

**State Performance Plan / Annual Performance Report:  
Part B**

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

**For reporting on  
FFY18**

**Hawaii**



**PART B DUE February 3, 2020**

**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

#### 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 Hawaii State Department of Education's (HIDOE) primary monitoring activities focus is on improving educational results and functional outcomes for all students with disabilities and ensuring that the school system meets the program requirements under this part, with a particular emphasis on those requirements that are most closely related to improving educational results and functional outcomes for students with disabilities.

As a unitary system, Hawaii is a single State Educational Agency (SEA) and Local Educational Agency (LEA). The statewide system is divided into Complex Areas and each Complex Area includes at least one complex. Each complex is comprised of at least one high school and the middle and elementary schools that feed into them. IDEA requirements are implemented by State-level offices, complex area offices and schools. Through a collaborative effort with State partners and education stakeholders statewide, the HIDOE is committed to ensure that all students in Hawaii are college and career ready as they exit the public school system.

The HIDOE ensures that:

- all students with disabilities have available a free appropriate public education (FAPE);
- rights of students with disabilities and their parents are protected; and
- federal and state special education requirements are implemented, monitored, enforced and reported on.

Hawaii's General Supervision System (GSS) is under the Office of the Deputy Superintendent, Monitoring and Compliance Branch (MAC) and the Office of Student Support Services (OSSS), Exceptional Support Branch (ESB). HIDOE monitors all public schools, including public charter schools. GSS includes quantitative and qualitative indicators according to the targets identified in Hawaii's State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR). IDEA requirements are implemented by state-level offices, complex-level offices and schools comprised of the following components:

- Policies/procedures/effective implementation
- Integrated monitoring activities
- Identification of findings of noncompliance
- Data management and reporting
- Incentives for complete and accurate reports
- Effective dispute resolution
- Fiscal and resource management
- Targeted technical assistance and professional development

#### Policies, Procedures and Effective Implementation:

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

#### Monitoring:

The HIDOE monitors all public schools, including public charter schools and complexes through a General Supervision and Support (GSS) system utilizing the state's electronic Comprehensive Student Support System (eCSSS) and the Longitudinal Data System (LDS) databases. The indicators reviewed include the following:

- Child Find (60-Day Timeline on Initial Evaluations)
- Educational Environments (Children Ages 6-21)
- Preschool Environments (Children Ages 3-5)
- Suspension and Expulsion
- Early Childhood Transition (Individualized Education Program (IEP) in place by student's 3rd birthday)
- Secondary Transition (Ages 16 and older)
- Disproportionate Representation (Based on Federal Racial and Ethnic Groups)
- Disproportionate Representation in Specific Disability Categories

#### Identification of Findings of Noncompliance:

The Special Education Compliance Action Table (SPED CAT) database was developed as the compliance monitoring database in HIDOE's GSS. Any findings of noncompliance identified are issued to the appropriate complex. Once informed of noncompliance, complexes correct or resolve all instances of noncompliance, verify the correction process, and provide evidence to HIDOE monitors that subsequent processes will be appropriately implemented. All noncompliance, both individual and systemic, is corrected within one year of identification. Timely correction of noncompliance is reviewed and verified by MAC staff.

**Data Management and Reporting:**

Child Count data of all students receiving special education and related services is collected electronically through eCSSS on November 29, and software tools are used to search for duplicates, perform error check, and prepare for data submission to ED Facts. Electronic submissions are provided by the State for exiting, discipline, personnel, dispute resolution, and Maintenance of Effort (MOE)/Coordinated Early Intervening Services (CEIS) data. The data are cleaned and prepared for submission to ED Facts or to EMAPS. HIDOE ensures that data is collected and reported on a timely manner that is consistent with the federal requirements.

**Incentives for Complete and Accurate Reports:**

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

**Dispute Resolution System:**

The Dispute Resolution System includes the State Written Complaints, Mediation, and Due Process Hearing systems. HIDOE is proud of its Dispute Resolution System which validates that the State continues to provide a FAPE to students with disabilities.

**Fiscal and Resource Management:**

Monitoring includes all complexes and covers the use of IDEA Part B funds. The monitoring of IDEA funds is based on Allowable Costs, Fixed Assets, and Time and Effort (payroll certification) as they relate to project proposals for Districts, Complex Areas, and Schools in relation to how they spend IDEA monies. HIDOE reviews its policies and procedures, ensuring consistency with IDEA and our State laws.

Through State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) process, the HIDOE is refining its infrastructure and components of its GSS to ensure that Hawaii continues to improve educational results and functional outcomes for our students and maintain compliance with requirements under IDEA.

**Technical Assistance System**

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

The HIDOE provides ongoing guidance and Technical Assistance (TA) to Complex Areas, schools and parent community in both compliance requirements and program improvements through collaboration between various offices within HIDOE and outside partners. Strategies such as one-on-one individual support for Complex Areas to problem solve specific needs; collaboration opportunities with peer Complex Areas, communities of practice such as Professional Learning Network (PLN), statewide conferences, interstate working groups around relevant issues such as Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC) in providing updates and receiving feedback on SPP/APR. In addition, the HIDOE has sought out TA and support from OSEP and OSEP approved TA providers; National Center for Systemic Improvement (NCSI), the IDEA Data Center (IDC), National Technical Assistance Center for Transition (NTACT), Early Childhood Personnel Center (ECPC), and Early Childhood Technical Assistance Center (ECTA).

**Collaboration of Offices:**

To improve statewide compliance requirements and increase performance for students with disabilities, the Monitoring and Compliance Branch (MAC), under the direct supervision of the Office of the Deputy Superintendent, is responsible for the monitoring activities set forth in 34 C.F.R. §§ 300.600 through 300.602 and annually report on performance of the State and each Complex Area as provided in 34 C.F.R. §§ 300.602(b)(1)(i)(A) and (b)(2) to ensure Hawaii meets the program requirements under Part B of the Act. MAC provides TA to program office, Complex Areas and schools, including review of guidance documents and compliance processes at Federal and State levels.

The Exceptional Support Branch (ESB) under the direct supervision of the Office of Student Support Services (OSSS) is responsible for the State's implementation of IDEA regulations and procedures. The ESB provides TA and support to Complex Areas and schools to improve educational results and functional outcomes for students with disabilities.

**Guidelines and Handbooks:**

Guidelines and handbooks are developed and updated to implement and clarify compliance requirements and/or programs. Guidelines and handbooks developed by the HIDOE in collaboration with outside partners include but are not limited to:

- Chapter 60 Guidelines
- Extended School Year (ESY) Guidelines
- Private School Participation Project (PSPP) Guidelines Handbook
- IEP Transition Handbook (DRAFT)

**Memos:**

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

**TA within each Complex Area:**

District Educational Specialists (DES) are located in the Complex Areas throughout the State. They provide TA to address the needs of their complexes and schools.

**SEAC's Monthly Meetings:**

The HIDOE utilizes the Special Education Advisory Council (SEAC) as a part of the TA system. The meetings are designed to provide opportunities for sharing of information, exchange ideas, and to make requests of SEAC members to communicate with and share ideas and perspectives with all stakeholders.

**Ongoing Guidance and TA:**

The MAC and ESB are available to provide guidance and answer questions via phone calls, written correspondence and emails received by parents, the general public, teachers, schools, districts, complexes, legislators and the Hawaii State Board of Education.

## **Data Systems:**

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

- Infinite Campus and PowerSchool:
  - o Provides student biographical data, attendance, class lists, school master schedules, grades, enrollment, parent information, student health information, and homelessness;
- Electronic Comprehensive Student Support System (eCSSS)
  - o Provides student information relating to special education, English Language Learners, assessments, disciplinary data, and an early warning system;
- Longitudinal Data System (LDS):
  - o Provides reports and dashboards where teachers and administrators can access data about student academic progress and performance;
- Financial Management System (FMS):
  - o Provides a repository for service verification and budget data;
- Special Education Compliance Action Table (SPED CAT) database:
  - o Provides a compliance monitoring database for Hawaii's System of general supervision.

## **Professional Development System**

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

### **Quality PD:**

The HIDOE's design principles of quality PD emphasizes the application of innovative curricular, instructional and educational designs in the learning environments for students and adults, transforms instructional practices, and provides evidence for reflection on the impact of student learning. The three Strategic Plan Goals: 1) Student Success; 2) Staff Success and 3) Successful Systems of Supports are the building blocks within complex areas' academic and IDEA project proposals.

The Professional Development Credit System initiated in SY 2002 is based on major cornerstones instituted to increase and strengthen the capacity of its educational workforce. As learning effectuates deepening of skills, knowledge and competencies of participants, the ultimate goal is to create a broad and deep impact on student learning through:

- Flexible, rigorous, and meaningful learning opportunities that advance HIDOE's 10-Year Strategic Plan, Five Promises, and vision;
- Tri-level alignment and implementation of priorities across the HIDOE organizational system (e.g., classroom and school, complex area, and statewide); and
- Equitable access to professional opportunities to collaborate and earn credits leading to compensation for the full range of educators and support staff across the State.

Staff register for PD courses and log their courses on PDE3 at <https://pde3.k12.hi.us/>. HIDOE staff are provided with login information to access PDE3.

### **Special Education Task Force Recommendations:**

As a result of the 2017 HIDOE's Superintendent, Dr. Christina Kishimoto, Special Education Program Review Task Force, the HIDOE is working on improvements to its PD system. The goal of this Task Force was to recommend steps to improve access to quality education for our students with disabilities and ensuring appropriate inclusion in the general education classroom. One of the recommendations of the Task Force was Professional Development for special education staff to improve access to quality education for all students with disabilities. Specific PD modules were developed from the ESB section to standardize professional learning regarding Individualized Education Program (IEP) development and process.

### **Special Education Conference:**

In Summer of 2018, the OSSS, ESB held the first statewide Special Education Conference "Together for Our Keiki" at various sites around the State. The conference included a series of face to face training sessions to increase teachers, counselors, school administrators, district personnel and related service providers' effectiveness in the areas of IEP development and process.

The sessions included the following learning opportunities:

- Applied Behavior Analysis (ABA)
- Standards for Students with Severe Cognitive Disabilities
- Transition to Adult Life
- Cornerstone of the Individualized Education Program (IEP): Present Levels of Educational Performance (PLEP)
- Least Restrictive Environment (LRE): A Focus on Services
- Understanding Extended School Year (ESY)
- Administrators: Leading the IEP Process
- Setting the Target: Goals and Objectives
- Purpose of Related Services
- Closing the Achievement Gap: Specially Designed Instruction (SDI)
- Student Led IEPs
- Accommodations and Curricular Modifications that Support Student Success
- IEP Process: The Basics
- Talk Story with Attorneys General

In Fall of 2018, the OSSS, ESB repeated the Summer 2018 Special Education Conference for general and special education teachers, counselors, school administrators, district personnel, and related service providers. These trainings are posted on the state's Google Drive and are available to all HIDOE staff.

### **Mandatory Special Education PD Training Modules:**

Beginning in School Year 2019-2020, the following Special Education Training Modules are mandatory for all special education teachers (e.g., full-time, part-time, and long-term substitutes). Staff throughout each Complex Area were trained using the trainer of trainers model in order to build capacity within each school throughout the State.

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

**Inclusive Practices:**

Our vision for inclusive practices is: HIDOE is committed to serving all students in inclusive schools where they are accepted members of their school community, where students with disabilities have equal access to and successfully engage in the same educational environment with the same learning opportunities as students without disabilities. Over the past two school years, the HIDOE through our provider, Stetson and Associates provided inclusive practices implementation training and consultation to schools statewide known as Hui Pu. As of October 2019, the average inclusion rate for the 39 Hui Pu schools was 56% compared to the 39% average inclusion rate for non-Hui Pu schools.

**Oral Language Development for Literacy:**

The ESB sponsored a series of PD opportunities for Speech-language pathologists, general education and special education teachers, preschool 619 coordinators/district resource teachers and speech-language pathologist coordinators. The focus was on oral language development with specific emphasis on the integration of oral language and literacy (reading and writing). Sessions were specifically geared to those who work with early learners (preschool through grade three) with speech, language and communication disabilities.

**Sessions focused on:**

- Explaining the foundational language skills students need to access and acquire the literacy expectations of the Common Core Standards (CCSS) and Hawaii Early Learning Development Standards (HELDS);
- Providing evidence based interventions on the development of discourse skills that help students with disabilities move from the acquisition of oral language to literacy academic language skills in support of reading, writing, speaking and listening standards;
- Applying a narrative discourse intervention methodology and connecting interventions to the specific age and grade level expectations of the CCSS and HELDS;
- Developing assessment and progress monitoring tools to guide interventions; and
- Developing collaboration techniques to increase the provision of educationally relevant interventions.

This is an ongoing series which emphasizes the development of coaching and mentoring strategies for those who support development of this teaching methodology for students who have or struggle with language and literacy.

**Quarterly Transition Meetings:**

Every quarter in each island, a day of PD is developed in partnership with HIDOE and outside agencies; Department of Human Services (DHS), Division of Vocational Rehabilitation (DVR), Developmental Disabilities Division (DDD), State Council on Developmental Disabilities (DD Council), Center on Disability Studies (CDS), and Self-Advocacy Advisory Council (SAAC). This PD is geared towards transition teachers/coordinators who plan and assist in the development of postsecondary transition plans for students with disabilities, and State coordinators and counselors who provide services to students with disabilities.

**Professional Learning Networks (PLNs):**

The HIDOE utilizes Professional Learning Networks (PLN) for the District Educational Specialists (DES). The DESs deliver special education TA and PD to complexes and schools; therefore, the State organizes mandatory DES meetings monthly. These meetings are an ongoing learning where DESs in special education, autism and school based behavioral health collaborate and discuss special education issues that need in-depth dialogue to operationalize for system effectiveness.

