

# **STATE PERFORMANCE PLAN / ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REPORT: PART B**

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

**For reporting on  
FFY 2020**

**Hawaii**



**PART B DUE February 1, 2022**

**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

The Hawaii State Department of Education (Department) is submitting its Part B State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR) to the U.S. Department of Education, Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) as required by the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). The plan was developed based on guidance from OSEP, OSEP funded technical assistance (TA) centers, and broad stakeholder input.

The Department serves as both the state educational agency (SEA) and the local educational agency (LEA) and operates as a tri-level system – state office, complex area, and school – with all levels working in cross-level teams to meet the needs of all students. While the Department oversees seven (7) Districts divided into 15 Complex Areas (CA) across 42 Complexes, it remains centralized as one (1) single District. The Department oversees 294 schools including public charter schools and over 173,000 students. Eleven percent (11%) of the total student population receive special education. Of that 11%, 43% are identified as economically disadvantaged, 3.5% as military, and 9% as English Language Learners. The most common languages are Ilocano, Chuukese, Marshallese, Tagalog, Spanish, Japanese, Mandarin, and Samoan.

The Superintendent serves as the chief executive officer of the public school system. The Department is currently headed by our interim superintendent, Keith Hayashi. The Monitoring and Compliance Branch (MAC) under the Office of the Deputy Superintendent, monitors all public schools, including public charter schools, to ensure compliance with IDEA and 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 TA to CAs and schools in planning and implementing programs that increase achievement for students with disabilities.

Support and services to students with disabilities are provided in accordance with IDEA and HAR Chapter 60. Policies and procedures are posted and disseminated on the Department's website

<https://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/TeachingAndLearning/SpecializedPrograms/SpecialEducation/Pages/home.aspx>. The Department meets with the state's IDEA advisory panel, Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC) monthly to share updates on special education programs, procedures, and policies.

Hawaii's IDEA Part B determination for both 2020 and 2021 is Needs Assistance. In accordance with section 616(e)(1) of the IDEA and 34 Code of Federal Regulations (C.F.R.) § 300.604(a), given Hawaii's determination of "Needs Assistance" for two (2) consecutive years, in the State's 2021 OSEP Determination Letter, the Secretary advised the Department of available sources for technical assistance, including OSEP-funded technical assistance centers, and required the State to work with appropriate entities. The Secretary directed the Department 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 2020 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2022, 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.

Consistent with federal requirements and a directive in the 2021 OSEP Determination Letter, the Department requested and received TA from various OSEP funded TA centers.

1. National Center for Systemic Improvement (NCSI)
2. National Center on Educational Outcomes (NCEO)
4. Center for IDEA Fiscal Reporting (CIFR)
5. National Technical Assistance Center for Transition: The Collaborative (NTACT:C)
6. IDEA Data Center (IDC)
7. National Association of State Directors of Special Education (NASDSE)

Throughout the year, TA was received in areas such as general supervision, policies and procedures, State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), secondary transition, and IDEA Part B data collection, reporting, and analysis. The assistance provided by the various TA centers was very valuable in assisting the Department in addressing the areas of need and improving its current system.

Three (3) major undertakings of the Department for FFY 2020 were:

- A) General Supervision System (GSS): The ESB and the MAC Branch worked with the NCSI and WestEd (Special Education Policy and Practice) to explore our grounding assumptions and develop a shared vision that aligns with the Department's vision that "Hawaii's students are educated, healthy and joyful lifelong learners who contribute positively to our community and global society". The areas of postsecondary transition planning and student achievement in English/Language Arts (ELA) were targeted as focus areas.
- B) State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP): The Department collaborated with IDC, NCSI, and NCEO who provided intensive technical assistance to support the implementation and evaluation of the SSIP.
- C) Authentic Engagement with Community Partners: The Department continued to utilize the Leading by Convening approach to building stronger partnerships with its parent and community partners.

The Department continues to work collaboratively with its partners, stakeholders statewide, and TA centers to fulfill its commitment to all students to be college and career-ready when they exit the public school and ensures that:

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

#### Additional information related to data collection and reporting

Numerous COVID-19 pandemic-related challenges arose across Hawaii's public schools which impacted instruction, learning, teachers, and students. In response to the COVID-19 pandemic, the Department's overall priorities focused on maintaining student well-being, addressing learning loss, particularly for students who were already behind their grade level expectations prior to the pandemic, and mitigation of the spread of the COVID-19 on campuses. COVID-19 has significantly disrupted student learning, and some students have also experienced stress, disruptions at home, and trauma. Various resources and support were put into place including expansion of health services by creating a student-focused hotline and telehealth service in partnership with the University of Hawaii School of Nursing. An additional nurse was added to each of the complex areas whose focus was to conduct school readiness assessments, create contingency plans for medically fragile students, coordinate COVID-19 testing, and serve as health experts. For more information on the Here to Help Supporting Student Well-Being and Mental Health, please refer to the Department's website at <https://heretohelp.hidoe.us/>.

Mobile support was provided for students and families when access to school campuses was limited. Home visits by the school social work staff, counselors, school-based behavioral health staff, and school administrators assisted in establishing communication to determine the scope of existing family needs. In addition, the Department focused on educating all school personnel on identifying students with mental health needs, understanding the impacts of trauma, self-care, social-emotional learning, and well-being supports.

Many students did not have access to devices and consistent connectivity at home. The Department purchased mobile devices and hot spots for students to engage in the virtual learning activities. Vans were utilized as mobile connectivity hubs on school campuses to provide online access to students in rural communities. To assist families who were unfamiliar with the new virtual learning modes, a hotline, the Ohana (family) Help Desk was established.

The Department established the Yes Project that supports students and families who experience homelessness. The Yes Project provides community-based programming and general outreach in partnership with shelters, community centers, encampments, and other outreach providers. They support the transition to school activities such as identification of students, provision of supplies, food and bus passes, completion of paperwork, connection to parents/families, and early childhood referrals. For more information on Yes Project can be found at <https://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/DOE%20Forms/OSSS/OSSS%20HCY%20Update%20Summer%202021%20v4.pdf>.

The Department delayed the start of the 2020-2021 school year by nine days to provide teachers and support staff with professional development on virtual instruction, strategies, and resources through distance learning training modules.

The Department continues to work with schools to determine the extent of the learning loss of students with disabilities by monitoring student progress towards the goals identified in the Individualized Educational Program (IEP). Guidelines were developed to assist the IEP teams in identifying learning skills loss, lack of adequate progress, learning loss, or the emergence of new needs that students may have experienced. Addressing learning loss materials and resources were developed by the Exceptional Support Branch to support school staff and families of students with disabilities. Addressing learning loss resources for students with disabilities can be found at <https://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/TeachingAndLearning/SpecializedPrograms/SpecialEducation/Pages/home.aspx>. For further resources and information regarding the Department's efforts to address the challenges that rose from COVID-19, please refer to the Department's website at <https://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/ConnectWithUs/MediaRoom/PressReleases/Pages/COVID-19-Information-Updates.aspx>.

The continued impact on learning as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic circumstances exacerbated pre-existing achievement gaps, especially for students with disabilities. When reviewing the data on each of the indicators and comparing the school year 2020-2021 as well as for some of the indicators that use lag data from the school year 2019-2020, to the extent possible, pandemic-related challenges including but not limited to, context to learning, test-taking, including participation rates, students' learning modalities, and access to adequate learning devices and internet connectivity should be considered.

#### **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.**

The Department implements a General Supervision System (GSS) that promotes continuous improvement in educational and functional outcomes for all students with disabilities, identifies noncompliance, and ensures verification of noncompliance in accordance with federal regulations. The implementation of GSS is accomplished through the collaborative work of the MAC and the ESB. To achieve improved outcomes, the ESB provides direction, PD, and TA on program implementation and improvement. The MAC ensures the Department meets the requirements of both IDEA and the HAR, Chapter 60 regulations, and provides targeted support related to these requirements.

The Department is a unitary system and considered a single SEA/LEA entity. Its learning organizational infrastructure is based on a tri-level system (State, CA, and School). While the Department is not required by OSEP to report on each CA's performance on IDEA implementation, the CAs still remain accountable for monitoring and supporting all applicable IDEA requirements.

The Department worked in collaboration with both internal and external stakeholders and technical assistance providers to improve its GSS. The Department explored grounding assumptions and developed a shared vision that aligns the GSS with the Department's vision of "Hawaii's students are educated, healthy and joyful lifelong learners who contribute positively to our community and global society".

#### **Components of the Department's GSS**

The following eight (8) components are addressed in the Department's GSS. While each component is specific and unique, all are interconnected and addressed simultaneously.

1. State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report
2. Data on Processes and Results
3. Policies, Procedures, and Effective Implementation
4. Fiscal Management
5. Integrated Monitoring Activities
6. Sustaining Compliance and Improvement
7. Targeted Technical Assistance and Professional Development
8. Effective Dispute Resolution

#### **State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR)**

The submission and implementation of SPP/APR is a collaborative effort of the MAC and the ESB. The MAC collects, examines, evaluates, reports data, and continuously monitors the implementation of IDEA in all public schools including charter schools. The ESB provides leadership in the planning,

development, coordination, implementation, and evaluation of programs and services to ensure that students with disabilities are provided a FAPE.

#### Data on Processes and Results

Using the SPP/APR indicators, a data collection and analysis process has been designed to measure each indicator, identify areas of priority for the Department, and determine levels of support. Schools regularly update their student information data, which is then verified. The MAC aggregates, examines, analyzes, and reports on the collected data. This data is used to identify the progress of CA on the SPP/APR indicators. To build the capacity of CA teams, the MAC and the ESB facilitate Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) with the CAs in analyzing their data to inform improvement efforts. Through the Department's improvement plan in the SPP/APR and performance data, ongoing state activities are used for program improvement and progress measurement. Technical assistance and PD are available for CAs to target areas of focus determined by their data.

#### Policies, Procedures, and Effective Implementation

The Department's policies and procedures are established primarily through the Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act of 2004 (IDEA), the HAR Chapter 60, and the Hawaii State Board of Education Policy. An electronic copy of HAR Chapter 60 and the Hawaii State Board Policy is available on the Hawaii State Board of Education website <https://boe.hawaii.gov/policies/AdminRules/Pages/default.aspx>.

#### Fiscal Management

Fiscal and resource management of federal IDEA funds are monitored at state, complex area, and school levels. Complex Area applications, financial reports, and related supporting documents are used to monitor the use of these funds. In addition to compliance with allowable costs, fixed assets, and payroll certification, assurances that all personnel are qualified to and actively participate in advancing IDEA priorities within their area are required.

#### Integrated Monitoring Activities

Integrated monitoring activities are achieved through a differentiated accountability and support system. The MAC and the ESB collaborate on providing accountability measures and support activities to CAs via a tiered system. A CA's need is based on how it performs on the Results and Compliance Rating. The rating is used to determine the CA's assigned intervention tier.

#### Examples of Tier I: Universal Activities

- Collect, verify, conduct annual audits, and analyze data for SPP/APR compliance and in results indicators.
- Public Reporting of SPP/APR data.
- Engage stakeholders in the process of receiving input about target setting, data analysis, developing improvement strategies, and evaluating progress.
- Statewide data-informed PD and TA.

#### Examples of Tier II: Targeted Activities

- In-depth file reviews for indicators 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13.
- Target CA improvement planning to address focused results indicators.
- Target TA to CA based on compliance data and findings.

#### Examples of Tier III: Intensive Activities

- Conduct on-site monitoring to audit files and review procedures and practices in place.
- Issue findings and ensure noncompliance findings are corrected in accordance with OSEP Memorandum 09-02.
- Require meetings with the CA team to monitor improvement activities and expected outcomes.

#### Sustaining Compliance and Improvement

The Department's comprehensive monitoring system provides oversight of the implementation of IDEA requirements by:

- Determining risk for noncompliance in the areas of fiscal management, IDEA requirements, and performance;
- Identifying noncompliance from a variety of sources;
- Issuing of findings of noncompliance as appropriate in accordance with OSEP Memorandum 09-02;
- Ensuring correction in a timely manner;
- Verifying and following up to ensure data reported reflect actual practice; and
- Providing TA and PD to meet the requirements of IDEA.

#### Targeted TA & PD

Across all tiers of support, the ultimate purpose is to improve educational and functional outcomes for all students with disabilities. Although the accountability and support activities vary across the three (3) tiers of support, the Department is committed to aligning its TA with critical components of evidence-based professional learning. Specifically, the Department is guided by Learning Forward's 7 Standards for Professional Learning: learning communities, leadership, resources, data, learning designs, implementation, and outcomes.

#### Effective Dispute Resolution

Several mechanisms are available through the Department to assist in resolving disputes. The processes are mediation, impartial due process hearing requests, resolution sessions, and written complaints.

#### 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.**

The Department has multiple mechanisms in place to ensure the timely delivery of high-quality, evidence-based TA and support to all CAs. The ESB and the MAC manage all TA activities related to the implementation of IDEA Part B. The ESB and the MAC have teams of subject matter experts in instruction, behavior, program planning, and IDEA regulations. Data from various sources are used to identify necessary TA and is provided to other Department offices, CAs, schools, and various organizations. TA is provided in the form of written guidance, standing meetings, professional learning communities, and agency collaboration. Meeting rosters and meeting minutes are available. Examples of the Department's TA include, but are not limited to the following activities:

#### District Educational Specialist Mandatory Monthly Meetings

During the monthly meetings, direct TA is provided to District Educational Specialists (DES) who are responsible for providing leadership and guidance to their designated schools relating to special education. Examples of TA, including but are not limited to, the following:

- Addressing compliance and subsequent verification of compliance issues.
- Assistance in communicating with parent(s)/legal guardian(s) and minimizing the need for formal dispute resolution options.
- Meeting reporting requirements for data and fiscal reporting.
- Submitting project proposals for IDEA part B funds and ensuring the appropriate use of the funds in including early intervening services.
- Disseminating information, prescribing policies, or evidence-based practices for the delivery of special education and related services.

- Providing evidence-based instructional strategies for students with disabilities.
- School Reopening: Providing intensive interventions for students with disabilities to accelerate learning.
- Discussing the implementation of language and literacy strategies for students with disabilities.
- Ongoing support to improve secondary transition plans.
- Ongoing support to improve preschool outcomes.

#### Monthly Meetings with Community Partners

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

#### Compliance and Monitoring TA Sessions

The MAC staff meet with each CA and their teams to review their data on noncompliance findings. These sessions are geared towards a deep dive into the corrections that need to be made, root causes of the noncompliance, and the development of a plan of action to support the CA and teachers, to ensure noncompliance does not reoccur.

#### Department and Early Intervention Part C TA and Collaboration

The ESB Preschool Educational Specialist and the IDEA Data Manager from MAC have extensive experience in Early Intervention and collaborate with Early Intervention Part C staff with the purpose of promoting networking and strengthening early childhood partnerships, programs, and systems building initiatives. The Department participated with the Hawaii State Department of Health, Early Intervention on the Comprehensive System of Personnel Development to address systemic issues for early childhood in the areas of personnel shortages (specifically in the areas of recruitment and retention of speech-language pathologists, occupational and physical therapists) and in-service training to build the capacity of the workforce.

#### Guidelines, Handbooks & Infographics

Guidelines, handbooks and infographics are developed by the Department in collaboration with stakeholders and updated to inform and clarify compliance requirements and best practices. Each document has a plan of action for the distribution and implementation expectations. These documents are published and available via the Department's intranet.

- Transportation for Students with Disabilities
- Inclusive Education
- Public Charter Schools
- Postsecondary Transition Handbook
- Extended School Year

#### Guidance on Distance Learning (DL) and Return to Learning for Students with Disabilities

With the ever-changing impact of the pandemic, TA to the field is provided via guidance and resources on DL and returning to learn.

#### School Year 2021-22 Distance Learning Programs

<https://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/Pages/DistanceLearning.aspx>

Distance Learning and Implementation of Individualized Education Programs and Section 504 Plans Memo 7.26.2021

<https://drive.google.com/file/d/1F3XQSo8rj3lUwr1Lc-NtsjUwIzCEdvAz/view>

Addressing IEP Goals via Distance Learning

<https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/1HCiYZZY1Uk9FUjGD8Se2EcP1Vl7jYVOf>

Distance Learning Considerations

[https://docs.google.com/document/d/1wCNR3dHqcpN\\_8iUJJoZBm7TVnUMJ9urfpr0jwnLLwFk/edit](https://docs.google.com/document/d/1wCNR3dHqcpN_8iUJJoZBm7TVnUMJ9urfpr0jwnLLwFk/edit)

SPED Reopening Schools Return to Learn

<https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/1xAkypzfokmOgnywTiCfqBD-SrtdDI5nQ>

#### Memos

Memos are developed to guide the field by establishing or clarifying procedures and policies. The Department issues and maintains a repository of State memos accessible to the Department's employees.

#### Infographics for Parent(s)/Legal Guardian(s) and Community Partners

Infographics, created in partnership with SEAC, SPIN, ESB, and MAC, were developed to provide parents and the community with information on various special education topics and programs. To support the stakeholder knowledge and engagement on SPP/APR indicators, infographics on each SPP/APR indicator were created. These infographics are available on <https://spinhawaii.org/>.

#### 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 children with disabilities.**

The Department is committed to aligning its professional learning with critical components of evidence-based professional learning and provides a variety of PD opportunities to ensure that service providers have the skills to improve results for children with disabilities. Rosters and meeting notes are available. The following mechanisms are examples of the Department's PD system.

#### Mandatory PLC Meetings

In an effort to address the areas of need and priority for the Department, the ESB and MAC staff facilitate PLCs focusing on priority indicators using various data to identify root causes that inform improvement activities. The PLCs priority areas focused on Preschool Outcomes, Secondary Transition, and State-Identified Measurable Results (SiMR) results.

#### Indicator 13 Compliance Targeted CA/School Training

The MAC provides PD to each CA and their schools on Indicator 13 requirements to build their capacity in writing effective transition plans that meet the 100% federal compliance requirements. These PD opportunities have been provided to all CAs and will continue as ongoing support across the state.

#### Instructional Modules and Other Training Materials

The Department's intranet houses additional resources and materials accessible to CA and school staff at their convenience. Instructional webinars available on a variety of special education topics including inclusive practices, evidence-based practices, and high-leverage instructional practices are available on <https://inclusion.hawaiipublicschools.org/> Courses were also made available for SY 2021-2022 to assist teachers in addressing learning loss due to the pandemic through the Hawaii Multi-Tiered

System of Supports and high-leverage instructional practices.

#### Quarterly Multi-Agency Transition Meetings

The Department, in partnership with the following stakeholders, hosts a day of PD to support and assist the development of postsecondary transition plans. The content of the PD is designed to update transition teachers, coordinators, and counselors who are responsible for the planning and development of postsecondary transition plans for students with disabilities. The following stakeholders participate in the quarterly meetings.

- Department of Human Services (DHS)
- Division of Vocational Rehabilitation (DVR)
- Developmental Disabilities Division (DDD)
- Hawaii State Council on Developmental Disabilities (DD Council)
- Center on Disability Studies (CDS)
- Self-Advocacy Advisory Council (SAAC)

#### Hawaii Statewide Assessment Program (HSAP) Training Conference

The MAC staff partnered with the Assessment and Accountability Section to facilitate a session on Indicator 3 during the HSAP Conference. The session provided CAs and schools with information about IDEA monitoring and reporting, a description of Indicator 3 statewide participation and performance of students with IEPs, a review of longitudinal data, and input from stakeholders on target setting and strategies for improvement.

#### **Broad Stakeholder Input:**

**The mechanisms for soliciting broad stakeholder input on the State's targets in the SPP/APR and any subsequent revisions that the State has made to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP).**

The Department collaborates closely with several partners to ensure that authentic engagement in all aspects of the Department's special education program is achieved. These stakeholders supported the Department with the process of soliciting and providing broad stakeholder input on the Department's FFY 2020-2025 SPP/APR cycle. Presentation materials and meeting notes are available at the following websites:

- SEAC website at SPP/APR Resources Page <https://seac-hawaii.org/spp-apr-resource-page/>
- The Department's website at <https://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/TeachingAndLearning/SpecializedPrograms/SpecialEducation/Pages/home.aspx>

#### State Advisory Panel – Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC)

The Special Education Advisory Council 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 our SEAC is an appointment of 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 are individuals with disabilities or parents of children with disabilities (ages birth through 26). In the SEAC monthly meetings, family, community, and Department partners come together to address the group's special education priorities. This is done by sharing information, hearing community concerns, and addressing actions for improvement. Meeting agendas and minutes, along with other family resources, can be found on the SEAC website at <https://seac-hawaii.org/>.

#### Special Parent Information Network (SPIN)

The Special Parent Information Network is co-sponsored by the Disability and Communication Access Board and the Department. The Department has a long-standing memorandum of agreement with the Hawaii State Department of Health to fund the SPIN to provide support to SEAC. In addition, SPIN provides training and technical assistance to parent(s)/legal guardian(s) of students with disabilities. This includes the development and maintenance of an informational website and other materials, an annual parent conference, and availability to answer parent questions via a telephone hotline. SPIN is guided by an advisory committee made up of parents, professionals, and persons with disabilities and works with the Department to support students and families. Additional information can be found on the SPIN webpage at <https://spinhawaii.org/>.

#### Community Children's Councils (CCCs)

The Community Children's Councils serve children and families including those with disabilities and mental health needs through collaborative partnerships. The CCC, led by parent and professional co-chairs, provides assistance to families in coordinating educational and community support and services for their children with disabilities. The CCC is composed of 17 councils across the state representing each CA's geographic community. Given this structure, the CCCs are an effective venue for the Department to reach the broad and diverse communities across all islands. Additional information can be found on the CCCs webpage at <https://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/ParentsAndStudents/SupportForParents/Pages/CCC.aspx>.

#### 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. 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. Additional information can be found on the LDAH webpage at <https://ldahawaii.org/>.

The Department continues to utilize the Leading by Convening framework to engage stakeholders in monthly Parent Partner meetings. These meetings are designed to provide opportunities for sharing information, exchanging ideas, understanding various perspectives, and supporting effective communication. Community stakeholders represented at these meetings include SEAC, SPIN, CCC, DD Council, and Hawaii's Parent Training and Information agency, LDAH.

The ESB and MAC in collaboration with SEAC, SPIN, and CCC, commenced a series of stakeholder meetings to begin discussions and develop recommended targets for the new six-year cycle of the revised SPP. Beginning in January 2021, these meetings were held over a one-year period and were designed to engage stakeholders from various backgrounds; educators, parents, school administrators, policy advisors, school psychologists, early education, advocacy groups, and state advisory board members. The Department leveraged the expertise of these stakeholders, with their breadth and depth of knowledge, to help inform the development of a new set of rigorous state targets and solicited new improvement activities for the next six-year SPP cycle.

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

YES

#### **Number of Parent Members:**

20

#### **Parent Members Engagement:**

**Describe how the parent members of the State Advisory Panel, parent center staff, parents from local and statewide advocacy and advisory committees, and individual parents were engaged in setting targets, analyzing data, developing improvement strategies, and evaluating progress.**

For all stakeholder meetings listed in the section above, presentations/materials were developed for each of the indicators to inform stakeholders of the history and data trends and assist them in engaging in rigorous discussions. Each presentation included an explanation of the indicator definition, how it is measured and calculated, and statewide performance trends over the last five (5) years. A total of 20 parents attended one or more of the monthly stakeholder meetings. The materials for each of the stakeholder meetings are uploaded on the Department's website at <https://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/TeachingAndLearning/SpecializedPrograms/SpecialEducation/Pages/home.aspx> under the section titled IDEA Part B Reports and SEAC's website <https://seac-hawaii.org/spp-apr-resource-page/> under the section titled SPP/APR Resource Page for the general public to view and provide feedback.

On December 10, 2021, a formal SPP/APR Stakeholder meeting was held with a focus on the priority indicators identified by SEAC. The meeting was attended by 58 stakeholders representing parents, the Department, and community agencies. At this meeting, stakeholders attended small breakout sessions to engage in rigorous discussion around data trends, improvement activities, and target setting. More detailed information on the December 10, 2021 agenda and breakout sessions can be found on the SEAC website in the SPP/APR Resource Page at <https://seac-hawaii.org/spp-apr-resource-page/>.

**Activities to Improve Outcomes for Children with Disabilities:**

**The activities conducted to increase the capacity of diverse groups of parents to support the development of implementation activities designed to improve outcomes for children with disabilities.**

The Department recognizes the importance of family engagement for student achievement and social development and a strategy for sustainable long-term student success. The Department values parents' involvement in the Individualized Education Program (IEP) meetings and other school activities/events relating to their children's education. The parents' participation in the Parent Involvement Survey helps the Department improve parental involvement in the special education process and increase positive outcomes for our students with disabilities and their families. An online survey was developed to support parents from diverse groups to respond to the survey. The survey can be found at <https://www.hiparentsurvey.com/>. In addition, the Department developed a handout with questions and answers to help parents understand the survey and its importance. The handout can be found at <https://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/DOE%20Forms/Special%20Education/Parent%20Involvement%20Survey%20Handout.pdf>.

The CCC, shared SPP/APR information at the 2nd quarter co-chair meeting specific to Indicator 8. Each co-chair was asked to take this information back to their respective communities with the intent to solicit more family engagement. Moving forward, the Department will use this venue to ensure that all communities within the state have access to and opportunity for stakeholder engagement.

**SEAC Monthly Meetings**

During monthly SEAC meetings, MAC and ESB staff provided participants with authentic engagement during the SPP/APR target-setting process. Participants were provided with specific information on indicators to help stakeholders engage in discussions and provide input on target setting and the development of strategies to support improved results for students with disabilities.

The members of the monthly Parent Partnership meetings have intentionally addressed the need to reach parents and families who are not typically represented by a parent group or organization. This group is currently looking at data to identify marginalized communities and families and is looking for solutions to facilitate their inclusion as authentic stakeholders.

**Soliciting Public Input:**

**The mechanisms and timelines for soliciting public input for setting targets, analyzing data, developing improvement strategies, and evaluating progress.**

Beginning January 2021 through December 2021, ten (10) SEAC meetings, open to the public, were conducted where Department GSS and SPP/APR information was shared and reviewed. During these meetings, the Department staff and stakeholders reviewed indicator data, historical trends and discussed improvement activities. In addition to soliciting input during these meetings, the Department published presentations on its website <https://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/TeachingAndLearning/SpecializedPrograms/SpecialEducation/Pages/home.aspx> on each indicator as a mechanism to make the information available to the public and developed electronic surveys through Padlet and Google Form to receive additional feedback. The Department collaborated with our SEAC to publish the presentations and feedback activities on their website <https://seac-hawaii.org/spp-apr-resource-page/>.

