pandemic for SY 2019-2020.

15 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

15 - OSEP Response

15 - Required Actions

Indicator 16: Mediation

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Results indicator: Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.

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

Data Source

Data collected under section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey in the ED Facts Metadata and Process System (EMAPS)).

Measurement

Percent = $(2.1(a)(i) + 2.1(b)(i))$ divided by 2.1 times 100.

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

States are not required to establish baseline or targets if the number of resolution sessions is less than 10. In a reporting period when the number of resolution sessions reaches 10 or greater, develop baseline, targets and improvement activities, and report on them in the corresponding SPP/APR.

States may express their targets in a range (e.g., 75-85%).

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data under IDEA section 618, explain.

States are not required to report data at the LEA level.

16 - Indicator Data

Select yes to use target ranges

Target Range not used

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2019-20 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/04/2020	2.1 Mediations held	7
SY 2019-20 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/04/2020	2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	1
SY 2019-20 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/04/2020	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	2

Select yes if the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under section 618 of the IDEA.

NO

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

HIDOE provided internal and external stakeholders with professional learning opportunities to provide input on the implementation of IDEA. The stakeholders included: Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC), Community Children's Councils (CCCs), Leadership in Disabilities & Achievement of Hawaii (LDAH), Special Parent Information Network (SPIN), Hawaii State Council on Developmental Disabilities (DD Council), State offices, Complex Areas, and schools.

FFY 2019 SPP/APR Input and Feedback

HIDOE, the Monitoring and Compliance Branch (MAC) met with SEAC members on December 11, 2020, and January 8, 2021, to share the longitudinal data for each of the indicators and received feedback on possible reasons for slippage as well as strategies for improvement regarding the FFY 2019 data. In addition, MAC engaged the District Educational Specialists in an activity where they provided their input and suggestions for areas of improvement at the complex area and systemic level based on FFY 2019 current and longitudinal data.

Stakeholder Engagement Utilizing Leading by Convening Framework

As one of its core improvement strategies, HIDOE continues to utilize the Leading by Convening Framework (Cashman et al., 2014) to engage internal and external stakeholder groups in improving results for students with disabilities. Stakeholder engagement and involvement through the Leading by Convening framework is designed to provide a safe and productive forum to exchange ideas, share information, and provide constructive criticism.

Infographics for Families and Community Partners

The Leading by Convening framework has allowed SEAC and HIDOE to create a professional learning community where ideas, additional perspectives, support, and advice are provided to co-create infographics to support the implementation of IDEA in Hawaii. The infographics can be found on HIDOE's website at <http://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/TeachingAndLearning/SpecializedPrograms/SpecialEducation/Pages/home.aspx>

SPIN's website at <https://spinhawaii.org/infographics/school-reopening-infographics/>

SEAC's website at <https://seac-hawaii.org/infographics/>

State Advisory Panel – Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC)

SEAC is the State established advisory panel and serves as an advisor to the state-level special education staff regarding the education of all children with disabilities. Membership for SEAC is an appointment by the Superintendent. The membership is representative of the State population and composed of individuals involved in or concerned with the education of children with disabilities. The majority of members shall be individuals with disabilities or parents of children with disabilities (ages birth through 26). The membership includes representatives from the following stakeholder

groups:

- Parents of children with disabilities ages birth through 26
- Individuals with disabilities
- Teachers (general and special education) of children with disabilities
- The University of Hawaii and other representatives of other institutions of higher education that prepare special education and related services personnel
- State, district, and school education officials
- Administrators of programs for children with disabilities
- Representatives of other state agencies involved in the financing or delivery of related services to children with disabilities
- Representatives of private schools and public charter schools
- Representative of a vocational, community, or business organization concerned with the provision of transition services to children with disabilities
- Representatives of the State juvenile and adult corrections agencies
- Representative of the Parent Training and Information Center
- Representatives of the community
- Representative of the education office responsible for the coordination of the Education for Homeless Children and Youth Program
- Representative of the state child welfare agency responsible for foster care of children
- Representative of military students and families

Special Parent Information Network (SPIN)

SPIN is co-sponsored by the Disability and Communication Access Board and HIDEO. Services include a phone call line for information and referral support, a quarterly newsletter, an annual conference, and community workshops. The Special Parent Information Network is guided by an advisory committee made up of parents, professionals, and people with disabilities. Additional information can be found on the SPIN webpage at <https://spinhawaii.org/>.