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

In December 2014, stakeholders from the Department of Education, parents, and community received longitudinal data for all Performance Indicators. The stakeholders reviewed the data and proposed targets for all performance indicators for the FFY 2013-2018 State Performance Plan (SPP).

In 2019, OSEP extended the current targets through FFY 2019, therefore, the HIDOE convened the stakeholders to obtain their input on the extended targets. On December 13, 2019 HIDOE presented the historical and current data for each indicator, as appropriate, along with proposed FFY 2019 targets. The HIDOE facilitated the input and feedback session. The facilitator provided the group members with the actual data and targets for each of the indicators beginning with the baseline year. The participants were asked to review the data trend, and ask the following questions for each of the indicators:

- Is the target met?
- Is there progress?
- Is there slippage?
- Keep the same target?
- Propose an alternate?
- What is the rationale?

Stakeholders provided input and reached agreement on FFY 2019 targets.

Membership for our SEAC are an appointment of the Superintendent. The membership is a representative of the State population and composed of individuals involved in or concerned with the education of children with disabilities. The majority of members shall be individuals with disabilities or parents of children with disabilities (ages birth through 26). The membership includes representatives from the following stakeholder groups:

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

- Representative of the state child welfare agency responsible for foster care of children
- Representative of military students and families

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

YES

#### **Reporting to the Public**

**How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY17 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 2017 APR, as required by 34 CFR §300.602(b)(1)(i)(A); and a description of where, on its Web site, a complete copy of the State's SPP, including any revision if the State has revised the SPP that it submitted with its FFY 2017 APR in 2019, is available.**

As a unitary system, Hawaii is a single State Educational Agency (SEA) and Local Educational Agency (LEA). The SPP/APR indicates how the LEA is meeting the SEA targets.

The FFY 2017 SPP/APR was posted on the HIDOE website indicated below within a week of submission to OSEP of its revised version submitted during the clarification process in April of 2019, which was within the IDEA requirements, no later than 120 days following the submission of HIDOE's APR to OSEP as required by 34 CFR §303.702(b)(1)(i)(A).

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

The most current SPP/APR, FFY 2018, will be posted on the Hawaii Department of Education homepage website indicated below not later than 120 days following the submission of HIDOE's APR to OSEP as required by 34 CFR §303.702(b)(1)(i)(A).

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

#### **Intro - Prior FFY Required Actions**

The State's IDEA Part B determination for both 2018 and 2019 is Needs Assistance. In the State's 2019 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 2018 SPP/APR submission, due February 3, 2020, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance; and (2) the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance. In the FFY 2018 SPP/APR due in February 2020, the State must report FFY 2018 data for the State-identified Measurable Result (SiMR). Additionally, the State must, consistent with its evaluation plan described in Phase II, assess and report on its progress in implementing the SSIP. Specifically, the State must provide: (1) a narrative or graphic representation of the principal activities implemented in Phase III, Year 4; (2) measures and outcomes that were implemented and achieved since the State's last SSIP submission (i.e., April 1, 2019); (3) a summary of the SSIP's coherent improvement strategies, including infrastructure improvement strategies, and evidence-based practices that were implemented by the State and progress toward short- and long-term outcomes that are intended to impact the SiMR; and (4) any supporting data that demonstrates that implementation of these activities are impacting the State's capacity to improve its SiMR data. If, in its FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the State is not able demonstrate progress in implementing its coherent improvement strategies, including progress in the areas of infrastructure improvement strategies or the implementation of evidence-based practices with fidelity, the State must provide its root cause analysis for each of these challenges.

#### **Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR**

TA Sources and Actions:

The HIDOE has accessed and received TA and support from OSEP and OSEP approved centers and resources, and as a result taken the following actions.

Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP)

o OSEP provided the following TA:

Met with the State staff and representatives from OSEP-funded TA centers to explore the potential barriers that have impacted State's progress toward achieving its SSIP targets.

Provided HIDOE with a written report of required actions/next steps

Engaged HIDOE on monthly TA calls to discuss State's progress

o As a result, HIDOE has:

Tailored the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) to address key issues shared by the OSEP team.

Aligned its SSIP with the HIDOE's strategic plan and aspects of Consolidated State Plan, as required under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, as amended by the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESEA).

National Center for System Improvement (NCSI)

o NCSI provided the following TA:

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

Professional development on Leading by Convening through workshops facilitated by Joanne Cashman for state office staff and Hawaii's Special Education Advisory Council.

Provided opportunities for HIDOE staff to attend Learning Collaborative events in the area of HIDOE SSIP SIMR

Provided TA on General Supervision Systems

o As a result, HIDOE has:

Implemented and submitted a revised FFY 2018 SPP/APR

Partnered with SEAC on the design of infographics in several key areas of special education.

Started changes to how SSIP activities are organized. More information will be provided in the upcoming Indicator 17 (SSIP).

Started revision to its General Supervision procedures and is working on a collaborative effort (service level agreement) across the special education offices, to improve accountability for special education results and compliance monitoring system.

#### IDEA Data Center (IDC)

o IDC provided the following TA:

Suggested revision with detailed suggestions for improvements on SPP/APR and SSIP submissions.

o As a result, HIDOE has:

Incorporated IDC suggestions in the FFY 2018 APR.

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

o NTACT provided the following TA

Improvement in the areas of Indicator 13 more specifically in identification of age appropriate transition assessments

o As a result, HIDOE has:

Developed a template for recommending targeted technical assistance based on statewide findings of noncompliance, slippage, and unmet targets. Expanded Quarterly Transition meetings statewide to ensure transition teachers/coordinators develop and implement effective transitions plans aligning with IDEA and Hawaii Administrative Rules, Chapter 60.

#### Early Childhood Technical Assistance Center (ECTA)

o ECTA has provided the following TA:

Provided materials and resources of preschool programs in other states

o As a result, HIDOE has:

Developed preliminary resources to improve practices and outcomes for preschool students with disabilities

#### Early Childhood Personnel Center (ECPC)

o ECPC has provided the following TA:

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

o As a result, HIDOE has:

Participated in cross-agency work related to personnel to build more effective systems of services and programs that will improve outcomes for young children with disabilities and families served under Part C and Section 619 and their transition to Part B.

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

o NASDSE offered the following TA:

National meeting for Special Education Directors, where HIDOE leadership participated in professional development sessions and had a chance to meet with other state directors and TA providers (NCSI, IDC, etc).

o As a result, HIDOE has:

Had a chance to get together to discuss special education in Hawaii, gathered more input on general supervision systems, and continued to refine improvements to how HIDOE systems are aligned to implement IDEA.

### Intro - OSEP Response

The State's determinations for both 2018 and 2019 were Needs Assistance. Pursuant to section 616(e)(1) of the IDEA and 34 C.F.R. § 300.604(a), OSEP's June 20, 2019 determination letter informed the State that it must report with its FFY 2018 SPP/APR submission, due February 3, 2020, 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.

The State provided a FFY 2019 target for Indicator B-17, State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), and OSEP accepts that target.

The State did not provide verification that the attachments it included in its FFY 2018 SPP/APR submission, including the SSIP, are in compliance with Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended (Section 508), as required by Section 508 and noted in the FFY 2018 SPP/APR User Guides and technical webinar.

**Note:** During clarification period 4/16/2020-4/30/2020, HIDOE resubmitted the SSIP with a certificate of compliance with Section 508.

### Intro - Required Actions

# Indicator 1: Graduation

## Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

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

### Data Source

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

### Measurement

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

### Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, use data from 2017-2018), and compare the results to the target. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

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

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

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

## 1 - Indicator Data

### Historical Data

Baseline	2011	59.30%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target >=	82.00%	84.00%	85.00%	87.00%	88.00%
Data	61.45%	59.31%	60.37%	59.49%	65.29%

### Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target >=	90.00%	83.00%

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

In December 2014, stakeholders from the Department of Education, parents, and community received longitudinal data for all Performance Indicators. The stakeholders reviewed the data and proposed targets for all performance indicators for the FFY 2013-2018 State Performance Plan (SPP).

In 2019, OSEP extended the current targets through FFY 2019, therefore, the HIDEOE convened the stakeholders to obtain their input on the extended targets. On December 13, 2019 HIDEOE presented the historical and current data for each indicator, as appropriate, along with proposed FFY 2019 targets. The HIDEOE facilitated the input and feedback session. The facilitator provided the group members with the actual data and targets for each of the indicators beginning with the baseline year. The participants were asked to review the data trend, and ask the following questions for each of the indicators:

- Is the target met?
- Is there progress?
- Is there slippage?
- Keep the same target?
- Propose an alternate?
- What is the rationale?

Stakeholders provided input and reached agreement on FFY 2019 targets.

Membership for our SEAC are an appointment of the Superintendent. The membership is a representative of the State population and composed of individuals involved in or concerned with the education of children with disabilities. The majority of members shall be individuals with disabilities or parents of children with disabilities (ages birth through 26). The membership includes representatives from the following stakeholder groups:

- Parents of children with disabilities (ages birth through 26)
- Individuals with disabilities
- Teachers (general and special education) of children with disabilities
- University of Hawaii and other representatives of other institutions of higher education that prepare special education and related services personnel
- State, district and school education officials
- Administrators of programs for children with disabilities
- Representatives of other state agencies involved in the financing or delivery of related services to children with disabilities
- Representatives of private schools and public charter schools
- Representative of a vocational, community or business organization concerned with provision of transition services to children with disabilities
- Representatives of the State juvenile and adult corrections agencies



- Representative of the Parent Training and Information Center
- Representatives of the community
- Representative of the education office responsible for the coordination of the Education for Homeless Children and Youth Program
- Representative of the state child welfare agency responsible for foster care of children
- Representative of military students and families

Targets set for youth with disabilities are the same as annual graduation rates targets under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA). On December 13, 2019, during the SEAC meeting, the stakeholder group and HDOE agreed to set the same target for reporting under Title I of ESEA, which is at 83%.

**Prepopulated Data**

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2017-18 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec FS151; Data group 696)	10/02/2019	Number of youth with IEPs graduating with a regular diploma	1,014
SY 2017-18 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec FS151; Data group 696)	10/02/2019	Number of youth with IEPs eligible to graduate	1,584
SY 2017-18 Regulatory Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec FS150; Data group 695)	10/02/2019	Regulatory four-year adjusted-cohort graduation rate table	64.01%

**FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data**

Number of youth with IEPs in the current year's adjusted cohort graduating with a regular diploma	Number of youth with IEPs in the current year's adjusted cohort eligible to graduate	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
1,014	1,584	65.29%	90.00%	64.01%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

**Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable**

Although a comparison between FFY 2018 and FFY 2017 shows a slight slippage on the graduation rates of students with disabilities, the overall trend shows improvement since the baseline data was established in FFY 2011.

2011 baseline: 59.31  
2018 data: 64.01

Variations in the graduation rate from year to year are to be expected, as they reflect changes in cohort membership. Fluctuations in student dropout and the number of certificates issued are among the factors contributing to these variations.

Numbers of Dropouts:  
2015-2016: 164  
2016-2017: 202  
2017-2018: 218  
2018-2019: 137

Number of Certificates Issued:  
2015-2016: 127  
2016-2017: 119  
2017-2018: 81  
2018-2019: 106

Once again, the overall trend is one of improvement for the graduation rate of students with disabilities in Hawaii.

**Graduation Conditions**

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

4-year ACGR

**If extended, provide the number of years**

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

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

- Realize their individual goals and aspirations;

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

To receive a regular high school diploma, all youth must meet the following course requirements and standards for a total of 24 credits:

English = 4 credits;  
 Social Studies = 4 credits;  
 Mathematics = 3 credits;  
 Science = 3 credits;  
 World Language or Fine Arts or Career & Technical Education/JROTC = 2 credits;  
 Physical Education = 1 credit;  
 Health = 0.5 credits;  
 Personal Transition Plan = 0.5 credit;  
 Electives = 6 credits

For FFY 2018, there were 1584 youth with IEPs in the current year's adjusted cohort eligible to graduate. In the current year's adjusted cohort, 1014 youth with IEPs graduated with a regular diploma. 64.01% of the youth with IEPs in the current year's adjusted cohort who were eligible to graduate, received a regular diploma. With 64.01% of youth with IEPs in the adjusted cohort graduating with a regular diploma, Hawaii does not meet the State target of 90.00%. Slippage is reported.

**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

**If yes, explain the difference in conditions that youth with IEPs must meet.**

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

**1 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR**

**1 - OSEP Response**

The State provided a target for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts that target.

**1 - Required Actions**

## Indicator 2: Drop Out

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

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

#### Data Source

OPTION 1:

Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), using the definitions in EDFacts file specification C009.

OPTION 2:

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

#### Measurement

OPTION 1:

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

OPTION 2:

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

#### Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

OPTION 1:

Use 618 exiting data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, use data from 2017-2018). Include in the denominator the following exiting categories: (a) graduated with a regular high school diploma; (b) received a certificate; (c) reached maximum age; (d) dropped out; or (e) died.

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

OPTION 2:

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

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

Options 1 and 2:

Data for this indicator are "lag" data. Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, use data from 2017-2018), and compare the results to the target.

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

## 2 - Indicator Data

### Historical Data

Baseline	2015	16.64%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target <=	5.50%	5.00%	4.50%	16.64%	14.00%
Data	6.05%	6.59%	16.64%	14.53%	14.89%

### Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target <=	11.00%	11.00%

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

In December 2014, stakeholders from the Department of Education, parents, and community received longitudinal data for all Performance Indicators. The stakeholders reviewed the data and proposed targets for all performance indicators for the FFY 2013-2018 State Performance Plan (SPP).