**SEAC Meeting Dates and Agenda Items:**

- January 8, 2021  
Shared data and improvement activity information on APR Indicators 9, 10 and 13
- February 12, 2021  
Shared data and improvement activity information on APR Indicator 13
- March 12, 2021  
Presented on FFY 2020-2025 SPP/APR Changes at a Glance and shared data and improvement activity information on APR Indicator 17
- April 9, 2021  
Shared data and improvement activity information and solicited feedback on setting targets for Indicators 5 and 6
- May 14, 2021  
Shared data and improvement activity information and solicited feedback on setting targets for Indicator 1, 2, and 4 (NCSI attended)
- August 13, 2021  
Presentation on OSEP Determination Based on Hawaii's FFY 19
- September 10, 2021  
Shared data and improvement activity information and solicited feedback on setting targets for Indicator 7
- October 8, 2021  
Shared data and improvement activity information for Indicator 3 (also included a presentation on changes to reporting requirements)
- November 12, 2021  
Shared data and improvement activity information for Indicator 13 and 14
- December 10, 2021 Stakeholder Engagement Meeting  
Engaged in rigorous discussion around data trends, improvement activities, and target setting in breakout sessions for Indicators 3, 6 and 7, 8, 13 and 14, and 17

**Stakeholder Involvement – Federal Fiscal Years (FFY) 2020-2025**

The Department posted presentation materials and a feedback form for each of the indicators for the public to provide their input. The indicator

resources are available to view on the Department's website at <https://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/TeachingAndLearning/SpecializedPrograms/SpecialEducation/Pages/home.aspx>.

### **Making Results Available to the Public:**

**The mechanisms and timelines for making the results of the target setting, data analysis, development of the improvement strategies, and evaluation available to the public.**

Results of each stakeholder engagement were made available to the public using the following methods:

- SEAC website at SPP/APR Resources Page <https://seac-hawaii.org/spp-apr-resource-page/>
- The Department's website at <https://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/TeachingAndLearning/SpecializedPrograms/SpecialEducation/Pages/home.aspx>
- Padlets and Google Forms online surveys.

### **Reporting to the Public**

**How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY 2019 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 2019 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/APR, including any revision if the State has revised the targets that it submitted with its FFY 2019 APR in 2021, is available.**

The FFY 2019 SPP/APR was posted on the Department's 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 2021, which was within the IDEA requirements, no later than 120 days following the submission of the Department'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 2020 and 2021 is Needs Assistance. In the State's 2021 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 2020 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2022, 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.

### **Response to actions required in FFY 2019 SPP/APR**

Throughout the year, technical assistance was received from various TA providers in areas such as general supervision, policies and procedures, SSIP, secondary transition, and IDEA Part B data collection, reporting, and analysis. The assistance provided by the various TA centers was valuable in assisting the Department address areas of need and next steps for improvement. Consistent with section 616(e)(1) of the IDEA and 34 C.F.R. § 300.604(a), and in response to the directive in the OSEP Determination letter, the Department requested and received TA from various OSEP approved TA Centers:

#### **Center for IDEA Fiscal Reporting (CIFR)**

CIFR provided TA to the ESB staff regarding fiscal and resource management of federal IDEA funds monitored by the state and complex areas. As a result, the ESB further refined the Complex Area Project Plans for the use of federal IDEA funds. The Complex Area Project Plans were amended to include essential and personnel costs with supporting documents so that the state can efficiently monitor the use of funds. In addition to compliance with allowable costs, fixed assets, and payroll certification, assurances that all personnel are qualified to and actively participate in advancing IDEA priorities within their area are required as well. In May 2021, TA was provided regarding how to determine if a complex area poses a fiscal risk. As a result, a tool that defined the elements of fiscal risk assessment was developed. Furthermore, CIFR provided resources and information on the Maintenance of Effort waiver requirements to assist the Department in preparation although fortunately this occurrence was not realized due to the state's economic upturn.

#### **National Technical Assistance Center for Transition (NTACT)**

The ESB attended the NTACT: C 2021 Capacity Building Virtual Institute (CBVI) - Improving Opportunities and Outcomes from May 3-6, 2021. The ESB was provided with TA from NTACT on May 6, 2021, to develop a statewide action plan to improve postsecondary transition policies and procedures. On July 23, 2021, ESB sent a draft of a statewide action plan that was developed by the ESB's Hawaii Post Secondary Transition Workgroup. To further refine the statewide action plan, the ESB team met with NTACT on July 26, 2021, and revised the tasks and activities.

#### **National Association of State Directors of Special Education (NASDSE)**

NASDSE has assisted the Department in staying abreast of both national and state policies and trends.

- 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

In addition, the Hawaii State Director of Special Education is a member of the NCSI State Education Agency Leadership (SEAL) cohort for new directors. This collaboration has given the Director the opportunity to engage in shared learning and network with valuable state and national partners. While this level of support for new directors seems helpful in any situation, it has been especially helpful in navigating the obligation to implement IDEA in light of the COVID1-9 pandemic.

#### **Coordinated Technical Assistance**

National Center for Systemic Improvement (NCSI), National Center on Educational Outcomes (NCEO), and IDEA Data Center (IDC)

Coordinated TA was provided to the Department ESB Team on the implementation of the State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). NCSI, NCEO, and IDC came together to provide an integrated approach to assisting the Department in reviewing the SSIP theory of action, operationalizing improvement activities, and identifying outcome data and measurement tools. This resulted in the development of an ESB-sponsored literacy initiative (discussed later in this report) as the primary improvement activity focusing on advancing ELA EBPs.

#### Cross-State Learning Collaboratives (NCSI)

NCSI facilitates four Learning Collaboratives that bring states together to form networks of shared leadership and peer support focusing on priority topics related to improving outcomes for students with disabilities. The Hawaii team participated in the Results-Based Accountability and Support (RBAS) learning collaborative. The RBAS learning collaborative focuses on the development, implementation, and evaluation of results-based accountability and support (general supervision) systems to improve outcomes for students with disabilities. The support that the Hawaii team received was very valuable in the process of refining our general supervision system. The Hawaii team looks forward to continuing in participating in the RBAS learning collaborative and receiving support as we enhance/redesign our systems of monitoring and supervision.

#### **Intro - OSEP Response**

The State's determinations for both 2020 and 2021 were Needs Assistance. Pursuant to section 616(e)(1) of the IDEA and 34 C.F.R. § 300.604(a), OSEP's June 24, 2021 determination letter informed the State that it must report with its FFY 2020 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2022, 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.

#### **Intro - Required Actions**

The State's IDEA Part B determination for both 2021 and 2022 is Needs Assistance. In the State's 2022 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 2021 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2023, 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.

# Indicator 1: Graduation

## Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Results indicator:** Percent of youth with Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) exiting special education due to graduating 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 under section 618 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), using the definitions in EDFacts file specification FS009.

### Measurement

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

### Instructions

*Sampling is not allowed.*

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 2020 SPP/APR, use data from 2019-2020), and compare the results to the target. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Include in the denominator the following exiting categories: (a) graduated with a regular high school diploma; (b) graduated with a state-defined alternate diploma; (c) received a certificate; (d) reached maximum age; or (e) dropped out.

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.

Provide a narrative that describes the conditions youth must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma. If the conditions that youth with IEPs must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma are different, please explain.

## 1 - Indicator Data

### Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2020	72.24%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target >=	85.00%	87.00%	88.00%	90.00%	83.00%
Data	60.37%	59.49%	65.29%	64.01%	63.41%

### Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target >=	72.24%	73.00%	74.00%	75.00%	76.00%	77.00%

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The Department collaborates closely with several partners to ensure that authentic engagement in all aspects of the Department's special education program is achieved. These stakeholders supported the Department with the process of soliciting and providing broad stakeholder input on the Department's FFY 2020-2025 SPP/APR cycle. Presentation materials and meeting notes are available at the following websites:

- SEAC website at SPP/APR Resources Page <https://seac-hawaii.org/spp-apr-resource-page/>

- The Department's website at <https://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/TeachingAndLearning/SpecializedPrograms/SpecialEducation/Pages/home.aspx>

### State Advisory Panel – Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC)

The Special Education Advisory Council 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 our SEAC is an appointment of 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 are individuals with disabilities or parents of children with disabilities (ages birth through 26). In the SEAC monthly meetings, family, community, and Department partners come together to address the group's special education priorities. This is done by sharing information, hearing community concerns, and addressing actions for improvement. Meeting agendas and minutes, along with other family resources, can be found on the SEAC website at <https://seac-hawaii.org/>.

### Special Parent Information Network (SPIN)

The Special Parent Information Network is co-sponsored by the Disability and Communication Access Board and the Department. The Department has a long-standing memorandum of agreement with the Hawaii State Department of Health to fund the SPIN to provide support to SEAC. In addition, SPIN provides training and technical assistance to parent(s)/legal guardian(s) of students with disabilities. This includes the development and maintenance of an informational website and other materials, an annual parent conference, and availability to answer parent questions via a telephone hotline. SPIN is guided by an advisory committee made up of parents, professionals, and persons with disabilities and works with the Department to support students and families. Additional information can be found on the SPIN webpage at <https://spinhawaii.org/>.

### Community Children's Councils (CCCs)

The Community Children's Councils serve children and families including those with disabilities and mental health needs through collaborative partnerships. The CCC, led by parent and professional co-chairs, provides assistance to families in coordinating educational and community support and services for their children with disabilities. The CCC is composed of 17 councils across the state representing each CA's geographic community. Given

this structure, the CCCs are an effective venue for the Department to reach the broad and diverse communities across all islands. Additional information can be found on the CCCs webpage at <https://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/ParentsAndStudents/SupportForParents/Pages/CCC.aspx>.

**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. 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. Additional information can be found on the LDAH webpage at <https://ldahawaii.org/>.

The Department continues to utilize the Leading by Convening framework to engage stakeholders in monthly Parent Partner meetings. These meetings are designed to provide opportunities for sharing information, exchanging ideas, understanding various perspectives, and supporting effective communication. Community stakeholders represented at these meetings include SEAC, SPIN, CCC, DD Council, and Hawaii’s Parent Training and Information agency, LDAH.

The ESB and MAC in collaboration with SEAC, SPIN, and CCC, commenced a series of stakeholder meetings to begin discussions and develop recommended targets for the new six-year cycle of the revised SPP. Beginning in January 2021, these meetings were held over a one-year period and were designed to engage stakeholders from various backgrounds; educators, parents, school administrators, policy advisors, school psychologists, early education, advocacy groups, and state advisory board members. The Department leveraged the expertise of these stakeholders, with their breadth and depth of knowledge, to help inform the development of a new set of rigorous state targets and solicited new improvement activities for the next six-year SPP cycle.

Additional information to the description shared in the Introduction section:

Graduation rate data for Hawaii are collected annually for all students with IEPs, reported in the subsequent annual report, and not sampled. Prior to FFY 2020, the Department reported graduation data based on a cohort of students who entered grade 9 together, and of those students, the ones who graduated during the next four years of high school. Starting in FFY 2020, the new methodology requirements per the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP), measures the number of students with disabilities who graduated from high school in a single year. Using the new calculation methodology, the graduation rates result in higher percentages because the numerator is larger as it includes any student who graduated in the year rather than only students in the cohort who entered grade 9 together.

Consistent with OSEP’s guidance, based on the change of the methodology of calculating the graduation rate, the Department in collaboration with stakeholders determined to set the baseline to FFY 2020. Reviewing the data trend after applying the new calculation method for FFY 2014 to FFY 2020, the Department in collaboration with its stakeholders determined a target increase of 1% each year to reach 77% of the graduation rate by FFY 2025 was rigorous and achievable. The Department in collaboration with its stakeholders will meet annually to review the data and targets and improvement activities.

The stakeholders suggested the following improvement activities in order to increase the graduation rate for students with disabilities for the FFY 2020-25 cycle:

- Student-led IEPs
- Collection of qualitative data such as Personal Transition Plans that could provide more insight
- Address absenteeism rate
- Improve collaboration between all levels: elementary, middle, and high school
- Focus on creating strategies at the freshman level
- Improve post-secondary transition plans
- Focus on reasons why students are dropping out
- Increase project-based learning to allow for students to take fun classes

**Prepopulated Data**

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a)	924
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a state-defined alternate diploma (b)	0
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (c)	115
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (d)	49
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (e)	191

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data**

<b>Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to graduating with a regular high school diploma</b>	<b>Number of all youth with IEPs who exited special education (ages 14-21)</b>	<b>FFY 2019 Data</b>	<b>FFY 2020 Target</b>	<b>FFY 2020 Data</b>	<b>Status</b>	<b>Slippage</b>
924	1,279	63.41%	72.24%	72.24%	N/A	N/A

**Graduation Conditions**

**Provide a narrative that describes the conditions youth must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma.**

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

**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)**

For Class of 2020, the Department provided continuity of learning that promoted the continuation of teaching and learning despite the circumstances related to closures due to the COVID-19 pandemic. The Department provided tools and resources such as; printed materials for distribution to affected students, instructional packets, teacher check-ins and tutorials, recorded class meetings, remediation and intervention, credit recovery option to fulfill graduation and grade level requirements, and student licenses for online learning to support seniors who needed support to meet their graduation requirements.

To increase the graduation rate, the Department has engaged in the following improvement activities:

- Hawaii Multi-Tiered System of Support (HMTSS) mandatory in all public schools
- Smaller Learning Communities and Career Pathways
- Personal Transition Plan (PTP)
- Personalized Interventions/Counselor Support
- Longitudinal Data System (LDS) Early Learning System

**1 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**1 - OSEP Response**

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2020, and OSEP accepts that revision.

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

**1 - Required Actions**

## Indicator 2: Drop Out

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Results indicator:** Percent of youth with IEPs who exited special education due to dropping out. (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 (For FFY 2020 ONLY):

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 exited special education (ages 14-21) in the denominator.

OPTION 2 (For FFY 2020 ONLY):

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.*

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 2020 SPP/APR, use data from 2019-2020), and compare the results to the target.

With the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2022, States may use either option 1 or 2. States using Option 2 must provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

OPTION 1:

**Use 618 exiting data** for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, use data from 2019-2020). Include in the denominator the following exiting categories: (a) graduated with a regular high school diploma; (b) graduated with a state-defined alternate diploma; (c) received a certificate; (d) reached maximum age; or (e) dropped out.

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:

Provide a narrative that describes what counts as dropping out for all youth. Please explain if there is a difference between what counts as dropping out for all students and what counts as dropping out for students with IEPs.

**Beginning with the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2023**, States must report data using Option 1 (i.e., the same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the IDEA). Option 2 will not be available beginning with the FFY 2021 SPP/APR.

## 2 - Indicator Data

### Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2020	14.93%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target <=	4.50%	16.64%	14.00%	11.00%	11.00%
Data	16.64%	14.53%	14.89%	16.82%	12.38%

### Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target <=	14.93%	14.00%	13.00%	12.00%	11.00%	10.00%

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The Department collaborates closely with several partners to ensure that authentic engagement in all aspects of the Department's special education program is achieved. These stakeholders supported the Department with the process of soliciting and providing broad stakeholder input on the Department's FFY 2020-2025 SPP/APR cycle. Presentation materials and meeting notes are available at the following websites:

- SEAC website at SPP/APR Resources Page <https://seac-hawaii.org/spp-apr-resource-page/>

- The Department's website at <https://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/TeachingAndLearning/SpecializedPrograms/SpecialEducation/Pages/home.aspx>

#### State Advisory Panel – Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC)

The Special Education Advisory Council 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 our SEAC is an appointment of 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 are individuals with disabilities or parents of children with disabilities (ages birth through 26). In the SEAC monthly meetings, family, community, and Department partners come together to address the group's special education priorities. This is done by sharing information, hearing community concerns, and addressing actions for improvement. Meeting agendas and minutes, along with other family resources, can be found on the SEAC website at <https://seac-hawaii.org/>.

#### Special Parent Information Network (SPIN)

The Special Parent Information Network is co-sponsored by the Disability and Communication Access Board and the Department. The Department has a long-standing memorandum of agreement with the Hawaii State Department of Health to fund the SPIN to provide support to SEAC. In addition, SPIN provides training and technical assistance to parent(s)/legal guardian(s) of students with disabilities. This includes the development and maintenance of an informational website and other materials, an annual parent conference, and availability to answer parent questions via a telephone hotline. SPIN is guided by an advisory committee made up of parents, professionals, and persons with disabilities and works with the Department to support students and families. Additional information can be found on the SPIN webpage at <https://spinhawaii.org/>.

#### Community Children's Councils (CCCs)

The Community Children's Councils serve children and families including those with disabilities and mental health needs through collaborative partnerships. The CCC, led by parent and professional co-chairs, provides assistance to families in coordinating educational and community support and services for their children with disabilities. The CCC is composed of 17 councils across the state representing each CA's geographic community. Given this structure, the CCCs are an effective venue for the Department to reach the broad and diverse communities across all islands. Additional information can be found on the CCCs webpage at <https://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/ParentsAndStudents/SupportForParents/Pages/CCC.aspx>.

#### 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. 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. Additional information can be found on the LDAH webpage at <https://ldahawaii.org/>.

The Department continues to utilize the Leading by Convening framework to engage stakeholders in monthly Parent Partner meetings. These meetings are designed to provide opportunities for sharing information, exchanging ideas, understanding various perspectives, and supporting effective communication. Community stakeholders represented at these meetings include SEAC, SPIN, CCC, DD Council, and Hawaii's Parent Training and Information agency, LDAH.

The ESB and MAC in collaboration with SEAC, SPIN, and CCC, commenced a series of stakeholder meetings to begin discussions and develop recommended targets for the new six-year cycle of the revised SPP. Beginning in January 2021, these meetings were held over a one-year period and were designed to engage stakeholders from various backgrounds; educators, parents, school administrators, policy advisors, school psychologists, early education, advocacy groups, and state advisory board members. The Department leveraged the expertise of these stakeholders, with their breadth and depth of knowledge, to help inform the development of a new set of rigorous state targets and solicited new improvement activities for the next six-year SPP cycle.

Additional information to the description shared in the Introduction section:

Dropout rate data for Hawaii are collected annually for all students with IEPs, reported in the subsequent annual report, and not sampled. The Department has been calculating the dropout rate using the number of students who dropped out of high school in a single year. Prior to FFY 2020, consistent with the OSEP's guidance, the number of students with disabilities who dropped out in a single year was divided by the total number of students with disabilities who exited special education due to dropping out, graduating with a regular diploma, receiving a certificate or reaching the maximum age, and those who died in a single year. Beginning FFY 2020, consistent with the new guidance from OSEP, the category of students who died is removed. Based on the change of the methodology to calculate the dropout rate, the Department in collaboration with stakeholders determined to reset the baseline to FFY 2020. Reviewing the data trend after using the new calculation method for FFY 2014 to FFY 2020, the Department in collaboration with its stakeholders determined a target decrease of 1% each year to reach 10% of the dropout rate by FFY 2025 was rigorous and achievable. The Department in collaboration with its stakeholders will meet annually to review the data and targets and improvement activities.

The stakeholders suggested the following improvement activities in order to increase the graduation rate for students with disabilities for the FFY 2020-2025 cycle:

- Make math fun and interactive
- Provide more interesting classes that are meaningful to students
- Gather data on the reasons why students are dropping out
- Increase engagement activities

#### Please indicate the reporting option used on this indicator

Option 1

#### Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a)	924
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a state-defined alternate diploma (b)	0
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (c)	115

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (d)	49
SY 2019-20 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/26/2021	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (e)	191

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data**

Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out	Number of all youth with IEPs who exited special education (ages 14-21)	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
191	1,279	12.38%	14.93%	14.93%	N/A	N/A

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

The Department 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-Department 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
- 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.**

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

To decrease the dropout rate, the Department has engaged in the following improvement activities for the FFY 2020-2025 cycle:

- Hawaii Multi-Tiered System of Support (HMTSS) mandatory in all public schools
- Smaller Learning Communities and Career Pathways
- Personal Transition Plan (PTP)
- Personalized Interventions/Counselor Support
- Longitudinal Data System (LDS) Early Learning System
- Social-Emotional Learning (SEL)/Trauma-Informed Care

**2 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**2 - OSEP Response**

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2020, and OSEP accepts that revision.

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

**2 - Required Actions**

## Indicator 3A: Participation for Children with IEPs

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

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

- A. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- B. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level academic achievement standards.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against alternate academic achievement standards.
- D. Gap in proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students against grade level academic achievement standards.

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

#### Data Source

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

#### Measurement

A. 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. Calculate separately for grades 4, 8, and high school. 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 3A: Provide separate reading/language arts and mathematics participation rates for children with IEPs for each of the following grades: 4, 8, & high school. Account for ALL children with IEPs, in grades 4, 8, and high school, 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.

### 3A - Indicator Data

#### Historical Data:

Subject	Group	Group Name	Baseline Year	Baseline Data
Reading	A	Grade 4	2018	96.31%
Reading	B	Grade 8	2018	94.11%
Reading	C	Grade HS	2018	87.79%
Math	A	Grade 4	2018	96.38%
Math	B	Grade 8	2018	94.85%
Math	C	Grade HS	2018	87.43%

#### Targets

Subject	Group	Group Name	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A >=	Grade 4	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Reading	B >=	Grade 8	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Reading	C >=	Grade HS	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Math	A >=	Grade 4	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Math	B >=	Grade 8	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Math	C >=	Grade HS	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%

## Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The Department collaborates closely with several partners to ensure that authentic engagement in all aspects of the Department's special education program is achieved. These stakeholders supported the Department with the process of soliciting and providing broad stakeholder input on the Department's FFY 2020-2025 SPP/APR cycle. Presentation materials and meeting notes are available at the following websites:

- SEAC website at SPP/APR Resources Page <https://seac-hawaii.org/spp-apr-resource-page/>
- The Department's website at <https://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/TeachingAndLearning/SpecializedPrograms/SpecialEducation/Pages/home.aspx>

### State Advisory Panel – Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC)

The Special Education Advisory Council 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 our SEAC is an appointment of 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 are individuals with disabilities or parents of children with disabilities (ages birth through 26). In the SEAC monthly meetings, family, community, and Department partners come together to address the group's special education priorities. This is done by sharing information, hearing community concerns, and addressing actions for improvement. Meeting agendas and minutes, along with other family resources, can be found on the SEAC website at <https://seac-hawaii.org/>.

### Special Parent Information Network (SPIN)

The Special Parent Information Network is co-sponsored by the Disability and Communication Access Board and the Department. The Department has a long-standing memorandum of agreement with the Hawaii State Department of Health to fund the SPIN to provide support to SEAC. In addition, SPIN provides training and technical assistance to parent(s)/legal guardian(s) of students with disabilities. This includes the development and maintenance of an informational website and other materials, an annual parent conference, and availability to answer parent questions via a telephone hotline. SPIN is guided by an advisory committee made up of parents, professionals, and persons with disabilities and works with the Department to support students and families. Additional information can be found on the SPIN webpage at <https://spinhawaii.org/>.

### Community Children's Councils (CCCs)

The Community Children's Councils serve children and families including those with disabilities and mental health needs through collaborative partnerships. The CCC, led by parent and professional co-chairs, provides assistance to families in coordinating educational and community support and services for their children with disabilities. The CCC is composed of 17 councils across the state representing each CA's geographic community. Given this structure, the CCCs are an effective venue for the Department to reach the broad and diverse communities across all islands. Additional information can be found on the CCCs webpage at <https://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/ParentsAndStudents/SupportForParents/Pages/CCC.aspx>.

### 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. 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. Additional information can be found on the LDAH webpage at <https://ldahawaii.org/>.

The Department continues to utilize the Leading by Convening framework to engage stakeholders in monthly Parent Partner meetings. These meetings are designed to provide opportunities for sharing information, exchanging ideas, understanding various perspectives, and supporting effective communication. Community stakeholders represented at these meetings include SEAC, SPIN, CCC, DD Council, and Hawaii's Parent Training and Information agency, LDAH.

The ESB and MAC in collaboration with SEAC, SPIN, and CCC, commenced a series of stakeholder meetings to begin discussions and develop recommended targets for the new six-year cycle of the revised SPP. Beginning in January 2021, these meetings were held over a one-year period and were designed to engage stakeholders from various backgrounds; educators, parents, school administrators, policy advisors, school psychologists, early education, advocacy groups, and state advisory board members. The Department leveraged the expertise of these stakeholders, with their breadth and depth of knowledge, to help inform the development of a new set of rigorous state targets and solicited new improvement activities for the next six-year SPP cycle.

## FFY 2020 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

### Data Source:

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS188; Data Group: 589)

### Date:

03/30/2022

### Reading Assessment Participation Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs*	1,551	1,524	1,184
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations	1,240	1,028	542
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations	20	15	6
d. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	128	105	102

### Data Source:

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS185; Data Group: 588)

**Date:**

03/30/2022

**Math Assessment Participation Data by Grade**

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs*	1,551	1,524	1,185
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations	1,257	1,055	542
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations	13	7	2
d. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	126	108	102

\*The children with IEPs count excludes children with disabilities who were reported as exempt due to significant medical emergency in row a for all the pre-filled data in this indicator.

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment**

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	Number of Children with IEPs	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	1,388	1,551		95.00%	89.49%	Did not meet target	N/A
B	Grade 8	1,148	1,524		95.00%	75.33%	Did not meet target	N/A
C	Grade HS	650	1,184		95.00%	54.90%	Did not meet target	N/A

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment**

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	Number of Children with IEPs	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	1,396	1,551		95.00%	90.01%	Did not meet target	N/A
B	Grade 8	1,170	1,524		95.00%	76.77%	Did not meet target	N/A
C	Grade HS	646	1,185		95.00%	54.51%	Did not meet target	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 Department has posted FFY 2019 SPP/APR data at the following link.  
<http://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/VisionForSuccess/SchoolDataAndReports/StateReports/Pages/Special-Education-Performance-Report.aspx>

Public Reporting of assessment results are also posted in the following links:

Participation

<https://adc.hidoe.us/#/participation>

Accountability Resource Center Hawaii (ARCH)  
<http://arch.k12.hi.us/>

Every Student Succeeds Act Report Card  
<http://arch.k12.hi.us/reports/essa> or at <https://arch-prod-reports-repository.s3-us-west-1.amazonaws.com/essa/2021/999ESSARpt.pdf>

618 Data Tables Public Reporting at the link  
<https://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/VisionForSuccess/SchoolDataAndReports/StateReports/Pages/Special-Education-Performance-Report.aspx>

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

With the new federal requirements, Indicator 3 has been revised and now requires States to report assessment data on four sub-indicators separately for grades 4, 8, and 11:

- A. Participation rates for children with IEPs
- B. Proficiency rates for children with IEPs against grade-level academic standards
- C. Proficiency rates for children with IEPs against alternate academic achievement standards
- D. The gap in proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all children against grade-level academic achievement standards

The Department recalculated the data for SY 2015-2016 through SY 2020-2021 using the new calculation measurement, and based on the new federal requirements and new calculation measurement, the Department set the baseline for the four sub-indicators to FFY 2018 since this data was not impacted by the COVID-19 pandemic and school closures. For FFY 2020, the Department did not meet the 95% target for grades 4, 8, and 11 in both ELA and Math, and the decrease in participation is related to the circumstances of the COVID-19 pandemic. When comparing the decrease in participation rates for SY 2020-2021, the results show consistency across student subgroups and subjects and the downward trend in participation reflects the data seen across the nation due to the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic. In addition, reviewing the participation rates across ELA, Math, and Science, for all students, the data indicates a decrease across all grade levels and subgroups. The Department in collaboration with the stakeholders determined to keep the targets for the FFY 2020-2025 cycle consistent with the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) not less than 95%. The COVID-19 pandemic's impact on instruction and learning had an effect on teachers and students, and those conditions should be considered when examining student participation in statewide assessments. Participation rates were impacted as a result of students' modes of learning, instruction, and test-taking options being disrupted or altered during the school year. Teachers, school leaders, and parents have gone to great lengths to support students during the 2020-2021 school year despite unprecedented challenges.

For the 2020-2021 school year, the U.S. Department of Education offered states a waiver from certain accountability requirements, which included the waiving of the 95% participation rate requirement, acknowledging that all states would have difficulty administering assessments due to the large proportion of students in blended or distance learning environments.

To reduce the stakes of assessments due to the COVID-19 pandemic, schools utilized assessment data alongside other important measures such as universal screener data to support instructional decisions for academic intervention and acceleration such as small-group instruction, intervention blocks, tutoring, programs provided beyond the school day (after school, weekends, intersessions or summer), academic coaching, personalized activities, specialized services, and other supports.

### **3A - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

### **3A - OSEP Response**

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2018, and OSEP accepts that revision.

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

### **3A - Required Actions**

## Indicator 3B: Proficiency for Children with IEPs (Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards)

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

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

- A. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- B. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level academic achievement standards.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against alternate academic achievement standards.
- D. Gap in proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students against grade level 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 FS175 and 178.

#### Measurement

B. Proficiency rate percent = [(# of children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards) divided by the (total # of children with IEPs who received a valid score and for whom a proficiency level was assigned for the regular assessment)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. Calculate separately for grades 4, 8, and high school. 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 3B: Proficiency calculations in this SPP/APR must result in proficiency rates for children with IEPs on the regular assessment in reading/language arts and mathematics assessments (separately) in each of the following grades: 4, 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.

### 3B - Indicator Data

#### Historical Data:

Subject	Group	Group Name	Baseline Year	Baseline Data
Reading	A	Grade 4	2018	8.36%
Reading	B	Grade 8	2018	6.29%
Reading	C	Grade HS	2018	12.56%
Math	A	Grade 4	2018	10.18%
Math	B	Grade 8	2018	4.15%
Math	C	Grade HS	2018	1.40%

#### Targets

Subject	Group	Group Name	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A >=	Grade 4	10.00%	12.00%	14.00%	16.00%	18.00%	20.00%
Reading	B >=	Grade 8	8.00%	10.00%	12.00%	14.00%	16.00%	18.00%
Reading	C >=	Grade HS	15.00%	17.00%	19.00%	21.00%	23.00%	25.00%
Math	A >=	Grade 4	12.00%	14.00%	16.00%	18.00%	20.00%	22.00%
Math	B >=	Grade 8	6.00%	8.00%	10.00%	12.00%	14.00%	16.00%
Math	C >=	Grade HS	3.00%	5.00%	7.00%	9.00%	11.00%	13.00%

#### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The Department collaborates closely with several partners to ensure that authentic engagement in all aspects of the Department's special education program is achieved. These stakeholders supported the Department with the process of soliciting and providing broad stakeholder input on the Department's FFY 2020-2025 SPP/APR cycle. Presentation materials and meeting notes are available at the following websites:

- SEAC website at SPP/APR Resources Page <https://seac-hawaii.org/spp-apr-resource-page/>
- The Department's website at <https://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/TeachingAndLearning/SpecializedPrograms/SpecialEducation/Pages/home.aspx>

#### State Advisory Panel – Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC)

The Special Education Advisory Council 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 our SEAC is an appointment of 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 are individuals with disabilities or parents of children with disabilities (ages birth through 26). In the SEAC monthly meetings, family,

community, and Department partners come together to address the group's special education priorities. This is done by sharing information, hearing community concerns, and addressing actions for improvement. Meeting agendas and minutes, along with other family resources, can be found on the SEAC website at <https://seac-hawaii.org/>.

**Special Parent Information Network (SPIN)**

The Special Parent Information Network is co-sponsored by the Disability and Communication Access Board and the Department. The Department has a long-standing memorandum of agreement with the Hawaii State Department of Health to fund the SPIN to provide support to SEAC. In addition, SPIN provides training and technical assistance to parent(s)/legal guardian(s) of students with disabilities. This includes the development and maintenance of an informational website and other materials, an annual parent conference, and availability to answer parent questions via a telephone hotline. SPIN is guided by an advisory committee made up of parents, professionals, and persons with disabilities and works with the Department to support students and families. Additional information can be found on the SPIN webpage at <https://spinhawaii.org/>.

**Community Children's Councils (CCCs)**

The Community Children's Councils serve children and families including those with disabilities and mental health needs through collaborative partnerships. The CCC, led by parent and professional co-chairs, provides assistance to families in coordinating educational and community support and services for their children with disabilities. The CCC is composed of 17 councils across the state representing each CA's geographic community. Given this structure, the CCCs are an effective venue for the Department to reach the broad and diverse communities across all islands. Additional information can be found on the CCCs webpage at <https://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/ParentsAndStudents/SupportForParents/Pages/CCC.aspx>.

**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. 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. Additional information can be found on the LDAH webpage at <https://ldahawaii.org/>.

The Department continues to utilize the Leading by Convening framework to engage stakeholders in monthly Parent Partner meetings. These meetings are designed to provide opportunities for sharing information, exchanging ideas, understanding various perspectives, and supporting effective communication. Community stakeholders represented at these meetings include SEAC, SPIN, CCC, DD Council, and Hawaii's Parent Training and Information agency, LDAH.

The ESB and MAC in collaboration with SEAC, SPIN, and CCC, commenced a series of stakeholder meetings to begin discussions and develop recommended targets for the new six-year cycle of the revised SPP. Beginning in January 2021, these meetings were held over a one-year period and were designed to engage stakeholders from various backgrounds; educators, parents, school administrators, policy advisors, school psychologists, early education, advocacy groups, and state advisory board members. The Department leveraged the expertise of these stakeholders, with their breadth and depth of knowledge, to help inform the development of a new set of rigorous state targets and solicited new improvement activities for the next six-year SPP cycle.

Additional information to the description shared in the Introduction section:

The stakeholder suggested the following strategies for improvement for the FFY 2020-2025:

- Increase the number of students who receive instruction with support in the general education classroom for most of the day
- Literacy coaches at CA and school levels, including an emphasis on disciplinary literacy
- Address chronic absenteeism
- Appropriate testing accommodations and modifications for students

**FFY 2020 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts**

**Data Source:**

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

**Date:**

03/03/2022

**Reading Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade**

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the regular assessment	1,260	1,043	548
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	108	87	89
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	4	0	2

**Data Source:**

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

**Date:**

03/03/2022

**Math Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade**

<b>Group</b>	<b>Grade 4</b>	<b>Grade 8</b>	<b>Grade HS</b>
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the regular assessment	1,270	1,062	544
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	93	32	10
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	2	0	0

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment**

<b>Group</b>	<b>Group Name</b>	<b>Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards</b>	<b>Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Regular Assessment</b>	<b>FFY 2019 Data</b>	<b>FFY 2020 Target</b>	<b>FFY 2020 Data</b>	<b>Status</b>	<b>Slippage</b>
<b>A</b>	Grade 4	112	1,260		10.00%	8.89%	Did not meet target	N/A
<b>B</b>	Grade 8	87	1,043		8.00%	8.34%	Met target	N/A
<b>C</b>	Grade HS	91	548		15.00%	16.61%	Met target	N/A

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment**

<b>Group</b>	<b>Group Name</b>	<b>Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards</b>	<b>Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Regular Assessment</b>	<b>FFY 2019 Data</b>	<b>FFY 2020 Target</b>	<b>FFY 2020 Data</b>	<b>Status</b>	<b>Slippage</b>
<b>A</b>	Grade 4	95	1,270		12.00%	7.48%	Did not meet target	N/A
<b>B</b>	Grade 8	32	1,062		6.00%	3.01%	Did not meet target	N/A
<b>C</b>	Grade HS	10	544		3.00%	1.84%	Did not meet target	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 Department has posted FFY 2019 SPP/APR data at the following link.  
<http://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/VisionForSuccess/SchoolDataAndReports/StateReports/Pages/Special-Education-Performance-Report.aspx>

Public Reporting of assessment results are also posted in the following links:

Proficiency  
<https://adc.hidoe.us/#/proficiency>

Accountability Resource Center Hawaii (ARCH)  
<http://arch.k12.hi.us/>

Every Student Succeeds Act Report Card  
<http://arch.k12.hi.us/reports/essa> or at <https://arch-prod-reports-repository.s3-us-west-1.amazonaws.com/essa/2021/999ESSARpt.pdf>

618 Data Tables Public Reporting at the link  
<https://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/VisionForSuccess/SchoolDataAndReports/StateReports/Pages/Special-Education-Performance-Report.aspx>

### Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

When reviewing the data for Indicator 3B for the school year 2020-2021 to the extent possible, COVID-19 pandemic-related challenges including but not limited to, context to learning, test-taking, including participation rates, students' learning modalities, and access to adequate learning devices and internet connectivity should be considered.

As a result of the COVID-19, for the SY 2019-2020, the Department was granted a waiver from the USDOE pertaining to the administration of assessments, therefore, there is no data available for SY 2019-2020.

The Department recalculated the data using the new calculation measurement and set the baseline for the four sub-indicators to FFY 2018 since this data was not impacted by the COVID-19 pandemic and school closures. With the recalculation of longitudinal data, the Department set the baseline to SY 2018-2019 at 8% ELA and 10% Math. This data was prior to the COVID-19 pandemic. The Department in collaboration with the stakeholders looking at data trends determined to increase targets by 2% each year after the baseline year. The data shows the results for reading tend to be higher than those for math.

To increase proficiency rates for students with disabilities participating in grade-level academic achievement standards, the Department has engaged in the following strategies:

Professional Learning and Support for Complex Areas in the following topics relating to students with disabilities:

- Evidence-based instructional strategies
- School Reopening: Providing intensive interventions to accelerate learning
- High-leverage instructional practices
- Facilitation of Complex Areas language and literacy Professional Learning Communities
- Language and Literacy Initiative (Professional Development with coaching for Complex Area leaders and teachers on effective language and literacy instruction)
- Creation of Reading Interventionist Certification Program (in collaboration with University of Hawaii-Manoa College of Education Special Education Department)
- Implementation of IDEA American Rescue Plan (ARP) Grants for Math, Language & Literacy, Assistive Technology, Postsecondary Transition, Low-Incidence Population
- Deaf, Hard of Hearing, DeafBlind (DHHDB) Advisory Committee meetings (ongoing)
- Release of mandatory training modules on the development and implementation of specially-designed instruction

## 3B - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 3B - OSEP Response

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2018, and OSEP accepts that revision.

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

## 3B - Required Actions

## Indicator 3C: Proficiency for Children with IEPs (Alternate Academic Achievement Standards)

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

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

- A. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- B. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level academic achievement standards.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against alternate academic achievement standards.
- D. Gap in proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students against grade level 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 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 for the alternate assessment)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. Calculate separately for grades 4, 8, and high school. 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 children with IEPs on the alternate assessment in reading/language arts and mathematics assessments (separately) in each of the following grades: 4, 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

#### Historical Data:

Subject	Group	Group Name	Baseline Year	Baseline Data
Reading	A	Grade 4	2018	50.00%
Reading	B	Grade 8	2018	41.61%
Reading	C	Grade HS	2018	35.20%
Math	A	Grade 4	2018	49.12%
Math	B	Grade 8	2018	39.86%
Math	C	Grade HS	2018	37.10%

#### Targets

Subject	Group	Group Name	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A >=	Grade 4	52.00%	54.00%	56.00%	58.00%	60.00%	62.00%
Reading	B >=	Grade 8	44.00%	46.00%	48.00%	50.00%	52.00%	54.00%
Reading	C >=	Grade HS	37.00%	39.00%	41.00%	43.00%	45.00%	47.00%
Math	A >=	Grade 4	51.00%	53.00%	55.00%	57.00%	59.00%	61.00%
Math	B >=	Grade 8	42.00%	44.00%	46.00%	48.00%	50.00%	52.00%
Math	C >=	Grade HS	39.00%	41.00%	43.00%	45.00%	47.00%	49.00%

## Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The Department collaborates closely with several partners to ensure that authentic engagement in all aspects of the Department's special education program is achieved. These stakeholders supported the Department with the process of soliciting and providing broad stakeholder input on the Department's FFY 2020-2025 SPP/APR cycle. Presentation materials and meeting notes are available at the following websites:

- SEAC website at SPP/APR Resources Page <https://seac-hawaii.org/spp-apr-resource-page/>
- The Department's website at <https://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/TeachingAndLearning/SpecializedPrograms/SpecialEducation/Pages/home.aspx>

### State Advisory Panel – Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC)

The Special Education Advisory Council 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 our SEAC is an appointment of 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 are individuals with disabilities or parents of children with disabilities (ages birth through 26). In the SEAC monthly meetings, family, community, and Department partners come together to address the group's special education priorities. This is done by sharing information, hearing community concerns, and addressing actions for improvement. Meeting agendas and minutes, along with other family resources, can be found on the SEAC website at <https://seac-hawaii.org/>.

### Special Parent Information Network (SPIN)

The Special Parent Information Network is co-sponsored by the Disability and Communication Access Board and the Department. The Department has a long-standing memorandum of agreement with the Hawaii State Department of Health to fund the SPIN to provide support to SEAC. In addition, SPIN provides training and technical assistance to parent(s)/legal guardian(s) of students with disabilities. This includes the development and maintenance of an informational website and other materials, an annual parent conference, and availability to answer parent questions via a telephone hotline. SPIN is guided by an advisory committee made up of parents, professionals, and persons with disabilities and works with the Department to support students and families. Additional information can be found on the SPIN webpage at <https://spinhawaii.org/>.

### Community Children's Councils (CCCs)

The Community Children's Councils serve children and families including those with disabilities and mental health needs through collaborative partnerships. The CCC, led by parent and professional co-chairs, provides assistance to families in coordinating educational and community support and services for their children with disabilities. The CCC is composed of 17 councils across the state representing each CA's geographic community. Given this structure, the CCCs are an effective venue for the Department to reach the broad and diverse communities across all islands. Additional information can be found on the CCCs webpage at <https://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/ParentsAndStudents/SupportForParents/Pages/CCC.aspx>.

### 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. 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. Additional information can be found on the LDAH webpage at <https://ldahawaii.org/>.

The Department continues to utilize the Leading by Convening framework to engage stakeholders in monthly Parent Partner meetings. These meetings are designed to provide opportunities for sharing information, exchanging ideas, understanding various perspectives, and supporting effective communication. Community stakeholders represented at these meetings include SEAC, SPIN, CCC, DD Council, and Hawaii's Parent Training and Information agency, LDAH.

The ESB and MAC in collaboration with SEAC, SPIN, and CCC, commenced a series of stakeholder meetings to begin discussions and develop recommended targets for the new six-year cycle of the revised SPP. Beginning in January 2021, these meetings were held over a one-year period and were designed to engage stakeholders from various backgrounds; educators, parents, school administrators, policy advisors, school psychologists, early education, advocacy groups, and state advisory board members. The Department leveraged the expertise of these stakeholders, with their breadth and depth of knowledge, to help inform the development of a new set of rigorous state targets and solicited new improvement activities for the next six-year SPP cycle.

Additional information to the description shared in the Introduction section:

The stakeholders suggested the following strategies for improvement for the FFY 2020-2025 cycle:

- Provide more professional learning opportunities for teachers of this student population.
- Examine the curriculum currently being used in schools ensuring rigor from preschool to high school for all students.

## FFY 2020 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

### Data Source:

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

### Date:

03/03/2022

## Reading Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the alternate assessment	128	105	102
b. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient	51	36	41

### Data Source:

**Date:**

03/03/2022

**Math Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade**

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the alternate assessment	126	108	102
b. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient	60	33	34

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment**

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Alternate Academic Achievement Standards	Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Alternate Assessment	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	51	128		52.00%	39.84%	Did not meet target	N/A
B	Grade 8	36	105		44.00%	34.29%	Did not meet target	N/A
C	Grade HS	41	102		37.00%	40.20%	Met target	N/A

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment**

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Alternate Academic Achievement Standards	Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Alternate Assessment	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	60	126		51.00%	47.62%	Did not meet target	N/A
B	Grade 8	33	108		42.00%	30.56%	Did not meet target	N/A
C	Grade HS	34	102		39.00%	33.33%	Did not meet target	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 Department has posted FFY 2019 SPP/APR data at the following link.

<http://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/VisionForSuccess/SchoolDataAndReports/StateReports/Pages/Special-Education-Performance-Report.aspx>

Public Reporting of assessment results are also posted at the following link.  
<https://adc.hidoe.us/#/proficiency>

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

To increase the proficiency rate for students who participate in alternate assessments, the Department has engaged in the following strategies:

- Year-long facilitation of Complex Area Professional Learning Communities on evidence-based practices for students with severe disabilities.
- Addressed recommendations provided by the Deaf, Hard of Hearing, DeafBlind workgroup to improve outcomes for this population.
- Contract for Braille Transcription services. Teachers of the visually impaired are able to get printed textbooks, exams, and materials transcribed into Braille formats: for literacy, math equations and symbols, science, and tactile graphics with descriptions for their students.
- Professional Development Opportunities on Assistive Technology specifically for Students with Visual Impairments.
- The assessment section is piloting the HSA Alternate Interim Assessment. Seventeen teachers attended the session in November and the process is being evaluated.

**3C - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**3C - OSEP Response**

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2018, and OSEP accepts that revision.

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

**3C - Required Actions**

## Indicator 3D: Gap in Proficiency Rates (Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards)

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

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

- A. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- B. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level academic achievement standards.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against alternate academic achievement standards.
- D. Gap in proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students against grade level academic achievement standards.

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

#### Data Source

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

#### Measurement

D. Proficiency rate gap = [(proficiency rate for children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2020-2021 school year) subtracted from the (proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2020-2021 school year)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. Calculate separately for grades 4, 8, and high school. The proficiency rate includes all children 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 3D: Gap calculations in this SPP/APR must result in the proficiency rate for children with IEPs were proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2020-2021 school year compared to the proficiency rate for all students who were proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2020-2021 school year. Calculate separately for reading/language arts and math in each of the following grades: 4, 8, and high school, including both children 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.

### 3D - Indicator Data

#### Historical Data:

Subject	Group	Group Name	Baseline Year	Baseline Data
Reading	A	Grade 4	2018	43.10
Reading	B	Grade 8	2018	45.20
Reading	C	Grade HS	2018	46.50
Math	A	Grade 4	2018	37.56
Math	B	Grade 8	2018	33.55
Math	C	Grade HS	2018	28.71

#### Targets

Subject	Group	Group Name	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A <=	Grade 4	41.00	39.00	37.00	35.00	33.00	31.00
Reading	B <=	Grade 8	43.00	41.00	39.00	37.00	35.00	33.00
Reading	C <=	Grade HS	44.00	42.00	40.00	38.00	36.00	34.00
Math	A <=	Grade 4	36.00	34.00	32.00	30.00	28.00	26.00
Math	B <=	Grade 8	32.00	30.00	28.00	26.00	24.00	22.00
Math	C <=	Grade HS	27.00	25.00	23.00	21.00	19.00	17.00

#### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The Department collaborates closely with several partners to ensure that authentic engagement in all aspects of the Department's special education program is achieved. These stakeholders supported the Department with the process of soliciting and providing broad stakeholder input on the Department's FFY 2020-2025 SPP/APR cycle. Presentation materials and meeting notes are available at the following websites:

- SEAC website at SPP/APR Resources Page <https://seac-hawaii.org/spp-apr-resource-page/>

- The Department's website at <https://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/TeachingAndLearning/SpecializedPrograms/SpecialEducation/Pages/home.aspx>

State Advisory Panel – Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC)

The Special Education Advisory Council 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 our SEAC is an appointment of 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 are individuals with disabilities or parents of children with disabilities (ages birth through 26). In the SEAC monthly meetings, family, community, and Department partners come together to address the group's special education priorities. This is done by sharing information, hearing community concerns, and addressing actions for improvement. Meeting agendas and minutes, along with other family resources, can be found on the SEAC website at <https://seac-hawaii.org/>.

**Special Parent Information Network (SPIN)**

The Special Parent Information Network is co-sponsored by the Disability and Communication Access Board and the Department. The Department has a long-standing memorandum of agreement with the Hawaii State Department of Health to fund the SPIN to provide support to SEAC. In addition, SPIN provides training and technical assistance to parent(s)/legal guardian(s) of students with disabilities. This includes the development and maintenance of an informational website and other materials, an annual parent conference, and availability to answer parent questions via a telephone hotline. SPIN is guided by an advisory committee made up of parents, professionals, and persons with disabilities and works with the Department to support students and families. Additional information can be found on the SPIN webpage at <https://spinhawaii.org/>.

**Community Children's Councils (CCCs)**

The Community Children's Councils serve children and families including those with disabilities and mental health needs through collaborative partnerships. The CCC, led by parent and professional co-chairs, provides assistance to families in coordinating educational and community support and services for their children with disabilities. The CCC is composed of 17 councils across the state representing each CA's geographic community. Given this structure, the CCCs are an effective venue for the Department to reach the broad and diverse communities across all islands. Additional information can be found on the CCCs webpage at <https://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/ParentsAndStudents/SupportForParents/Pages/CCC.aspx>.

**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. 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. Additional information can be found on the LDAH webpage at <https://ldahawaii.org/>.

The Department continues to utilize the Leading by Convening framework to engage stakeholders in monthly Parent Partner meetings. These meetings are designed to provide opportunities for sharing information, exchanging ideas, understanding various perspectives, and supporting effective communication. Community stakeholders represented at these meetings include SEAC, SPIN, CCC, DD Council, and Hawaii's Parent Training and Information agency, LDAH.

The ESB and MAC in collaboration with SEAC, SPIN, and CCC, commenced a series of stakeholder meetings to begin discussions and develop recommended targets for the new six-year cycle of the revised SPP. Beginning in January 2021, these meetings were held over a one-year period and were designed to engage stakeholders from various backgrounds; educators, parents, school administrators, policy advisors, school psychologists, early education, advocacy groups, and state advisory board members. The Department leveraged the expertise of these stakeholders, with their breadth and depth of knowledge, to help inform the development of a new set of rigorous state targets and solicited new improvement activities for the next six-year SPP cycle.

Additional information to the description shared in the Introduction section:

The stakeholders suggested the following strategies for improvement for the FFY 2020-2025 cycle:

- Improving reading proficiency in early childhood will have an impact in later grades for both math and ELA. Include a component for reaching out to parents and providing them with the tools to help their young children at home.
- Revisit targets to ensure they are rigorous yet achievable.
- Ensure students are receiving appropriate testing accommodations and modifications in accordance with their needs.
- Increase the number of students who receive instruction with support in the general education classroom.
- Provide training for teachers to keep current with high-leverage instructional practices.

**FFY 2020 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts**

**Data Source:**

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

**Date:**

03/03/2022

**Reading Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade**

<b>Group</b>	<b>Grade 4</b>	<b>Grade 8</b>	<b>Grade HS</b>
a. All Students who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	12,610	10,751	7,775
b. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	1,260	1,043	548
c. All students in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	5,801	5,479	5,032
d. All students in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	5	1	2

e. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	108	87	89
f. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	4	0	2

**Data Source:**

SY 2020-21 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

**Date:**

03/03/2022

**Math Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade**

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. All Students who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	12,675	10,851	7,758
b. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	1,270	1,062	544
c. All students in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	4,527	2,684	2,159
d. All students in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	2	0	0
e. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	93	32	10
f. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	2	0	0

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment**

Group	Group Name	Proficiency rate for children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	Proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	8.89%	46.04%		41.00	37.15	Met target	N/A
B	Grade 8	8.34%	50.97%		43.00	42.63	Met target	N/A
C	Grade HS	16.61%	64.75%		44.00	48.14	Did not meet target	N/A

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment**

Group	Group Name	Proficiency rate for children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	Proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	7.48%	35.73%		36.00	28.25	Met target	N/A
B	Grade 8	3.01%	24.74%		32.00	21.72	Met target	N/A
C	Grade HS	1.84%	27.83%		27.00	25.99	Met target	N/A

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

During SY 2020-2021, the Department focused on critical issues that arose as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic. The main critical issues included maintaining health and safety for students and staff, addressing learning loss and the social-emotional effects due to school closures, and the change in learning modalities. The Department has been addressing the achievement gap prior to the pandemic; however, the detrimental effect of learning loss impacted by the COVID-19 pandemic warrants more concerted efforts in targeted instruction and high-level engagement to mitigate these challenges. Furthermore, the Department is focusing on the early identification of mental health concerns related to the COVID-19 pandemic to ensure students have the support they need to engage in classroom and social settings.

The Department will use FFY 2018 (SY 2018-2019) for its baseline for all of the sub-indicators. This has been decided due to FFY 2020 (SY 2020-2021) being impacted by the COVID-19 pandemic and school closures. In addition, due to the COVID-19 pandemic, assessment data for FFY 2019 does not exist. The U.S. Department of Education waived all state assessments for FFY 2019 (SY 2019-2020).

To calculate sub-indicator 3D, the Department used EdFacts File Specifications C175: Data Group 583, submitted on 11/15/2019, and C178: Data Group 584, submitted on 11/15/2019. In accordance with FFY 2020 Measurement Table, the Department calculated the gap (proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2018-2019 school year compared to the proficiency rate for all students who were proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2018-2019 school year) separately for reading/language arts and math in each of the following grades: 4, 8, and high school, including both children enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year. Only children with disabilities who had an IEP at the time of testing were included.

**3D - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**3D - OSEP Response**

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2018, and OSEP accepts that revision.

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

**3D - 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 local educational agencies (LEA) that have a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and
- B. Percent of LEAs that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, 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, as defined by the State, 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 LEAs that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) that have a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, in the rates of suspensions and expulsions for more than 10 days during the school year of children with IEPs) divided by the (# of LEAs in the State that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable))] times 100.

Include State's definition of "significant discrepancy."

#### Instructions

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, LEAs 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 LEAs 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 2020 SPP/APR, use data from 2019-2020), including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity to determine if significant discrepancies, as defined by the State, are occurring in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions (more than 10 days during the school year) 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.

Because the measurement table requires that the data examined for this indicator are lag year data, States should examine the 618 data that was submitted by LEAs that were in operation during the school year before the reporting year. For example, if a State has 100 LEAs operating in the 2019-2020 school year, those 100 LEAs would have reported 618 data in 2019-2020 on the number of children suspended/expelled. If the State then opens 15 new LEAs in 2020-2021, suspension/expulsion data from those 15 new LEAs would not be in the 2019-2020 618 data set, and therefore, those 15 new LEAs should not be included in the denominator of the calculation. States must use the number of LEAs from the year before the reporting year in its calculation for this indicator. For the FFY 2020 SPP/APR submission, States must use the number of LEAs reported in 2019-2020 (which can be found in the FFY 2019 SPP/APR introduction).

Indicator 4A: Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation (based upon districts that met the minimum n and/or cell 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 LEA with discrepancies had policies, procedures or practices that contributed to the significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, 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 (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 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 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	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target <=	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

**Targets**

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target <=	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

The Department collaborates closely with several partners to ensure that authentic engagement in all aspects of the Department’s special education program is achieved. These stakeholders supported the Department with the process of soliciting and providing broad stakeholder input on the Department’s FFY 2020-2025 SPP/APR cycle. Presentation materials and meeting notes are available at the following websites:

- SEAC website at SPP/APR Resources Page <https://seac-hawaii.org/spp-apr-resource-page/>
- The Department’s website at <https://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/TeachingAndLearning/SpecializedPrograms/SpecialEducation/Pages/home.aspx>

**State Advisory Panel – Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC)**

The Special Education Advisory Council 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 our SEAC is an appointment of 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 are individuals with disabilities or parents of children with disabilities (ages birth through 26). In the SEAC monthly meetings, family, community, and Department partners come together to address the group’s special education priorities. This is done by sharing information, hearing community concerns, and addressing actions for improvement. Meeting agendas and minutes, along with other family resources, can be found on the SEAC website at <https://seac-hawaii.org/>.

**Special Parent Information Network (SPIN)**

The Special Parent Information Network is co-sponsored by the Disability and Communication Access Board and the Department. The Department has a long-standing memorandum of agreement with the Hawaii State Department of Health to fund the SPIN to provide support to SEAC. In addition, SPIN provides training and technical assistance to parent(s)/legal guardian(s) of students with disabilities. This includes the development and maintenance of an informational website and other materials, an annual parent conference, and availability to answer parent questions via a telephone hotline. SPIN is guided by an advisory committee made up of parents, professionals, and persons with disabilities and works with the Department to support students and families. Additional information can be found on the SPIN webpage at <https://spinhawaii.org/>.

**Community Children’s Councils (CCCs)**

The Community Children’s Councils serve children and families including those with disabilities and mental health needs through collaborative partnerships. The CCC, led by parent and professional co-chairs, provides assistance to families in coordinating educational and community support and services for their children with disabilities. The CCC is composed of 17 councils across the state representing each CA’s geographic community. Given this structure, the CCCs are an effective venue for the Department to reach the broad and diverse communities across all islands. Additional information can be found on the CCCs webpage at <https://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/ParentsAndStudents/SupportForParents/Pages/CCC.aspx>.

**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. 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. Additional information can be found on the LDAH webpage at <https://ldahawaii.org/>.

The Department continues to utilize the Leading by Convening framework to engage stakeholders in monthly Parent Partner meetings. These meetings are designed to provide opportunities for sharing information, exchanging ideas, understanding various perspectives, and supporting effective communication. Community stakeholders represented at these meetings include SEAC, SPIN, CCC, DD Council, and Hawaii’s Parent Training and Information agency, LDAH.

The ESB and MAC in collaboration with SEAC, SPIN, and CCC, commenced a series of stakeholder meetings to begin discussions and develop recommended targets for the new six-year cycle of the revised SPP. Beginning in January 2021, these meetings were held over a one-year period and were designed to engage stakeholders from various backgrounds; educators, parents, school administrators, policy advisors, school psychologists, early education, advocacy groups, and state advisory board members. The Department leveraged the expertise of these stakeholders, with their breadth and depth of knowledge, to help inform the development of a new set of rigorous state targets and solicited new improvement activities for the next six-year SPP cycle.

Additional information to the description shared in the Introduction section:

During the meetings with the stakeholders, the Department reviewed longitudinal data trends and determined that the rate difference of 3 percentage points to determine whether the Department has significant discrepancy was too high. Decreasing the threshold to 0.75 percentage points was more reasonable. Furthermore, the suggestion was to use the threshold of 0.50 rate difference as a proactive measure to raise awareness and provide support towards decreasing the number of suspensions and expulsions of more than 10 days for students with IEPs.

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data**

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

YES

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

0

Number of LEAs that have a significant discrepancy	Number of LEAs that met the State’s minimum n/cell size	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 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**

**Methodology**

Hawaii is a single District State, which means that SEA and LEA are the same; therefore, Hawaii determines significant discrepancy by comparing the rates of suspension/expulsion for children with Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) to the rates of suspension/expulsion for children without disabilities within the Local Education Agency (LEA)/State Education Agency (SEA). Consistent with IDEA Data Center (IDC) Measuring Significant Discrepancy "An Indicator B4 Technical Assistance Guide," pages 37-41 ([https://ideadata.org/sites/default/files/media/documents/2017-09/measuring\\_significant\\_discrepancy-an\\_ind.pdf](https://ideadata.org/sites/default/files/media/documents/2017-09/measuring_significant_discrepancy-an_ind.pdf)), to compare a district-level suspension/expulsion rate for children with disabilities to the same district suspension/expulsion rate for children without disabilities, the Department uses the rate difference methodology. Rate difference compares suspension/expulsion rate for children with disabilities to the suspension/expulsion rate for children without disabilities. Rate difference equation = state suspension/expulsion rate for children with disabilities minus (-) the state rate for children without disabilities. 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)].

**Definition of Significant Discrepancy**

The Department defines "significant discrepancy" when the rate difference is 0.75 percentage points. This means, the Department is considered to be identified as having a significant discrepancy when the suspension/expulsion rate for children with disabilities is 0.75 percentage points more than the State's suspension/expulsion rate for children without disabilities. The Department uses a minimum N-cell size of five (5) children in order for the data to be included for analysis.

In analyzing the FFY 2020 data, the Department used the data from EdFacts Report 088 submitted in November 2020 (Children with Disabilities Disciplinary Removals Suspended/Expelled for More than 10 Days) for the school year 2019- 2020. No sampling for this indicator was involved.

**FFY 2020**

Step 1: Calculate the State's suspension/expulsion rates of children with and without disabilities:

**State's Rate for Children with Disabilities:**

83 (Total number of special education children removed for greater than 10 days) divided by 20,125 (Total number of special education children) = 0.41%

**State's Rate for Children without Disabilities:**

284 (Total number of children without disabilities removed for greater than 10 days) divided by 161,371 (Total number of children without disabilities) = 0.18%

Rate Difference = (Rate of suspension/expulsion of children with disabilities) - (Rate of suspension/expulsion of children without disabilities)  
0.41% - 0.18% = 0.23 percentage points

**Summary**

The difference between the suspension/expulsion rate for children with disabilities and the suspension rate for children without IEPs within the Department is 0.23 percentage points, which is lower than 0.75. Because the rate difference is less than 0.75 percentage points, the Department IS NOT identified as having a significant discrepancy.

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

The Indicator 4A data is complete, valid, and reliable. Data shows the number of children with disabilities by race/ethnicity suspended/expelled for more than 10 days in the SY 2019-2020 is less than the previous year for each racial/ethnic group. This reduction is due to the extraordinary circumstances of school campus closures in SY 2019-2020 and the shift from a face-to-face instructional delivery model to various modalities and blended models to address health and safety protocols in response to the national pandemic of COVID-19.

To decrease the rates of suspension/expulsion, the Department has engaged in the following improvement activities for the FFY 2020-2025 cycle:

- Hawaii Multi-Tiered System of Support (HMTSS) - mandatory in all schools, Implementation Guide - March 2021
- Professional Development Sessions:
  - Cultural Responsiveness
  - Inclusive Skill-Building Learning Approach
- Alternatives to Suspensions
- Social-Emotional Learning (SEL)/Trauma-Informed Care
- Personalized Interventions/Counselor Support
- Longitudinal Data System (LDS) Early Learning System

**Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2020 using 2019-2020 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 Department DID NOT have a significant discrepancy for FFY 2020.

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 2019**

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 2019**

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2019 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

**4A - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**4A - OSEP Response**

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

**4A - Required Actions**

## Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Compliance Indicator:** Rates of suspension and expulsion:

- A. Percent of local educational agencies (LEA) that have a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and
- B. Percent of LEAs that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, 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, as defined by the State, 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 LEAs that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, by race or ethnicity, in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of more than 10 days during the school year of children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, 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 LEAs 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 "significant discrepancy."

#### Instructions

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, LEAs 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 LEAs totally 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 2020 SPP/APR, use data from 2019-2020), including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity to determine if significant discrepancies, as defined by the State, are occurring in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions (more than 10 days during the school year) 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.

Because the measurement table requires that the data examined for this indicator are lag year data, States should examine the 618 data that was submitted by LEAs that were in operation during the school year before the reporting year. For example, if a State has 100 LEAs operating in the 2019-2020 school year, those 100 LEAs would have reported 618 data in 2019-2020 on the number of children suspended/expelled. If the State then opens 15 new LEAs in 2020-2021, suspension/expulsion data from those 15 new LEAs would not be in the 2019-2020 618 data set, and therefore, those 15 new LEAs should not be included in the denominator of the calculation. States must use the number of LEAs from the year before the reporting year in its calculation for this indicator. For the FFY 2020 SPP/APR submission, States must use the number of LEAs reported in 2019-2020 (which can be found in the FFY 2019 SPP/APR introduction).

Indicator 4B: Provide the following: (a) the number of LEAs that met the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups that have a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, by race or ethnicity, in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions (more than 10 days during the school year) for children with IEPs; and (b) the number of those LEAs 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 LEA with discrepancies had policies, procedures or practices that contributed to the significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, 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 (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 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 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	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

#### Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

#### FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

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

YES

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

0

Number of LEAs that have a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity	Number of those LEAs that have policies, procedure or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements	Number of LEAs that met the State's minimum n/cell size	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 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

The Department defines "significant discrepancy" when the rate difference is 0.75 percentage points. This means, the Department is considered to be identified as having a significant discrepancy when the suspension/expulsion rate for children with disabilities is 0.75 percentage points more than the State's suspension/expulsion rate for children without disabilities. The Department uses a minimum N-cell size of five (5) children in each race/ethnicity category in order for the data to be included for analysis.

##### Methodology

Hawaii is a single District State, which means that SEA and LEA are the same; therefore, Hawaii determines significant discrepancy by comparing the rates of suspension/expulsion for children with Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) to the rates of suspension/expulsion for children without disabilities within the Local Education Agency (LEA)/State Education Agency (SEA). Consistent with IDEA Data Center (IDC) Measuring Significant Discrepancy "An Indicator B4 Technical Assistance Guide," pages 37-41 ([https://ideadata.org/sites/default/files/media/documents/2017-09/measuring\\_significant\\_discrepancy-an\\_ind.pdf](https://ideadata.org/sites/default/files/media/documents/2017-09/measuring_significant_discrepancy-an_ind.pdf)), to compare a district-level suspension/expulsion rate for children with disabilities to the same district suspension/expulsion rate for children without disabilities, the Department uses the rate difference methodology. Rate difference compares suspension/expulsion rate for children with IEPs to the suspension/expulsion rate for children without IEPs. Rate difference equation = state suspension/expulsion rate for children with disabilities minus (-) the state rate for children without disabilities. 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)].

##### FFY 2020 Rate Difference Percentages by Race/Ethnicity Category.

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.

##### State's Rate for Children with Disabilities:

83 (Total number of special education children removed for greater than 10 days) divided by 20,125 (Total number of special education children) = 0.41%

##### State's Rate for Children without Disabilities:

284 (Total number of children without disabilities removed for greater than 10 days) divided by 161,371 (Total number of children without disabilities) =

0.18%

Rate Difference= (Rate of suspension/expulsion of students with disabilities) - (Rate of suspension/expulsion of students without disabilities)  
0.41% - 0.18%= 0.23 percentage points.

#### 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  $(284/161,371)*100 = 0.18\%$
- 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  $(5/3471)*100 = 0.14\%$
- The state rate for children without disabilities is  $(284/161,371)*100 = 0.18\%$
- Rate difference is  $0.14-0.18 = -0.04$  percentage points

#### Black or African American

- 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  $(284/161,371)*100 = 0.18\%$
- Rate difference is N/A as the cell size in this category is less than five (5)

#### Hispanic or Latino

- Suspension/Expulsion rate (more than 10 days) for children with disabilities is  $(21/3844)*100 = 0.55\%$
- The state rate for children without disabilities is  $(284/161,371)*100 = 0.18\%$
- Rate difference is  $0.55-0.18 = 0.37$  percentage points

#### Two or More Races

- Suspension/Expulsion rate (more than 10 days) for children with disabilities is  $(8/3042)*100 = 0.26\%$
- The state rate for children without disabilities is  $(284/161,371)*100 = 0.18\%$
- Rate difference is  $0.26-0.18 = 0.08$  percentage points

#### Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander

- Suspension/Expulsion rate (more than 10 days) for children with disabilities is  $(37/6811)*100 = 0.54\%$
- The state rate for children without disabilities is  $(284/161,371)*100 = 0.18\%$
- Rate difference is  $0.54-0.18 = 0.36$  percentage points

#### White

- Suspension/Expulsion rate (more than 10 days) for children with disabilities is  $(9/2538)*100 = 0.35\%$
- The state rate for children without disabilities is  $(284/161,371)*100 = 0.18\%$
- Rate difference is  $0.35-0.18 = 0.17$  percentage points

#### Summary

The data indicates that the rate difference is lower than 0.75 percentage points in each of the race/ethnicity categories. Therefore, the Department DID NOT have a significant discrepancy for FFY 2020 by race or ethnicity, in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of more than 10 days during the school year of children with disabilities.

#### **Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

The Indicator 4B data is complete, valid, and reliable. Data shows the number of students with disabilities by race/ethnicity suspended/expelled for more than 10 days in the SY 2019-2020 is less than the previous year for each racial/ethnic group. This reduction is due to the extraordinary circumstances of school campus closures in SY 2019-2020 and the shift from a face-to-face instructional delivery model to various modalities and blended models to address health and safety protocols in response to the national pandemic of COVID-19.

To decrease the rates of suspension/expulsion, the Department has engaged in the following improvement activities for the FFY 2020-2025 cycle:

- Hawaii Multi-Tiered System of Support (HMTSS) - mandatory in all schools, Implementation Guide - March 2021
- Professional Development Sessions:
  - Cultural Responsiveness
  - Inclusive Skill-Building Learning Approach
  - Alternatives to Suspensions
  - Social-Emotional Learning (SEL)/Trauma-Informed Care
  - Personalized Interventions/Counselor Support
  - Longitudinal Data System (LDS) Early Learning System

#### **Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2020 using 2019-2020 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 DID NOT have a significant discrepancy for FFY 2020 by race or ethnicity, in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of more than 10 days during the school year of children with disabilities.

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 2019**

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 2019**

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2019 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

**4B - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**4B - OSEP Response**

**4B- Required Actions**

## Indicator 5: Education Environments (children 5 (Kindergarten) - 21)

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Results indicator:** Percent of children with IEPs aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and 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

- A. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day) divided by the (total # of students aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.
- B. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day) divided by the (total # of students aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.
- C. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements) divided by the (total # of students aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.

#### Instructions

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

States must report five-year-old children with disabilities who are enrolled in kindergarten in this indicator. Five-year-old children with disabilities who are enrolled in preschool programs are included in Indicator 6. 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	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
A	2020	Target >=	41.00%	47.00%	52.00%	57.00%	57.00%
A	50.71%	Data	36.83%	37.33%	40.63%	43.86%	47.95%
B	2020	Target <=	17.00%	16.00%	15.00%	14.00%	14.00%
B	16.30%	Data	20.24%	20.40%	18.94%	17.15%	16.41%
C	2020	Target <=	1.50%	1.50%	1.50%	1.50%	1.50%
C	0.96%	Data	1.17%	1.15%	1.11%	1.21%	1.07%

### Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A >=	50.71%	53.00%	55.00%	57.00%	59.00%	61.00%
Target B <=	16.30%	15.80%	15.30%	14.80%	14.30%	13.80%
Target C <=	0.96%	0.96%	0.95%	0.95%	0.94%	0.94%

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The Department collaborates closely with several partners to ensure that authentic engagement in all aspects of the Department's special education program is achieved. These stakeholders supported the Department with the process of soliciting and providing broad stakeholder input on the Department's FFY 2020-2025 SPP/APR cycle. Presentation materials and meeting notes are available at the following websites:

- SEAC website at SPP/APR Resources Page <https://seac-hawaii.org/spp-apr-resource-page/>

- The Department's website at <https://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/TeachingAndLearning/SpecializedPrograms/SpecialEducation/Pages/home.aspx>

### State Advisory Panel – Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC)

The Special Education Advisory Council 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 our SEAC is an appointment of 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 are individuals with disabilities or parents of children with disabilities (ages birth through 26). In the SEAC monthly meetings, family, community, and Department partners come together to address the group's special education priorities. This is done by sharing information, hearing community concerns, and addressing actions for improvement. Meeting agendas and minutes, along with other family resources, can be found on the SEAC website at <https://seac-hawaii.org/>.

### Special Parent Information Network (SPIN)

The Special Parent Information Network is co-sponsored by the Disability and Communication Access Board and the Department. The Department has a long-standing memorandum of agreement with the Hawaii State Department of Health to fund the SPIN to provide support to SEAC. In addition, SPIN provides training and technical assistance to parent(s)/legal guardian(s) of students with disabilities. This includes the development and maintenance of an informational website and other materials, an annual parent conference, and availability to answer parent questions via a telephone hotline. SPIN is guided by an advisory committee made up of parents, professionals, and persons with disabilities and works with the Department to support students and families. Additional information can be found on the SPIN webpage at <https://spinhawaii.org/>.

**Community Children’s Councils (CCCs)**

The Community Children’s Councils serve children and families including those with disabilities and mental health needs through collaborative partnerships. The CCC, led by parent and professional co-chairs, provides assistance to families in coordinating educational and community support and services for their children with disabilities. The CCC is composed of 17 councils across the state representing each CA’s geographic community. Given this structure, the CCCs are an effective venue for the Department to reach the broad and diverse communities across all islands. Additional information can be found on the CCCs webpage at <https://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/ParentsAndStudents/SupportForParents/Pages/CCC.aspx>.

**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. 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. Additional information can be found on the LDAH webpage at <https://ldahawaii.org/>.

The Department continues to utilize the Leading by Convening framework to engage stakeholders in monthly Parent Partner meetings. These meetings are designed to provide opportunities for sharing information, exchanging ideas, understanding various perspectives, and supporting effective communication. Community stakeholders represented at these meetings include SEAC, SPIN, CCC, DD Council, and Hawaii’s Parent Training and Information agency, LDAH.

The ESB and MAC in collaboration with SEAC, SPIN, and CCC, commenced a series of stakeholder meetings to begin discussions and develop recommended targets for the new six-year cycle of the revised SPP. Beginning in January 2021, these meetings were held over a one-year period and were designed to engage stakeholders from various backgrounds; educators, parents, school administrators, policy advisors, school psychologists, early education, advocacy groups, and state advisory board members. The Department leveraged the expertise of these stakeholders, with their breadth and depth of knowledge, to help inform the development of a new set of rigorous state targets and solicited new improvement activities for the next six-year SPP cycle.

Additional information to the description shared in the Introduction section:

During the stakeholder engagement meetings, the Department and the stakeholders reviewed the longitudinal data, compared Hawaii to the national norms, and determined that decreasing by 0.005% each year from the baseline of FFY 2020 (0.96) was reasonable and achievable. FFY 2021 (0.955%); FFY 2022 (0.950%); FFY 2023 (0.945%); FFY 2024 (0.940%); FFY 2025 (0.935%). The EdFacts SPP/APR platform does not allow for precise numbers to that decimal value. The stakeholders acknowledge that there are limitations with regards to decreasing targets for Indicator 5C.

Stakeholders suggested the following improvement activities:

- Provide more support for students to be included in the general education classroom
- More teacher training for different models of inclusion
- More support for co-teaching at the school level
- More training for parents and students to be prepared for appropriate inclusion

**Prepopulated Data**

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/07/2021	Total number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21	18,029
SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/07/2021	A. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	9,142
SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/07/2021	B. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	2,939
SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/07/2021	c1. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in separate schools	110
SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/07/2021	c2. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in residential facilities	20
SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/07/2021	c3. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in homebound/hospital placements	43

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 2020 SPP/APR Data**

Education Environments	Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	9,142	18,029	47.95%	50.71%	50.71%	N/A	N/A
B. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	2,939	18,029	16.41%	16.30%	16.30%	N/A	N/A
C. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements [c1+c2+c3]	173	18,029	1.07%	0.96%	0.96%	N/A	N/A

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

As a result of the change in methodology for federal reporting requirements for 5-year-old students with disabilities to be categorized in preschool or kindergarten, impacting the data for students aged 5 in kindergarten to 21, as such, the Department has established a new baseline for indicator 5A, 5B, and 5C to be FFY 2020. The Indicator 5 data is complete, valid, and reliable as the data collection was not impacted by the COVID-19 pandemic for SY 2020-2021.

To increase the inclusion rate, the Department engaged in the following improvement activities:

- Hawaii Multi-Tiered System of Support (HMTSS) mandatory in all public schools
- Over the past four years, the Department in partnership with Stetson & Associates, Inc., has provided inclusive practices implementation training and consultation to schools statewide in the initiative titled Hui Pu Project. Through this initiative, the Department established a clear vision and a continued commitment and expectations for inclusive practices. The Department's vision for inclusive practices remains as follows: "The Department is committed to serving all students in inclusive environments where students are accepted members of their community, where students with disabilities have equal access to and successfully engage in the same educational environment with the same learning opportunities as their students without disabilities".
- Free available courses were made available to school staff. Inclusive practices modules and resources are available online at <https://drive.google.com/file/d/1KP74-PRQk7ggcwZCnyfeLcUc5OZU6kfU/view>.

**5 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**5 - OSEP Response**

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2020, and OSEP accepts that revision.

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

**5 - Required Actions**

## Indicator 6: Preschool Environments

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Results indicator:** Percent of children with IEPs aged 3, 4, and aged 5 who are enrolled in a preschool program 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.
- C. Receiving special education and related services in the home.

(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

- A. Percent =  $[(\# \text{ of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program}) \div (\text{total } \# \text{ of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs})] \times 100$ .
- B. Percent =  $[(\# \text{ of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility}) \div (\text{total } \# \text{ of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs})] \times 100$ .
- C. Percent =  $[(\# \text{ of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs receiving special education and related services in the home}) \div (\text{total } \# \text{ of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs})] \times 100$ .

#### Instructions

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

States must report five-year-old children with disabilities who are enrolled in preschool programs in this indicator. Five-year-old children with disabilities who are enrolled in kindergarten are included in Indicator 5.

States may choose to set one target that is inclusive of children ages 3, 4, and 5, or set individual targets for each age.

For Indicator 6C: States are not required to establish a baseline or targets if the number of children receiving special education and related services in the home is less than 10, regardless of whether the State chooses to set one target that is inclusive of children ages 3, 4, and 5, or set individual targets for each age. In a reporting period during which the number of children receiving special education and related services in the home reaches 10 or greater, States are required to develop baseline and targets and report on them in the corresponding SPP/APR.

For Indicator 6C: States may express their targets in a range (e.g., 75-85%). 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 IDEA section 618, explain.

## 6 - Indicator Data

**Not Applicable**

**Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.**

NO

### Historical Data – 6A, 6B

Part	FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
A	Target >=	34.00%	34.50%	35.00%	35.50%	35.50%
A	Data	27.58%	27.54%	27.34%	26.93%	28.44%
B	Target <=	23.50%	23.40%	23.30%	23.20%	23.20%
B	Data	29.58%	24.53%	27.99%	21.76%	23.82%

#### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The Department collaborates closely with several partners to ensure that authentic engagement in all aspects of the Department's special education program is achieved. These stakeholders supported the Department with the process of soliciting and providing broad stakeholder input on the Department's FFY 2020-2025 SPP/APR cycle. Presentation materials and meeting notes are available at the following websites:

- SEAC website at SPP/APR Resources Page <https://seac-hawaii.org/spp-apr-resource-page/>
- The Department's website at <https://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/TeachingAndLearning/SpecializedPrograms/SpecialEducation/Pages/home.aspx>

State Advisory Panel – Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC)

The Special Education Advisory Council 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 our SEAC is an appointment of 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 are individuals with disabilities or parents of children with disabilities (ages birth through 26). In the SEAC monthly meetings, family, community, and Department partners come together to address the group's special education priorities. This is done by sharing information, hearing community concerns, and addressing actions for improvement. Meeting agendas and minutes, along with other family resources, can be found on the SEAC website at <https://seac-hawaii.org/>.

Special Parent Information Network (SPIN)

The Special Parent Information Network is co-sponsored by the Disability and Communication Access Board and the Department. The Department has

a long-standing memorandum of agreement with the Hawaii State Department of Health to fund the SPIN to provide support to SEAC. In addition, SPIN provides training and technical assistance to parent(s)/legal guardian(s) of students with disabilities. This includes the development and maintenance of an informational website and other materials, an annual parent conference, and availability to answer parent questions via a telephone hotline. SPIN is guided by an advisory committee made up of parents, professionals, and persons with disabilities and works with the Department to support students and families. Additional information can be found on the SPIN webpage at <https://spinhawaii.org/>.

**Community Children’s Councils (CCCs)**

The Community Children’s Councils serve children and families including those with disabilities and mental health needs through collaborative partnerships. The CCC, led by parent and professional co-chairs, provides assistance to families in coordinating educational and community support and services for their children with disabilities. The CCC is composed of 17 councils across the state representing each CA’s geographic community. Given this structure, the CCCs are an effective venue for the Department to reach the broad and diverse communities across all islands. Additional information can be found on the CCCs webpage at <https://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/ParentsAndStudents/SupportForParents/Pages/CCC.aspx>.

**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. 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. Additional information can be found on the LDAH webpage at <https://ldahawaii.org/>.

The Department continues to utilize the Leading by Convening framework to engage stakeholders in monthly Parent Partner meetings. These meetings are designed to provide opportunities for sharing information, exchanging ideas, understanding various perspectives, and supporting effective communication. Community stakeholders represented at these meetings include SEAC, SPIN, CCC, DD Council, and Hawaii’s Parent Training and Information agency, LDAH.

The ESB and MAC in collaboration with SEAC, SPIN, and CCC, commenced a series of stakeholder meetings to begin discussions and develop recommended targets for the new six-year cycle of the revised SPP. Beginning in January 2021, these meetings were held over a one-year period and were designed to engage stakeholders from various backgrounds; educators, parents, school administrators, policy advisors, school psychologists, early education, advocacy groups, and state advisory board members. The Department leveraged the expertise of these stakeholders, with their breadth and depth of knowledge, to help inform the development of a new set of rigorous state targets and solicited new improvement activities for the next six-year SPP cycle.

Additional information to the description shared in the Introduction section:

The Department in collaboration with stakeholders reviewed Indicator 6 data towards setting the baseline for FFY 2020-2025 cycle. Based on stakeholder input, as targets are to be rigorous yet achievable, the target for 6A was increased, for subsequent yearly target increases to be by 0.75%, and decreases for 6B by 1.00% and 0.03% for 6C.

Stakeholders suggested the following improvement activities in order to increase preschool educational environments for preschool students with disabilities:

- Establish universal preschool to support students with disabilities
- Include a DOE special education teacher or district/complex resource teacher in a private preschool to provide special education and related services
- Collaborate further with Head Start to open more preschool inclusion slots
- Work with Department of Human Services for certification of general education preschool sites

**Targets**

**Please select if the State wants to set baseline and targets based on individual age ranges (i.e. separate baseline and targets for each age), or inclusive of all children ages 3, 4, and 5.**

Inclusive Targets

**Please select if the State wants to use target ranges for 6C.**

Target Range not used

**Baselines for Inclusive Targets option (A, B, C)**

Part	Baseline Year	Baseline Data
A	2020	21.33%
B	2020	32.29%
C	2020	1.26%

**Inclusive Targets – 6A, 6B**

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A >=	21.33%	22.00%	22.75%	23.50%	24.25%	25.00%
Target B <=	32.29%	31.00%	30.00%	29.00%	28.00%	27.00%

**Inclusive Targets – 6C**

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
-----	------	------	------	------	------	------

Target C <=	1.26%	1.23%	1.20%	1.17%	1.14%	1.11%
-------------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------

**Prepopulated Data**

**Data Source:**

SY 2020-21 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)

**Date:**

07/07/2021

Description	3	4	5	3 through 5 - Total
Total number of children with IEPs	651	1,001	336	1,988
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	90	230	104	424
b1. Number of children attending separate special education class	250	306	78	634
b2. Number of children attending separate school	3	3	1	7
b3. Number of children attending residential facility	1	0	0	1
c1. Number of children receiving special education and related services in the home	8	14	3	25

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 2020 SPP/APR Data - Aged 3 through 5**

Preschool Environments	Number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 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	424	1,988	28.44%	21.33%	21.33%	N/A	N/A
B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility	642	1,988	23.82%	32.29%	32.29%	N/A	N/A
C. Home	25	1,988		1.26%	1.26%	N/A	N/A

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

As a result of the change in methodology for federal reporting requirements for 5-year-old students with disabilities to be categorized in preschool or Kindergarten, impacting the data for students ages 3-5 in preschool. As such, the Department has established a new baseline for indicators 6A and 6B.

Recognizing the importance of early childhood programming, the State of Hawaii expanded early childhood education programming, with ten (10) new sites added to the Executive Office on Early Learning Public Pre-K Program (EOEL ) in SY 2020-2021. In addition, legislation passed in 2021, Act 46, further set the goal for preschool children ages 3 to 4 years of age who are unserved, to have access to enrollment in a public preschool program, with targets of 50% by December 31, 2027, and 100% by December 31, 2032. This gradual growth of a public preschool program will provide increased inclusion opportunities for preschool students with disabilities.

To promote community stakeholder awareness and engagement, the Department's community partner, SPIN, developed infographics for select SPP/APR indicators. An indicator 6 resource was created and can be found on the SPIN's website of the SPP/APR stakeholder meeting at: <https://seac-hawaii.org/spp-apr-stakeholder-meeting/>.

The Indicator 6 data is complete, valid, and reliable as the data collection was not impacted by the COVID-19 pandemic for SY 2020-2021.

## **6 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

## **6 - OSEP Response**

The State has revised the baseline for Indicators 6A and 6B, using data from FFY 2020, and OSEP accepts that revision.

The State established baseline for Indicator 6C, using data from FFY 2020, and OSEP accepts the baseline.

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

## **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	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
A1	2018	Target >=	71.41%	72.00%	73.00%	74.00%	74.00%
A1	62.01%	Data	71.41%	76.70%	63.59%	62.01%	69.66%
A2	2018	Target >=	49.79%	50.00%	51.00%	52.00%	52.00%

A2	44.28%	Data	49.79%	58.74%	47.99%	44.28%	43.13%
B1	2018	Target >=	73.53%	74.00%	75.00%	76.00%	76.00%
B1	65.56%	Data	73.53%	79.89%	67.37%	65.56%	69.79%
B2	2018	Target >=	53.22%	54.00%	55.00%	56.00%	56.00%
B2	49.53%	Data	53.22%	59.21%	53.82%	49.53%	45.02%
C1	2018	Target >=	73.28%	74.00%	75.00%	76.00%	76.00%
C1	63.90%	Data	73.28%	87.18%	93.16%	63.90%	71.56%
C2	2018	Target >=	55.83%	57.00%	58.00%	59.00%	59.00%
C2	40.11%	Data	55.83%	78.74%	91.33%	40.11%	39.00%

### Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A1 >=	66.00%	68.00%	70.00%	72.00%	74.00%	76.00%
Target A2 >=	45.00%	46.00%	47.00%	48.00%	49.00%	50.00%
Target B1 >=	68.00%	70.00%	72.00%	74.00%	76.00%	78.00%
Target B2 >=	51.00%	52.00%	53.00%	54.00%	55.00%	56.00%
Target C1 >=	68.00%	70.00%	72.00%	74.00%	76.00%	78.00%
Target C2 >=	41.00%	42.00%	43.00%	44.00%	45.00%	46.00%

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The Department collaborates closely with several partners to ensure that authentic engagement in all aspects of the Department's special education program is achieved. These stakeholders supported the Department with the process of soliciting and providing broad stakeholder input on the Department's FFY 2020-2025 SPP/APR cycle. Presentation materials and meeting notes are available at the following websites:

- SEAC website at SPP/APR Resources Page <https://seac-hawaii.org/spp-apr-resource-page/>
- The Department's website at <https://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/TeachingAndLearning/SpecializedPrograms/SpecialEducation/Pages/home.aspx>

### State Advisory Panel – Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC)

The Special Education Advisory Council 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 our SEAC is an appointment of 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 are individuals with disabilities or parents of children with disabilities (ages birth through 26). In the SEAC monthly meetings, family, community, and Department partners come together to address the group's special education priorities. This is done by sharing information, hearing community concerns, and addressing actions for improvement. Meeting agendas and minutes, along with other family resources, can be found on the SEAC website at <https://seac-hawaii.org/>.

### Special Parent Information Network (SPIN)

The Special Parent Information Network is co-sponsored by the Disability and Communication Access Board and the Department. The Department has a long-standing memorandum of agreement with the Hawaii State Department of Health to fund the SPIN to provide support to SEAC. In addition, SPIN provides training and technical assistance to parent(s)/legal guardian(s) of students with disabilities. This includes the development and maintenance of an informational website and other materials, an annual parent conference, and availability to answer parent questions via a telephone hotline. SPIN is guided by an advisory committee made up of parents, professionals, and persons with disabilities and works with the Department to support students and families. Additional information can be found on the SPIN webpage at <https://spinhawaii.org/>.

### Community Children's Councils (CCCs)

The Community Children's Councils serve children and families including those with disabilities and mental health needs through collaborative partnerships. The CCC, led by parent and professional co-chairs, provides assistance to families in coordinating educational and community support and services for their children with disabilities. The CCC is composed of 17 councils across the state representing each CA's geographic community. Given this structure, the CCCs are an effective venue for the Department to reach the broad and diverse communities across all islands. Additional information can be found on the CCCs webpage at <https://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/ParentsAndStudents/SupportForParents/Pages/CCC.aspx>.

### 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. 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. Additional information can be found on the LDAH webpage at <https://ldahawaii.org/>.

The Department continues to utilize the Leading by Convening framework to engage stakeholders in monthly Parent Partner meetings. These meetings are designed to provide opportunities for sharing information, exchanging ideas, understanding various perspectives, and supporting effective

communication. Community stakeholders represented at these meetings include SEAC, SPIN, CCC, DD Council, and Hawaii's Parent Training and Information agency, LDAH.

The ESB and MAC in collaboration with SEAC, SPIN, and CCC, commenced a series of stakeholder meetings to begin discussions and develop recommended targets for the new six-year cycle of the revised SPP. Beginning in January 2021, these meetings were held over a one-year period and were designed to engage stakeholders from various backgrounds; educators, parents, school administrators, policy advisors, school psychologists, early education, advocacy groups, and state advisory board members. The Department leveraged the expertise of these stakeholders, with their breadth and depth of knowledge, to help inform the development of a new set of rigorous state targets and solicited new improvement activities for the next six-year SPP cycle.

Additional information to the description shared in the Introduction section:

The Department in collaboration with stakeholders reviewed Indicator 7 data, including looking at the baseline established in 2018 and resetting targets using the baseline data as the starting point for establishing future targets. Target setting was increased for summary statement 1 by 2.00% each year, and summary statement 2 to increase by 1.00%.

The stakeholders suggested the following improvement activities in order to increase preschool outcomes for preschool students with disabilities:

- Increase opportunities for preschool students with disabilities to access the general education curriculum, model and work with general education peers
- Language rich classrooms
- Increase parent training/coaching (e.g. teaching, learning, and ages/stages of development)

#### FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

##### Number of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs assessed

619

##### 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	64	10.34%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	121	19.55%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	179	28.92%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	175	28.27%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	80	12.92%

Outcome A	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 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>	354	539	69.66%	66.00%	65.68%	Did not meet target	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 program. <i>Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)</i>	255	619	43.13%	45.00%	41.20%	Did not meet target	Slippage

##### 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	67	10.82%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	108	17.45%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	180	29.08%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	193	31.18%

Outcome B Progress Category	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	71	11.47%

Outcome B	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 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. <i>Calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)</i>	373	548	69.79%	68.00%	68.07%	Met 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. <i>Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)</i>	264	619	45.02%	51.00%	42.65%	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	76	12.28%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	103	16.64%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	209	33.76%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	175	28.27%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	56	9.05%

Outcome C	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 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. <i>Calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)</i>	384	563	71.56%	68.00%	68.21%	Met target	No 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: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)</i>	231	619	39.00%	41.00%	37.32%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
A1	The COVID-19 pandemic's impact on instruction and learning had an effect on teachers and students, and those conditions should be considered when examining preschool outcomes. The small slippage was likely an impact as a result of students' modes of learning and

Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
	instruction being disrupted or altered during the school year. Due to protocols established in SY 2020-2021 to address COVID-19, schools implemented distance and blended learning models, which fostered online interactions while reducing personal face-to-face social interactions, which likely resulted in a decrease in practicing social-emotional skills of preschool students who exited that were enrolled in the DOE preschool program for students with disabilities.
A2	The COVID-19 pandemic's impact on instruction and learning had an effect on teachers and students, and those conditions should be considered when examining preschool outcomes. The small slippage was likely an impact as a result of students' modes of learning and instruction being disrupted or altered during the school year. Due to protocols established in SY 2020-2021 to address COVID-19, schools implemented distance and blended learning models, which fostered online interactions while reducing personal face-to-face social interactions, which likely resulted in a decrease in practicing social-emotional skills of preschool students who exited that were enrolled in the DOE preschool program for students with disabilities.
B2	The COVID-19 pandemic's impact on instruction and learning had an effect on teachers and students, and those conditions should be considered when examining preschool outcomes. The decline in performance was likely an impact as a result of students' modes of learning and instruction being disrupted or altered during the school year. Due to protocols established in SY 2020-2021 to address COVID-19, schools implemented distance and blended learning models, which fostered online interactions while reducing personal face-to-face social interactions, which likely resulted in a decrease in communication and early language skills of preschool students who exited that were enrolled in the DOE preschool program for students with disabilities.
C2	The COVID-19 pandemic's impact on instruction and learning had an effect on teachers and students, and those conditions should be considered when examining preschool outcomes. The decline in the use of appropriate behaviors was likely an impact as a result of students' modes of learning and instruction being disrupted or altered during the school year. Due to protocols established in SY 2020-2021 to address COVID-19, schools implemented distance and blended learning models, which fostered online interactions while reducing personal face-to-face social interactions, which likely resulted in a decrease in the usage of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs of preschool students who exited that were enrolled in the DOE preschool program for students with disabilities.

**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, the Department adopted GOLD by Teaching Strategies (a.k.a. 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 students with disabilities. In SY 2017-2018, TS GOLD changed its platform, resulting in setting a new baseline in 2018.

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 (COS). Children with ratings of six or seven are considered to be functioning at a level "comparable to same-aged peers." To obtain outcomes, student developmental level data is collected by the Early Childhood Special Education (ECSE) teacher within two (2) months of entry as well as prior to exiting the ECSE program.

TS GOLD training for all ECSE teachers is required to be familiar with the procedures on gathering student progress data that is used to generate outcome ratings used for Indicator 7. Technical assistance was made available throughout the year from the regional 619 Preschool Resource Teachers to support the use and collection of student data.

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

The Indicator 7 data is complete, valid, and reliable as the data collection was not impacted by the COVID-19 pandemic for SY 2020-2021. However, the performance for Outcomes A1, A2, B2, and C2 was impacted by the COVID-19 pandemic. Schools followed a hybrid model of providing instruction in the classroom and virtually to adhere to COVID-19 social distancing protocols. Social distancing and using an online platform limited classroom dynamics and dampened learning and instruction.

The Department, in efforts to improve early childhood outcomes, implemented a professional learning community (PLC) targeted to support literacy skills for early learners. The PLC was provided to speech-language pathologists and 619 Preschool Resource Teachers to support classroom teachers in the implementation of instructional practices that will aid in literacy development. The Department implemented a Language and Literacy Initiative, the building of foundational language and literacy skills of early childhood teachers towards increasing the usage of evidence-based oral language and foundational literacy strategies. This initiative included a preschool workgroup comprised of District Educational Specialists.

The Department in collaboration with our community partner, SPIN, developed a Preschool Outcomes infographic to increase parental awareness and engagement. The infographic is available on SPIN's website at: <https://spinhawaii.org/spin-mac-office-infographics/>. In addition, to further promote community stakeholder awareness and engagement, SPIN developed additional infographics for select SPP/APR indicators, the Indicator 7 resource, and can be found on the SPIN's website of the SPP/APR stakeholder meeting at: <https://seac-hawaii.org/spp-apr-stakeholder-meeting/>.

## 7 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 7 - OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

## 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 and the number of respondent parents. The survey response rate is automatically calculated using the submitted data.

States must compare the response rate for the reporting year to the response rate for the previous year (e.g., in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, compare the FFY 2020 response rate to the FFY 2019 response rate) and describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.

The State must also analyze the response rate to identify potential nonresponse bias and take steps to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross section of parents of children with disabilities.

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

States must describe the metric used to determine representativeness (e.g., +/- 3% discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to target group).

If the analysis shows that the demographics of the children for whom 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.

**Beginning with the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2023**, when reporting the extent to which the demographics of the children for whom parents responded are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services, States must include race/ethnicity in their analysis. In addition, the State's analysis must also include at least one of the following demographics: age of the student, disability category, gender, geographic location, and/or another demographic category approved through the stakeholder input process.

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

The Department collaborates closely with several partners to ensure that authentic engagement in all aspects of the Department's special education program is achieved. These stakeholders supported the Department with the process of soliciting and providing broad stakeholder input on the Department's FFY 2020-2025 SPP/APR cycle. Presentation materials and meeting notes are available at the following websites:

- SEAC website at SPP/APR Resources Page <https://seac-hawaii.org/spp-apr-resource-page/>

- The Department's website at <https://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/TeachingAndLearning/SpecializedPrograms/SpecialEducation/Pages/home.aspx>

#### State Advisory Panel – Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC)

The Special Education Advisory Council 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 our SEAC is an appointment of 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 are individuals with disabilities or parents of children with disabilities (ages birth through 26). In the SEAC monthly meetings, family, community, and Department partners come together to address the group's special education priorities. This is done by sharing information, hearing community concerns, and addressing actions for improvement. Meeting agendas and minutes, along with other family resources, can be found on the SEAC website at <https://seac-hawaii.org/>.

#### Special Parent Information Network (SPIN)

The Special Parent Information Network is co-sponsored by the Disability and Communication Access Board and the Department. The Department has a long-standing memorandum of agreement with the Hawaii State Department of Health to fund the SPIN to provide support to SEAC. In addition, SPIN provides training and technical assistance to parent(s)/legal guardian(s) of students with disabilities. This includes the development and maintenance of an informational website and other materials, an annual parent conference, and availability to answer parent questions via a telephone hotline. SPIN is guided by an advisory committee made up of parents, professionals, and persons with disabilities and works with the Department to support students

and families. Additional information can be found on the SPIN webpage at <https://spinhawaii.org/>.

**Community Children’s Councils (CCCs)**

The Community Children’s Councils serve children and families including those with disabilities and mental health needs through collaborative partnerships. The CCC, led by parent and professional co-chairs, provides assistance to families in coordinating educational and community support and services for their children with disabilities. The CCC is composed of 17 councils across the state representing each CA’s geographic community. Given this structure, the CCCs are an effective venue for the Department to reach the broad and diverse communities across all islands. Additional information can be found on the CCCs webpage at <https://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/ParentsAndStudents/SupportForParents/Pages/CCC.aspx>.

**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. 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. Additional information can be found on the LDAH webpage at <https://ldahawaii.org/>.

The Department continues to utilize the Leading by Convening framework to engage stakeholders in monthly Parent Partner meetings. These meetings are designed to provide opportunities for sharing information, exchanging ideas, understanding various perspectives, and supporting effective communication. Community stakeholders represented at these meetings include SEAC, SPIN, CCC, DD Council, and Hawaii’s Parent Training and Information agency, LDAH.

The ESB and MAC in collaboration with SEAC, SPIN, and CCC, commenced a series of stakeholder meetings to begin discussions and develop recommended targets for the new six-year cycle of the revised SPP. Beginning in January 2021, these meetings were held over a one-year period and were designed to engage stakeholders from various backgrounds; educators, parents, school administrators, policy advisors, school psychologists, early education, advocacy groups, and state advisory board members. The Department leveraged the expertise of these stakeholders, with their breadth and depth of knowledge, to help inform the development of a new set of rigorous state targets and solicited new improvement activities for the next six-year SPP cycle.

Additional information to the description shared in the Introduction section:

The Department in collaboration with stakeholders reviewed Indicator 8 data towards setting the baseline for FFY 2020-2025 cycle. Some stakeholders expressed using the 2019-2020 data, at 58% towards setting a higher standard, however, with the change in data collection methodology implemented in 2020-2021, using 2020-2021 data as the baseline was determined to be more appropriate. Subsequent yearly targets for indicator 8 were set to increase by 2% each year.

The stakeholders suggested the following improvement activities in order to increase the involvement of parents of students with disabilities:

- Invite family/parent organizations to present at quarterly district meetings to increase awareness
- Increase relationship-building opportunities
- Provide incentives for parents or the schools to increase the number of survey returns
- Collaboration between the parent-teacher organization and special education
- Mentor/train parents on procedural safeguards, collaborating and IEPs

**Historical Data**

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2020	51.78%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target >=	53.00%	53.00%	54.00%	54.00%	60.00%
Data	54.33%	56.55%	54.88%	57.42%	58.20%

**Targets**

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target >=	51.78%	54.00%	56.00%	58.00%	60.00%	62.00%

**FFY 2020 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 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
610	1,178	58.20%	51.78%	51.78%	N/A	N/A

**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.**

Upon completion of a student’s initial or annual Individualized Education Program (IEP) meeting, the parent(s)/guardian(s) of a student aged 3 through 21 (preschool and school-age) are given an opportunity to respond to the Parent Involvement Survey. The Parent Involvement Survey consists of a 25-item rating scale, Schools’ Efforts to Partner with Parents Scale (SEPPS) that was developed and validated by the National Center for Special Education

and Accountability Monitoring (NCSEAM). As IEP meetings shifted from in-person to teleconferencing, in SY 2020-21, the Department released the online parent involvement survey as an additional option to the paper version to promote parent involvement with survey responses. All returned surveys for students ages 3-21 between July 1, 2020 through June 30, 2021, are combined, processed, aggregated, and analyzed by a third-party contracted data analysis company. The Department uses one survey for parents of all grade levels including parents of preschool children.

**The number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed.**

20,017

**Percentage of respondent parents**

5.88%

**Response Rate**

FFY	2019	2020
Response Rate	3.26%	5.88%

**Describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate year over year, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.**

A focus area for the Department has been to increase the response rate and ensure representativeness of all groups of parents in this data collection. To achieve this, the Department implemented an online survey option for parents to provide another venue to give input and feedback in their children's education. Parents now had the option to provide survey input either by paper or electronically. To promote representativeness of the demographics of children receiving special education services in Hawaii, the Department 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 HDOE website and at <http://www.hiparentsurvey.com/>. To facilitate access to the survey, a handout was developed for schools and parents with frequently asked questions. The survey and the handout can be found on the Department's website under Parent Involvement Survey: <http://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/TeachingAndLearning/SpecializedPrograms/SpecialEducation/Pages/home.aspx>.

The Department in collaboration with our community partner, SPIN, developed a Parent Involvement Survey infographic towards increasing parental awareness and engagement. The infographic can be found on the SPIN's website at: <https://spinhawaii.org/spin-mac-office-infographics/>. In addition, to promote community stakeholder awareness and engagement, SPIN developed additional infographics for select SPP/APR indicators, the Indicator 8 resource, and can be found on the SPIN's website of the SPP/APR stakeholder meeting at: <https://seac-hawaii.org/spp-apr-stakeholder-meeting/>.

**Describe the analysis of the response rate including any nonresponse bias that was identified, and the steps taken to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross section of parents of children with disabilities.**

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.

The Department's mean measure on the SEPPS is 613, with a standard deviation of 157. The Department's mean measure on the SEPPS is 613, with a standard deviation of 157. The standard error of the sample mean is 4.6. The 95% confidence interval for the sample mean is 604.2 – 622.1. 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 613 and 612 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 are 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.

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 51.78% (unweighted). The standard error of the sample percentage is 1.5%. The 95% confidence interval for the sample percentage is 48.9% – 54.6%. This means that there is a 95% likelihood that the true value of the state percentage is between 48.9% – 54.6%. When weighted by race/ethnicity and primary disability, the percentages meeting the standard were 51.65% and 51.91%, respectively. The 95% confidence interval was 48.8% – 54.5% when weighted by race/ethnicity and 49.0% – 54.7% weighted by primary disability.

Parental responses were obtained using the School's Efforts to Partner with Parents Scale (SEPPS), which 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. 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 51.78% (unweighted). The standard error of the sample percentage is 1.5%. The 95% confidence interval for the sample percentage is 48.9% – 54.6%. This means that there is a 95% likelihood that the true value of the state percentage is between 48.9% – 54.6%. When weighted by race/ethnicity and primary disability, the percentages meeting the standard were 51.65% and 51.91%, respectively. The 95% confidence interval was 48.8% – 54.5% when weighted by race/ethnicity and 49.0% – 54.7% weighted by primary disability. In other words, the percent of parents at or above the Standard value of 600 on the SEPPs by racial/ethnic category fell within the 95% confidence interval for each race/ethnicity.

Based on the return rate of surveys and the comparison of the composition of respondents and target populations, the data indicates there is no identification of nonresponse bias in the respondent groups.

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

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 that 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 regard to schools' facilitation of parent involvement. OSEP requires that the states' performance be reported as the percent of parents who report that schools facilitated their involvement. Deriving a percent from a continuous distribution requires the application of a standard or cut-score. The Department elected to apply the standard recommended by a nationally representative stakeholder group convened by NCSEAM. The recommended standard, established based on item content expressed in the scale, was operationalized as a measure of 600. Thus, 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.

The Department's mean measure on the SEPPS is 613, with a standard deviation of 157. The standard error of the sample mean is 4.6. The 95% confidence interval for the sample mean is 604.2 – 622.1. 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 613 and 612 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 are 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.

Analysis of data of the respondents to the survey for comparing the composition of the target population and the respondent group, based on the following demographics: race/ethnicity, age of the student, disability category, grade, and geographic location.

**The demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services. (yes/no)**

YES

**If no, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics.**

**Describe the metric used to determine representativeness (e.g., +/- 3% discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to target group).**

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.

The Department's mean measure on the SEPPS is 613, with a standard deviation of 157. The standard error of the sample mean is 4.6. The 95% confidence interval for the sample mean is 604.2 – 622.1. 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 613 and 612 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 are 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.

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
If yes, provide a copy of the survey.	

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

When determining targets, the Department rounded the targets from FFY 2021 through FFY 2025.

### **8 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

### **8 - OSEP Response**

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2020, and OSEP accepts that revision.

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

### **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 the reporting year, 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 2020 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2021).

#### Instructions

Provide racial/ethnic disproportionality data for all children aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and 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 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 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.

## 9 - Indicator Data

### Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

#### Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2020	0.00%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

#### Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

#### FFY 2020 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/ethnic groups in special education and related services	Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial/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 and/or cell size	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
1	0	1	0.00%	0%	0.00%	N/A	N/A

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:

Hawaii is a single District state, which means the SEA and LEA are the same and reported as one district.

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 districts/1) x 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.

The Department's 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 for children aged 5 who are enrolled in Kindergarten through 21 served under IDEA. The risk ratios are then compared to their respective confidence interval based on racial/ethnic group and group size.

For the second tier, the Department 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 the Department's general supervision process consistent with OSEP's Memorandum 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.

The Department's Process for Identifying Disproportionality:

The Department'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) 2010-2011, the Department disaggregated race/ethnicity data into the seven (7) identified federal ethnic groups: 1) Hispanic/Latino of any race; 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 2012-2013, the Department 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 Department uses for Tier I analysis of Disproportionate Representation.

The Department's 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 Department's Tier II consists of a two-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 the Department'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.**

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 2020, the Department 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 Islanders (PI)), with 683 students in the HI group and 578 students in the PI group (students identified in SY 2020-2021), and the resulting sample sizes were of 85 (HI) and 83 (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 the Department’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)**

Based on feedback from stakeholders, suggested improvement strategies included looking at disaggregating Asians into smaller ethnic groups to see if there may be any trends or patterns and looking at how to better support schools and general education teachers in the areas where there is a higher percentage of identified students eligible for special education and related services.

Prior to FFY 2020, the Department was required to provide racial/ethnic disproportionality data for all children aged 6 through 21 served under IDEA, aggregated across all disability categories. With the new requirements, beginning with FFY 2020, OSEP is requiring states to provide racial/ethnic disproportionality data for all children aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten, in addition to those aged 6 through 21 served under IDEA, aggregated across all disability categories. Because this data change translates into an indicator specification change, the Department established a new baseline using FFY 2020 data.

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 national pandemic of COVID-19 for SY 2020-2021.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019**

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 2019**

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2019 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

**9 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**9 - OSEP Response**

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2020, and OSEP accepts that revision.

**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 2020, 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 specific disability categories is the result of inappropriate identification, even if the determination of inappropriate identification was made after the end of the FFY 2020 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2021).

### Instructions

Provide racial/ethnic disproportionality data for all children aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served under IDEA. Provide these data at a minimum for children in the following six disability categories: intellectual disability, specific learning disabilities, emotional disturbance, speech or language impairments, other health impairments, and autism. If a State has identified disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories other than these six disability categories, the State must include these data and report on whether the State determined that the disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification.

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 specific disability categories 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 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 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.

## 10 - Indicator Data

### Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

### Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2020	0.00%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

### Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

**FFY 2020 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/ethnic groups in specific disability categories	Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	Number of districts that met the State's minimum n and/or cell size	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
1	0	1	0.00%	0%	0.00%	N/A	N/A

**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:

Hawaii is a single District state, which means the SEA and LEA are the same and reported as one district.

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 a State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups)] times 100.

(0 districts/1) x 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.

The Department’s 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 ratio is then compared to its respective confidence interval based on racial/ethnic group and group size.

For the second tier, the Department 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 the Department’s general supervision process consistent with the OSEP Memorandum 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.

The Department’s Process for Identifying Disproportionality:

The Department’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) 2010-2011, the Department disaggregated race/ethnicity data into the seven (7) identified federal ethnic groups: 1) Hispanic/Latino of any race; 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 2012-2013, the Department 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 Department uses for Tier I analysis of Disproportionate Representation.

The Department's 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 Department's Tier II consists of a two-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 the Department'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 Department 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 2020, the Department 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 10, the over-identified ethnic groups by ethnicity in SY 2020-2021 were: SLD, OHI, and ED for Hispanic/Latino students, OHI, SLI, and Autism for White, and SLD, OHI, ED, and ID for Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander students. The sample sizes were the following: Hispanic/Latino with 68, 50, and 19 new students, White with 49, 47, and 41 new students, and 69, 39, 16, and 15 new students for Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander new students.

All students in the analysis samples for Indicator 10 were identified randomly and made available for the review team. Each file for all of 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 10 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 the Department's general supervision process. When disproportionate identification is the result of inappropriate identification, and noncompliance is identified, it is addressed under the Department's general supervision process consistent with the OSEP Memorandum 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)**

Based on feedback from stakeholders, suggested improvement strategies included looking at disaggregating Asians into smaller ethnic groups to see if there may be any trends or patterns and looking at how to better support schools and general education teachers in the areas where there is a higher percentage of identified students eligible for special education and related services.

Prior to FFY 2020, the Department was required to provide racial/ethnic disproportionality data for all children aged 6 through 21 served under IDEA, aggregated across all disability categories. With the new requirements, beginning with FFY 2020, OSEP is requiring states to provide racial/ethnic disproportionality data for all children aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten, in addition to those aged 6 through 21 served under IDEA, aggregated across all disability categories. Because this data change translates into an indicator specification change, the Department established a new baseline using FFY 2020 data.

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 national pandemic of COVID-19 for SY 2020-2021.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019**

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 2019**

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2019 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

**10 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**10 - OSEP Response**

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2020, and OSEP accepts that revision.

**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 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 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.

## 11 - Indicator Data

### Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	93.77%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	95.60%	95.25%	95.20%	95.39%	92.52%

### Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

### FFY 2020 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 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
3,287	3,174	92.52%	100%	96.56%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

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

113

**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 2020-2021:

- A total of 3287 Initial Evaluations were received.
- 113 Initial Evaluations were completed beyond the 60-day timeline.
- 96.56% of Initial Evaluations were completed within less than or equal to the 60-day timeline.

**Eligible IDEA:**

- A total of 3173 Initial Evaluations were IDEA eligible.
- 80 eligible IDEA Initial Evaluations were completed beyond the 60-day timeline.
- 97.48% of Initial Evaluations were completed within less than or equal to the 60-day timeline.

**Not Eligible IDEA:**

- A total of 545 Initial Evaluations were IDEA ineligible.
- 33 ineligible IDEA Initial Evaluations were completed beyond the 60-day timeline.
- 93.94% 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 80 Eligible Initial Evaluations were completed.

- 45 were completed within 1-10 days beyond the 60-day timeline.
- 16 were completed within 11-30 days beyond the 60-day timeline.
- 10 were completed within 31-60 days beyond the 60-day timeline.
- 9 were completed beyond 60 days beyond the 60-day timeline.

A total of 33 Not Eligible Initial Evaluations were completed.

- 16 were completed within 1-10 days beyond the 60-day timeline.
- 9 were completed within 11-30 days beyond the 60-day timeline.
- 3 were completed within 31-60 days beyond the 60-day timeline.
- 5 were completed beyond 60 days beyond the 60-day timeline.

**Reasons for Delay Beyond 60-Day Timeline:**

A total of 80 Eligible Initial Evaluations were delayed beyond the 60-Day timeline.

- 8 were delayed due to the provider not being available.
- 3 were delayed due to the provider's report not being available.
- 13 were delayed due to COVID-19.
- 56 were delayed due to "other" reasons.

A total of 33 Not Eligible Initial Evaluations were delayed beyond the 60-Day timeline.

- 4 were delayed due to the provider not being available.
- 3 were delayed due to the provider's report not being available.
- 5 were delayed due to COVID-19.
- 21 were delayed due to "other" 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.**

The Department monitors the entire system of individual complexes and individual schools. The data for Indicator 11, Child Find, was retrieved through the Department's statewide electronic Comprehensive Student Support System (eCSSS) for all students receiving initial evaluations in SY 2020-2021. The data is aggregated and analyzed to determine whether initial evaluations were completed within the 60-day timeline.

**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)**

Stakeholder feedback for improvement strategies includes improving coordination of documentation (e.g. out of state evaluations and IEPs, private school reports, etc.) for timely evaluations and eligibility.

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 2020-2021; however, the timeliness to complete evaluations within the 60 days was impacted by the circumstances related to the COVID-19 pandemic, including parents, school staff and students being afflicted with COVID-19, and scheduling and availability of IEP team members.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019**

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
37	37	0	0

**FFY 2019 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

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

The Department identified findings in 37 complexes, based on a total of 264 cases 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)).

Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) Memorandum 09-02 Prong 1 verification is described in the next section.

OSEP Memorandum 09-02 Prong 2: In order to ensure that these complexes were correctly implementing the 60-day timeline, the Department 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, the Department has verified for Indicator 11 each complex 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.

The Department notified in writing the 37 complexes that noncompliance was corrected and verified.

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

OSEP Memorandum 09-02 Prong 1: The Department identified findings in 37 complexes, based on a total of 264 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)). The Monitoring and Compliance Branch (MAC) reviewed the files of these 264 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 MAC informed the Complex Area Superintendents and the District Educational Specialists of the 37 complexes of the findings and the timeline for submission and implementation of corrective actions, consistent with the requirements of IDEA and the OSEP Memorandum 09-02. Each individual instance of noncompliance was required to be corrected with a written response of correction with supporting data and submitted to the MAC. In addition, utilizing the eCSSS database, the 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 2019**

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2019 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

**11 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2019, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019, although its FFY 2019 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019.

**Response to actions required in FFY 2019 SPP/APR**

**11 - OSEP Response**

**11 - Required Actions**

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2020, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, that it has verified that

each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction. If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2020, although its FFY 2020 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2020.

## 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.

Targets must be 100%.

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.

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 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 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.

## 12 - Indicator Data

### Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

#### Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	90.90%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	96.01%	92.96%	94.98%	93.27%	85.86%

#### Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

#### FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

a. Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.	402
b. Number of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to third birthday.	37

c. Number of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	272
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.	17
e. Number of children who were referred to Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.	4
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 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 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.	272	344	85.86%	100%	79.07%	Did not meet target	Slippage

**Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable**

Slippage in Indicator 12 has been due to the COVID-19 national pandemic. There were initial challenges with converting to a teleconference model for both Part C and B (the Department) in conducting transition meetings, assessments and evaluations, and IEP meetings. In addition, some delays may be due to some Part C providers unfamiliar with the protocol for transition notices to be sent to Part B unless the parent chose to opt-out, declining to have the transition notice be sent to the Department. The Department continues to collaborate with Part C on a regular basis for improving seamless coordination between both systems, including 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**

72

**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 an IEP implemented by age three were that transition notices were received late from Part C and schools did not conduct the Request for Evaluation in a timely manner upon receipt of the Part C Transition Notice.

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

The breakdown is as follows:

- Eighteen children were referred from Part C to Part B less than the required 90 days. There was no noncompliance 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.
- Forty-eight children were delayed in the evaluation, eligibility, and IEP development process.
- Five (5) children were timely referred and met eligibility timelines; however, did not have an IEP implemented by the child's third birthday.
- One (1) child was determined not to be evaluated; however, was found eligible after his/her third birthday.

Range of Days Beyond Age 3

The number of days beyond the third birthday ranged from 1 to 255.

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

- 1-10 Days - 20 cases
- 11-30 Days - 24 cases
- 31-60 Days - 11 cases
- > 60 Days - 17 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 2020-2021. 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, IDEA ineligible, withdrawn, consent revoked)
- Referral Source (Part C) - Transition Notice
- Date the initial Individualized Education Program (IEP) was held
- Date services were made available

The data from the report generated for SY 2020-2021 was reviewed and analyzed to ensure the accuracy of the information by the Monitoring and Compliance Branch.

**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 2020-2021. However, the timeliness of evaluations, eligibility, and implementation of the IEP by the child's third birthday was impacted by the COVID-19 pandemic. The number of children served in Part C and referred to Part B decreased from 565 to 402, a substantial decrease of 29%, suggesting parents may be choosing to opt-out and refrain from having their child be referred from Part C to Part B.

Stakeholder feedback for improvement strategies include:

- Continue to provide ongoing support and training to school staff related to transitioning students from Part C to Part B.
- Support parents with the transition process from Part C to Part B.
- Create resources such as a flow chart for families and teachers to understand the transition process from Part C to Part B.

To support timely transitions, the Department, Part C, and the Special Parent Information Network (SPIN) collaborated and drafted a resource infographic related to the transition from Part C to B and is pending release.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019**

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
29	29	0	0

**FFY 2019 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

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

The Department identified findings in 29 complexes, based on a total of 67 cases of noncompliance for the children who were referred by Part C prior to age 3 and 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 29 complexes and the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) Memorandum 09-02 verification process was utilized. In accordance with the OSEP Memorandum 09-02, The Department 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 29 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: The Department issued findings of noncompliance in 29 complexes. The Monitoring and Compliance Branch (MAC) reviewed the 67 instances in the 29 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 (after their third birthday), satisfying Prong 1 verification. Written notification from the MAC informed the 29 Complex Area Superintendents and the District Educational Specialists of the findings and the timeline for submission and implementation of corrective actions, consistent with the requirements of IDEA and the OSEP Memorandum 09-02.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2019**

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2019 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

**12 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2019, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019, although its FFY 2019 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019.

**Response to actions required in FFY 2019 SPP/APR**

**12 - OSEP Response**

**12 - Required Actions**

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2020, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2020, although its FFY 2020 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2020.

## Indicator 13: Secondary Transition

### Instructions and Measurement

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

**Compliance indicator:** 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 that is likely to be responsible for providing or paying for transition services, including, if appropriate, pre-employment transition services, 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 that is likely to be responsible for providing or paying for transition services, including, if appropriate, pre-employment transition services, 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 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 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.

## 13 - Indicator Data

### Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2009	76.00%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	70.32%	74.14%	64.62%	69.21%	13.57%

### Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

### FFY 2020 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 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
83	588	13.57%	100%	14.12%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

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 through the electronic Comprehensive Student Support System (eCSSS) database by a random sample file review of 588 Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) of all students aged 16 years and older from all schools (including public charter schools) statewide.

A random sample calculator was used to determine the number of students to be represented in the sample. The student sample was randomly selected from the SY 2020-2021 special education composition with a confidence level of 99% and a confidence interval of 5. The Monitoring and Compliance Branch (MAC) reviewed the sample to ensure each of the complexes statewide were represented. If a school was not included in the sample, a student from that school was randomly selected.

The National Secondary Transition Technical Assistance Center (NSTTAC)/National Technical Assistance Center on Transition: The Collaborative (NTACT:C) Indicator 13 Checklist Form B was used to conduct IEP file reviews to determine Indicator 13 compliance. In order to be considered in compliance with Indicator 13, an IEP must have demonstrated compliance with the eight (8) specific requirements:

1. The IEP must include appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that address education, training, employment, and independent living (as appropriate);
2. The postsecondary goals are updated annually;
3. The postsecondary goals 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 goals;
5. The transition services include courses of study that will reasonably enable the student to meet his or her postsecondary goals;
6. There is/are annual IEP goal(s) related to the student’s transition services 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 that is likely to be responsible for providing or paying for transition services 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 2020-2021. However, the COVID-19 pandemic continued to affect Indicator 13 performance as schools moved between in-person and 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.

**State Priority Area: Secondary Transition**

Taking into consideration the comparison of the Department’s data to national data, alignment with statewide initiatives, stakeholder feedback, and OSEP’s priorities (Hawaii’s Determination), the Department determined secondary transition a priority area. In response, the Exceptional Support Branch and the Monitoring and Compliance Branch provided a series of training to complex areas and schools on the eight areas required by Indicator 13 for compliant secondary transition plans. In addition, mandatory PLCs for all complex areas were instituted in order to ensure all staff who are responsible for the development and implementation of transition plans are fully prepared to develop compliant transition plans and use effective transition practices. The Department is committed to improving transition service planning for our students with disabilities and will continue to partner with our community agencies as well as receive TA from OSEP-approved TA centers.

In addition, to promote community stakeholder awareness and engagement, SPIN developed additional infographics for select SPP/APR indicators, the Indicator 13 resource, and can be found on the SPIN’s website of the SPP/APR stakeholder meeting at: <https://seac-hawaii.org/spp-apr-stakeholder-meeting/>.

**Description of Stakeholder Input**

The stakeholders suggested the following improvement activities in order to improve transition planning for students with disabilities:

- Transition PLCs
- Offer collaborative training to parents and teachers in transition components needed for success
- Prepare students to lead their IEP/transition planning
- Build self-advocacy
- Expand use of transition assessments to better inform transition planning
- Increase collaboration with agency partners to provide transition services to students
- Align courses/activities based on individual needs, strengths, preferences, interests
- Update IEP template to drive transition planning

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019**

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
42	16	0	26

**FFY 2019 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

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

Numerous COVID-19 pandemic-related challenges arose across Hawaii’s public schools. Many challenges were common across schools, yet others were unique to a particular school or group of schools within a particular geographic area. The pandemic’s impact on staffing, student attendance, instruction, and transition planning had a tremendous impact on administrators, teachers, students, parents, and participating agencies and those conditions should be considered when examining Indicator 13 data.

The Department identified findings of noncompliance in 42 complexes based on 535 files of students with IEPs aged 16 years and older whose IEPs did not meet one or more of the requirements related to Indicator 13. Thus, the Department issued 42 findings of noncompliance statewide.

Written notification from the Monitoring and Compliance Branch (MAC) informed the Complex Area Superintendent and the District Educational Specialist for each of the 42 complexes of the noncompliance findings and the timeline for submittal and implementation of corrective actions, consistent with the requirements of IDEA and the OSEP Memorandum 09-02: (1) correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the student was no longer within the jurisdiction of the Department, consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02.

In order to ensure that the complexes were correctly implementing transition services, at the time of this report, the Department reviewed updated transition plans in those IEPs of youth aged 16 and above collected through the electronic Comprehensive Student Support System (eCSSS) database.

The MAC has verified, based on a review of updated data in eCSSS database system, that (1) each of the 535 files in 42 complexes with a finding of noncompliance, reflected in the FFY 2019 data reported for this indicator, have been corrected, unless the student was no longer within the jurisdiction of the Department; and (2) 16 complexes are correctly implementing the regulatory requirements based on a review of subsequent data (100% compliance with this requirement) within a year of the written notification of noncompliance. 26 complexes have not achieved 100% compliance on a review of subsequent data consistent with the OSEP Memorandum 09-02.

The MAC staff met with each of the 26 complexes to review their data and will continue to monitor these 26 complexes to ensure 100% compliance is met on a review of subsequent data. The MAC and Exceptional Support Branch (ESB) staff are providing extensive support and training to these 26 complexes to ensure a required subsequent review of additional files will confirm 100% compliance with Indicator 13 requirements.

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

The MAC identified individual findings of noncompliance in 42 complexes based on 535 files of students aged 16 years and older whose IEPs did not meet one or more of the requirements related to Indicator 13. Individual student files identified as noncompliant were reviewed by the MAC to verify correction of noncompliance. For students reported as no longer within the jurisdiction of the Department, the MAC verified that the students exited (moved, graduated, or dropped out) to ensure the correction of noncompliance was no longer required.

The MAC reviewed and verified that all 535 individual cases of noncompliance in 42 complexes were corrected consistent with the requirements of the OSEP Memorandum 09-02.

**FFY 2019 Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected**

**Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected**

State and complex area staff continue to monitor complexes that were unable to demonstrate 100% compliance for implementing the specific regulatory requirements on updated data. The Department continues to provide technical assistance to CAs to ensure sustained compliance through monitoring of updated IEPs. To support complexes and schools in achieving 100% compliance on updated IEPs, the Department took the following actions:

- A. Continued to identify 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:
  - System infrastructure,
  - Inclusion and access to school supports, and
  - Community and family partnerships;
- C. Provided intensive TA and PD to Complex Areas and school-level staff addressing:
  - Indicator 13 requirements,
  - File Reviews utilizing the Indicator 13 Form B Checklist,
  - Documentation of Indicator 13 requirements within the eCSSS database, and
  - Root-cause analysis of data by complex area and schools;
- D. Utilized statewide Postsecondary Transition Handbook for developing effective transition plans;
- E. Provided targeted professional development to complex area and school-level staff to ensure each noncompliant student file was corrected in accordance with the OSEP Memorandum 09-02;
- F. Facilitated mandatory Data-Driven PLCs with each Complex Area focusing on a deep review and root cause analysis on Indicator 13 for each Complex Area team;
- G. Identified areas of need in employment-related services to secondary students with disabilities to improve alignment and coordination with agency partners; and
- H. Attended NTACTION Capacity Building Virtual Institute for Technical Assistance and Resources.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2019**

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2019 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

**13 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2019, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019, although its FFY 2019 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019.

## 13 - OSEP Response

### 13 - Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2020, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 for this indicator. In addition, the State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, that the remaining 26 uncorrected findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 were corrected.

When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 and each LEA with remaining noncompliance identified in [FFY 2019 (and add other years, as needed)]: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2020, although its FFY 2020 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2020.

## Indicator 14: Post-School Outcomes

### Instructions and Measurement

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

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

- A. Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.
- B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school.
- C. 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 2021 on students who left school during 2019-2020, timing the data collection so that at least one year has passed since the students left school. Include students who dropped out during 2019-2020 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”:

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 of 1973, as amended by Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA). 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

States must describe the metric used to determine representativeness (e.g., +/- 3% discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to target group).

Provide the total number of targeted youth in the sample or census.

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.

States must compare the response rate for the reporting year to the response rate for the previous year (e.g., in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, compare the FFY 2020 response rate to the FFY 2019 response rate), and describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate year over year, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.

The State must also analyze the response rate to identify potential nonresponse bias and take steps to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross section of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.

### 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 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. States should consider categories such as race/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.

**Beginning with the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, due Feb. 1, 2023**, when reporting the extent to which the demographics of respondents 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 must include race/ethnicity in its analysis. In addition, the State’s analysis must include at least one of the following demographics: disability category, gender, geographic location, and/or another demographic category approved through the stakeholder input process.

## 14 - Indicator Data

### Historical Data

Measure	Baseline	FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
A	2020	Target >=	34.00%	35.00%	35.00%	40.00%	40.00%
A	19.78%	Data	35.87%	36.34%	35.17%	34.15%	31.05%
B	2020	Target >=	75.00%	76.00%	77.00%	78.00%	80.00%
B	70.69%	Data	83.37%	85.04%	85.69%	79.95%	72.73%
C	2020	Target >=	86.00%	87.00%	87.00%	88.00%	90.00%
C	75.32%	Data	89.79%	93.11%	93.05%	88.35%	80.45%

### FFY 2020 Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A >=	19.78%	23.10%	26.40%	29.70%	33.00%	36.30%
Target B >=	70.69%	73.70%	76.70%	79.70%	82.70%	85.70%
Target C >=	75.32%	78.90%	82.40%	86.00%	89.50%	93.10%

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The Department collaborates closely with several partners to ensure that authentic engagement in all aspects of the Department’s special education program is achieved. These stakeholders supported the Department with the process of soliciting and providing broad stakeholder input on the Department’s FFY 2020-2025 SPP/APR cycle. Presentation materials and meeting notes are available at the following websites:

- SEAC website at SPP/APR Resources Page <https://seac-hawaii.org/spp-apr-resource-page/>
- The Department’s website at <https://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/TeachingAndLearning/SpecializedPrograms/SpecialEducation/Pages/home.aspx>

The Special Education Advisory Council 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 our SEAC is an appointment of 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 are individuals with disabilities or parents of children with disabilities (ages birth through 26). In the SEAC monthly meetings, family, community, and Department partners come together to address the group's special education priorities. This is done by sharing information, hearing community concerns, and addressing actions for improvement. Meeting agendas and minutes, along with other family resources, can be found on the SEAC website at <https://seac-hawaii.org/>.

#### Special Parent Information Network (SPIN)

The Special Parent Information Network is co-sponsored by the Disability and Communication Access Board and the Department. The Department has a long-standing memorandum of agreement with the Hawaii State Department of Health to fund the SPIN to provide support to SEAC. In addition, SPIN provides training and technical assistance to parent(s)/legal guardian(s) of students with disabilities. This includes the development and maintenance of an informational website and other materials, an annual parent conference, and availability to answer parent questions via a telephone hotline. SPIN is guided by an advisory committee made up of parents, professionals, and persons with disabilities and works with the Department to support students and families. Additional information can be found on the SPIN webpage at <https://spinhawaii.org/>.

#### Community Children's Councils (CCCs)

The Community Children's Councils serve children and families including those with disabilities and mental health needs through collaborative partnerships. The CCC, led by parent and professional co-chairs, provides assistance to families in coordinating educational and community support and services for their children with disabilities. The CCC is composed of 17 councils across the state representing each CA's geographic community. Given this structure, the CCCs are an effective venue for the Department to reach the broad and diverse communities across all islands. Additional information can be found on the CCCs webpage at <https://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/ParentsAndStudents/SupportForParents/Pages/CCC.aspx>.

#### 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. 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. Additional information can be found on the LDAH webpage at <https://ldahawaii.org/>.

The Department continues to utilize the Leading by Convening framework to engage stakeholders in monthly Parent Partner meetings. These meetings are designed to provide opportunities for sharing information, exchanging ideas, understanding various perspectives, and supporting effective communication. Community stakeholders represented at these meetings include SEAC, SPIN, CCC, DD Council, and Hawaii's Parent Training and Information agency, LDAH.

The ESB and MAC in collaboration with SEAC, SPIN, and CCC, commenced a series of stakeholder meetings to begin discussions and develop recommended targets for the new six-year cycle of the revised SPP. Beginning in January 2021, these meetings were held over a one-year period and were designed to engage stakeholders from various backgrounds; educators, parents, school administrators, policy advisors, school psychologists, early education, advocacy groups, and state advisory board members. The Department leveraged the expertise of these stakeholders, with their breadth and depth of knowledge, to help inform the development of a new set of rigorous state targets and solicited new improvement activities for the next six-year SPP cycle.

Additional information to the description shared in the Introduction section:

As described in the "Broad Stakeholder Input" and "Soliciting Public Input" sections of the Introduction, the data for this indicator was presented and discussed with the stakeholder groups. The baseline has been reset to FFY 2020. Starting with the end in mind, the highest performance from longitudinal data is the target for the end of the FFY 2020-25 cycle, with equal performance gains across the years.

Measurement A: Increase 3.30% each year to reach 36.30% by FFY 2025.

Measurement B: Increase by 3.00% each year to reach 85.70% by FFY 2025.

Measurement C: Increase by 3.56% each year to reach 93.10% by FFY 2025.

#### Description of Stakeholder Input

The stakeholders suggested the following improvement activities in order to increase post-school outcomes for students with disabilities:

- Reassess targets next year, based on data collection, trends, and the current state of the COVID-19 pandemic
- Increase collaboration with agency partners to provide transition services to students
- Include more soft skills preparation for college, employment, independence
- Empower students in learning to be a self-advocate
- Provide training for Department staff on services and transition planning
- Expand outreach and information regarding post-school outcomes survey to prepare students/families to respond one year after exiting
- Offer incentives to respondents to increase the number of survey returns

#### FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

Total number of targeted youth in the sample or census	1,224
Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	713
Response Rate	58.25%
1. Number of respondent youth who enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school	141
2. Number of respondent youth who competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	363
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)	25
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).	8

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 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Enrolled in higher education (1)	141	713	31.05%	19.78%	19.78%	N/A	N/A
B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (1 +2)	504	713	72.73%	70.69%	70.69%	N/A	N/A
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)	537	713	80.45%	75.32%	75.32%	N/A	N/A

**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.

**Response Rate**

FFY	2019	2020
Response Rate	55.47%	58.25%

**Describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate year over year, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.**

A priority area for the Department has been to ensure the representativeness of all groups of students in this data collection. To achieve this, the Department operates a data dashboard with live data for Complex Areas (CA) and School staff to view the progress of completion rates by disability category, race/ethnicity, and type of exit throughout the data collection window. The Department plans to implement additional training, as part of its annual training, that directs survey implementers to continually track representation of student groups within their respective School or Complex Area Dashboard to ensure representativeness in next year's data collection.

CAs and schools are working with current students and families in preparation for future data collection of post-school outcomes by collecting contact information and providing pre-notification for the survey implementation. In conducting the surveys, CAs and schools utilize specific strategies that include familiarity and interest when making contact with student alumni.

**Describe the analysis of the response rate including any nonresponse bias that was identified, and the steps taken to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross section of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.**

This is the second year the Department used a revised data collection tool with updated questions and online access. A copy of the Post-School Outcomes Survey is available at: <https://drive.google.com/file/d/1FuYTLbQc8h1R3HKthNqs6cEn0LFbhKco/view?usp=sharing>.

As a result, it has continued to increase the number of survey respondents. In FFY 2019, 583 of 1051 student alumni (55.47%) completed the survey, which was an increase of 19.01 percentage points from FFY 2018 (36.46%). In FFY 2020, 713 of 1224 student alumni (58.25%) completed the survey. While the return rate increase was only 2.78 percentage points, the response rate continues to increase.

The Department examined the response rates for FFY 2019 and FFY 2020 by the following demographic groups: race/ethnicity (the seven federal race/ethnicity categories), types of exit (graduated with a regular diploma, received certificate, reached maximum age, and dropped out), and disability categories. Using the -3/+3% methodology to compare the composition of the target group and the respondent group using these categories, no specific was underrepresented. Therefore, based on the return rate of surveys for the last two years and the comparison of the composition of respondents and

target populations, we do not assume there was any nonresponse bias last year and this year in the respondent groups, based on these three major demographic groups described above.

**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 of the respondents to the survey using the -3/+3% methodology for comparing the composition of the target population and the respondent group, based on three demographics: race/ethnicity (the seven federal categories); types of exit (graduation with a regular diploma, received a certificate, reached maximum age, and dropout), and the disability categories. No group within these three demographic categories were identified as underrepresented in the respondent group.

**The response data is representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school. (yes/no)**

YES

**If no, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics.**

**Describe the metric used to determine representativeness (e.g., +/- 3% discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to target group).**

Analysis of data of the respondents to the survey used the -3/+3% methodology for comparing the composition of the target population and the respondent group, based on three demographics: race/ethnicity (the seven federal categories); types of exit (graduation with a regular diploma, received a certificate, reached maximum age, and dropout), and the disability categories.

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?	YES
If yes, attach a copy of the survey	

**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 national pandemic of COVID-19. However, the performance for this indicator continues to be impacted by the COVID-19 pandemic, thus the uncertainty of future potential restrictions/disruptions prompted a need to reset the baseline and targets for Indicator 14.

In FFY 2020, the Department continued to refine its process for collecting post-school outcomes data through a revised online survey to make it more accessible for exited students to respond during the COVID-19 pandemic. A copy of the Post-School Outcomes Survey is available at: <https://drive.google.com/file/d/1FuYTLbQc8h1R3HKthNqs6cEn0LFbhKco/view?usp=sharing>.

