

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Indicator 11: Child Find

Historical Data and Targets

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))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data		93.77%	97.00%	95.00%	96.00%	98.00%	98.80%	98.60%	98.20%	97.49%	96.43%

FFY	2015	2016
Target	100%	100%
Data	95.60%	95.25%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Indicator 11: Child Find

FFY 2017 Data

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))

FFY 2017 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 2016 Data	FFY 2017 Target	FFY 2017 Data	Status	Slippage
5,086	4,842	95.25%	100%	95.20%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

Number of children included in (a), but not included in (b) [a-b]	244
---	-----

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.

The following chart indicates the total number of initial evaluations by eligibility and 60 day timeline.

SY	Total Initial Evaluations			Eligible IDEA			Ineligible IDEA		
	Total	>60 days	%<= 60 days	Total	>60 days	%<= 60 days	Total	>60 days	%<= 60 days
2017-18	5086	244	95.2%	3993	178	95.5%	1093	66	94.0%
2016-17	5074	241	95.3%	3764	142	96.2%	1310	99	92.4%
2015-16	5020	221	95.6%	3687	116	96.9%	1333	105	92.1%
2014-15	4791	171	96.4%	3595	100	97.3%	1196	71	93.7%
2013-14	4708	118	97.5%	3869	10	99.7%	839	108	87.1%
2012-13	3950	75	98.2%	2954	49	98.4%	996	25	97.5%
2011-12	5419	78	98.6%	3891	42	98.9%	1528	36	97.6%
2010-11	5379	65	98.8%	3974	41	99.0%	1405	24	98.3%
2009-10	4787	95	98.0%	3338	66	98.0%	1449	29	98.0%
2008-09	5394	199	96.3%	3879	172	95.6%	1515	27	98.2%
2007-08	4348	210	95.2%	3131	161	94.9%	1217	49	96.0%
2006-07	4969	167	96.6%	3388	103	97.0%	1581	64	96.0%
2005-06	5743	344	94.0%	3783	191	95.0%	1960	153	92.2%

The following chart indicates the number of days beyond the 60 day timeline.

	Number of Days Beyond the 60 days									
	Total Initial Evaluations		1-10 days		11-30 days		31-60 days		60+ days	
	Eligible	Not Eligible	Eligible	Not Eligible	Eligible	Not Eligible	Eligible	Not Eligible	Eligible	Not Eligible
2017-18	178	66	99	31	51	24	18	9	10	2
2016-17	142	99	89	57	33	23	11	7	9	12
2015-16	116	105	57	31	40	11	11	18	8	45
2014-15	105	66	51	24	27	20	19	11	8	11
2013-14	10	108	2	57	0	38	7	11	1	2
2012-13	49	26	27	8	16	10	56	6	0	2
2011-12	42	36	29	14	7	11	3	4	3	7
2010-11	41	24	24	8	11	12	6	4	0	0
2009-10	66	29	35	19	23	6	7	1	1	3
2008-09	172	28	90	19	44	6	26	1	12	2
2007-08	161	49	82	30	45	11	23	7	11	1
2006-07	103	64	54	41	*49	*23	*eligible:24 > 30 days; ineligible: 12>30 days			
2005-06	191	153	87	80	**104	**73	**eligible: 67>20 days; ineligible: 44>20 days			

The following chart indicates the reasons for delay beyond the 60 day timeline.

Reasons for Delay

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

	Total Initial Evaluations		Parent not Available		Student Not Available		Parental Request		Provider Not Available		Provider's Report Not Available		Unknown	
	Eligible	Not Eligible	Eligible	Not Eligible	Eligible	Not Eligible	Eligible	Not Eligible	Eligible	Not Eligible	Eligible	Not Eligible	Eligible	Not Eligible
2017-18	178	66	18	1	7	2	11	6	3	1	8	2	131	54
2016-17	142	99	13	7	2	4	15	7	0	0	3	3	111	82
2015-16	116	105	8	7	1	4	10	7	1	1	1	2	95	84
2014-15	100	71	8	4	5	1	13	2	4	0	4	5	65	59
2013-14	10	108	0	1	0	4	0	1	0	0	0	0	10	102
2012-13	47	25	2	0	0	1	3	2	6	1	3	3	33	18
2011-12	43	38	3	2	1	2	2	3	1	1	8	6	28	24
2010-11	42	23	9	3	0	0	1	1	1	2	1	0	30	17
2009-10	66	29	11	5	0	0	8	1	0	0	5	3	40	20
2008-09	172	27	22	5	12	1	17	5	6	2	9	3	84	10
2007-08	161	49	29	11	2	5	19	3	2	2	12	1	81	27
2006-07	103	64	20	11	1	5	0	0	3	0	6	5	63	37
2005-06	191	153	62	46	6	11	0	0	4	1	12	18	93	68

Indicate the evaluation timeline used

- The State used the 60 day timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted.
- The State established a timeline within which the evaluation must be conducted.

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

- State monitoring
- State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

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

Hawaii Department of Education (HIDOE) is a unitary system with one (1) Board of Education (BOE) appointing the Superintendent of Education. HIDOE is both the State Education Agency (SEA)/LEA functioning as the state system and one (1) district. HIDOE monitors the entire system of individual complexes and individual schools. In spring 2017, SEA monitoring duties began to transition to the Monitoring and Compliance Office (MAC) from the Special Education Section (SES).

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) 2017-18.

60 day timeline

The initial evaluation shall be conducted within 60 days of receiving parental consent for the evaluation; and determine if the student is a student with a disability and the educational needs of the student.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Indicator 11: Child Find

Required Actions from FFY 2016

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))

Actions required in FFY 2016 response

none

Note: Any actions required in last year's response table that are related to correction of findings should be responded to on the "Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance" page of this indicator. If your State's only actions required in last year's response are related to findings of noncompliance, a text field will not be displayed on this page.

FFY 2017 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Indicator 11: Child Find

Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance

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))

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2016

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
34	34	0	0

FFY 2016 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

Hawaii Department of Education (HIDOE) identified findings in thirty-four (34) complexes, based on a total of two hundred forty-one (241) 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, HIDOE reviewed subsequent 60-day timeline data collected through the electronic Comprehensive Student Support System (eCSSS) database and verified that 100% of these subsequent files were compliant, consistent with 34 CFR §300.301(c).

Satisfying the two verification tests consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, HIDOE has verified the correction of each individual case of noncompliance identified in FFY 2016 for Indicator 11 and the correct implementation of the regulatory requirements in accordance with 34 CFR §300.301(c) within a year of the noncompliance notification, the thirty-four (34) 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: HIDOE identified findings in thirty-four (34) complexes, based on a total of two hundred forty-one (241) instances of noncompliance for initial evaluations of eligible and ineligible students who were evaluated beyond 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation (60-day timeline, 34 CFR §300.301(c)).

HIDOE's monitoring team reviewed the files of these 241 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 informed the complex area superintendents of the 34 complexes and the district educational specialist of the findings and the timeline for submittal and implementation of corrective actions, consistent with the requirements of IDEA and the 09-02 memo. Each individual instance of noncompliance was required to be corrected with a written response of correction with supporting data and submitted to the Monitoring and Compliance Branch (MAC). Utilizing the eCSSS database, the MAC reviewed the files of all those students who were still enrolled at the time of correction; they were verified to be in compliance satisfying Prong 1.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2016

	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2016 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
None			