In 2019, OSEP extended the current targets through FFY 2019, therefore, the HIDEOE convened the stakeholders to obtain their input on the extended targets. On December 13, 2019 HIDEOE presented the historical and current data for each indicator, as appropriate, along with proposed FFY 2019 targets. The HIDEOE facilitated the input and feedback session. The facilitator provided the group members with the actual data and targets for each of the indicators beginning with the baseline year. The participants were asked to review the data trend, and ask the following questions for each of the indicators:

- Is the target met?
- Is there progress?
- Is there slippage?
- Keep the same target?
- Propose an alternate?
- What is the rationale?

Stakeholders provided input and reached agreement on FFY 2019 targets.

Membership for our SEAC are an appointment of the Superintendent. The membership is a representative of the State population and composed of individuals involved in or concerned with the education of children with disabilities. The majority of members shall be individuals with disabilities or parents of children with disabilities (ages birth through 26). The membership includes representatives from the following stakeholder groups:

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

On December 13, 2019, the HDOE and the stakeholder group agreed to keep the same target as FFY 2018 for FFY 2019.

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

Option 1

**Prepopulated Data**

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2017-18 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/30/2019	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a)	943
SY 2017-18 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/30/2019	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (b)	81
SY 2017-18 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/30/2019	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (c)	48
SY 2017-18 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/30/2019	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (d)	218
SY 2017-18 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/30/2019	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education as a result of death (e)	6

**FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data**

Number of youth with IEPs who exited special education due to dropping out	Total number of High School Students with IEPs by Cohort	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
218	1,296	14.89%	11.00%	16.82%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

**Has your State made or proposes to make changes to the data source under Option 2, when compared to the information reported in its FFY 2010 SPP/APR submitted on February 1, 2012? (yes/no)**

XXX

**If yes, provide justification for the changes below.**

XXX

**Use a different calculation methodology (yes/no)**

XXX

**Change numerator description in data table (yes/no)**

XXX

**Change denominator description in data table (yes/no)**

XXX

**If use a different calculation methodology is yes, provide an explanation of the different calculation methodology**

XXX

**FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data**

Number of youth with IEPs who exited special education due to dropping out	Total number of High School Students with IEPs by Cohort	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX

**Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable**

Over the last few years, HIDOE has been working to improve several variables that influence dropout rates. For example, although students with disabilities comprise the group with highest levels of chronic absenteeism, data shows continued reduction of this indicator for this group of students over the last three years. The performance gap on assessments, between students with disabilities and general students has also been reducing over the last three years. In addition, more students with disabilities are receiving services in the general education classroom. Although HIDOE continues efforts in reducing suspensions and expulsions, this is the only variable that did not show improvement over the last year. HIDOE had an increase of students who dropped out in 2017-2018, an increase that is similar to the increase in suspensions and expulsions including suspensions for more than ten days. We believe the increase in suspensions and expulsions explains the slippage (increase) of dropout rates for students with disabilities in Hawaii.

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

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

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

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

NO

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

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

**2 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

**2 - OSEP Response**

The State provided a target for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts that target.

The State's FFY 2018 data represent slippage from the FFY 2017 data and the State did not meet its FFY 2018 target for this indicator. The State did not, as required, provide the reasons for slippage.

**Note:** During clarification period 4/16/2020-4/30/2020, HIDOE revised the slippage reasons to meet OSEP's requirements, which is reflected in this version. See section above entitled, *Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable.*

**2 - Required Actions**

## Indicator 3B: Participation for Students with IEPs

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

#### Data Source

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

#### Measurement

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

#### Instructions

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

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

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

## 3B - Indicator Data

### Reporting Group Selection

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

Group	Group Name	Grade 3	Grade 4	Grade 5	Grade 6	Grade 7	Grade 8	Grade 9	Grade 10	Grade 11	Grade 12	HS
A	Overall I	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
B												
C												
D												
E												
F												
G												
H												
I												
J												
K												
L												

### Historical Data: Reading

Group	Group Name	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A	Overall	2005	Target >=	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
A	Overall	96.61%	Actual	95.91%	93.98%	94.82%	94.80%	95.69%
B			Target >=					
B			Actual					
C			Target >=					
C			Actual					
D			Target >=					

D			Actual					
E			Target >=					
E			Actual					
F			Target >=					
F			Actual					
G			Target >=					
G			Actual					
H			Target >=					
H			Actual					
I			Target >=					
I			Actual					
J			Target >=					
J			Actual					
K			Target >=					
K			Actual					
L			Target >=					
L			Actual					

**Historical Data: Math**

Group	Group Name	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A	Overall	2005	Target >=	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
A	Overall	96.45%	Actual	95.95%	93.50%	94.55%	94.76%	95.83%
B			Target >=					
B			Actual					
C			Target >=					
C			Actual					
D			Target >=					
D			Actual					
E			Target >=					
E			Actual					
F			Target ≥					
F			Actual					
G			Target >=					
G			Actual					
H			Target >=					
H			Actual					
I			Target >=					
I			Actual					
J			Target >=					
J			Actual					
K			Target >=					
K			Actual					
L			Target >=					
L			Actual					

**Targets**

	Group	Group Name	2018	2019
Reading	A >=	Overall	95.00%	95.00%
Reading	B >=			
Reading	C >=			
Reading	D >=			
Reading	E >=			
Reading	F >=			
Reading	G >=			
Reading	H >=			
Reading	I >=			
Reading	J >=			
Reading	K >=			
Reading	L >=			
Math	A >=	Overall	95.00%	95.00%
Math	B >=			
Math	C >=			
Math	D >=			
Math	E >=			
Math	F >=			
Math	G >=			
Math	H >=			
Math	I >=			
Math	J >=			
Math	K >=			
Math	L >=			

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

In December 2014, stakeholders from the Department of Education, parents, and community received longitudinal data for all Performance Indicators. The stakeholders reviewed the data and proposed targets for all performance indicators for the FFY 2013-2018 State Performance Plan (SPP).

In 2019, OSEP extended the current targets through FFY 2019, therefore, the HIDOE convened the stakeholders to obtain their input on the extended targets. On December 13, 2019 HIDOE presented the historical and current data for each indicator, as appropriate, along with proposed FFY 2019 targets. The HIDOE facilitated the input and feedback session. The facilitator provided the group members with the actual data and targets for each of the indicators beginning with the baseline year. The participants were asked to review the data trend, and ask the following questions for each of the indicators:

- Is the target met?
- Is there progress?
- Is there slippage?
- Keep the same target?
- Propose an alternate?
- What is the rationale?

Stakeholders provided input and reached agreement on FFY 2019 targets.

Membership for our SEAC are an appointment of the Superintendent. The membership is a representative of the State population and composed of individuals involved in or concerned with the education of children with disabilities. The majority of members shall be individuals with disabilities or parents of children with disabilities (ages birth through 26). The membership includes representatives from the following stakeholder groups:

- Parents of children with disabilities (ages birth through 26)
- Individuals with disabilities
- Teachers (general and special education) of children with disabilities
- University of Hawaii and other representatives of other institutions of higher education that prepare special education and related services personnel
- State, district and school education officials
- Administrators of programs for children with disabilities
- Representatives of other state agencies involved in the financing or delivery of related services to children with disabilities
- Representatives of private schools and public charter schools
- Representative of a vocational, community or business organization concerned with provision of transition services to children with disabilities
- Representatives of the State juvenile and adult corrections agencies



- Representative of the Parent Training and Information Center
- Representatives of the community
- Representative of the education office responsible for the coordination of the Education for Homeless Children and Youth Program
- Representative of the state child welfare agency responsible for foster care of children
- Representative of military students and families

The HDOE shared with the stakeholder group that ESEA section 1111(c)(4)(E)(ii) requires any measure used within the Academic Achievement indicator to include the performance of at least 95 percent of all students and 95 percent of all students in each subgroup of students.

**FFY 2018 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts**

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

NO

**Data Source:**

SY 2018-19 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS188; Data Group: 589)

**Date:**

04/08/2020

**Reading Assessment Participation Data by Grade**

Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
a. Children with IEPs	1,420	1,294	1,586	1,590	1,471	1,474			1,121		
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations	1,236	1,121	1,362	1,385	1,258	1,227			844		
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations	10	10	14	12	11	11			15		
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	136	116	174	145	120	149			125		

**Data Source:**

SY 2018-19 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS185; Data Group: 588)

**Date:**

04/08/2020

**Math Assessment Participation Data by Grade**

Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
a. Children with IEPs	1,423	1,299	1,589	1,593	1,476	1,476			1,122		
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations	1,239	1,130	1,371	1,393	1,283	1,242			848		
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations	6	9	14	8	7	10			9		
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	133	114	172	148	124	148			124		

**FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment**

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Overall	9,956	9,481	95.69%	95.00%	95.23%	Met Target	No Slippage
B							N/A	N/A

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
C							N/A	N/A
D							N/A	N/A
E							N/A	N/A
F							N/A	N/A
G							N/A	N/A
H							N/A	N/A
I							N/A	N/A
J							N/A	N/A
K							N/A	N/A
L							N/A	N/A

Group	Group Name	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
A	Overall	XXX
B		XXX
C		XXX
D		XXX
E		XXX
F		XXX
G		XXX
H		XXX
I		XXX
J		XXX
K		XXX
L		XXX

**FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment**

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Overall	9,978	9,532	95.83%	95.00%	95.53%	Met Target	No Slippage
B							N/A	N/A
C							N/A	N/A
D							N/A	N/A
E							N/A	N/A
F							N/A	N/A
G							N/A	N/A
H							N/A	N/A
I							N/A	N/A
J							N/A	N/A
K							N/A	N/A
L							N/A	N/A

Group	Group Name	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
A	Overall	XXX
B		XXX
C		XXX
D		XXX
E		XXX
F		XXX
G		XXX
H		XXX
I		XXX
J		XXX
K		XXX
L		XXX

**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 a unitary system, Hawaii is a single State Educational Agency (SEA) and Local Educational Agency (LEA). The FFY 2017 SPP/APR was posted on the HIDOE website indicated below within a week of submission to OSEP of its revised version submitted during the clarification process in April of 2019, which was within the IDEA requirements, no later than 120 days following the submission of HIDOE’s APR to OSEP as required by 34 CFR §303.702(b)(1)(i)(A).

<http://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/VisionForSuccess/SchoolDataAndReports/StateReports/Pages/Special-Education-Performance-Report.aspx>  
See also IDEA Part B Reports, Data Reports 2017-2018 at: <https://adc.hidoe.us/#/participation>

The most current SPP/APR, FFY 2018, will be posted on the Hawaii Department of Education homepage website indicated below not later than 120 days following the submission of HIDOE’s APR to OSEP as required by 34 CFR §303.702(b)(1)(i)(A).

<http://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/VisionForSuccess/SchoolDataAndReports/StateReports/Pages/Special-Education-Performance-Report.aspx>  
See also IDEA Part B Reports, Data Reports 2018-2019 at: <https://adc.hidoe.us/#/participation>

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

**3B - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR**

**3B - OSEP Response**

The State provided targets for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

**3B - Required Actions**

## Indicator 3C: Proficiency for Students with IEPs

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

#### Data Source

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

#### Measurement

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

#### Instructions

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

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

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

## 3C - Indicator Data

### Reporting Group Selection

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

Group	Group Name	Grade 3	Grade 4	Grade 5	Grade 6	Grade 7	Grade 8	Grade 9	Grade 10	Grade 11	Grade 12	HS
A	Overall I	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
B												
C												
D												
E												
F												
G												
H												
I												
J												
K												
L												

### Historical Data: Reading

Group	Group Name	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A	Overall	2014	Target >=	72.00%	74.00%	48.00%	53.00%	57.00%
A	Overall	11.93%	Actual	21.78%	11.93%	13.30%	14.50%	16.39%
B			Target >=					
B			Actual					
C			Target >=					

C			Actual					
D			Target >=					
D			Actual					
E			Target >=					
E			Actual					
F			Target >=					
F			Actual					
G			Target >=					
G			Actual					
H			Target >=					
H			Actual					
I			Target >=					
I			Actual					
J			Target >=					
J			Actual					
K			Target >=					
K			Actual					
L			Target >=					
L			Actual					

**Historical Data: Math**

Group	Group Name	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A	Overall	2014	Target >=	64.00%	64.00%	41.00%	46.00%	51.00%
A	Overall	9.94%	Actual	14.77%	9.94%	10.90%	11.62%	12.09%
B			Target >=					
B			Actual					
C			Target >=					
C			Actual					
D			Target >=					
D			Actual					
E			Target >=					
E			Actual					
F			Target >=					
F			Actual					
G			Target >=					
G			Actual					
H			Target >=					

H			Actual					
I			Target >=					
I			Actual					
J			Target >=					
J			Actual					
K			Target >=					
K			Actual					
L			Target >=					
L			Actual					

**Targets**

	Group	Group Name	2018	2019
Reading	A >=	Overall	61.00%	61.00%
Reading	B >=			
Reading	C >=			
Reading	D >=			
Reading	E >=			
Reading	F >=			
Reading	G >=			
Reading	H >=			
Reading	I >=			
Reading	J >=			
Reading	K >=			
Reading	L >=			
Math	A >=	Overall	56.00%	56.00%
Math	B >=			
Math	C >=			
Math	D >=			
Math	E >=			
Math	F >=			
Math	G >=			
Math	H >=			
Math	I >=			
Math	J >=			
Math	K >=			
Math	L >=			

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

In December 2014, stakeholders from the Department of Education, parents, and community received longitudinal data for all Performance Indicators. The stakeholders reviewed the data and proposed targets for all performance indicators for the FFY 2013-2018 State Performance Plan (SPP).

In 2019, OSEP extended the current targets through FFY 2019, therefore, the HIDOE convened the stakeholders to obtain their input on the extended targets. On December 13, 2019 HIDOE presented the historical and current data for each indicator, as appropriate, along with proposed FFY 2019 targets. The HIDOE facilitated the input and feedback session. The facilitator provided the group members with the actual data and targets for each of the indicators beginning with the baseline year. The participants were asked to review the data trend, and ask the following questions for each of the indicators:

- Is the target met?
- Is there progress?
- Is there slippage?
- Keep the same target?
- Propose an alternate?

- What is the rationale?

Stakeholders provided input and reached agreement on FFY 2019 targets.

Membership for our SEAC are an appointment of the Superintendent. The membership is a representative of the State population and composed of individuals involved in or concerned with the education of children with disabilities. The majority of members shall be individuals with disabilities or parents of children with disabilities (ages birth through 26). The membership includes representatives from the following stakeholder groups:

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

On December 13, 2019, the HDOE and the stakeholder group agreed to keep the same target as FFY 2018 for FFY 2019.

### FFY 2018 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

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

NO

**Data Source:**

SY 2018-19 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

**Date:**

04/08/2020

### Reading Proficiency Data by Grade

Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	1,382	1,247	1,550	1,542	1,389	1,387			984		
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	117	95	114	116	102	78			106		
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	4	0	4	1	0	0			2		
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient against grade level	67	58	91	68	60	62			44		

**Data Source:**

SY 2018-19 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

**Date:**

04/08/2020

### Math Proficiency Data by Grade

Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a	1,378	1,253	1,557	1,549	1,414	1,400			981		

Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
proficiency was assigned											
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	181	115	98	74	58	52			12		
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	0	1	0	0	0	0			0		
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient against grade level	69	56	88	63	49	59			46		

**FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment**

Group	Group Name	Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	Number of Children with IEPs Proficient	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Overall	9,481	1,189	16.39%	61.00%	12.54%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage
B							N/A	N/A
C							N/A	N/A
D							N/A	N/A
E							N/A	N/A
F							N/A	N/A
G							N/A	N/A
H							N/A	N/A
I							N/A	N/A
J							N/A	N/A
K							N/A	N/A
L							N/A	N/A

Group	Group Name	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
A	Overall	<p>The HDOE has been experiencing teacher shortage and the most severe being special education classroom teachers. This is reflected on the reduction of the percent of highly qualified teachers from FFY 2017 to FFY 2018. School staff have indicated that this shortage is impacting the performance for students with disabilities in reading and math assessment.</p> <p>The HDOE announced a new initiative to tackle the teacher shortage by providing incentives for educators teaching in critical areas that face the most severe shortages, with special education being with the highest incentive from the proposed initiative.</p>
B		XXX
C		XXX
D		XXX
E		XXX
F		



Group	Group Name	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
G		XXX
H		XXX
I		XXX
J		XXX
K		XXX
L		XXX

**FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment**

Group	Group Name	Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	Number of Children with IEPs Proficient	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Overall	9,532	1,021	12.09%	56.00%	10.71%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage
B							N/A	N/A
C							N/A	N/A
D							N/A	N/A
E							N/A	N/A
F							N/A	N/A
G							N/A	N/A
H							N/A	N/A
I							N/A	N/A
J							N/A	N/A
K							N/A	N/A
L							N/A	N/A

Group	Group Name	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
A	Overall	<p>The HIDOE has been experiencing teacher shortage and the most severe being special education classroom teachers. This is reflected on the reduction of the percent of highly qualified teachers from FFY 2017 to FFY 2018. School staff have indicated that this shortage is impacting the performance for students with disabilities in reading and math assessment.</p> <p>The HIDOE announced a new initiative to tackle the teacher shortage by providing incentives for educators teaching in critical areas that face the most severe shortages, with special education being with the highest incentive from the proposed initiative.</p>
B		XXX
C		XXX
D		XXX
E		XXX
F		XXX
G		XXX
H		XXX
I		XXX
J		XXX
K		XXX
L		XXX

## 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 a unitary system, Hawaii is a single State Educational Agency (SEA) and Local Educational Agency (LEA). The FFY 2017 SPP/APR was posted on the HIDOE website indicated below within a week of submission to OSEP of its revised version submitted during the clarification process in April of 2019, which was within the IDEA requirements, no later than 120 days following the submission of HIDOE's APR to OSEP as required by 34 CFR §303.702(b)(1)(i)(A).

<http://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/VisionForSuccess/SchoolDataAndReports/StateReports/Pages/Special-Education-Performance-Report.aspx>  
See also IDEA Part B Reports, Data Reports 2017-2018 at: <https://adc.hidoe.us/#/participation>

The most current SPP/APR, FFY 2018, will be posted on the Hawaii Department of Education homepage website indicated below not later than 120 days following the submission of HIDOE's APR to OSEP as required by 34 CFR §303.702(b)(1)(i)(A).

<http://www.hawaiipublicschools.org/VisionForSuccess/SchoolDataAndReports/StateReports/Pages/Special-Education-Performance-Report.aspx>  
See also IDEA Part B Reports, Data Reports 2018-2019 at: <https://adc.hidoe.us/#/participation>

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

### 3C - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

**Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR**

### 3C - OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

### 3C - Required Actions

## Indicator 4A: Suspension/Expulsion

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

#### Data Source

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

#### Measurement

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

Include State's definition of "significant discrepancy."

#### Instructions

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

Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, use data from 2017-2018), including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity to determine if significant discrepancies are occurring in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions of children with IEPs, as required at 20 U.S.C. 1412(a)(22). The State's examination must include one of the following comparisons:

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

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

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

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

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the data for 2017-2018), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 4A - Indicator Data

### Historical Data

Baseline	2005	1.00%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target <=	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

### Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target <=	0.00%	0.00%

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

In December 2014, stakeholders from the Department of Education, parents, and community received longitudinal data for all Performance Indicators. The stakeholders reviewed the data and proposed targets for all performance indicators for the FFY 2013-2018 State Performance Plan (SPP).

In 2019, OSEP extended the current targets through FFY 2019, therefore, the HIDOE convened the stakeholders to obtain their input on the extended targets. On December 13, 2019 HIDOE presented the historical and current data for each indicator, as appropriate, along with proposed FFY 2019 targets. The HIDOE facilitated the input and feedback session. The facilitator provided the group members with the actual data and targets for each of the indicators beginning with the baseline year. The participants were asked to review the data trend, and ask the following questions for each of the indicators:

- Is the target met?
- Is there progress?
- Is there slippage?
- Keep the same target?
- Propose an alternate?
- What is the rationale?

Stakeholders provided input and reached agreement on FFY 2019 targets.

Membership for our SEAC are an appointment of the Superintendent. The membership is a representative of the State population and composed of individuals involved in or concerned with the education of children with disabilities. The majority of members shall be individuals with disabilities or parents of children with disabilities (ages birth through 26). The membership includes representatives from the following stakeholder groups:

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

The HIDOE shared with the stakeholder group that the target for this indicator is set at 0%.

**FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data**

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

YES

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

0

Number of districts that have a significant discrepancy	Number of Districts that met the State's minimum n-size	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
0	1	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	Met Target	No Slippage

**Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable**

XXX

**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**

Discrepancy is computed by comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions for students with Individual Education Programs (IEPs) to rates for students without an IEP within the Local Education Agency (LEA)/State Education Agency (SEA). Hawaii is a unitary system, one LEA/SEA.

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

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

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

In analyzing the FFY 2018 data, HIDOE used the data from EdFacts Report 088 submitted on November 2018 (Children with Disabilities Disciplinary Removals Suspended/Expelled for More than 10 Days) for the school year 2017- 2018. No sampling for this indicator was involved.

FFY 2018 Special Education

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

(Total number of special education students removed for greater than 10 days) 243 divided by 18861 (Total number of special education students)

=1.29%

Actual Target Data for FFY 2018  
0% (Results Indicator)

Regular Education: (Total number of regular education students removed for greater than 10 days) 611 divided by 161976 (Total number of regular education students) =0.38%

Rate Difference  
1.29% - 0.38%= 0.91%

\*Must be larger than 3% for significant discrepancy

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

**Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2018 using FFY17- FFY18 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.**

NA

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

**The State must report on the correction of noncompliance in next year's SPP/APR consistent with requirements in the Measurement Table and OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008. Please explain why the State did not ensure that policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements.**

XXX

**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.**

XXX

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017**

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

**FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

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

XXX

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

XXX

**FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected**

**Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected**

XXX

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017**

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of PFFY01 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

**Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

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

XXX

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

XXX

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

**Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected**

XXX

**Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

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

XXX

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

XXX

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

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

**Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

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

XXX

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

XXX

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

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

**4A - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

**4A - OSEP Response**

The State provided a target for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts that target.

**4A - Required Actions**

## Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

#### Data Source

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

#### Measurement

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

Include State's definition of "significant discrepancy."

#### Instructions

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

Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, use data from 2017-2018), including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity to determine if significant discrepancies are occurring in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions of children with IEPs, as required at 20 U.S.C. 1412(a)(22). The State's examination must include one of the following comparisons

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

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

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

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

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the data for 2017-2018), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

Targets must be 0% for 4B.

## 4B - Indicator Data

### Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Provide an explanation of why it is not applicable below:

### Historical Data

Baseline	2009	0.00%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

**Targets**

FFY	2018	2019
Target	0%	0%

**FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data**

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

YES

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

0

Number of districts that have a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity	Number of those districts that have policies procedure, or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements	Number of Districts that met the State's minimum n-size	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
0	0	1	0.00%	0%	0.00%	Met Target	No Slippage

**Provide reasons for slippage, if not applicable**

XXX

**Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?**

YES

**State's definition of "significant discrepancy" and methodology**

Methodology

For the analysis, the HIDOE used the data from EdFacts Report 088 submitted on 11/15/2018 (Children with Disabilities Disciplinary Removals Suspended/Expelled for More than 10 Days) for the school year 2017- 2018. No sampling for this indicator was involved.

For the FFY 2018 State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR), the HIDOE used a rate difference methodology to compare the statewide suspension/expulsion rate for students with disabilities in each racial/ethnic category to the statewide suspension/expulsion rate for students without disabilities in the analysis of the SY 2017-2018 data. This is one of the OSEP-approved comparison methodologies that is used to determine whether significant discrepancies in the rates of suspension and expulsion by race/ethnicity are occurring between students with disabilities and students without disabilities [34 CFR §300.170(a)].

Definition of significant discrepancy

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

Hawaii rate difference percentages by race/ethnicity category (state rate of each ethnicity w/ disabilities minus state rate of students w/out disabilities)

State rate for students without disabilities =  $(611/161976) * 100 = 0.38\%$

\*For significant, discrepancy must be larger than 3%.

American Indian

- Suspension/Expulsion rate (more than 10 days) for Special Education student
- o Cell size in this category is less than 5
- State rate for students w/o disabilities = .38%
- o  $(611/161976) * 100 = 0.38\%$
- Rate Difference
- o Cell size in this category is less than 5.

Asian

- Suspension/Expulsion rate (more than 10 days) for Special Education student
- o  $(13/3494) * 100 = 0.37\%$
- State rate for students w/o disabilities = .38%
- o  $(611/161976) * 100 = 0.38\%$
- Rate Difference
- o  $0.37\% - 0.38\% = -.01\%$

Black

- Suspension/Expulsion rate (more than 10 days) for Special Education student
- o Cell size in this category is less than 5.
- State rate for students w/o disabilities = .38%
- o  $(611/161976) * 100 = 0.38\%$
- Rate Difference
- o Cell size in this category is less than 5.

Hispanic

- Suspension/Expulsion rate (more than 10 days) for Special Education student



- o  $(32/3454) * 100 = 0.93\%$
- State rate for students w/o disabilities = .38%
- o  $(611/161976) * 100 = 0.38\%$
- Rate Difference
- o  $0.93\% - 0.38\% = 0.55\%$

Multiple

- Suspension/Expulsion rate (more than 10 days) for Special Education student
- o  $(22/2761) * 100 = 0.80\%$
- State rate for students w/o disabilities = .38%
- o  $(611/161976) * 100 = 0.38\%$
- Rate Difference
- o  $0.80\% - 0.38\% = 0.42\%$

Pacific Islander

- Suspension/Expulsion rate (more than 10 days) for Special Education student
- o  $(153/6914) * 100 = 2.21\%$
- State rate for students w/o disabilities = .38%
- o  $(611/161976) * 100 = 0.38\%$
- Rate Difference
- o  $2.21\% - 0.38\% = 1.83\%$

White

- Suspension/Expulsion rate (more than 10 days) for Special Education student
- o  $(22/2531) * 100 = 0.87\%$
- State rate for students w/o disabilities = .38%
- o  $(611/161976) * 100 = 0.38\%$
- Rate Difference
- o  $0.87\% - 0.38\% = 0.49\%$

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

**Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2018 using 2017-2018 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.**

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

**If YES, select one of the following:**

**The State must report on the correction of noncompliance in next year's SPP/APR consistent with requirements in the Measurement Table and OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008. Please explain why the State did not ensure that policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements.**

XXX

**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.**

XXX

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017**

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

**FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

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

XXX

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

XXX

**FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected**

**Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected**

XXX

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017**

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of PFFY01 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

**Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

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

XXX

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

XXX

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

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

**Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

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

XXX

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

XXX

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

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

**Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

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

XXX

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

XXX

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

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

**4B - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

**4B - OSEP Response**

**4B- Required Actions**

## Indicator 5: Education Environments (children 6-21)

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

#### Data Source

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

#### Measurement

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

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

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

#### Instructions

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

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

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

## 5 - Indicator Data

### Historical Data

	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A	2005	Target >=	37.00%	39.00%	41.00%	47.00%	52.00%
A	23.00%	Data	36.71%	36.90%	36.83%	37.33%	40.63%
B	2005	Target <=	19.00%	18.00%	17.00%	16.00%	15.00%
B	34.00%	Data	19.35%	20.09%	20.24%	20.40%	18.94%
C	2005	Target <=	2.00%	2.00%	1.50%	1.50%	1.50%
C	3.00%	Data	1.04%	1.08%	1.17%	1.15%	1.11%

### Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target A >=	57.00%	57.00%
Target B <=	14.00%	14.00%
Target C <=	1.50%	1.50%

#### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

In December 2014, stakeholders from the Department of Education, parents, and community received longitudinal data for all Performance Indicators. The stakeholders reviewed the data and proposed targets for all performance indicators for the FFY 2013-2018 State Performance Plan (SPP).

In 2019, OSEP extended the current targets through FFY 2019, therefore, the HIDEOE convened the stakeholders to obtain their input on the extended targets. On December 13, 2019 HIDEOE presented the historical and current data for each indicator, as appropriate, along with proposed FFY 2019 targets. The HIDEOE facilitated the input and feedback session. The facilitator provided the group members with the actual data and targets for each of the indicators beginning with the baseline year. The participants were asked to review the data trend, and ask the following questions for each of the indicators:

- Is the target met?
- Is there progress?
- Is there slippage?
- Keep the same target?
- Propose an alternate?
- What is the rationale?

Stakeholders provided input and reached agreement on FFY 2019 targets.

Membership for our SEAC are an appointment of the Superintendent. The membership is a representative of the State population and composed of individuals involved in or concerned with the education of children with disabilities. The majority of members shall be individuals with disabilities or parents of children with disabilities (ages birth through 26). The membership includes representatives from the following stakeholder groups:

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

On December 13, the HIDOE and the stakeholder group agreed to set the targets for FFY 2019 the same as the FFY 2018.

Target A >= 57

Target B <= 14

Target C <= 1.5

#### Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/11/2019	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	17,037
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/11/2019	A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	7,472
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/11/2019	B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	2,921
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/11/2019	c1. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in separate schools	136
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/11/2019	c2. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in residential facilities	22
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/11/2019	c3. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in homebound/hospital placements	48

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

Provide an explanation below

#### FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

	Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	7,472	17,037	40.63%	57.00%	43.86%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage
B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	2,921	17,037	18.94%	14.00%	17.15%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage
C. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	206	17,037	1.11%	1.50%	1.21%	Met Target	No Slippage

	Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
inside separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements [c1+c2+c3]							

	Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX
B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX
C. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements [c1+c2+c3]	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX

Use a different calculation methodology (yes/no)

NO

Please explain the methodology used to calculate the numbers entered above.

Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
A	XXX
B	XXX
C	XXX

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

### 5 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

### 5 - OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFY 2019 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:** Preschool environments: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a:

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

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

#### Data Source

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

#### Measurement

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

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

#### Instructions

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

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

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

### 6 - Indicator Data

#### Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Provide an explanation of why it is not applicable below.

#### Historical Data

	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A	2011	Target >=	33.00%	33.50%	34.00%	34.50%	35.00%
A	33.90%	Data	32.22%	28.72%	27.58%	27.54%	27.34%
B	2011	Target <=	23.70%	23.60%	23.50%	23.40%	23.30%
B	24.20%	Data	27.27%	28.38%	29.58%	24.53%	27.99%

#### Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target A >=	35.50%	35.50%
Target B <=	23.20%	23.20%

#### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

In December 2014, stakeholders from the Department of Education, parents, and community received longitudinal data for all Performance Indicators. The stakeholders reviewed the data and proposed targets for all performance indicators for the FFY 2013-2018 State Performance Plan (SPP).

In 2019, OSEP extended the current targets through FFY 2019, therefore, the HIDEOE convened the stakeholders to obtain their input on the extended targets. On December 13, 2019 HIDEOE presented the historical and current data for each indicator, as appropriate, along with proposed FFY 2019 targets. The HIDEOE facilitated the input and feedback session. The facilitator provided the group members with the actual data and targets for each of the indicators beginning with the baseline year. The participants were asked to review the data trend, and ask the following questions for each of the indicators:

- Is the target met?
- Is there progress?
- Is there slippage?
- Keep the same target?
- Propose an alternate?
- What is the rationale?

Stakeholders provided input and reached agreement on FFY 2019 targets.

Membership for our SEAC are an appointment of the Superintendent. The membership is a representative of the State population and composed of individuals involved in or concerned with the education of children with disabilities. The majority of members shall be individuals with disabilities or parents of children with disabilities (ages birth through 26). The membership includes representatives from the following stakeholder groups:

- Parents of children with disabilities (ages birth through 26)

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

On December 13, 2019, the HIDOE and the stakeholder group agreed to keep the same targets for FFY 2019 as the FFY 2018 targets. The rationale was to keep the same targets for one more year and monitor results.

#### Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)	07/11/2019	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	2,555
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)	07/11/2019	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	688
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)	07/11/2019	b1. Number of children attending separate special education class	546
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)	07/11/2019	b2. Number of children attending separate school	8
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)	07/11/2019	b3. Number of children attending residential facility	2

#### FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

	Number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 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	688	2,555	27.34%	35.50%	26.93%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage
B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility	556	2,555	27.99%	23.20%	21.76%	Met Target	No Slippage

#### Use a different calculation methodology (yes/no)

NO

Please explain the methodology used to calculate the numbers entered above.

#### Provide reasons for slippage for A

Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
A	XXX
B	XXX

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

**6 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR**

**6 - OSEP Response**

The State provided targets for FFY 2019 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

**Provide an explanation of why it is not applicable below.**

## Historical Data

	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A1	2018	Target >=	91.00%	91.50%	71.41%	72.00%	73.00%
A1	62.01%	Data	94.43%	95.82%	71.41%	76.70%	63.59%
A2	2018	Target >=	52.00%	52.50%	49.79%	50.00%	51.00%
A2	44.28%	Data	50.52%	55.34%	49.79%	58.74%	47.99%
B1	2018	Target >=	90.50%	91.00%	73.53%	74.00%	75.00%
B1	65.56%	Data	96.27%	96.96%	73.53%	79.89%	67.37%
B2	2018	Target >=	53.50%	54.00%	53.22%	54.00%	55.00%
B2	49.53%	Data	53.35%	56.03%	53.22%	59.21%	53.82%
C1	2018	Target >=	92.00%	92.50%	73.28%	74.00%	75.00%
C1	63.90%	Data	95.93%	97.58%	73.28%	87.18%	93.16%
C2	2018	Target >=	65.00%	65.50%	55.83%	57.00%	58.00%
C2	40.11%	Data	59.02%	62.93%	55.83%	78.74%	91.33%

## Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target A1 >=	74.00%	74.00%
Target A2 >=	52.00%	52.00%
Target B1 >=	76.00%	76.00%
Target B2 >=	56.00%	56.00%
Target C1 >=	76.00%	76.00%
Target C2 >=	59.00%	59.00%

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

In December 2014, stakeholders from the Department of Education, parents, and community received longitudinal data for all Performance Indicators. The stakeholders reviewed the data and proposed targets for all performance indicators for the FFY 2013-2018 State Performance Plan (SPP).

In 2019, OSEP extended the current targets through FFY 2019, therefore, the HIDOE convened the stakeholders to obtain their input on the extended targets. On December 13, 2019 HIDOE presented the historical and current data for each indicator, as appropriate, along with proposed FFY 2019 targets. The HIDOE facilitated the input and feedback session. The facilitator provided the group members with the actual data and targets for each of the indicators beginning with the baseline year. The participants were asked to review the data trend, and ask the following questions for each of the indicators:

- Is the target met?
- Is there progress?
- Is there slippage?
- Keep the same target?
- Propose an alternate?
- What is the rationale?

Stakeholders provided input and reached agreement on FFY 2019 targets.

Membership for our SEAC are an appointment of the Superintendent. The membership is a representative of the State population and composed of individuals involved in or concerned with the education of children with disabilities. The majority of members shall be individuals with disabilities or parents of children with disabilities (ages birth through 26). The membership includes representatives from the following stakeholder groups:

- Parents of children with disabilities (ages birth through 26)
- Individuals with disabilities
- Teachers (general and special education) of children with disabilities
- University of Hawaii and other representatives of other institutions of higher education that prepare special education and related services personnel
- State, district and school education officials
- Administrators of programs for children with disabilities
- Representatives of other state agencies involved in the financing or delivery of related services to children with disabilities
- Representatives of private schools and public charter schools
- Representative of a vocational, community or business organization concerned with provision of transition services to children with disabilities

- Representatives of the State juvenile and adult corrections agencies
- Representative of the Parent Training and Information Center
- Representatives of the community
- Representative of the education office responsible for the coordination of the Education for Homeless Children and Youth Program
- Representative of the state child welfare agency responsible for foster care of children
- Representative of military students and families

On December 13, 2019, the HDOE and the stakeholder group agreed to keep the same target as FFY 2018 for FFY 2019 while the Department works with Teaching Strategies GOLD to determine the root cause for the statewide decrease from FFY 2017 to FFY 2018.

#### FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

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

743

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

	Number of children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	98	13.19%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	144	19.38%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	172	23.15%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	223	30.01%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	106	14.27%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 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>	395	637	63.59%	74.00%	62.01%	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>	329	743	47.99%	52.00%	44.28%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

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

	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	93	12.52%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	124	16.69%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	158	21.27%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	255	34.32%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	113	15.21%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
B1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome	413	630	67.37%	76.00%	65.56%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
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:</i> $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$							
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:</i> $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$	368	743	53.82%	56.00%	49.53%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

**Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs**

	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	102	13.73%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	137	18.44%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	206	27.73%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	217	29.21%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	81	10.90%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 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.	423	662	93.16%	76.00%	63.90%	Did Not Meet Target	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.	298	743	91.33%	59.00%	40.11%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
A1	<p>Prior to FFY 2017, the HIDOE used 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 FFY 2017, the HIDOE began to use GOLD® (by Teaching Strategies) as a replacement.</p> <p>In August 2017, Teaching Strategies converted their online platform to accommodate the changes made to the tool when it was expected to include items up to the third grade.</p> <p>In Fall 2018, a consensus was reached among large-scale GOLD® users with OSEP reporting that the process for converting raw scores to scale scores for Outcome 3/C was not classifying children into useful categories according to their developmental progress. The specific consensus was that the cut scores in use appeared to be too generous in that too many children were being classified as meeting expectations or exceeding expectations.</p> <p>Based on the consensus noted above, since the methodology for scoring data was changed, the FFY 2018 becomes the new baseline for Indicator B7.</p>

Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
<b>A2</b>	<p>Prior to FFY 2017, the HIDEOE used 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 FFY 2017, the HIDEOE began to use GOLD® (by Teaching Strategies) as a replacement.</p> <p>In August 2017, Teaching Strategies converted their online platform to accommodate the changes made to the tool when it was expected to include items up to the third grade.</p> <p>In Fall 2018, a consensus was reached among large-scale GOLD® users with OSEP reporting that the process for converting raw scores to scale scores for Outcome 3/C was not classifying children into useful categories according to their developmental progress. The specific consensus was that the cut scores in use appeared to be too generous in that too many children were being classified as meeting expectations or exceeding expectations.</p> <p>Based on the consensus noted above, since the methodology for scoring data was changed, the FFY 2018 becomes the new baseline for Indicator B7.</p>
<b>B1</b>	<p>Prior to FFY 2017, the HIDEOE used 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 FFY 2017, the HIDEOE began to use GOLD® (by Teaching Strategies) as a replacement.</p> <p>In August 2017, Teaching Strategies converted their online platform to accommodate the changes made to the tool when it was expected to include items up to the third grade.</p> <p>In Fall 2018, a consensus was reached among large-scale GOLD® users with OSEP reporting that the process for converting raw scores to scale scores for Outcome 3/C was not classifying children into useful categories according to their developmental progress. The specific consensus was that the cut scores in use appeared to be too generous in that too many children were being classified as meeting expectations or exceeding expectations.</p> <p>Based on the consensus noted above, since the methodology for scoring data was changed, the FFY 2018 becomes the new baseline for Indicator B7.</p>
<b>B2</b>	<p>Prior to FFY 2017, the HIDEOE used 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 FFY 2017, the HIDEOE began to use GOLD® (by Teaching Strategies) as a replacement.</p> <p>In August 2017, Teaching Strategies converted their online platform to accommodate the changes made to the tool when it was expected to include items up to the third grade.</p> <p>In Fall 2018, a consensus was reached among large-scale GOLD® users with OSEP reporting that the process for converting raw scores to scale scores for Outcome 3/C was not classifying children into useful categories according to their developmental progress. The specific consensus was that the cut scores in use appeared to be too generous in that too many children were being classified as meeting expectations or exceeding expectations.</p> <p>Based on the consensus noted above, since the methodology for scoring data was changed, the FFY 2018 becomes the new baseline for Indicator B7.</p>
<b>C1</b>	<p>Prior to FFY 2017, the HIDEOE used 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 FFY 2017, the HIDEOE began to use GOLD® (by Teaching Strategies) as a replacement.</p> <p>In August 2017, Teaching Strategies converted their online platform to accommodate the changes made to the tool when it was expected to include items up to the third grade.</p> <p>In Fall 2018, a consensus was reached among large-scale GOLD® users with OSEP reporting that the process for converting raw scores to scale scores for Outcome 3/C was not classifying children into useful categories according to their developmental progress. The specific consensus was that the cut scores in use appeared to be too generous in that too many children were being classified as meeting expectations or exceeding expectations.</p> <p>Based on the consensus noted above, since the methodology for scoring data was changed, the FFY 2018 becomes the new baseline for Indicator B7.</p>
<b>C2</b>	<p>Prior to FFY 2017, the HIDEOE used 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 FFY 2017, the HIDEOE began to use GOLD® (by Teaching Strategies) as a replacement.</p> <p>In August 2017, Teaching Strategies converted their online platform to accommodate the changes made to the tool when it was expected to include items up to the third grade.</p> <p>In Fall 2018, a consensus was reached among large-scale GOLD® users with OSEP reporting that the process for converting raw scores to scale scores for Outcome 3/C was not classifying children into useful categories according to their developmental progress. The specific consensus was that the cut scores in use appeared to be too generous in that too many children were being classified as meeting expectations or exceeding expectations.</p>

Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
	Based on the consensus noted above, since the methodology for scoring data was changed, the FFY 2018 becomes the new baseline for Indicator B7.

**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

**Please explain why the State did not 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
Was sampling used?	NO
If yes, has your previously-approved sampling plan changed?	
If the plan has changed, please provide sampling plan	

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

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

YES

**If no, provide the criteria for defining “comparable to same-aged peers.”**

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

In 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 Hawaii Department of Education (DOE) 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.

TS GOLD is an online assessment tool, aligned with OSEP preschool outcomes and the Hawaii Early Learning and Development Standards (HELDS), and converts student progress information into the seven (7) point scale on the Child Outcomes Summary Form (COSF). Children with ratings of six or seven are considered to be functioning at a level "comparable to same-aged peers." Procedures to gather data for this indicator required TS GOLD training for all Early Childhood Special Education (ECSE) teachers.

In August 2017, Teaching Strategies converted their online platform to accommodate the changes made to the tool when it was expected to include items up to the third grade.

In Fall 2018, a consensus was reached among large-scale GOLD® users with OSEP reporting that the process for converting raw scores to scale scores for Outcome 3 was not classifying children into useful categories according to their developmental progress. The specific consensus was that the cut scores in use appeared to be too generous in that too many children were being classified as Meeting Expectations or Exceeding Expectations.

Based on the consensus noted above, since the methodology for scoring data was changed, the FFY 2018 becomes the new baseline for Indicator B7.

No sampling was conducted.

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

### 7 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

**Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR**

### 7 - OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

The State did not provide verification that the attachment it included in its FFY 2018 SPP/APR submission is in compliance with Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended (Section 508), as required by Section 508 and noted in the FFY 2018 SPP/APR User Guides and technical webinar.

**Note:** During clarification period 4/16/2020-4/30/2020, HIDEOE reviewed the indicator data and recognized that the attachment previously submitted with the initial submission was not necessary.

### 7 - Required Actions

## Indicator 8: Parent involvement

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

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

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

#### Data Source

State selected data source.

#### Measurement

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

#### Instructions

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

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

Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

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

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

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

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

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

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

### 8 - Indicator Data

	Yes / No
Do you use a separate data collection methodology for preschool children?	NO
If yes, will you be providing the data for preschool children separately?	XXX

#### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

In December 2014, stakeholders from the Department of Education, parents, and community received longitudinal data for all Performance Indicators. The stakeholders reviewed the data and proposed targets for all performance indicators for the FFY 2013-2018 State Performance Plan (SPP).

In 2019, OSEP extended the current targets through FFY 2019, therefore, the HIDEOE convened the stakeholders to obtain their input on the extended targets. On December 13, 2019 HIDEOE presented the historical and current data for each indicator, as appropriate, along with proposed FFY 2019 targets. The HIDEOE facilitated the input and feedback session. The facilitator provided the group members with the actual data and targets for each of the indicators beginning with the baseline year. The participants were asked to review the data trend, and ask the following questions for each of the indicators:

- Is the target met?
- Is there progress?
- Is there slippage?
- Keep the same target?
- Propose an alternate?
- What is the rationale?

Stakeholders provided input and reached agreement on FFY 2019 targets.

Membership for our SEAC are an appointment of the Superintendent. The membership is a representative of the State population and composed of individuals involved in or concerned with the education of children with disabilities. The majority of members shall be individuals with disabilities or parents of children with disabilities (ages birth through 26). The membership includes representatives from the following stakeholder groups:

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

- Representative of the education office responsible for the coordination of the Education for Homeless Children and Youth Program
- Representative of the state child welfare agency responsible for foster care of children
- Representative of military students and families

On December 13, 2019, the HIDEOE and the stakeholder group agreed to set the target at 60% for FFY 2019. The rationale to increase target to 60% was based on the actual data showing an increase from 54.88% in 2017 to 57.42 in 2018.

#### Historical Data

<b>Baseline</b>	2005	34.00%			
<b>FFY</b>	<b>2013</b>	<b>2014</b>	<b>2015</b>	<b>2016</b>	<b>2017</b>
Target >=	53.00%	53.00%	53.00%	53.00%	54.00%
Data	51.18%	53.53%	54.33%	56.55%	54.88%

#### Targets

<b>FFY</b>	<b>2018</b>	<b>2019</b>
Target >=	54.00%	60.00%

#### FFY 2018 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 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
654	1,139	54.88%	54.00%	57.42%	Met Target	No Slippage

The number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed.

19,592

Percentage of respondent parents

5.81%

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

XXX

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.

HIDEOE uses a parent survey consisting of a 25-item rating scale, the Schools' Efforts to Partner with Parents Scale (SEPPS), developed and validated by the National Center for Special Education and Accountability Monitoring (NCSEAM). Parents, of students (ages 3-21) receiving special education services, were provided a survey through the student's school after the student's annual IEP meeting. Surveys were collected year round from August 1, 2018 until July 31, 2019. In total, 19,592 paper surveys were distributed. 1,139 surveys from parents were mailed directly to Piedra Data Services, HIDEOE's contracted data analysis company. Overall, the valid response rate was 5.8%. This number exceeds the minimum number required for an adequate confidence level based on established survey sample guidelines (e.g., <https://surveysystem.com/sscalc.htm>). Cover letters and postage-paid business reply envelopes were included with the surveys. To protect student confidentiality, no child information was tied to the identifiers; demographic information used in the analyses was taken strictly from responses provided by parents to the last five survey items (items 26-30).

#### Historical Data

	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>FFY</b>	<b>2013</b>	<b>2014</b>	<b>2015</b>	<b>2016</b>	<b>2017</b>
Preschool	XXX	Target >=	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX
Preschool	XXX	Data	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX
School age	XXX	Target >=	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX
School age	XXX	Data	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX

#### Targets

<b>FFY</b>	<b>2018</b>	<b>2019</b>
Target A >=	XXX	XXX
Target B >=	XXX	XXX



**FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data: Preschool Children Reported Separately**

	<b>Number of respondent parents who report schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities</b>	<b>Total number of respondent parents of children with disabilities</b>	<b>FFY 2017 Data</b>	<b>FFY 2018 Target</b>	<b>FFY 2018 Data</b>	<b>Status</b>	<b>Slippage</b>
Preschool	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX
<b>School age</b>	<b>XXX</b>	<b>XXX</b>	<b>XXX</b>	<b>XXX</b>	<b>XXX</b>	<b>XXX</b>	<b>XXX</b>

**Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable**

XXX

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

XXX

**Percentage of respondent School-Age parents**

XXX

	<b>Yes / No</b>
Was sampling used?	NO
If yes, has your previously-approved sampling plan changed?	
If yes, provide sampling plan.	

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

	<b>Yes / No</b>
Was a survey used?	YES
If yes, is it a new or revised survey?	NO
If yes, provide a copy of the survey.	XXX
The demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services.	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.**

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

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

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

Hawaii's mean measure on the SEPPS is 634, with a standard deviation of 161. The standard error of the sample mean is 4.8. The 95% confidence interval for the sample mean is 624.6-643.3. This means that there is a 95% likelihood that the true value of the state mean is within the range. The data was also weighed and analyzed by race/ethnicity and primary disability. The weighted data had a mean measure of 635 and 631 when weighted by race/ethnicity and primary disability, respectively. The obtained sampled mean value of SEPPS may become a biased estimate of the true population mean if the sample used to compute the mean is not representative of the population as a whole with respect to key demographic variables. For example, if the distribution of race/ethnicity in the sample is not representative of that in the population as a whole, the resulting sample mean may not be representative of the overall population mean. As a result of this effect, it is often of interest to obtain a sample mean that weighs the contribution of each relevant demographic group (e.g., racial/ethnic group) according to the weight attributed to that group in the population. Such a mean is called a weighted mean. To obtain a mean value of SEPPS measures that is weighted with respect to race/ethnicity of the population, the following procedures are followed. First, the mean SEPPS measure of each race/ethnicity category (i.e., White, Black/African – American, etc.) is obtained for the sample. Then the sample mean for each race/ethnicity category is multiplied by the proportion of the population classified as the particular race/ethnicity category. Finally, the category level products (sample mean for the category multiplied by population for the category) are summed to yield the final weighted

mean. A similar procedure would be used to obtain a weighted percentage meeting the criterion of 600 with the exception that the sample mean for each race/ethnicity category would be replaced by the sample percentage meeting the criterion of 600 for each race/ethnicity category. Similarly, a mean that was weighted by primary disability would follow analogous procedures with the exception that the categories would correspond to primary disability rather than race.

The percent of parents who reported that schools facilitated parent involvement, calculated as the percentage of respondents with a SEPPS measure at or above the adopted standard of 600, is 57% (unweighted) with a 95% confidence interval. When weighted by race/ethnicity and primary disability, the percent meeting the standard is 58% and 57% with a 95% confidence interval.

A parent with a measure of 600 would typically have expressed strong or very strong agreement with items having higher calibrations at or below 600, and would have expressed simple agreements with items having higher calibrations. Fifty-seven percent of parents of students with disabilities in Hawaii had measures high enough to support the claim that schools facilitate parent involvement at the level deemed desirable and appropriate by the HIDO.

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

**8 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR**

**8 - OSEP Response**

The State provided a target for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts that target.

**8 - Required Actions**

## Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representation

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** Disproportionality

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

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

#### Data Source

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

#### Measurement

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

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

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

#### Instructions

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

States are not required to report on underrepresentation.

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

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

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

Targets must be 0%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken. If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2017), 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

Provide an explanation of why it is not applicable below.

#### Historical Data

Baseline	2005	0.00%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

#### Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target	0%	0%

**FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data**

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

YES

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

0

Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services	Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	Number of districts that met the State's minimum n and/or cell size	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
0	0	1	0.00%	0%	0.00%	Met Target	No Slippage

**Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable**

XXX

**Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?**

YES

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

Measurement:

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

(0 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.

HIDOE Methodology:

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

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

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

HIDOE Process for Identifying Disproportionality

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

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

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

The second tier consists of a two (2) prong analysis, a review relating to over-identification. From the racial/ethnic groups identified in Tier I, a

representative sample of student files are reviewed utilizing the Analysis of Identified Procedures and Practices (AIPP) to determine if students were appropriately identified by 34 CFR §300.173, 300.111 and 300.301 through 300.311. Policies, practices, and procedures are reviewed, as necessary, with identified noncompliance related to inappropriate practices addressed under HIDOE's general supervision process.

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

State Description of Disproportionality Determination (Tier II):

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

For FFY 2018, HIDOE used a sample size determined by a 90% confidence interval with a tolerated margin of error of 10% for each group identified as having disproportionate representation. In the case for Indicator B9, there was one group over-identified (Native Hawaiian and other Pacific Islanders - PI), with 564 students in that group (students identified in SY 2018-19), and the sample size was 61.

All students in the analysis samples for B9 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 B9 groups.

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

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

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017**

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

**FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

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

XXX

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

XXX

**FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected**

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017**

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of PFFY01 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

**Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

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

XXX

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

XXX

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

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

**Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

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

XXX

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

XXX

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

**Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected**

XXX

**Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

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

XXX

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

XXX

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

**Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected**

XXX

### **9 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

### **9 - OSEP Response**

### **9 - Required Actions**

## Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representation in Specific Disability Categories

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** Disproportionality

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

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

#### Data Source

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

#### Measurement

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

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

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

#### Instructions

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

States are not required to report on underrepresentation.

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

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

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

Targets must be 0%.

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2017), 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

Provide an explanation of why it is not applicable below

#### Historical Data

Baseline	2005	0.00%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

#### Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target	0%	0%

**FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data**

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

YES

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

0

Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories	Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	Number of districts that met the State's minimum n and/or cell size	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
0	0	1	0.00%	0%	0.00%	Met Target	No Slippage

**Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable**

XXX

**Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?**

YES

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

Measurement:

Percent = [(# of districts, that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups, with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in 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.

(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 in a specific disability category by conducting a file review for each student.

HIDOE Methodology:

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

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

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

HIDOE Process for Identifying Disproportionality

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

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

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

The second tier consists of a two (2) prong analysis, a review relating to over-identification. From the racial/ethnic groups (by the six disability categories for indicator 10) identified in Tier I, a representative sample of student files are reviewed utilizing the Analysis of Identified Procedures and Practices (AIPP) to determine if students were appropriately identified by 34 CFR §300.173, 300.111 and 300.301 through 300.311. Policies, practices, and procedures are reviewed as necessary, with identified noncompliance related to inappropriate practices addressed under the HIDOE’s general



supervision process.

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

State Description of Disproportionality Determination (Tier II):

The state analyzes the identification practices from a representative sampling of students in the racial or ethnic group that is disproportionately over identified (by the six disability categories for indicator B10) by conducting a file review for each student in the sample.

For FFY 2018, the HIDOE used a sample size determined by a 90% confidence interval with a tolerated margin of error of 10% for each group identified as having disproportionate representation. For indicator B10, the over-identified groups were: ID, SLD, ED and OHI for Native Hawaiian and other Pacific Islanders, with 37, 323, 44, and 95 students identified in SY 2018-19, and their sample sizes were 24, 56, 27, and 40 respectively; SLD and OHI for Hispanic students, with 285 and 106 new students with sample sizes of 56 and 41 respectively; and SoL, OHI and Autism for White students with 45, 104 and 28 new students with sample sizes of 24, 41, and 28 respectively. All students in the analysis samples for B10 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 both B9 and B10 groups.

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

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

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017**

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

**FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

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

XXX

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

XXX

**FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected**

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017**

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of PFFY01 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

**Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

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

XXX

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

XXX

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

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

**Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

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

XXX

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

XXX

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

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

**Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

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

XXX

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

XXX

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

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

**10 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

**10 - OSEP Response**

**10 - Required Actions**

## Indicator 11: Child Find

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** Effective General Supervision Part B / Child Find

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

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

#### Data Source

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

#### Measurement

- # of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received.
- # 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 2018 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2017), 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	2005	93.77%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	97.49%	96.43%	95.60%	95.25%	95.20%

### Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target	100%	100%

### FFY 2018 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 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
4,855	4,631	95.20%	100%	95.39%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

#### Provide reasons for slippage

XXX

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

224

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 School Year 2018-2019:**

- A total of 4855 Initial Evaluations were completed.
- 224 Initial Evaluations were completed beyond the 60-day timeline.
- 95.38% of Initial Evaluations were completed within less than or equal to 60-day timeline.

**Eligible IDEA:**

- A total of 3744 of Initial Evaluations were IDEA eligible.
- 154 eligible IDEA Initial Evaluations were completed beyond the 60-day timeline.
- 95.89% of Initial Evaluations were completed within less than or equal to the 60-day timeline.

**Ineligible IDEA:**

- A total of 1111 of Initial Evaluations were IDEA ineligible.
- 70 ineligible IDEA Initial Evaluations were completed beyond the 60-day timeline.
- 93.7% 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 154 Eligible Initial Evaluations were completed.

- 70 were completed within 1-10 days beyond the 60-day timeline.
- 46 were completed within 11-30 days beyond the 60-day timeline.
- 23 were completed within 31-60 days beyond the 60-day timeline.
- 15 were completed beyond 60 days beyond the 60-day timeline.

A total of 70 Not Eligible Initial Evaluations were completed.

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

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

A total of 154 Eligible Initial Evaluations were delayed beyond the 60-Day timeline.

- 11 were delayed due to parent not being available.
- 8 were delayed to student not being available.
- 15 were delayed due to parental request.
- 1 was delayed due to provider not being available.
- 6 were delayed due to provider's report not being available.
- 113 were delayed due to unknown reasons.

A total of 70 Not Eligible Initial Evaluations were delayed beyond the 60-Day timeline.

- 11 were delayed due to parent not being available.
- 3 were delayed to student not being available.
- 6 were delayed due to parental request.
- 2 was delayed due to provider not being available.
- 1 were delayed due to provider's report not being available.
- 47 were delayed due to unknown reasons.

**Indicate the evaluation timeline used:**

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

**What is the State's timeline for initial evaluations? If the State-established timeframe provides for exceptions through State regulation or policy, describe cases falling within those exceptions and include in (b).**

**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 HIDOE monitors the entire system of individual complexes and individual schools. The data for Indicator 11, Child Find, was retrieved through HIDOE's electronic Comprehensive Student Support System (eCSSS) for all students receiving initial evaluations in the School Year (SY) 2018-19.

**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)**

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017**

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
30	30	0	0

**FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

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

The HIDEOE identified findings in (30) Complexes, based on a total of 244 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)).

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

OSEP Memo 09-02 Prong 2: In order to ensure that these complexes were correctly implementing the 60-day timeline, the HIDEOE 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 HIDEOE has verified for Indicator 11 each complex area that was notified of noncompliance has demonstrated they have met the two prongs of correction within one year of the finding:

- each individual case of noncompliance is corrected
- each complex area that did not meet the 100% compliance demonstrated evidence of achieving 100% compliance based on a review of updated data

The HIDEOE notified in writing the (30) complexes that noncompliance was verified and corrected.

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

OSEP Memo 09-02 Prong 1: HIDEOE identified findings in thirty (30) complexes, based on a total of two hundred forty-four (244) 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 HIDEOE's monitoring team reviewed the files of these 244 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 office informed the complex area superintendents of the 30 complexes and the district educational specialist of the findings and the timeline for submittal and implementation of corrective actions, consistent with the requirements of IDEA and the 09-02 memo. Each individual instance of noncompliance was corrected and the 30 complexes provided written responses of correction and supporting data to the MAC. Additionally, utilizing the eCSSS database, the MAC conducted a subsequent review of all students still enrolled at the time of correction and verified all to be in compliance, satisfying Prong 1.

**FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected**

**Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected**

XXX

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017**

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of PFFY01 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

**Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

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

XXX

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

XXX

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

**Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected**

XXX

**Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

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

XXX

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

XXX

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

**Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected**

XXX

**Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

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

XXX

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

XXX

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

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

**11 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

**11 - OSEP Response**

**11 - Required Actions**

## Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition

### Instructions and Measurement

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

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

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

#### Data Source

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

#### Measurement

- # of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.
- # of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to their third birthdays.
- # of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.
- # 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.
- # of children determined to be eligible for early intervention services under Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.
- # of children whose parents chose to continue early intervention services beyond the child's third birthday through a State's policy under 34 CFR §303.211 or a similar State option.

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

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

#### Instructions

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

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

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

Targets must be 100%.

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2017), 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

Provide an explanation of why it is not applicable below.

#### Historical Data

Baseline	2005	90.90%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	95.97%	92.48%	96.01%	92.96%	94.98%

#### Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target	100%	100%

#### FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

a. Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.	751
b. Number of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to third birthday.	100
c. Number of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	554

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.	47
e. Number of children who were referred to Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.	10
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

	Numerator (c)	Denominator (a-b-d-e-f)	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 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.	554	594	94.98%	100%	93.27%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

**Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable**

Although, the HIDEOE decreased progress towards achieving 100% compliance for this indicator (94.98% in FFY 2017 to 93.27% in FFY 2018), in discussion with our Part C partners, this decrease may have been due to inconsistencies of understanding when the transition notices should be sent to Part B. The HIDEOE continues to refine the referral process between Part C and Part B.

**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**

40

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

Reasons for Delays:

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

Forty (40) children, in thirty-two (32) schools were included in (a) but not in (b), (c), (d), or (e).

- Twenty-four (24) 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.
- Eleven (11) children were delayed in the evaluation, eligibility and IEP development process.
- Four (4) children were determined not to be evaluated; however, were found eligible after their 3rd birthday.
- One (1) student was found eligible, however student was withdrawn from school and no IEP was developed.

Range of Days Beyond Age 3

The number of days beyond the third birthday ranged from 2 to 85.

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

- 1-10 with 17 cases
- 11-20 with 4 cases
- 21-30 with 4 cases
- 31-40 with 6 cases
- 41-50 with 4 cases
- > 50 with 5 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 school year (SY) 2018-2019 (July 1, 2018 – June 30, 2019). For each child, the report includes:

- Birth date
- Date of the child's third birthday
- Date the school received the referral
- Number of days the referral was received prior to the third birthday
- Date the parent signed consent for the initial evaluation
- Date the evaluation is projected to be completed (In Hawaii, evaluations are considered complete when services are available; 60 days from consent.)



- Evaluation Status (IDEA eligible, (Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) ineligible, withdrawn, consent revoked)
- Referral Source (Part C, if applicable)
- Date the initial Individualized Education Program (IEP) was held
- Date services were made available

The data from the report generated for SY 2018 - 2019 was reviewed by the Monitoring and Compliance Educational Specialist (ES) and Preschool Special Education Section ES to ensure the accuracy of the information about each individual child. In addition, Monitoring and Compliance Office collects and maintains Part C Transition Notices which provide information on when children were referred to Part C, and when Part C referred the children to Part B.

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

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017**

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

**FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

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

The Hawaii Department of Education (HIDOE) issued sixteen (16) findings of noncompliance for the children who were referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, but who did not have an Individualized Education Plan (IEP) developed and implemented by their third birthdays. These sixteen (16) findings were issued in thirteen (13) complexes. Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) Memo 09-02 Prong 1 verification is described in the next section. OSEP Memo 09-02 Prong 2: In order to ensure that these complexes were correctly implementing early childhood transitions, the HIDOE reviewed subsequent early childhood transition data collected through the electronic Comprehensive Student Support System (eCSSS) database and verified that 100% of these subsequent files on these thirteen (13) complexes were compliant, consistent with 34 CFR §300.124(b). Satisfying the two verification tests consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02; the HIDOE has verified the correction of all individual cases of noncompliance identified in FFY 2017 for Indicator 12 and the correct implementation of the regulatory requirements in accordance with 34 CFR §300.124(b) within a year of the notification of noncompliance, the thirteen (13) complexes were notified in writing that noncompliance was verified as corrected.

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

OSEP Memo 09-02 Prong 1: The Hawaii Department of Education (HIDOE) issued sixteen (16) findings of noncompliance in thirteen (13) complexes. The HIDOE's monitoring team reviewed the files of these 16 children in the 13 complexes through the eCSSS database and verified all of those students who were still enrolled at the time of the review had an IEP developed, although late (past their third birthday), satisfying Prong 1 verification. Written notification informed the 13 complex area superintendents and the district educational specialists of the findings and the timeline for submittal and implementation of corrective actions, consistent with the requirements of IDEA and the 09-02 memo.

**FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected**

**Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected**

XXX

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017**

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of PFFY01 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

**Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

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

XXX

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

XXX

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

**Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected**

XXX

**Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

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

XXX

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

XXX

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

**Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected**

XXX

**Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

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

XXX

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

XXX

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

**Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected**

XXX

## **12 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR**

## **12 - OSEP Response**

## **12 - Required Actions**

## Indicator 13: Secondary Transition

### Instructions and Measurement

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

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

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

#### Data Source

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

#### Measurement

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

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

#### Instructions

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

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. Describe the method used to collect these data and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Targets must be 100%.

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2017), 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	2009	76.00%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	89.30%	84.55%	70.32%	74.14%	64.62%

### Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target	100%	100%

### FFY 2018 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 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
236	341	64.62%	100%	69.21%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

**Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable**

XXX

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

State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

**Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data.**

Data for this Indicator are derived from a review of 341 randomly selected IEPs of students aged 16 years and older from all schools, including public charter schools, which serve students of that age group. These students were selected from SY18-19's special education composition with a confidence level of 90% and an interval of 10%. National Technical Assistance Center on Transition (NTACT) checklist was used to conduct the review. In order to be considered in compliance with the NTACT checklist and Indicator 13, an Individualized Education Program (IEP) must have demonstrated compliance with the eight specific requirements.

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

The FFY 2018 data were disaggregated by eligibility categories and by compliance with each of the eight requirements in the NSSTAC checklist. The eligibility categories included:

- Specific Learning Disability (SLD)
- Other Health Disability (OHD)
- Intellectual Disability (ID)
- Emotional Disability (ED)
- Autism Spectrum Disorder (ASD)
- Speech or Language (SoL)
- Other (Includes, Deaf, Hard of Hearing, Multiple Disabilities, Orthopedic Disability, Traumatic Brain Injury, and Visual including Blindness).

Of the eight specific requirements to meet compliance with this indicator, the following did not meet the 90% level:

- The measurable postsecondary goal(s) are based on age appropriate transition assessment;
- There is evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services were discussed;
- There is evidence that the postsecondary goal(s) were updated annually;
- There is evidence of transition services in the IEP that focus on improving the academic and functional achievement of the child to facilitate their movement from school to post-school.

	Yes / No
Do the State's policies and procedures provide that public agencies must meet these requirements at an age younger than 16?	NO
If yes, did the State choose to include youth at an age younger than 16 in its data for this indicator and ensure that its baseline data are based on youth beginning at that younger age?	
If yes, at what age are youth included in the data for this indicator	

If no, please explain

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

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017**

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
54	54	0	0

**FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

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

The HDOE issued fifty-four (54) findings of noncompliance for youth with Individual Education Plans (IEP) aged 16 whose transition plans did not meet one or more of the requirements under 34 CFR §300.320(b) in thirty-one (31) complexes.

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

The OSEP Memo 09-02 Prong 2: In order to ensure that these complexes were correctly implementing transition services, the HDOE reviewed subsequent transition plans in those IEPs of youth aged 16 and above collected through the electronic Comprehensive Student Support System (eCSSS) database and verified all (100 percent) subsequent transition plans in those IEPs of youth aged 16 and above in thirty-one (31) complexes were compliant within one year of notification consistent with 34 CFR §300.320(b). At the time of this report, all transition plans of students still enrolled in the thirty-one (31) complexes met all B13 requirements under 34 CFR §300.320(b).

Satisfying the two verification tests consistent with the OSEP Memorandum 09-02, HDOE has verified the correction of all individual cases of noncompliance identified in FFY 2018 for Indicator 13 and the correct implementation of the regulatory requirements in accordance with 34 CFR §300.320(b) at the time of this report. The thirty-one (31) complexes were notified in writing that noncompliance was verified as corrected.

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

The HIDEOE's verification of correction of noncompliance is consistent with the OSEP Memo 09-02.

The OSEP Memo 09-02 Prong 1: The HIDEOE issued fifty-four (54) of noncompliance for youth with Individual Education Plans (IEP) aged 16 and above whose transition plans did not meet one or more of the Indicator B13 requirements under 34 CFR § 300.320(b) in thirty-one (31) complexes.

The HIDEOE's monitoring team reviewed the files of the 54 students on the database and verified, within one year of the notification, that all those students in the 31 complexes, who were still enrolled at the time of the review, met all of the Indicator B13 requirements under 34 CFR § 300.320(b).

Written notification informed the complex area superintendents and the district educational specialists of the findings and the timeline for submittal and implementation of corrective actions, consistent with the requirements of IDEA and the 09-02 memo.

**FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected**

**Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected**

XXX

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017**

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of PFFY01 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

**Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

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

XXX

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

XXX

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

**Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected**

XXX

**Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

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

XXX

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

XXX

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

**Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected**

XXX

**Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

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

XXX

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

XXX

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

**Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected**

XXX

**13 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR**

**13 - OSEP Response**

**13 - Required Actions**

## Indicator 14: Post-School Outcomes

### Instructions and Measurement

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

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

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

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

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

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

#### Data Source

State selected data source.

#### Measurement

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

#### Instructions

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

Collect data by September 2019 on students who left school during 2017-2018, timing the data collection so that at least one year has passed since the students left school. Include students who dropped out during 2017-2018 or who were expected to return but did not return for the current school year. This includes all youth who had an IEP in effect at the time they left school, including those who graduated with a regular diploma or some other credential, dropped out, or aged out.

#### I. Definitions

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

*Competitive employment* as used in measures B and C: States have two options to report data under “competitive employment” in the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, due February 2020:

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

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

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

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

#### II. Data Reporting

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

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

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

### III. Reporting on the Measures/Indicators

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

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

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

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

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

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

## 14 - Indicator Data

### Historical Data

	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A	2009	Target >=	33.67%	34.00%	34.00%	35.00%	35.00%
A	38.00%	Data	33.67%	31.45%	35.87%	36.34%	35.17%
B	2009	Target >=	74.90%	75.00%	75.00%	76.00%	77.00%
B	69.00%	Data	74.90%	68.15%	83.37%	85.04%	85.69%
C	2009	Target >=	85.46%	86.00%	86.00%	87.00%	87.00%
C	77.00%	Data	85.46%	73.19%	89.79%	93.11%	93.05%

### FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target A >=	40.00%	40.00%
Target B >=	78.00%	80.00%
Target C >=	88.00%	90.00%

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

In December 2014, stakeholders from the Department of Education, parents, and community received longitudinal data for all Performance Indicators. The stakeholders reviewed the data and proposed targets for all performance indicators for the FFY 2013-2018 State Performance Plan (SPP).

In 2019, OSEP extended the current targets through FFY 2019, therefore, the HIDEOE convened the stakeholders to obtain their input on the extended targets. On December 13, 2019 HIDEOE presented the historical and current data for each indicator, as appropriate, along with proposed FFY 2019 targets. The HIDEOE facilitated the input and feedback session. The facilitator provided the group members with the actual data and targets for each of the indicators beginning with the baseline year. The participants were asked to review the data trend, and ask the following questions for each of the indicators:

- Is the target met?
- Is there progress?
- Is there slippage?
- Keep the same target?
- Propose an alternate?
- What is the rationale?

Stakeholders provided input and reached agreement on FFY 2019 targets.

Membership for our SEAC are an appointment of the Superintendent. The membership is a representative of the State population and composed of individuals involved in or concerned with the education of children with disabilities. The majority of members shall be individuals with disabilities or parents of children with disabilities (ages birth through 26). The membership includes representatives from the following stakeholder groups:

- Parents of children with disabilities (ages birth through 26)
- Individuals with disabilities
- Teachers (general and special education) of children with disabilities



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

As described in the introduction section "stakeholder involvement", the data for this indicator was presented and shared with the stakeholder group at the December 13, 2019 meeting. The HDOE and the stakeholder group agreed to set the targets to the following for FFY 2019:

Target A >= 40

Target B >= 80

Target C >= 90

#### FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	369
1. Number of respondent youth who enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school	126
2. Number of respondent youth who competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	169
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)	15
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).	16

	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 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Enrolled in higher education (1)	126	369	35.17%	40.00%	34.15%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage
B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (1+2)	295	369	85.69%	78.00%	79.95%	Met Target	No Slippage
C. Enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment (1+2+3+4)	326	369	93.05%	88.00%	88.35%	Met Target	No Slippage

Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
A	The slippage represented in the data provided by the respondents for Indicator 14A mirrors the enrollment trend at the Hawaii's public universities and community colleges for all students during the same period. According to data collected by the Hawaii University System, in Fall 2017, undergraduate enrollment at UH system decreased by 3.3 percent and UH community colleges decreased by 4.6 percent. In

Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
	Fall 2018, undergraduate enrollment at UH system decreased by 1.2 percent and UH community colleges decreased by 2.3 percent. This data trend can be found at <a href="https://www.hawaii.edu/iro/">https://www.hawaii.edu/iro/</a> .
B	XXX
C	XXX

**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.

	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	NO
If yes, has your previously-approved sampling plan changed?	
If yes, provide sampling plan.	

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

	Yes / No
Was a survey used?	YES
If yes, is it a new or revised survey?	NO
If yes, attach a copy of the survey	XXX

**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.**

See Attachment, Indicator 14: State's Analyses.

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

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

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

**14 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR**

**14 - OSEP Response**

The State provided targets for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

State did not provide verification that the attachment(s) it included in its FFY 2018 SPP/APR submission is in compliance with Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended (Section 508), as required by Section 508 and noted in the FFY 2018 SPP/APR User Guides and technical webinar.

**14 - Required Actions**

## Indicator 15: Resolution Sessions

### Instructions and Measurement

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

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

#### Data Source

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

#### Measurement

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

#### Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

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

States are not required to establish baseline or targets if the number of resolution sessions is less than 10. In a reporting period when the number of resolution sessions reaches 10 or greater, develop baseline, targets and improvement activities, and report on them in the corresponding SPP/APR. States may express their targets in a range (e.g., 75-85%).

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

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

## 15 - Indicator Data

### Select yes to use target ranges

Target Range not used

### Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2018-19 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/11/2019	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	47
SY 2018-19 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/11/2019	3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	28

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

Provide an explanation below.

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

In December 2014, stakeholders from the Department of Education, parents, and community received longitudinal data for all Performance Indicators. The stakeholders reviewed the data and proposed targets for all performance indicators for the FFY 2013-2018 State Performance Plan (SPP).

In 2019, OSEP extended the current targets through FFY 2019, therefore, the HIDOE convened the stakeholders to obtain their input on the extended targets. On December 13, 2019 HIDOE presented the historical and current data for each indicator, as appropriate, along with proposed FFY 2019 targets. The HIDOE facilitated the input and feedback session. The facilitator provided the group members with the actual data and targets for each of the indicators beginning with the baseline year. The participants were asked to review the data trend, and ask the following questions for each of the indicators:

- Is the target met?
- Is there progress?
- Is there slippage?
- Keep the same target?
- Propose an alternate?
- What is the rationale?

Stakeholders provided input and reached agreement on FFY 2019 targets.

Membership for our SEAC are an appointment of the Superintendent. The membership is a representative of the State population and composed of individuals involved in or concerned with the education of children with disabilities. The majority of members shall be individuals with disabilities or parents of children with disabilities (ages birth through 26). The membership includes representatives from the following stakeholder groups:

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

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

The HDOE and the stakeholder group agreed to set the target at 60% for FFY 2019.

**Historical Data**

<b>Baseline</b>	2005	16.00%			
<b>FFY</b>	<b>2013</b>	<b>2014</b>	<b>2015</b>	<b>2016</b>	<b>2017</b>
Target >=	43.00%	43.00%	44.00%	44.00%	45.00%
Data	16.07%	51.85%	70.51%	43.59%	89.74%

**Targets**

<b>FFY</b>	<b>2018</b>	<b>2019</b>
Target >=	45.00%	60.00%

**FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data**

3.1(a) Number resolutions sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3.1 Number of resolutions sessions	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
28	47	89.74%	45.00%	59.57%	Met Target	No Slippage

**Targets**

<b>FFY</b>	2018 (low)	2018 (high)	2019 (low)	2019 (high)
Target	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX

**FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data**

3.1(a) Number resolutions sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3.1 Number of resolutions sessions	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target (low)	FFY 2018 Target (high)	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX

**Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable**

XXX

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

**15 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR**

**15 - OSEP Response**

The State provided a target for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts that target.

**15 - Required Actions**

## Indicator 16: Mediation

### Instructions and Measurement

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

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

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

#### Data Source

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

#### Measurement

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

#### Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

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

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

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

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

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

## 16 - Indicator Data

### Select yes to use target ranges

Target Range not used

### Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2018-19 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/11/2019	2.1 Mediations held	5
SY 2018-19 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/11/2019	2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	2
SY 2018-19 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/11/2019	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

Provide an explanation below

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

In December 2014, stakeholders from the Department of Education, parents, and community received longitudinal data for all Performance Indicators. The stakeholders reviewed the data and proposed targets for all performance indicators for the FFY 2013-2018 State Performance Plan (SPP).

In 2019, OSEP extended the current targets through FFY 2019, therefore, the HIDEOE convened the stakeholders to obtain their input on the extended targets. On December 13, 2019 HIDEOE presented the historical and current data for each indicator, as appropriate, along with proposed FFY 2019 targets. The HIDEOE facilitated the input and feedback session. The facilitator provided the group members with the actual data and targets for each of the indicators beginning with the baseline year. The participants were asked to review the data trend, and ask the following questions for each of the indicators:

- Is the target met?
- Is there progress?
- Is there slippage?
- Keep the same target?
- Propose an alternate?
- What is the rationale?

Stakeholders provided input and reached agreement on FFY 2019 targets.

Membership for our SEAC are an appointment of the Superintendent. The membership is a representative of the State population and composed of individuals involved in or concerned with the education of children with disabilities. The majority of members shall be individuals with disabilities or parents of children with disabilities (ages birth through 26). The membership includes representatives from the following stakeholder groups:

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

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

In FFY 2018, there were less than 10 mediations. Per the Measurement Table: "States are not required to establish baseline or targets if the number of mediations is less than 10." As such, no baseline or targets have been established. This data was shared with the stakeholder group on December 13, 2019.

**Historical Data**

<b>Baseline</b>	2005				
<b>FFY</b>	<b>2013</b>	<b>2014</b>	<b>2015</b>	<b>2016</b>	<b>2017</b>
Target >=					
Data	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	50.00%	0.00%

**Targets**

<b>FFY</b>	<b>2018</b>	<b>2019</b>
Target >=		

**FFY 2018 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 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
2	2	5	0.00%		80.00%	N/A	N/A

**Targets**

<b>FFY</b>	2018 (low)	2018 (high)	2019 (low)	2019 (high)
Target	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX

**FFY 2018 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 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target (low)	FFY 2018 Target (high)	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX

**Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable**

XXX

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

In FFY 2018, five (5) meditations were conducted. Pursuant to OSEP instructions, the HIDEOE is not required to report on targets for years in which less than 10 mediations are held. Because HIDEOE did not conduct more than 10 mediations, it could not determine progress or slippage or whether it met a target. The HIDEOE consulted the Consortium for Appropriate Dispute Resolution in Special Education (CADRE) website to investigate ways to improve the entire dispute resolution system (written complaints, due process hearings, resolution sessions, mediations). Since the Resolution Session was required by the federal regulations, participation in mediation has dwindled. Although the HIDEOE has encouraged mediation through a variety of sources, mediation is a voluntary option and parties have not opted for mediation but have readily participated in the resolution session process. The resolution session has produced durable resolutions which eliminates the necessity for a formal hearing.

## **16 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

### **Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR**

## **16 - OSEP Response**

The State reported fewer than ten mediations held in FFY 2018. The State is not required to meet its target until any fiscal year in which ten or more mediations were held.

## **16 - Required Actions**

## **Certification**

### **Instructions**

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

#### **Certify**

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

#### **Select the certifier's role:**

Designated by the Chief State School Officer to certify

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

#### **Name:**

Cara Tanimura

#### **Title:**

Acting Director

#### **Email:**

Cara.tanimura@k.12.hi.us

#### **Phone:**

808-307-3604

#### **Submitted on:**

04/29/20 1:20:46 PM



### Indicator 14: State's Analyses

HIDOE's response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school. Examination of the data reveals the respondent rate for both ethnicity and disabilities is representative of the population of those students with disabilities who exited the HIDOE.

<b>Ethnicity</b>	<b>Graduates (%) n= 1012</b>	<b>Respondent (%) n= 369</b>
American Indian/ Native Alaskan	1.48%	1.63%
Asian	24.51%	29.81%
Black	4.54%	6.23%
Hispanic	4.15%	3.79%
Native Hawaiian/ Pacific Islander	47.73%	40.65%
White	15.81%	15.45%
Two or more	1.78%	2.44%

<b>Ethnicity</b>	<b>Graduates (%) n= 1012</b>	<b>Respondent (%) n= 369</b>
Autism	5.53%	6.23%
Deaf	0.40%	0.54%
Emotional Disability	8.20%	7.05%
Hearing Impairment	0.99%	1.08%
Intellectual Disability	4.64%	2.98%
Multiple Disability	0.20%	0.27%
Orthopedic Disability	0.20%	0.54%
Other Health Disability	17.98%	17.62%
Specific Learning Disability	60.57%	61.52%
Speech or Language Disability	0.40%	0.81%
Traumatic Brain Injury	0.40%	0.27%
Visual Disability including Blindness	0.40%	0.81%