The Department revised its Post-School Outcomes Survey to provide additional data to school and complex area staff to empower staff to:

1. Better understand the trajectories of its student alumni,
2. Gather feedback on services received and suggestions for how to improve services for students enrolled in secondary school, and
3. Understand the impact that COVID-19 has had on post-school outcomes.

**Baseline Reset to FFY 2020**

As described in the “Broad Stakeholder Input” and “Soliciting Public Input” sections of the Introduction, the data for this indicator was presented and discussed with the stakeholder groups. Due to the updated survey, longitudinal data trends, and stakeholder input, the baseline has been reset to FFY 2020. Starting with the end in mind, achieving the highest performance from longitudinal data is the target for the end of this six-year cycle, with equal performance gains across the years.

Measurement A: Increase 3.30% each year to reach 36.30%.

Measurement B: Increase by 3.00% each year to reach 85.70%.

Measurement C: Increase by 3.56% each year to reach 93.10%.

The COVID-19 pandemic was a major factor that impacted post-school outcomes. The survey included an optional question asking respondents if COVID-19 impacted their plans since leaving high school. Respondents were allowed to select all ways that their post-school activities were impacted.

272 respondents (38.14%) indicated that COVID-19 has impacted their plans since leaving high school. 46 respondents (6.4%) selected they preferred not to answer and 77 respondents (10.79%) skipped the question. If these additional respondents had opted to respond, it is believed that more would have reported being impacted by COVID-19 in one or more ways.

100 of those respondents that participated in the optional question related to COVID-19 (36.76%) reported that they were not able to enroll in or complete a term in a school, job training, or education program. 34 respondents (12.50%) reported they were unable to access education/training support services and 22 respondents (8.09%) reported they were not able to access employment support services. This combined group of students constitutes 7.85% of all respondents. An additional 114 respondents selected that their post-school activities were impacted by an “other reason” not listed from choices given, which constitutes 15.99% of all respondents. The selection of “other reason” prompted respondents to type in an individualized response. The most common responses were related to work, issues accessing other services that closed as a result of COVID-19, and difficulty participating in virtual learning.

Tourism (which historically makes up over 20% of the state’s economy), hiring freezes by local employers, and the temporary restrictions and/or shutdown of businesses may have negatively affected the ability of students to secure and/or maintain competitive employment. 79 respondents (29.04%) reported they were unable to get a job, which constitutes 11.08% of all respondents.

Additionally, this is the second year the Department used a revised data collection tool. As a result, it has continued to increase the number of survey

respondents. In FFY 2019, 583 of 1051 student alumni (55.47%) completed the survey. In FFY 2020, 713 of 1224 student alumni (58.25%) completed the survey. While the return rate increase was only 2.78 percentage points, the net increase in responses may have continued to impact result trends.

To promote community stakeholder awareness and engagement, SPIN developed additional infographics for select SPP/APR indicators, the Indicator 14 resource, and can be found on the SPIN's website of the SPP/APR stakeholder meeting at: <https://seac-hawaii.org/spp-apr-stakeholder-meeting/>.

The Department continues to improve its practices and develop strategies that will impact positive post-school outcomes.

#### **14 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

#### **14 - OSEP Response**

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2020, and OSEP accepts that revision.

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

#### **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 and targets 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 2020-21 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/03/2021	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	37
SY 2020-21 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/03/2021	3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	11

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

The Department collaborates closely with several partners to ensure that authentic engagement in all aspects of the Department's special education program is achieved. These stakeholders supported the Department with the process of soliciting and providing broad stakeholder input on the Department's FFY 2020-2025 SPP/APR cycle. Presentation materials and meeting notes are available at the following websites:

- SEAC website at SPP/APR Resources Page <https://seac-hawaii.org/spp-apr-resource-page/>
- The Department's website at <https://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/TeachingAndLearning/SpecializedPrograms/SpecialEducation/Pages/home.aspx>

#### State Advisory Panel – Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC)

The Special Education Advisory Council 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 our SEAC is an appointment of 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 are individuals with disabilities or parents of children with disabilities (ages birth through 26). In the SEAC monthly meetings, family, community, and Department partners come together to address the group's special education priorities. This is done by sharing information, hearing community concerns, and addressing actions for improvement. Meeting agendas and minutes, along with other family resources, can be found on the SEAC website at <https://seac-hawaii.org/>.

#### Special Parent Information Network (SPIN)

The Special Parent Information Network is co-sponsored by the Disability and Communication Access Board and the Department. The Department has a long-standing memorandum of agreement with the Hawaii State Department of Health to fund the SPIN to provide support to SEAC. In addition, SPIN provides training and technical assistance to parent(s)/legal guardian(s) of students with disabilities. This includes the development and maintenance of an informational website and other materials, an annual parent conference, and availability to answer parent questions via a telephone hotline. SPIN is guided by an advisory committee made up of parents, professionals, and persons with disabilities and works with the Department to support students and families. Additional information can be found on the SPIN webpage at <https://spinhawaii.org/>.

#### Community Children's Councils (CCCs)

The Community Children's Councils serve children and families including those with disabilities and mental health needs through collaborative partnerships. The CCC, led by parent and professional co-chairs, provides assistance to families in coordinating educational and community support and services for their children with disabilities. The CCC is composed of 17 councils across the state representing each CA's geographic community. Given this structure, the CCCs are an effective venue for the Department to reach the broad and diverse communities across all islands. Additional information can be found on the CCCs webpage at <https://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/ParentsAndStudents/SupportForParents/Pages/CCC.aspx>.

**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. 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. Additional information can be found on the LDAH webpage at <https://ldahawaii.org/>.

The Department continues to utilize the Leading by Convening framework to engage stakeholders in monthly Parent Partner meetings. These meetings are designed to provide opportunities for sharing information, exchanging ideas, understanding various perspectives, and supporting effective communication. Community stakeholders represented at these meetings include SEAC, SPIN, CCC, DD Council, and Hawaii’s Parent Training and Information agency, LDAH.

The ESB and MAC in collaboration with SEAC, SPIN, and CCC, commenced a series of stakeholder meetings to begin discussions and develop recommended targets for the new six-year cycle of the revised SPP. Beginning in January 2021, these meetings were held over a one-year period and were designed to engage stakeholders from various backgrounds; educators, parents, school administrators, policy advisors, school psychologists, early education, advocacy groups, and state advisory board members. The Department leveraged the expertise of these stakeholders, with their breadth and depth of knowledge, to help inform the development of a new set of rigorous state targets and solicited new improvement activities for the next six-year SPP cycle.

**Historical Data**

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2019	64.00%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target >=	44.00%	44.00%	45.00%	45.00%	60.00%
Data	70.51%	43.59%	89.74%	59.57%	64.00%

**Targets**

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target >=	66.00%	68.00%	70.00%	72.00%	74.00%	76.00%

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data**

3.1(a) Number resolutions sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3.1 Number of resolutions sessions	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
11	37	64.00%	66.00%	29.73%	Did not meet target	Slippage

**Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable**

The collection of the data, completeness, validity, and reliability for this indicator was not affected by the national pandemic of COVID-19 for SY 2020-2021; however, due to the circumstances related to the COVID-19, there was a substantial increase in the number of decisions within the extended timeline (2 in FFY 2019; 11 in FFY 2020). The percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions and that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements declined from 64% in FFY 2019 to 29.73% in FFY 2020.

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

The Indicator 15 resolution data is complete, valid, and reliable. Consistent with 34 C.F.R. § 300.328, the Department offered the use of alternative means such as video conferences and conference calls to hold the resolution meetings, subject to the parent’s agreement, as a result of the pandemic.

The last baseline was set in 2005 at 16%. The Department reviewed past data and reset the baseline to the 2019 data of 64% as it reflected pre-pandemic trend results.

**15 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**15 - OSEP Response**

The State provided targets for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

## 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 mediations is less than 10. In a reporting period when the number of resolution mediations reaches 10 or greater, develop baseline and targets 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 2020-21 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/03/2021	2.1 Mediations held	4
SY 2020-21 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/03/2021	2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	0
SY 2020-21 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/03/2021	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

The Department collaborates closely with several partners to ensure that authentic engagement in all aspects of the Department's special education program is achieved. These stakeholders supported the Department with the process of soliciting and providing broad stakeholder input on the Department's FFY 2020-2025 SPP/APR cycle. Presentation materials and meeting notes are available at the following websites:

- SEAC website at SPP/APR Resources Page <https://seac-hawaii.org/spp-apr-resource-page/>

- The Department's website at <https://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/TeachingAndLearning/SpecializedPrograms/SpecialEducation/Pages/home.aspx>

#### State Advisory Panel – Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC)

The Special Education Advisory Council 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 our SEAC is an appointment of 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 are individuals with disabilities or parents of children with disabilities (ages birth through 26). In the SEAC monthly meetings, family, community, and Department partners come together to address the group's special education priorities. This is done by sharing information, hearing community concerns, and addressing actions for improvement. Meeting agendas and minutes, along with other family resources, can be found on the SEAC website at <https://seac-hawaii.org/>.

#### Special Parent Information Network (SPIN)

The Special Parent Information Network is co-sponsored by the Disability and Communication Access Board and the Department. The Department has a long-standing memorandum of agreement with the Hawaii State Department of Health to fund the SPIN to provide support to SEAC. In addition, SPIN provides training and technical assistance to parent(s)/legal guardian(s) of students with disabilities. This includes the development and maintenance of an informational website and other materials, an annual parent conference, and availability to answer parent questions via a telephone hotline. SPIN is guided by an advisory committee made up of parents, professionals, and persons with disabilities and works with the Department to support students and families. Additional information can be found on the SPIN webpage at <https://spinhawaii.org/>.

#### Community Children's Councils (CCCs)

The Community Children's Councils serve children and families including those with disabilities and mental health needs through collaborative partnerships. The CCC, led by parent and professional co-chairs, provides assistance to families in coordinating educational and community support and services for their children with disabilities. The CCC is composed of 17 councils across the state representing each CA's geographic community. Given this structure, the CCCs are an effective venue for the Department to reach the broad and diverse communities across all islands. Additional information

can be found on the CCCs webpage at <https://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/ParentsAndStudents/SupportForParents/Pages/CCC.aspx>.

**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. 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. Additional information can be found on the LDAH webpage at <https://ldahawaii.org/>.

The Department continues to utilize the Leading by Convening framework to engage stakeholders in monthly Parent Partner meetings. These meetings are designed to provide opportunities for sharing information, exchanging ideas, understanding various perspectives, and supporting effective communication. Community stakeholders represented at these meetings include SEAC, SPIN, CCC, DD Council, and Hawaii’s Parent Training and Information agency, LDAH.

The ESB and MAC in collaboration with SEAC, SPIN, and CCC, commenced a series of stakeholder meetings to begin discussions and develop recommended targets for the new six-year cycle of the revised SPP. Beginning in January 2021, these meetings were held over a one-year period and were designed to engage stakeholders from various backgrounds; educators, parents, school administrators, policy advisors, school psychologists, early education, advocacy groups, and state advisory board members. The Department leveraged the expertise of these stakeholders, with their breadth and depth of knowledge, to help inform the development of a new set of rigorous state targets and solicited new improvement activities for the next six-year SPP cycle.

Additional information to the description shared in the Introduction section:

The feedback provided by stakeholders was to encourage the Department to improve their strategies that further promote the use of mediation to resolve disputes.

**Historical Data**

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target >=					
Data	0.00%	50.00%	0.00%	80.00%	42.86%

**Targets**

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target >=						

**FFY 2020 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 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
0	2	4	42.86%		50.00%	N/A	N/A

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

In accordance with OSEP instructions, HIDOE is not required to establish baseline or targets if the number of mediations held is less than ten (10).

The Indicator 16 data is complete, valid, and reliable. While the mediation process continued to be held in an online/virtual model, a shift from the traditional face-to-face model, the collection of the data was not affected by the national pandemic of COVID-19 for SY 2020-2021.

Mediation continues to be minimally used across the State with most disputes resulting in due process impartial hearings. To increase awareness and the use of mediation across the State, the Department is working with complex areas and the schools to promote the use of mediation and educate parents.

The Department recognizes the importance of mediation in resolving disputes and will be working with its community partners to devise a plan of action to increase the use of mediation across the State.

**16 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**16 - OSEP Response**

The State reported fewer than ten mediations held in FFY 2020. The State is not required to establish baseline or provide targets until any fiscal year in which ten or more mediations were held.

**16 - Required Actions**

## Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** General Supervision

The State's SPP/APR includes a State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) that meets the requirements set forth for this indicator.

#### Measurement

The State's SPP/APR includes an SSIP that is a comprehensive, ambitious, yet achievable multi-year plan for improving results for children with disabilities. The SSIP includes each of the components described below.

#### Instructions

**Baseline Data:** The State must provide baseline data that must be expressed as a percentage and which is aligned with the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities.

**Targets:** In its FFY 2020 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2022, the State must provide measurable and rigorous targets (expressed as percentages) for each of the six years from FFY 2020 through FFY 2025. The State's FFY 2025 target must demonstrate improvement over the State's baseline data.

**Updated Data:** In its FFYs 2020 through FFY 2025 SPPs/APRs, due February 2, 2022, the State must provide updated data for that specific FFY (expressed as percentages) and that data must be aligned with the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities. In its FFYs 2020 through FFY 2025 SPPs/APRs, the State must report on whether it met its target.

#### Overview of the Three Phases of the SSIP

It is of the utmost importance to improve results for children with disabilities by improving educational services, including special education and related services. Stakeholders, including parents of children with disabilities, local educational agencies, the State Advisory Panel, and others, are critical participants in improving results for children with disabilities and should be included in developing, implementing, evaluating, and revising the SSIP and included in establishing the State's targets under Indicator 17. The SSIP should include information about stakeholder involvement in all three phases.

##### **Phase I: Analysis:**

- Data Analysis;
- Analysis of State Infrastructure to Support Improvement and Build Capacity;
- State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities;
- Selection of Coherent Improvement Strategies; and
- Theory of Action.

**Phase II: Plan** (which, in addition to the Phase I content (including any updates) outlined above:

- Infrastructure Development;
- Support for local educational agency (LEA) Implementation of Evidence-Based Practices; and
- Evaluation.

**Phase III: Implementation and Evaluation** (which, in addition to the Phase I and Phase II content (including any updates) outlined above:

- Results of Ongoing Evaluation and Revisions to the SSIP.

#### Specific Content of Each Phase of the SSIP

Refer to FFY 2013-2015 Measurement Table for detailed requirements of Phase I and Phase II SSIP submissions.

Phase III should only include information from Phase I or Phase II if changes or revisions are being made by the State and/or if information previously required in Phase I or Phase II was not reported.

##### **Phase III: Implementation and Evaluation**

In Phase III, the State must, consistent with its evaluation plan described in Phase II, assess and report on its progress implementing the SSIP. This includes: (A) data and analysis on the extent to which the State has made progress toward and/or met the State-established short-term and long-term outcomes or objectives for implementation of the SSIP and its progress toward achieving the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities (SiMR); (B) the rationale for any revisions that were made, or that the State intends to make, to the SSIP as the result of implementation, analysis, and evaluation; and (C) a description of the meaningful stakeholder engagement. If the State intends to continue implementing the SSIP without modifications, the State must describe how the data from the evaluation support this decision.

###### A. Data Analysis

As required in the Instructions for the Indicator/Measurement, in its FFYs 2020 through 2025 SPP/APR, the State must report data for that specific FFY (expressed as actual numbers and percentages) that are aligned with the SiMR. The State must report on whether the State met its target. In addition, the State may report on any additional data (e.g., progress monitoring data) that were collected and analyzed that would suggest progress toward the SiMR. States using a subset of the population from the indicator (e.g., a sample, cohort model) should describe how data are collected and analyzed for the SiMR if that was not described in Phase I or Phase II of the SSIP.

###### B. Phase III Implementation, Analysis and Evaluation

The State must provide a narrative or graphic representation, e.g., a logic model, of the principal activities, measures and outcomes that were implemented since the State's last SSIP submission (i.e., Feb 2021). The evaluation should align with the theory of action described in Phase I and the evaluation plan described in Phase II. The State must describe any changes to the activities, strategies, or timelines described in Phase II and include a rationale or justification for the changes. If the State intends to continue implementing the SSIP without modifications, the State must describe how the data from the evaluation support this decision.

The State must summarize the infrastructure improvement strategies that were implemented, and the short-term outcomes achieved, including the measures or rationale used by the State and stakeholders to assess and communicate achievement. Relate short-term outcomes to one or more areas of a systems framework (e.g., governance, data, finance, accountability/monitoring, quality standards, professional development and/or technical assistance) and explain how these strategies support system change and are necessary for: (a) achievement of the SiMR; (b) sustainability of systems improvement efforts; and/or (c) scale-up. The State must describe the next steps for each infrastructure improvement strategy and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next fiscal year (e.g., for the FFY 2020 APR, report on anticipated outcomes to be obtained during FFY 2021, i.e., July 1, 2021-June 30, 2022).

The State must summarize the specific evidence-based practices that were implemented and the strategies or activities that supported their selection and ensured their use with fidelity. Describe how the evidence-based practices, and activities or strategies that support their use, are intended to impact the SiMR by changing program/district policies, procedures, and/or practices, teacher/provider practices (i.e., behaviors), parent/caregiver outcomes,

and/or child outcomes. Describe any additional data (i.e., progress monitoring data) that was collected to support the on-going use of the evidence-based practices and inform decision-making for the next year of SSIP implementation.

**C. Stakeholder Engagement**

The State must describe the specific strategies implemented to engage stakeholders in key improvement efforts and how the State addressed concerns, if any, raised by stakeholders through its engagement activities.

**Additional Implementation Activities**

The State should identify any activities not already described that it intends to implement in the next fiscal year (e.g., for the FFY 2020 APR, report on activities it intends to implement in FFY 2021, i.e., July 1, 2021-June 30, 2022) including a timeline, anticipated data collection and measures, and expected outcomes that are related to the SiMR. The State should describe any newly identified barriers and include steps to address these barriers.

**17 - Indicator Data**

**Section A: Data Analysis**

**What is the State-identified Measurable Result (SiMR)?**

The Hawaii State Department of Education (Department) SiMR is the improvement of English Language Arts (ELA)/Literacy outcomes for students with disabilities (SWD) identified in the categories of Other Health Disability (OHD), Specific Learning Disability (SLD), and Speech or Language Disability (SoL) in grades 3 and 4. The Department's key measure (proficiency and growth) for the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) is the percentage of 3rd and 4th-grade students, combined, with eligibility categories of OHD, SLD, and SoL who are proficient on the Smarter Balanced Assessment (SBA) for ELA/Literacy.

The Department has consistently embraced the use of professional learning communities (PLCs), Implementation of chosen Evidenced-Based Practices (EBPs), and Stakeholder Engagement to achieve improved educational performance and functional outcomes for the SiMR population as well as for all SWDs. The effects of the SSIP Theory of Action and accompanying strategies on outcomes for SWDs are measured by the SiMR.

**Has the SiMR changed since the last SSIP submission? (yes/no)**

NO

**Is the State using a subset of the population from the indicator (e.g., a sample, cohort model)? (yes/no)**

YES

**Provide a description of the subset of the population from the indicator.**

Indicator 17 subset of students includes those identified as OHD, SLD, and SoL in grades 3 and 4 attending Hawaii public schools, including those in public charter schools.

**Is the State's theory of action new or revised since the previous submission? (yes/no)**

NO

**Please provide a link to the current theory of action.**

[https://drive.google.com/file/d/10OQ6m3nt067y6LmZtkvgA9dw\\_GX92if\\_/view?usp=sharing](https://drive.google.com/file/d/10OQ6m3nt067y6LmZtkvgA9dw_GX92if_/view?usp=sharing)

**Does the State intend to continue implementing the SSIP without modifications? (yes/no)**

YES

**If yes, describe how evaluation data support the decision to implement without any modifications to the SSIP.**

The ELA performance data for Hawaii's identified SiMR continues to remain low with relatively little change and is not close to reaching targets. The results of data collected on teacher EBP capacity and practice confirmed a need for additional Professional Development (PD). Thirty-seven percent (37%) of general and special education teachers surveyed (N=884) revealed no formal training in reading instruction for struggling learners. In addition, 35-45% reported the need for additional PD in EBP in reading instruction. Given self-reported data and lack of improvement in reading outcomes, the strategy to utilize PLCs continues to be appropriate. However, adjustments to the PLCs need to be made to address improving student outcomes. Hawaii has restructured the composition of the Complex Areas (CA) PLCs to include building knowledge around foundational language and literacy skills, focusing on change in teaching practices and coaching to ensure implementation of EBPs with fidelity.

**Progress toward the SiMR**

**Please provide the data for the specific FFY listed below (expressed as actual number and percentages).**

**Select yes if the State uses two targets for measurement. (yes/no)**

NO

**Historical Data**

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2014	8.33%

**Targets**

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target>= =	50.00%	50.00%	50.00%	50.00%	50.00%	50.00%

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data**

The number of 3rd and 4th grade students combined, with eligibility categories of OHD, SLD, and SoL who are proficient on the SBA for ELA/Literacy	The total number of 3rd and 4th grade students, combined with eligibility categories of OHD, SLD, and SoL who took the SBA for ELA/Literacy	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
177	1,680		50.00%	10.54%	Did not meet target	N/A

**Provide the data source for the FFY 2020 data.**

Department SY 2020-2021 Smarter Balanced Assessment (SBA)

**Please describe how data are collected and analyzed for the SiMR.**

The SBA data is collected through the Department’s Longitudinal Data System (LDS). The LDS provides reports and dashboards where teachers and administrators can access data about student academic progress and performance.

A comparison in data of Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2018 and FFY 2020 SBA ELA for the SiMR population (3rd and 4th grade combined) shows a 0.56% decrease in proficiency. The decrease is 0.56% which is less than 1.0%, therefore it is not considered slippage.

**Optional: Has the State collected additional data (i.e., benchmark, CQI, survey) that demonstrates progress toward the SiMR? (yes/no)**

YES

**Describe any additional data collected by the State to assess progress toward the SiMR.**

The additional data collected to assess progress toward the SiMR is the Median Growth Percentile (MGP) of 4th grade students with eligibility categories of OHD, SLD, and SoL on the SBA for ELA/Literacy. The MGP is calculated by taking the individual Student Growth Percentile (SGP) for each student, then ordering them from lowest to highest, and identifying the middle score. The MGP provides a more sensitive analysis of student progress, and the state target is sixty (60). However, due to COVID-19, there was no administration of the SBA in FFY 2019, and therefore, the MGP could not be determined for FFY 2020.

The Department also collected benchmark data from school-administered i-Ready and Star assessments for a limited analysis of progress toward SiMR during the FFY 2018, FFY 2019, and FFY 2020 through the Longitudinal Data System (LDS). The LDS provides reports and dashboards where teachers and administrators can access data about student academic progress and performance. The following reflects the percent of students in the SiMR for whom data was collected:

**FFY 2018 (at or above grade level of SiMR population):**

- Grades 3 and 4 combined (N=1,266), 13.89%
- Grade 3 (N=641), 18.62%
- Grade 4 (N=625), 8.98%

**FFY 2019 (at or above grade level of SiMR population):**

- Grades 3 and 4 combined (N=0), Data Unavailable
- Grade 3 (N=0), Data Unavailable
- Grade 4 (N=829), 13.77%

**FFY 2020 (at or above grade level of SiMR population):**

- Grades 3 and 4 combined (N=1,922), 10.35%
- Grade 3 (N=847), 16.17%
- Grade 4 (N=1,075), 5.77%

Source: Department Longitudinal Data System (LDS), 12/23/2021

Due to COVID-19, there were no i-Ready or Star assessment results for grade 3 during FFY 2019. However, longitudinal data analysis indicates there was a 3.54% (11.89% - 10.35%) decrease of students performing at or above grade level for grades 3 and 4 combined. The decrease or worsening is 3.54% which is more than 1.0%, and therefore, it is considered slippage. Slippage in all probability is due to the interruption in instruction as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic.

Although the SBA data indicates there was no slippage, it is noted there was no growth either. The SBA data, in conjunction with benchmark data, confirms the need for consistent, systematic implementation of EBPs with fidelity for students in prekindergarten to 4th grade over a period of time in order to see a positive impact on academic achievement for the SiMR population.

**Did the State identify any general data quality concerns, unrelated to COVID-19, that affected progress toward the SiMR during the reporting period? (yes/no)**

NO

**Did the State identify any data quality concerns directly related to the COVID-19 pandemic during the reporting period? (yes/no)**

YES

**If data for this reporting period were impacted specifically by COVID-19, the State must include in the narrative for the indicator: (1) the impact on data completeness, validity and reliability for the indicator; (2) an explanation of how COVID-19 specifically impacted the State's ability to collect the data for the indicator; and (3) any steps the State took to mitigate the impact of COVID-19 on the data collection.**

Due to the national emergency of the COVID-19 pandemic, the Department was granted a waiver for the assessment requirements under the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) for SY 2019-2020, thus no statewide tests were administered. In FFY 2020, Hawaii public schools administered a shortened version of the statewide assessment. A skip-year growth methodology was used, and participation rate penalties were waived as approved by the U.S. Department of Education. Although a shortened version is a comparable assessment, the results may not accurately display student knowledge to the degree of the full version assessment.

FFY 2020 was impacted by the pandemic from the first day of instruction to the last day of class. Throughout this school year, numerous pandemic-related challenges arose across Hawaii's public schools. Many challenges were common across schools, yet others were unique to a particular school or group of schools within a particular geographic area. These disruptions undoubtedly impacted both teacher instruction and student learning. (2021 Strive HI Statewide Snapshot).

## **Section B: Implementation, Analysis and Evaluation**

**Please provide a link to the State's current evaluation plan.**

<https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/1aZCSLhMuHaMwKeRDmyPZrL0-Rw2oWK3s>

**Is the State's evaluation plan new or revised since the previous submission? (yes/no)**

NO

**Provide a summary of each infrastructure improvement strategy implemented in the reporting period:**

All SSIP infrastructure improvement strategies are designed to support the tri-level system of the Department. Typically, the Department State Office (i.e., the Exceptional Support Branch [ESB]) works to build the capacity and knowledge of CA leaders, who, in turn, strive to build the capacity of educators and administrators within their CA. Occasionally, the Department State Office will work collaboratively and simultaneously with both CA and school-level leaders. This approach has been elevated to intentionally engage all tri-level stakeholders in collaborative engagement and participation. In the Department's efforts to build capacity across all CAs within the state, as well as all schools across the state, both of these approaches have been employed. The Department strives to systematically provide infrastructure improvement strategies in targeted areas for all CAs. In addition, the Department State Office will provide tailored technical assistance for CA based on specific requests for support. The following infrastructure improvement strategies are examples of the tri-level systems of support implemented to address ELA proficiency of the SiMR:

Speech-Language Pathologist (SLP) and 619 Coordinators PLCs

Complex/District level representatives (seven (7) Preschool 619 coordinators and seven (7) SLPs) met monthly (10 sessions) as a PLC to delve deeper into the foundational language skills needed to advance literacy for early learners. Each PLC focused on learning about the research supporting the need to develop emergent literacy skills that predict future academic performance and have a strong correlation to positive reading outcomes in the 3rd and 4th grade. Information about emergent literacy was provided to those who will instruct, guide, and coach classroom teachers in the implementation of instructional practices that will aid with literacy development and eventual reading and writing proficiency.

Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) Part B Funds

The Department implemented a CA fiscal planning process to ensure CA IDEA Part B funds were used to address PD and implementation of literacy EBPs.

Inclusive Practices (IP)

Over the past four school years, the Department in collaboration with Stetson and Associates conducted inclusive practices implementation training and consultation to schools statewide.

Monthly Mandatory Meeting

The ESB conducted mandatory monthly meetings with the District Educational Specialists (DES) responsible for leading their CA schools in the implementation of IDEA.

DES Workgroups

The DES workgroups were formed to focus on assessment and programming for high incidence populations to build capacity within the CAs. Specifically, CAs were invited to participate in the "Evidenced-Based Practices and Instructional Coaching" Workgroup to support tri-level understanding of EBPs, and to assist CA leads in developing their skills as instructional coaches. The high-incidence EBP workgroup focused on specific strategies to support teachers in improving outcomes for SWD, including the SiMR population. The goals of the workgroup were:

1. Improve instructional coaching of District Resource Teachers (RTs).
2. Increase district-level and school-level understanding of EBPs.
3. Increase implementation of EBPs in the classroom to improve student outcomes.

To address goal 1, participants completed the IRIS module: Teacher Induction: Providing Comprehensive Training for New Special Educators (<https://iris.peabody.vanderbilt.edu/module/induction/>) and participated in several synchronous sessions to review the content and complete application activities.

To address goals 2 and 3, participants completed the IRIS modules:

Evidence-Based Practices (Part 1): Identifying and Selecting a Practice or Program

([https://iris.peabody.vanderbilt.edu/module/ebp\\_01/](https://iris.peabody.vanderbilt.edu/module/ebp_01/))

Evidence-Based Practices (Part 2): Implementing a Practice or Program with Fidelity

([https://iris.peabody.vanderbilt.edu/module/ebp\\_02/#content](https://iris.peabody.vanderbilt.edu/module/ebp_02/#content))

Evaluating Learning Outcomes and Fidelity (Part 3)

([https://iris.peabody.vanderbilt.edu/module/ebp\\_03/#content](https://iris.peabody.vanderbilt.edu/module/ebp_03/#content))

Following the completion of each module, the workgroup participants met synchronously to review the content and discuss school-level application activities.

Focused Technical Assistance

The Department provided direct and personalized technical assistance (TA) to each CA with attention to schools identified as target schools for improvement based on the performance of SWD. Student data was reviewed to determine root causes, identification and implementation of appropriate

evidence-based interventions, and alignment of resources.

New Professional Learning Model, the Language and Literacy Initiative (LLI)

Although not awarded SPDG funding, the Department developed the LLI, which will be implemented in CAs using ESSER funds. The LLI is based upon the SPDG project proposal.

The goals of the LLI are to:

1. Implement evidence-based PL, focusing on job-embedded coaching and collaboration between coaches (resource teacher/SLPs) and teachers;
2. Increase the overall capacity (in both content knowledge and number of qualified personnel) of coaches and teachers within the Department to provide evidence-based oral language and foundational literacy instruction;
3. Increase implementation of evidence-based oral language and foundational literacy strategies in PreK-grade 4;
4. Increase home literacy activities through parent and community partnerships.

Participants of the LLI will increase their understanding and application of evidence-based language and literacy instruction by completing the Language Essentials for Teachers of Reading and Spelling (LETRS) professional learning curriculum and receiving embedded coaching and ongoing individualized classroom support. Professional learning will be based upon extant research on effective professional learning (Darling-Hammond, Hyler, Gardner, 2017) and will be monitored and evaluated using coaching fidelity tools developed by the National Center for Systemic Improvement.

By implementing evidence-based language and foundational literacy strategies with fidelity, improving parent and child language and literacy interactions, and establishing a sustainable system to achieve this, it is intended there will be improved student proficiency on language and literacy assessments. Assessments, observations, and fidelity checklists will be used to evaluate teacher performance and expected outcomes for the SiMR population.

Statewide Benchmark/Interim Assessment Implementation

The Department worked with the National Center on Educational Outcomes to explore the next steps on improving statewide literacy benchmark testing.

CA Performance Portfolio - Each CA Superintendent maintains a CA portfolio of performance measures that includes IDEA required timelines, educational environments for students with disabilities, and special education teacher PD and support on literacy instruction.

**Describe the short-term or intermediate outcomes achieved for each infrastructure improvement strategy during the reporting period including the measures or rationale used by the State and stakeholders to assess and communicate achievement. Please relate short-term outcomes to one or more areas of a systems framework (e.g., governance, data, finance, accountability/monitoring, quality standards, professional development and/or technical assistance) and explain how these strategies support system change and are necessary for: (a) achievement of the SiMR; (b) sustainability of systems improvement efforts; and/or (c) scale-up.**

The following is a description of the short-term or intermediate outcomes achieved for each infrastructure activity.

Speech-Language Pathologist (SLP) and 619 Coordinators PLCs.

Participants met monthly with learning focused on the critical foundational skills required to become proficient readers. Meetings increased participants' knowledge of the foundational language and literacy skills needed for academic success. However, participants were unable to connect the information to review data and identify areas of need. An Early Learners Assessment Tool was developed to review IEPs of early learners to determine (a) if goals addressed areas of need and targeted the foundational language and literacy skills; (b) appropriateness of services (i.e., dosage and intensity), and (c) student growth. The tool was used on a trial basis and revised based on input from participants. This tool will be in full implementation during FFY 2021 focusing on student outcomes in language and literacy and the connections to 3rd and 4th-grade reading proficiency.

IDEA Part B Funds

One-hundred percent (100%), or 15 of 15, CAs developed a CA Project Plan which addressed fiscal management, utilization of staff, and services that are redesigned to directly support improving literacy outcomes for their SiMR population. The CA Project Plans included activities such as (a) provide teachers with professional learning opportunities on foundational reading instruction, (b) use ongoing assessment tools such as iReady, Imagine Learning, Lexia Core 5, STAR, etc., (c) ensure fidelity of implementation of foundational reading instruction and evidence-based interventions (d) provide professional learning opportunities on development and implementation of specially designed instruction, (e) provide ongoing coaching to support school-wide efforts to support all teachers in need of additional guidance. Each activity includes a measurement instrument, identified lead personnel, projected timeline, and ongoing status updates. The CA Project Plans were developed in FFY 2020, and continue to be implemented in FFY 2021 and the upcoming years. To address the changing needs of the CA, CA Project Plans are reviewed and updated not less than annually.

Inclusive Practices (IP)

The FFY 2020 least restrictive environment (LRE) is 50.71% of SWD ages 6 through 21 are in the general education class 80% or more of the day. This is a 13.38% increase from FFY 2016 baseline. Nineteen (19) Online Inclusive Practices Courses, which include training on classroom accommodations and differentiated instruction are available through the Department PD platform (PDE3). Each CA has a Professional Learning Network (PLN) member to continue providing support to schools to ensure statewide capacity building efforts are maintained once the Stetson and Associates contracts sunsets on December 28, 2022. Ninety-five percent (95%) of PLN members have completed their training and are certified to present Step by Step Inclusive Training to Schools. Participating schools increased by 334% from 50 to 167 schools. Rosters and meeting notes are available.

Monthly Mandatory Meeting

Ten (10) meetings were held throughout the school year with an average of over 95% attendance of IDEA DESs. The DESs were kept abreast of issues, challenges, and successes relating to the provision of special education and related services as students returned to in-person learning. Examples of issues and challenges that were addressed included identifying and mitigating learning/skill loss or lack of expected progress for SWD. Because in person learning was not available at many schools, information and resources pertaining to providing effective instruction during distance learning were shared. These meetings resulted in DES engagement in collaborative work on developing and transforming existing guidance such as the provision of transportation as a related services, secondary transition, and fiscal management and accountability. Rosters and meeting notes are available.

DES Workgroups

Following the initial training period, CA RTs, selected classroom teachers to apply their learning and build school-level capacity. Each CA RT provided coaching sessions for individual teachers on a selected evidence-based ELA strategy. All five of the participating CAs reported completion of this portion of the Workgroup assignment. Selected EBPs for school-level coaching included: explicit vocabulary instruction (i.e., Frayer Model), summarization strategy (i.e., "Get the Gist"), Self-Regulatory Strategy Development (TWA), and Guided Repeated Reading. Participating teachers collected pre, during, and post data on student performance to report back to their instructional coach. All of the teachers that participated in the training completed implementation of the selected reading intervention, and reported improved outcomes for all students in discrete skill targeted intervention. Teachers

presented detailed information about the implementation period along with specific student data.

#### Focused Technical Assistance

Student data was reviewed in each CA to compare performance between state, CA, and schools. However, the data review at that level was not always sufficient to determine root causes, improvement activities, and alignment of resources. Consequently, these TA sessions have evolved into PLCs. Monthly PLCs now review student, school, and system data. A modified version of the IDC data rubric is used and requires teams to now consider factors such as:

1. Personnel Capacity - teacher/staff qualifications, training topics, and training methodology
2. Policy and Procedures - teacher assignments, implementation of inclusive practices and tiered supports, and other school-level policies
3. Curriculum and Instruction - use of effective and EBPs, instructional materials, and learner needs

This comprehensive review of data helps schools identify root causes that are addressed through a school or CA action plan. This practice will be in full implementation during FFY 2021 as part of the Department's General Supervision universal support with the focus on student outcomes in language and literacy. Rosters and meeting notes are available.

#### New Professional Learning Model, LLI

A proposal to fund the LLI using ARP ESSER funds was submitted to the Department Office of Fiscal Services and approved by the Hawaii Board of Education at the December 2021 meeting. Information about the initiative and applications for participation were developed for CAs to review and to apply for participation in the project.

#### Statewide Benchmark/Interim Assessment Implementation

The Department explored the option of surveying all schools across the state, but determined the focus regarding the use of statewide benchmark/interim assessment will be the schools participating in the upcoming LLI. It was not feasible, now or anytime soon, to survey all schools due to the enormous demands the pandemic has put on schools.

CA Performance Portfolio - Each CA Superintendent maintains a CA portfolio of performance measures that includes IDEA required timelines, educational environments for students with disabilities, and special education teacher PD and support on literacy instruction.

#### **Did the State implement any new (newly identified) infrastructure improvement strategies during the reporting period? (yes/no)**

NO

#### **Provide a summary of the next steps for each infrastructure improvement strategy and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next reporting period.**

##### Speech Language Pathologist (SLP) and 619 Coordinators PLCs

This PLC will be folded into the LLI and focus on clearly identifying the correlations between foundational oral language and literacy and 3rd and 4th grade reading outcomes. The LETRS for Early Childhood Educators will be used as the curriculum to build knowledge. A coaching model will be used to ensure instructional practices will be implemented with fidelity and a parent training component will be added to the PD to increase parent knowledge and skills and implementation of teaching opportunities in the natural environment. It is expected that participants will have increased knowledge to identify PD needs of schools, and begin developing a PD plan that is individualized for the school which includes knowledge building and use of coaching to ensure implementation fidelity.

IDEA Part B Funds - Successful implementation of activities and impact on student outcomes for each CA's FFY 2020 Project plan will be assessed. The results of this assessment will be used to course correct and/or adjust planning as needed. Through this process, the Department will create a system to effectively direct funds to identified areas of need.

Inclusive Practices (IP) - Although the Department has met its LRE target, each CA PLN member will continue to provide support and training to schools to ensure statewide capacity building efforts that were instituted by Stetson and Associates are maintained.

Monthly Meeting - Monthly DESs meetings will continue with an emphasis on bringing stakeholders together to increase the depth of interaction. In addition to the large group sharing, breakout opportunities will be provided to encourage networking and collaboration on statewide issues and challenges.

Focused Technical Assistance - This root cause analysis and action planning PLCs will be in full implementation SY 2021/22 as part of the Department's General Supervision universal support with a continued focus on student outcomes in language and literacy. Through the work of the PLCs, the CA will be better informed to plan for the use of their IDEA funds, prioritize and leverage CA initiatives, and support schools with their academic planning.

#### New Professional Learning Model, the Language and Literacy Initiative

Cohort 1 of the LLI will begin training on 1/22; cohort 2 will begin training on 8/22. The initiative includes plans to scale statewide in subsequent years. Each cohort will include preschools and elementary schools across no more than 6 CAs.

The goals of the LLI are to:

1. Implement evidence-based PL, focusing on job-embedded coaching and collaboration between coaches (resource teacher/SLPs) and teachers;
2. Increase the overall capacity (in both content knowledge and number of qualified personnel) of coaches and teachers within Department to provide evidence-based oral language and foundational literacy instruction;
3. Increase implementation of evidence-based oral language and foundational literacy strategies in PreK-grade 4;
4. Increase home literacy activities through parent and community partnerships.

#### Statewide Benchmark/Interim Assessment Implementation

In 2022, the Department will survey the schools participating in the LLI regarding the use of the Statewide Benchmark/Interim Assessment.

#### **List the selected evidence-based practices implement in the reporting period:**

Evidence-Based Programs:

Read 180/System 44

Achieve 3000

Enhanced Core Reading Instruction (ECRI)

LETRS Professional Learning for Teachers

Lindamood Phoneme Sequencing Program

Evidenced-Based Practices:

Multi-sensory language instruction  
Dialogic Reading  
Guided Repeated Reading  
Self-Regulatory Strategy Development  
Summarization Strategies  
Explicit vocabulary instruction  
Systematic Phonological Awareness Training

Note: The Department was unable to collect a comprehensive list of EBPs implemented in all schools during the reporting period due to COVID classroom and school disruption. The Department did provide ongoing training on effective online instruction for SWD to support schools in effectively engaging SWD and providing FAPE during periods of remote instruction.

**Provide a summary of each evidence-based practices.**

Evidence-Based Programs:

Read 180:

Blended learning reading intervention program for students in grades 4-12.

System 44:

Intervention program targeting foundational reading skills for students in grades 3-12.

Achieve 3000:

Supplemental online literacy program that provides nonfiction reading content to students in grades preK–12; focuses on building phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, reading comprehension, vocabulary, and writing skills.

Enhanced Core Reading Instruction (ECRI):

Multi-tiered program (Tier 1 and Tier 2) that targets teaching routines designed to increase the efficiency and effectiveness of reading instruction in kindergarten, first, and second grade.

LETRS Professional Learning for Teachers:

Blended professional learning model for teachers to develop knowledge and application of effective language and literacy instruction.

Lindamood Phoneme Sequencing Program:

Intervention program that teaches students the oral-motor movements of phonemes and to verify the identity, number, and sequence of sounds in words.

Evidenced-Based Practices:

Multi-sensory language instruction:

The use of visual, auditory, and kinesthetic-tactile pathways simultaneously to enhance memory and learning of language.

Dialogic Reading:

The process of having a structured dialogue with children about the text they are reading.

Guided Repeated Reading:

Reading fluency intervention in which students orally read a single passage multiple times (with error correction) in order to reach a certain accuracy rate or criterion, or to complete a prescribed number of readings.

Self-Regulatory Strategy Development:

Intervention designed to improve students' academic skills through a six-step process that teaches students specific academic strategies and self-regulation skills.

Summarization Strategies:

Strategies to help students determine the most important ideas in a text passage and to consolidate supporting details.

Explicit vocabulary instruction:

Vocabulary instruction that provides students with both definitional and contextual information about a word, offers multiple exposures to the word, and engages students in active practice that fosters deep processing about a word's meaning and use.

Systematic Phonological Awareness Training:

Various activities that focus on teaching children to identify, detect, delete, segment, or blend segments of spoken words (i.e., words, syllables, onsets and rimes, phonemes) or that focus on teaching children to detect, identify, or produce rhyme or alliteration.

**Provide a summary of how each evidence-based practice and activities or strategies that support its use, is intended to impact the SiMR by changing program/district policies, procedures, and/or practices, teacher/provider practices (e.g. behaviors), parent/caregiver outcomes, and/or child /outcomes.**

In order to impact the SiMR, it is necessary for the Department to provide multiple means of support for multiple groups across the tri-level system (e.g., CA leaders, school-level leaders, teachers, administrators, parents, advocates, etc.). The variety of evidence-based strategies and infrastructure improvement activities have been implemented by leveraging existing practices and systems when possible and are meant to build the capacity of the Department system in improving student outcomes. To make a significant impact on student performance, a multi-faceted approach is required. This includes a focus on building the foundational oral language and early literacy skills which are highly correlated to increased reading outcomes for the SiMR population. In addition, providing PD to district personnel on evidence-based curriculum and interventions was provided to expand the CA leadership and stakeholders' knowledge of foundational skill building with the intention of changing beliefs, practices, policies, and procedures. These activities were implemented to stress the importance of teacher practice, instructional culture, and the overall mindset of the potential of SWD within the Department.

### **Describe the data collected to monitor fidelity of implementation and to assess practice change.**

Due to the pandemic and continuous school disruption, the Department was unable to collect comprehensive data on the implementation of EBPs in this reporting period. The PD activities were regularly offered (once a month) to focus on the critical skills students need to acquire proficiency in reading. However, due to competing work responsibilities, the need to support schools during closures, providing coverage due to staff shortages, addressing distance learning challenges, and other COVID related issues, participant attendance was inconsistent. It was difficult to advance PD sessions while addressing staff burnout and stress. The content was continuously reviewed, to address competing stressors and accommodate participant absences. Participants shared that PD content was helpful, but expressed concerns about burdening schools with additional PD and acknowledged that many times students were not accessible for practitioners to practice with. The Department focused much of its efforts on providing training sessions and ongoing support on effective online instruction for SWD to support schools in effectively engaging SWD and providing FAPE during periods of remote instruction.

Moving forward, the Department revisited the need to provide PD to bring about practice change. It was decided that the LLI will be implemented. The focus will be on the required oral language and literacy skills that have been shown to have a high correlation to improving reading proficiency. While the Department recognizes that there may not be an immediate change in instructional practices for those teaching the SIMR population, there is a need to build on the foundational skills beginning at the preschool level to prevent gaps from growing as these children advance to upper grades. It is anticipated that by addressing foundational skills, reading development will be more easily achieved, students will experience success, and teachers will be reinforced, which will reinforce changes in instructional practices. Since this initiative includes a comprehensive data collection protocol to monitor fidelity of implementation of effective language and literacy instruction, it is anticipated that there will be data to assess change in practice. The LLI provides the Department with the opportunity to regularly monitor implementation fidelity as coaches will provide embedded support for participating teachers in their classrooms. Coaches will also conduct observations of teacher practice; this observational data will provide the Department with the ability to directly monitor fidelity of implementation. Additionally, this data will allow the Department to provide targeted support when there is a demonstrated need. Implementation fidelity data is one component of the LLI comprehensive evaluation plan. Additional data will be collected to measure the following short, intermediate, and long-term outcomes:

#### **Short Term Outcomes**

- Increased knowledge of effective language and literacy instruction and assessment for both coaches and teachers.
  - Data Source: Pre-Post LETRS Assessments, LETRS formative assessments
- Increased coaches' understanding of effective coaching strategies.
  - Data Source: Coaching Strategies Assessments
- Increased parent knowledge of home strategies to support language and literacy development.
  - Data Source: Parent Surveys

#### **Intermediate Outcomes**

- Effective teacher implementation of evidence-based language and literacy instruction and assessment.
  - Data Source: Formal Observations, LETRS application activities
- Teacher alignment of instructional strategy with discrete student need.
  - Data Source: Formal Observations
- Effective implementation of coaching strategies to improve teacher practice.
  - Data Source: NCSI Coaching Fidelity Assessment

#### **Long-Term Outcomes**

- Improved teacher efficacy and beliefs as evidenced by Improved reading proficiency rates
  - Data Source: Teacher efficacy survey, Smarter Balanced Assessment scores

### **Describe any additional data (e.g. progress monitoring) that was collected that supports the decision to continue the ongoing use of each evidence-based practice.**

NA

### **Provide a summary of the next steps for each evidence-based practices and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next reporting period.**

The Indicator 17 stakeholder group identified several challenges with scaling the implementation of literacy EBPs with fidelity in all elementary schools in the state. It was suggested by this group that consideration be given to changing the SIMR population to only those students attending the schools participating in the LLI. This suggestion will be revisited by the Indicator 17 stakeholder group once participating schools have been selected.

The evidence-based programs and practices listed above will continue to be implemented. Additionally, the Department will focus more closely on the LLI, particularly in building the oral language and literacy foundational skills needed for students to become proficient readers. It is also expected that targeting the appropriate foundational skills will enhance the development of reading skills and increase proficiency with the SIMR population. Expected short term outcomes to be attained during the next reporting period include:

- Increased knowledge of effective language and literacy instruction and assessment for both coaches and teachers.
  - Data Source: Pre-Post LETRS Assessments, LETRS formative assessments
- Increased coaches' understanding of effective coaching strategies.
  - Data Source: Coaching Strategies Assessments

Intermediate and Long-Term Outcomes will be addressed in subsequent reporting periods.

## **Section C: Stakeholder Engagement**

### **Description of Stakeholder Input**

The Department collaborates closely with several partners to ensure that authentic engagement in all aspects of the Department's special education program is achieved. These stakeholders supported the Department with the process of soliciting and providing broad stakeholder input on the Department's FFY 2020-2025 SPP/APR cycle. Presentation materials and meeting notes are available at the following websites:

- SEAC website at SPP/APR Resources Page <https://seac-hawaii.org/spp-apr-resource-page/>
- The Department's website at <https://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/TeachingAndLearning/SpecializedPrograms/SpecialEducation/Pages/home.aspx>

#### State Advisory Panel – Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC)

The Special Education Advisory Council 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 our SEAC is an appointment of 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 are individuals with disabilities or parents of children with disabilities (ages birth through 26). In the SEAC monthly meetings, family, community, and Department partners come together to address the group's special education priorities. This is done by sharing information, hearing community concerns, and addressing actions for improvement. Meeting agendas and minutes, along with other family resources, can be found on the SEAC website at <https://seac-hawaii.org/>.

#### Special Parent Information Network (SPIN)

The Special Parent Information Network is co-sponsored by the Disability and Communication Access Board and the Department. The Department has a long-standing memorandum of agreement with the Hawaii State Department of Health to fund the SPIN to provide support to SEAC. In addition, SPIN provides training and technical assistance to parent(s)/legal guardian(s) of students with disabilities. This includes the development and maintenance of an informational website and other materials, an annual parent conference, and availability to answer parent questions via a telephone hotline. SPIN is guided by an advisory committee made up of parents, professionals, and persons with disabilities and works with the Department to support students and families. Additional information can be found on the SPIN webpage at <https://spinhawaii.org/>.

#### Community Children's Councils (CCCs)

The Community Children's Councils serve children and families including those with disabilities and mental health needs through collaborative partnerships. The CCC, led by parent and professional co-chairs, provides assistance to families in coordinating educational and community support and services for their children with disabilities. The CCC is composed of 17 councils across the state representing each CA's geographic community. Given this structure, the CCCs are an effective venue for the Department to reach the broad and diverse communities across all islands. Additional information can be found on the CCCs webpage at <https://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/ParentsAndStudents/SupportForParents/Pages/CCC.aspx>.

#### 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. 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. Additional information can be found on the LDAH webpage at <https://ldahawaii.org/>.

The Department continues to utilize the Leading by Convening framework to engage stakeholders in monthly Parent Partner meetings. These meetings are designed to provide opportunities for sharing information, exchanging ideas, understanding various perspectives, and supporting effective communication. Community stakeholders represented at these meetings include SEAC, SPIN, CCC, DD Council, and Hawaii's Parent Training and Information agency, LDAH.

The ESB and MAC in collaboration with SEAC, SPIN, and CCC, commenced a series of stakeholder meetings to begin discussions and develop recommended targets for the new six-year cycle of the revised SPP. Beginning in January 2021, these meetings were held over a one-year period and were designed to engage stakeholders from various backgrounds; educators, parents, school administrators, policy advisors, school psychologists, early education, advocacy groups, and state advisory board members. The Department leveraged the expertise of these stakeholders, with their breadth and depth of knowledge, to help inform the development of a new set of rigorous state targets and solicited new improvement activities for the next six-year SPP cycle.

#### **Describe the specific strategies implemented to engage stakeholders in key improvement efforts.**

Indicator 17 stakeholders have expressed their concern of the widespread implementation of the EBPs across all Department elementary schools recognizing the difficulty in providing oversight and monitoring of EBP implementation. They are in agreement that a more focused effort to target schools, where direct support by designated personnel can be provided, would most likely yield better results. Stakeholders support the LLI and have suggested changing the SIMR population to only those students attending the schools participating in the LLI. This suggestion will be revisited by the Indicator 17 stakeholder group once participating schools have been selected.

#### **Were there any concerns expressed by stakeholders during engagement activities? (yes/no)**

YES

#### **Describe how the State addressed the concerns expressed by stakeholders.**

Indicator stakeholder discussions will continue through the various stakeholder engagement activities where implementation of LLI will be monitored and reviewed and where details on a newly defined SIMR will be finalized for reporting on the FFY 2021 SPP/APR.

#### **Additional Implementation Activities**

##### **List any activities not already described that the State intends to implement in the next fiscal year that are related to the SiMR.**

Ongoing collaboration with the Department Office of Curriculum Instruction and Design (OCID) has been established. The OCID has established several LETRS professional learning cohorts across the state. In addition to the LLI this work can assist teachers in effectively addressing struggling learners who may comprise the SiMR population. The Department has also provided CAs with IDEA ARP funds (dependent upon funding proposal submissions) to support their efforts in improving reading proficiency for SWDs. The allocated funds can be used within CAs to purchase professional learning, evidence-based curriculum, or supplementary ELA intervention programs.

##### **Provide a timeline, anticipated data collection and measures, and expected outcomes for these activities that are related to the SiMR.**

The Department OCID LETRS initiative is ongoing. Expected outcomes of this initiative include improved teacher knowledge and application of effective reading instruction and improved student ELA proficiency. The IDEA ARP funds will be released to CAs in Spring 2022. Outcomes and activities are dependent upon CA proposals but are expected to support improved ELA proficiency of SWDs in alignment with funding proposal criteria.

#### **Describe any newly identified barriers and include steps to address these barriers.**

The impacts of the pandemic continue to evolve. In addition to potential state-mandated restrictions and closures, the Department is now faced with staffing shortages. Schools must contend on a daily basis with the absences of teachers, staff, and students making it difficult to conduct business as usual. The Department has aligned its health and safety guidelines with the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention relaxing the quarantine requirements with hopes that both staff and students can remain in schools more. The Department will continue its efforts to prioritize in-person learning and ensure a FAPE for SWDs through the implementation of IDEA.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional).

**17 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**17 - OSEP Response**

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

**17 - 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:**

Annie Kalama

##### **Title:**

Special Education Director

##### **Email:**

annie.kalama@k12.hi.us

##### **Phone:**

808-305-9806

##### **Submitted on:**

04/27/22 5:52:39 PM