Leadership in Disabilities & Achievement of Hawaii (LDAH)

LDAH is a nonprofit organization working to support and educate parents, families, and professionals to meet the needs of children and youth (ages birth through 26) with any disability. Dedicated to the service of individuals with special needs, LDAH is the Parent Training and Information Center for the State of Hawaii and provides interactive training opportunities, disseminates high-quality educational resources, and offers advocacy assistance at no cost to families. As of 2015, LDAH has developed partnerships with American Samoa, Guam, the Republic of Palau, the Republic of the Marshall Islands, the Federated States of Micronesia, and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands. As a Parent Training and Information Center, LDAH and its partners provide information and referral, mentoring and advocacy, and education and training to parents and family members of children with disabilities and the professionals who serve them. LDAH's goal is to ensure that all children with disabilities receive a proper education. Additional information can be found on the LDAH webpage at <https://ldahawaii.org/>.

Community Children's Councils (CCCs)

CCCs serve children and families including those with disabilities and mental health needs through collaborative partnerships. The CCCs are led by parent and professional co-chairs and include representation from public and private child-serving agencies and other community members such as recreational services, businesses, churches, and others. The CCC office provides technical and administrative support to the seventeen (17) councils, including information gathering and dissemination, logistical assistance for conferences and workshops, training in leadership and facilitation, and providing TA and support. Additional information can be found on the CCCs webpage at <http://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/ParentsAndStudents/SupportForParents/Pages/CCC.aspx>.

Hawaii's State Council on Developmental Disabilities (DD Council)

DD Council engages communities in advocacy, capacity-building, and systemic change activities that are consistent with the policy in the federal law. The DD Council promotes self-determination for individuals with developmental disabilities and their families by contributing to a coordinated and comprehensive service system that is person-centered and family-directed. Additional information can be found on the DD Council webpage at <https://hiddcouncil.org/>.

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target >=					
Data	0.00%	0.00%	50.00%	0.00%	80.00%

Targets

FFY	2019
Target >=	

FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data

2.1.a.i Mediation agreements related to due process complaints	2.1.b.i Mediation agreements not related to due process complaints	2.1 Number of mediations held	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
1	2	7	80.00%		42.86%	N/A	N/A

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Pursuant to OSEP instructions, HIDOE is not required to report on targets for years in which less than 10 mediations are held. HIDOE consulted with the Consortium for Appropriate Dispute Resolution in Special Education (CADRE) to keep current with national trends.

The indicator 16 data is complete, valid, and reliable. While the mediation process required adjustment to an online/virtual model from a face-to-face model, the collection of data was not affected by the COVID-19 pandemic for SY 2019-2020.

16 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

16 - OSEP Response

The State reported fewer than ten mediations held in FFY 2019. The State is not required to provide targets until any fiscal year in which ten or more mediations were held.

16 - Required Actions

Certification

Instructions

Choose the appropriate selection and complete all the certification information fields. Then click the "Submit" button to submit your APR.

Certify

I certify that I am the Chief State School Officer of the State, or his or her designee, and that the State's submission of its IDEA Part B State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report is accurate.

Select the certifier's role:

Designated by the Chief State School Officer to certify

Name and title of the individual certifying the accuracy of the State's submission of its IDEA Part B State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report.

Name:

Cara Tanimura

Title:

Director, Monitoring and Compliance Branch

Email:

cara.tanimura@k12.hi.us

Phone:

808-307-3600

Submitted on: